As agreed with you, I contacted sometime in December Miss Bag牺牲, asking her to try to find a typist for a potential 2 days/week starting Jan 1. I specified that I would be responsible for deciding about her professional competence and therefore, suggested a 2 days test with no further obligation at this point.

This morning I was surprised to find out that the (very pleasant) young lady sent over to see me last only did not have any Romance language but warned me, when I expressed my willingness to try to instruct her in the difficulties of the assignment, that she is regularly employed and had 2 spare days to offer.

I would like you to help convince Miss Bagid to search for a more suited candidate and thank you in advance for your understanding.
San Marco Project: Report and Budget Statement

February 14, 1978

1. Work accomplished during calendar 1977:

Spring Campaign:

1. N. and S. Galleries of nave
2. Chapel of SS. Peter and Clemente
3. Prophet panels, N. aisle, main nave
4. Isolated saints on intradosses of lower arches, nave.

Photography: Color 13 X 18 262

b/w 18 X 24 262

color slides 645

b/w 6 X 6 125

Fall Campaign:

1. Atrium, Genesis dome and Noah arch

Photography: Color 13 X 18 114

b/w 18 X 24 110

color slides 280

b/w 6 X 6 110

2. List of areas still to be cleaned, photographed and described for the Corpus:

1. Atrium: 12 bays (domes, arches, tympana) 10
2. Capella Zen 1
3. Baptistry 5-6
4. S. Isidore chapel
5. N-W wall, transept (Life of Virgin) 1

3. Schedule:

1. Preparation of San Marco Symposium replaces Spring Field Campaign.
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2. Research travel (NEH Grant budget Item III, A & B)
   July and Sept.

3. Fall campaign in San Marco:
   October: two Bays of Atrium

4. Work on Corpus at D. 0.
   November to mid-January

5. Spring Campaign in San Marco:
   Mid-January to April:
   Capella Zen, Baptistry, completion of Atrium

(Ecclesiastical permission has to be negotiated for these campaigns; Ritter's academic responsibilities in Vienna allow him only October in the Fall, but ca. 10-12 weeks beginning about mid-Jan.)
February 14, 1978

San Marco Project: Budget and Report Estimates

In this project, NEH bears by far most of the staff salaries, shares travel, per diem, etc., while D. O. bears the full cost of the photography and scaffolding. Since the Symposium replaces a field campaign, most of the funds budgeted by D. O. for San Marco in ’77-'78 will not have been expended by June 30, '78.

Current balance, NEH

Estimated balance, DO, June 30

Available July 1, '78 Total

$34,743

36,000

$70,743

Required to complete the Field Work:

From NEH

From DO

Total

$34,743

46,000

80,743

To be budgeted by D.O. for San Marco Field work in '78-'79 $10,000

Analysis:

1. Balance from June 30, 1977 $12,586
   Paid to Ritter, Feb. 1978 8,500
   Bal. 4,000 4,000

2. San Marco Field Budget, '77-'78 43,000
   Total 47,000

3. Expended, July 1-Dec. 31 '77 5,800
   Est. Exp. Jan.-June 30, '78 5,200
   Total 11,000 11,600
   Balance 36,000
February 14, 1978

Fall Campaign (October) and Spring Campaign (Jan.-April) in San Marco, including staff and Research travel and time: $46,000

Photography and Scaffolding, $34,000;

Staff and Research travel and time, $12,000

$46,000

5. San Marco Field Budget, 1978-79 $10,000
Dear Giles,

Attached is a brief but comprehensive report on the current status of the San Marco project. Since both Prof. Demus and Prof. Andreescu are here, I suggest you speak to either of them if you have questions about any points. I believe that the schedule as outlined here is the only possible one, granted the commitment to a Symposium this Spring, granted the photographer's academic commitments in Vienna, and granted the requirements of the ecclesiastical authorities of San Marco. I shall be asking NEH for more time in which to expend the funds they have already committed (no new funds required). I believe they will regard this as reasonable in view of the speed with which this vast project has moved, in view of the facts that Demus has virtually completed the text for his Vol. I, and that we are presenting substantial results to the academic community in a well-articulated symposium,--all within the time-frame of the Field Work Project. I doubt another example of this could be cited, certainly not with reference to any other D.O. project. You will note that D.O.'s commitment for '78-'79 is minimal, granted the carry-over of unexpended funds in the '77-'78 budget.

Naturally, I'll be glad to discuss any points with you.
The Corpus for Wall Mosaics in the N Adriatic Area

The systematic recording of wall-mosaics on a large scale is a difficult undertaking, if not for anything else, because of the scaffolding required to reach the objectives and the costs involved. Several attempts in this direction have been made in the last four decades, starting with Th. Whittemore's reports on the work done in St. Sophia at Istanbul, later reports by C. Mango and E. Hawkins, P. Underwood and Hawkins, R. Cormack and Hawkins, and continuing with the publication of the Kahrie Djami mosaics and those of Lythrangomi, Cyprus. The recording according to the requirements necessary for a corpus, as separated from the study of the mosaics at a later stage, has been one of the main goals of the project involving the churches decorated with wall mosaics of the N Adriatic area. This group of monuments preserves decorations from the XI-XIII centuries as well as later decorations. For the latter, only the mosaics belonging to the XIVth century will be included in our survey.

The recording is done in writing and by photography. Descriptions follow a printed form on which each mosaic figure is analyzed. Since these subjects are the overwhelming majority in the wall decorations, identifying numbers incorporated in a topographic system are ascribed only to figures, while ornaments are treated together with the general survey of the scene where the figures belong, unless the ornament has an independent function within the decoration.

The photographs are in black/white (13 x 18 cm. neg.), color transparencies (13 x 18 cm. or 5 x 7 inches) and color slides 24 x 36 mm. and 6 x 6 cm.). In most cases the black/white coverage repeats the large color transparencies, though sometimes it supplements it. Color slides are taken additionally to record mostly details and close-ups of archaeological and technical value. At
a later stage, after having tried to save time by reducing the transparen-
cies into slides in the laboratory for lecture purposes, it was noticed that
the colors of the slides obtained this way were unsatisfactory; since then
more slides have been taken in situ. The unusual feature of this Corpus if
compared with previous projects, is the extensive color coverage, as well as
the emphasis on details. Color and materials are essential in our under-
standing and definition of the mosaics, as of all painting, and the chromatic
and technical characteristics of a workshop are among the safest factors in
correctly identifying it archaeologically and comparing it with other work-
shops on typological grounds.

The inscriptions are published with the indication of the restorations
which might have affected them since they had been set on the wall.

Because of the impossibility of using more elaborate methods (requiring
both time and funds), the measurements are taken according to an ideal ver-
tical and several horizontal axes for each figure and scene. When possible,
measurements of the architectural units on which the mosaics rest are also
taken. Measurements are not exhaustive but numerous sample figures which are
meant to serve as references are thoroughly measured.

The subsequent entry identifies the technical framework for the mosaic's
execution. A subentry records the setting bed, mainly as it appears from
superficial examination, with no tests made that would involve removal of the
tesserae, and with the principal aim of establishing whether it is still the
original one or if it has been changed at some later stage through restoration.

Other subentries record the background against which the figure is in-
scribed, as well as frames or accessory features connected with our figure.

The largest space is devoted to detailed recording of the figures them-
elves. Only the color scheme and the technical characteristics of the glass
paste and/or stone cubes are stated. Attention is paid to the garments, the attributes and especially to the head, the hands and the feet. The head's features are each individually analyzed in detail. It has been possible to establish over a large number of recorded figures (and considering mostly the head, hands, and feet), the existence of several schemes and sub-schemes used in various combinations, either all through a workshop with subdivisions of "hands", or defining different workshops and allowing us to compare them on a technical, more objective basis, before stylistic interpretations are undertaken.

The state of preservation has been recorded in as far as visible changes have altered the original, but only by close examination of the object and without being able to use more elaborate testing systems. At this point, the research of local archives has proved indispensable and while important evidence of those restorations has been lost in time, much material came out as a result of our search. This information will be incorporated under the entry "state of preservation", in quoted or condensed forms, accordingly.

Finally space for an entry allowing for general observations, has been reserved on our form and has proved very useful in the process of making the first records on the scaffolding, allowing for visual associations to be jotted down to be checked further, and eventually incorporated or excluded from the final version of the form.

For the published version, to help place the figures in the monument's context, the larger units and/or compositions will be briefly introduced in the publication, following basically the same criteria of technical observations, and preceding the detailed presentation of the individual entries. A code has been tentatively conceived, identifying each figure by site, monument, part of the monument, composition, place in the composition vertical and hori-
zontal, from top to bottom and left to right (for example: TO, SMA, W, III, 6 will be read as Torcello, Santa Maria Assunta, West Wall, 3rd register [Last Judgment], 6th figure [Apostle Peter]). To indicate the photographic coverage, the classification for the black and white negatives and the large color transparencies follows the one used at the Photo Collection of the Byzantine Center, Dumbarton Oaks, and is indicated at the beginning of the record. A separate numbering will be used to identify the small color slides. The photographs will be published as extensively as possible, and relative emphasis will be put on the color documents.

The publication of the measurements seems better served by graphically tracing the figures from the photographs and reconstructing the axes that have been used when the measurements were first taken.

As a last entry, pertinent remarks from literature concerning the unit which is dealt with, will be quoted when applicable.

To record the data on the scaffolding, a team has been working at the sites, basically one person recording on the forms and taking the detail photographs, one person covering the large photography, two or three taking measures. At times, an additional person has recorded data on forms. The records and the photographs have been consistently dated and identified by initials. Because of the short time allowed for the whole coverage, the pace had to be extremely quick and some of the less distinctive features have been left to be completed at the desk, from photographic evidence. To give an idea about progress in recording, the project started in January 1975 and is scheduled to end by the end of 1978. About ten months have been spent on scaffoldings in the N. Adriatic area and all monuments except for San Marco, have been completely recorded. To date (winter 1977/78) only the Atrium (except for one dome and arch), the Baptistery, the San Isidoro Chapel and the Wall with the Life of the Virgin in San Marco, have not yet been surveyed. Archives and public libraries (especially for local publication) have been researched all through this period.
The clean transcription and subsequent collation of the unedited records, the classification of the photographic material and the preparation of the final entries for publication, as well as the bibliographical research, is done in Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D. C. The person who recorded the data on the scaffolding works in between field campaigns with a research assistant, an assistant to the Photo Collection and a technical assistant.

To allow valid comparative references for problems of attribution (cultural and possibly ethnic) and dating, as well as definitions of style, similar campaigns have been conducted in monuments decorated with mosaics roughly of the same period in the Byzantine area, in Turkey (Istanbul, the Church of St. Sophia) and Greece (Daphni and Osios Loukas). The complete photographic coverage in color of those monuments has emerged as the single most important research tool of the mosaic Corpus.

The organization for publication/public consultation of this huge amount of material (approximately 1200-1400 entries), will require a further effort, difficult to estimate at this time. Its full utilization as a research tool for the further scholarly investigation of the monuments (history, cultural history, art history) in the form of books and scholarly articles, has already started.9

Irina Andreescu
Dumbarton Oaks


All the above mentioned projects have been undertaken by the Byzantine Institute of America and later, by the Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, which carried on the field work activity initiated by the latter. Another project started by Dumbarton Oaks is the Corpus of Sicilian Mosaics, directed by Ernst Kitzinger.

7. The project, sponsored by Dumbarton Oaks and generously supported by two grants (1975 and 1977/1978) from the National Endowment for the Humanities is directed by Otto Demus; field director and Corpus organizer, Irina Andreescu.

8. See infra, Appendix, p. ...

9. O. Demus has all but completed vol. I of his monograph on *The Mosaics of San Marco.* Several articles have already been published by I. Andreescu. Both authors have also lectured on various aspects of this project's results.
Future publications should include *The Mosaics of San Marco*, II (by O. Demus) and *The Mosaics of Torcello, Ravenna (Ursiana), Trieste and Murano* (by I. Andreescu). The annual Dumbarton Oaks Symposium will be devoted in May 1978 to *The Byzantine Sources of the Venetian Mosaics* (symposiarch: O. Demus).
Appendix

VENICE  SAN MARCO  MOSAICS  

I  Emplacement; Identification
II  Photographs
III  Inscriptions; Palaeography (including measurements)
IV  Measurements
V  Material, color, shape
   1. setting bed
   2. grounds
   3. ornaments, frames
   4. architecture, vegetation, background
   5. garments
   6. halo
   7. head
      hair
      beard/moustache
      flesh tones
      forehead
      cheeks
      chin
      throat/neck
      ears
      eyebrows/eyelids
      eyes
      nose
      mouth

8. hands
9. feet and footwear
10. attributes
VI  State of preservation
VII  Observations

I. In London (3 days). The objectives were

1.) the study of an unpublished stained glass window representing an Annunciation, owned by the V and A Museum. The object is said to come from Torcello, but its authenticity had raised some doubts.

2.) The unpublished head in mosaic (on a detached panel), owned by the V and A Museum, as well, said to come from Milan. The documents pertaining to the acquisition of both objects by the museum are very meagre. The head might have been connected with G. Moro's activities and the traffic of art objects from Venice to England in the XIX century.

3.) Several ivory objects in the V and A Museum for technical observations.

4.) XI-XII century Byzantine sculptures (several sessions at the Courtauld Institute). Because of lack of time I couldn't investigate further the archives of the Balestrasse family (in connection with the acquisition of a mosaic head said to come from Torcello, at an unknown date).

Outside my own research objectives, I also had several detailed conversations with Prof. Paul Blyth (in Birmingham) about

1.) Bethlehem and the Holy Places.
2.) Mount Athos.

I will report separately to the Faculty on these last subjects.

II. Paris – conversation with Noël Duval about our request to obtain photographic materials from his collection. The conclusion is that, except for a first batch chosen on a general basis, he would have to be given more specific indications as for

1.) what is our main subject of interest in his collection, considered in the broader definition of our Photo Collection's future development.
2.) how detailed the coverage should be.

III. Venice (6 days). The objectives were trifold:

1.) research on the monuments (Torcello, Aquileia, San Marco) supplemented by photographs and architectural measurements;

2.) in the archives (Sopraintendenza ai Monumenti Venezia) for drawings and photographs of older restorations;
3.) in the libraries (Correr, Marciana, Fondazione Cini) for books and articles not available here through ILL or not yet ordered by us, a list of which I had taken with me and to which I was able to add more material on the spot. A substantial amount of Xerox copies was brought by me; some more should be sent by mail.

At this last stage the work was carried on an almost round-the-clock and round-the-week basis, from 8 a.m. to 1 a.m. regularly by myself as well as by Mr. Ekkehard Ritter, photographer and part of the time by Arch. Bruno Tarentola.

During the month of March, Dr. Rudolf Kloos, Director of Archives, Munich, took a short trip to Venice to study the inscriptions for the Corpus. To settle dubious issues he required more photographs (specifically indicating which ones) to be taken by Mr. Ritter at some future time.
April 25, 1978

Dr. Irina Andreescu
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Irina:

Thank you for your report of your recent visit to London, Paris and Venice, and for your memorandum concerning the per diem allowance, which I shall lay before the Senior Fellows when they meet next month. I agree that the cost of living in Europe is high, and rising, and probably is not reasonably covered by $30 a day. I am uncertain, however, to what extent Dumbarton Oaks should take into consideration the fact that work in Venice is in effect part of your job and therefore covered, at least in part, by your salary, and also whether we should adopt a fixed higher per diem or a system of precise accounting (perhaps up to an established maximum).

Your own accounting seems to combine the two systems, and I confess not to understand it fully. Apparently, it combines a per diem in London and Paris of $30 with one in Venice of, in effect, just under $50, which is partially substantiated by receipts. I do not in any way question the amounts, but feel it would be better to work either by one system or by the other.

With regard to your report, I am glad that you got so much done. I wish, however, that you had consulted with me before speaking with Professor Mylonas about field work projects which are outside your area of responsibility. The Bethlehem project, in particular, is, as you know, one of great sensitivity and I am very anxious to avoid any possible misunderstandings.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable
Director
9/1
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Dear Giles:

To clarify some of your questions as they came through your letter of April 25, 1978, answering my memorandum on the rate of per diem in big cities, as well as commenting on my scholarly report on the trip:

1) I attached vouchers in order to prove that the actual costs of living are, in a big city, i.e., Venice, in support of my suggestion that the rate of the per diem be raised. Instead of making two separate memoranda, I incorporated my accounting for the last trip, the request for a raise and the evidence to support the claim. I simplified matters, however, and suggested, for instance, the 20$ food allowance, even though the vouchers, exactly calculated, would have indicated more. I also did not attach all vouchers because it is not customary in Italy to receive the check after you have paid; it is retained usually by the house. If one doesn't think about it at the right time, it is very difficult to receive it later and I had to use complicated means to retrieve some of them. I just wanted to produce evidence for the ordre de grandeur of the costs. If we were to agree to account on vouchers, I will strain myself to collect all of them. Either way you prefer to account, with vouchers or with a fixed per diem, could be done.

Meanwhile, I would like to be reimbursed for the balance, since I can't afford to finance the operation myself and I need the money for my own obligations.

2) About my conversation with Prof. P. Mylonas, which I mention in my report, I see no instance in which I have acted tactlessly in what I have known for many years to be a delicate matter, neither do I see how I overstepped my responsibilities. The Bethlehem mosaics are not only professionally within my area of interest, but have been the object of recent discussion in several groups, to some of which I belong, and talking to Prof. Mylonas brought very useful information. I would like to reassure you that at no moment in this conversation did I involve Dumbarton Oaks in plans for this project, nor did I carry the conversation under false pretense.

Sincerely,

Irina

Irina Andreescu
Assistant Professor
Byzantine Archaeology

Mr. Giles Constable, Director
Dumbarton Oaks
Washington, D. C.
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May 16, 1978

Prof. William C. Loerke
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Bill:

This is to put into writing my understanding of the discussion at the meeting of the Senior Fellows last Wednesday with regard to the Santa Sophia photo campaign. It was agreed to support the project if funds are available (as I hope that they will be) provided that (a) you will seek from Irina written recognition that the San Marco project must be completed before the end of the time extension you intend to seek from the National Endowment for the Humanities, that is, July 1, 1979, and (b) all those concerned, including the authorities at San Marco, are aware that a delay for any reason may mean that part of the building will not be photographed. It would therefore be wise to have a statement from the authorities that any time used to photograph in Santa Sophia cannot be used in San Marco.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable
Director
May 19, 1978

Dear Giles,

With reference to your note of 16 May recording our discussion of the Hagia Sophia photo campaign, my memory of the two conditions to be met (leaving open the availability of funds) is the following:

a) the two week campaign in Hagia Sophia would take place at a time when it would not be possible to work in San Marco;

b) the two weeks in Hagia Sophia could not be cited as a reason for not completing the field work of the San Marco project by July 1, 1979.

With respect to your point a), I recall pointing out to you during our discussion that photography might not reach the last medieval mosaics within the extended period, that Prof. Demus also recognized this, and that the order of priorities should be Narthex, Baptistry, San Isidoro, and Life of the Virgin. You said it would be a pity not to finish it; I agreed. I had agreed to get Irina's assent to the truth of my point a). To finish the whole by July 1, '79 can not be guaranteed prior to Irina's negotiating with the Proto and Canons for time in the building during this period.

With respect to your point b), this would be unwise, not to say unprofessional on our part, for it would exhibit to the Proto (or whoever might be the proper authority) our lack of confidence in the word of our own field director, with the consequence of undermining our own credibility with them, and seriously weakening Irina's negotiating position. Such a statement from them is in any case pointless, because the record shows and I can assure you that July and August have always been ruled out of the San Marco Field project from the outset, because of the tourist season. I can't believe their position has changed on this point.

The mosaics in the Southwest Room in Hagia Sophia are very important in their own right. They should not be held hostage to guarantees of the completion of another project, least of all by us at D.C., who should have done this work years ago. There is no conflict between the two week photo campaign in Hagia Sophia and the San Marco campaign.

Sincerely yours,

William Loerke
Dear Bill:

Here is Sabine's written statement. It is my only copy, so if you want to keep it for your files could you please make a copy?

Jules

Dear Giles,

Many thanks - I've copied this for the San Marco file.

Bill
I have read Professor Loerke’s memo regarding my questions and statements about the San Marco transparencies. The following points may be made to sum up Professor Loerke’s second paragraph, but not in any sense to diverge from it, since it reports more or less what I did say. This may then serve as the signed statement Professor Loerke wishes to have on such matters. I said:

1. the transparencies have no colour and grey scales, whereas it is normal practice in art publishing that such scales are included, for reasons I also gave and elaborate *** below.

2. The transparencies are mounted in such a way that it is not possible to see the edge, front or back. I was not allowed to see a transparency without this mounting, and therefore suspected that it should be checked that they are indeed the originals.

3. I had the impression that the transparencies did not have enough yellow.

4. For reasons I gave, and elaborate below, I suggested that the processing of the transparencies be checked on.

The issue now appears to be such differences as there may exist between ordinary art publishing and the commissioning of photography for such purposes on the one hand, and the practice of the San Marco project on the other. My comments were made in the light of experience with several publishers of illustrated or fine art books, for which cf. my CV submitted to D.O (Greek and Roman Mythology is an illustrated book), and add, for present purposes (apart from books I only edited, or only commissioned pictures for)


MacCormack, for Rainbird/MacMillan, Frazer, Illustrated Golden Bough, in page proof.


To elaborate now what I said, and add such details as may be relevant.

As archivist of Phaidon Press, in charge of all transparencies, photographs and negatives owned by the Press, and in charge of all current ordering and commissioning of photography, and of all copyright clearances, I *** (like my predecessor and successor) had it impressed on me by editors and Production department that the Press was most unhappy to print from (without colour and grey scales, or from duplicates where they did not have the original in the house (the quality of dups may be all right to print from, *** but they can produce copyright problems).
a) As regards transparencies ordered by the Press from Museums or photo archives. It did happen that transparencies without scales, a nd/or not or iginal in circumstances where it was simply not possible to obtain a replacement. Phaidon often published what they had. But on occasion, when the quality of reproduction in the book in question was regarded as a particular priority, they tried to persuade authors to allow an alternative to be used. There were also instances when I was asked not to authorize payment until a transparency with scales, and an original, was obtained, even if the resulting delay would hold up the production schedule of the book in question (delayed production schedules, although they do occur frequently, are anathema in commercial publishing because of the expense they tend to cause).

b) As regards specially commissioned photography (the San Marco type): whenever possible, this was done by A.C. Cooper. Whether done by them or not, here also, the Press insisted that the transparencies had the scales original (but cf. below), and were originals. The latter point was checked, as a matter of routine, by Production. The standard commissioning letter, devised by my predecessor in consultation with editors and Production, had a clause requiring the scales.

Notwithstanding this letter, specially commissioned transparencies without scales did turn up (e.g. from the Prado, where, however, scales are now used; the Hirmer Archive, among several others, also do not use scales). It was quite clear, however, that Phaidon did not like to reproduce from transparencies without scales, and they did not think that they could obtain the best results from them. Accordingly, when they could return such transparencies and get substitutes (i.e., generally, in circumstances where prepayment had not been required), they did so. Picture editors and researchers were very firmly instructed to do all they could to avoid delays and expenditure by not submitting transparencies without scales for art books (standards were not so rigorous of other books). In short, Phaidon’s policy, as I experienced it, was quite clear on this point, which they regarded as sufficiently important to make an issue of repeatedly.

To come now to the memo more directly:

The NGA apparently do not think colour/grey scales are necessary.

Firstly, they say that instead, they compare their transparencies to the original paintings. This is, I agree, by far the best procedure (followed in my experience, by Phaidon editors and others where possible), but circumstances do not always allow it to be followed; in which case, the scales provide some guidance as to the accuracy of the photography. They also provide some guidance — and this is a point I originally made — as to how much a transparency has faded by the time it is to be printed. In the NGA this is not a problem that arises, since they have the original paintings available and can rephotograph as required. D.O. will not, I presume, be able to rephotograph.

Secondly, the NGA must be aware that publishers want colour and grey scales since the transparencies they loan to publishers (or, at any rate all the ones I ever received from them) have the scales, with the following exception: because it is not possible to attach the scales to a painting without potentially damaging it, but only to the frame or the wall near it, transparencies of details when taken from the centre of a painting without any edge showing do not have the scales. With mosaic, the risk of damage resulting from scales being attached does not obtain.
Publishability of transparencies: as already implied above, at times it is better to have something than nothing, and all publishers realize this. I have myself, in the context of a book I illustrated and edited impressed on the publishers (Rainbird for MacMillan) that if they would not do their best with what I was able to obtain for them, they would lose an essential aspect of the pictorial import of the book. While the house editor was in agreement with me on this point, the designers and Production did refuse to print some pictures, and in one instance they rephotographed, at some inconvenience and expense (it was a matter of no scales, also they didn't like the lighting). The loss of essential material if one is too fussy is all the more an issue with an arthistoric publication, where only a particular picture, and no other, may illustrate the point in hand. My observation remains, however, that a better result can be obtained from some transparencies than others. Where photography is specially commissioned, it is possible to obtain superb results, as some of Phaidon's books demonstrate.

Obviously, however, it is for the people on each particular job to decide what can and cannot be done in their case to obtain such results. And, admittedly it is not one of D.O.'s functions to make a speciality of fine arts publishing. I would have thought, however, that the experience and expertise which would be available from, I am sure, several art publishers for the asking, could usefully be brought to bear on D.O. projects when it is relevant. As regards the lighting, for instance (memo paragraph number 6, and my point about the yellow), it may be worth exploring whether, even in the difficult conditions obtaining on the project, it would not be possible to obtain greater stability and evenness with battery operated lights. This may not be a realistic or feasible suggestion, but there may be other methods which others have explored, especially in scientific photography.

Originals. Anyone commissioning photography, from whatever photographer, should make an explicit point of checking on this, and it is normal publishing practice. In the context of looking at the transparencies, which were, after all, displayed to be looked at, I raised this question since, under the circumstances, I could not answer it for myself. The rule of thumb method I suggested (which is not quite accurately reported in the memo's second paragraph) was in use in the Phaidon archive, to be applied before transparencies went to Production. I do not see what the allegation of constructive malice (Webster 2nd ed. !!!!) has to do with such an elementary and straightforward technical point, which, however if left uncertain, can conspire to make disputes of copyright (such as do, through none's fault, occasionally arise, especially about unique photography) and their results well nigh interminable. Perhaps the publishers I have worked with are excessively cautious about this kind of thing; all I can say is that copyright disputes, when they do arise, are never less than extremely timeconsuming and irritating.

Lifespan of transparencies: I do not have as gloomy a view of this as does the NGA, and accordingly think processing is important. While it is worth making colour separations as early as possible, transparencies can be satisfactory after more than five years, depending on how they are processed. I had evidence of this when cataloguing the Phaidon colour archive. This contained transparencies which had been purchased outright more than five years previously, and of which Phaidon had duplicates made by A.C. Cooper at the time of purchase, the dupe to be used for editorial consultation while the original was with author or printer. The original and the dupe were therefore of roughly the same age. In numerous instances the Production department thought that the duplicates had lasted far better than the originals because they had been processed better, and that
the duplicates could still be used for reproduction while the originals could not. As I said originally, I cannot myself tell the difference between various methods of processing; I could however see, in the case of these older Phaidon transparencies, that the dupes were clearly in a better state, and that this had nothing to do with their age. It seems to me, therefore, that processing does vary, and is worth thinking about, especially where the material is, and is likely to remain, unique.

The issue of the colour and grey scales recurs here. One can tell from these scales to what extent transparencies, whether original or duplicate, have faded, and in which colours fading has occurred. If the scale was not in the original, it is of course of limited use putting it into the duplicate, although it would still help a little when assessing the duplicate. Editors also found the scales useful in transparencies which were too old to be used for printing, but were being kept for reference, precisely because the scales show in which colours, and to what extent, fading has occurred. The D.O. transparencies (which, I have the impression, may be wrongly, are too numerous to be published in their entirety), will be invaluable for scholarly reference even after they are too old for publication. There would seem to be a point, therefore, in adding the scales in future.

In so far as Phaidon Press has been a widely recognized art publisher (Phaidon Press was taken over by Elsevier some five years ago, and as a result is now forced to produce more commercial books, in which they cannot always maintain their old quality of reproduction and design; before this takeover, which occurred before I started working for them, they may have been, for all I know, even more rigorous in their demands of photographers), and in so far as other publishers I have worked for substantiate much of my Phaidon experience, Phaidon procedures may be of interest to others in related fields. My questions and statements reflect Phaidon procedures, and whether or not these procedures are judged relevant to D.O., it may be useful to know, now or in future, what they are, or used to be, if only as a basis for comparison. Questions of innuendo may then, perhaps, be usefully dispensed with.

May 29th, 1978

Sabine MacCormack
May 23, 1978

Prof. Irina Andreescu
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Irina:

As a result of our two long conversations last week, and of one with Professor Demus, I think that I should put into writing my conviction that our responsibility both to the NEH and to other scholars makes the completion of the photography in San Marco and the organization of the Corpus the first priority for the coming academic year. As you know, the Faculty decided in December 1976 to extend your appointment for one final year (1978-79) on the assumption that the field work would be completed by 30 April 1978 and that the additional year would be used for drafting the Corpus and working on the final publication. That proved impossible. The NEH grant was extended until 1 December 1978 and now, I gather, a further extension until 1 July 1979 is to be sought. This cannot be done in good faith unless we guarantee that every effort will be made to complete the field work by that date. I can therefore approve no other work, either at Santa Sophia or Torcello or on the preparation of materials for publication, until the completion of the photography in San Marco and the organization of the material derived therefrom is assured. Once that is done, I still hope that there will be time for you either to do further field work or to work on your own report.

It would therefore be wise to plan a meeting between myself, yourself, and Professors Demus and Loerke sometime between Professor Demus’s return from the West on June 2 and his departure on June 8 in order to make sure that (a) the priorities for work to be done are generally understood, and (b) realistic plans have been formulated to complete the photographic campaign. Professor Demus tells me he is available at any time for the remainder of this year except for the last three weeks of July (8-30).

I have appreciated the constructive tone of our last two meetings, and trust that it will continue.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable
Director

xc: Prof. Demus
    Prof. Loerke
Mr. Giles Constable,
Director,
Dumbarton Oaks,
1703 Thirty-second Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Dear Giles,

Here is a reminder of the preliminary proposal already distributed to you and to the Faculty in July 1977, concerning the publication of my part of the North Adriatic mosaics project. Since Mr. Demus's vol. I on San Marco is all but submitted for publication, this brings the issue of how the whole is to be published in the immediate future.

As I did one year ago, I suggest for my part the following:

(1) Fascicule of Plates giving complete coverage of Torcello, Ravenna, Trieste, Murano, the order keyed to the system of recording used in the Corpus;

(2) Data of the Corpus itself - for the comments of (1) above;

(3) Study of Torcello et al. which would refer to the Plates of (1) above for the primary material and add comparative monuments only in its own plates.

The material for (1) and (2) has been here since the end of 1975. It is the oldest material of the project and would logically be expected to start the publication series. The Plates, (1) above, would require minimal effort to be presented to the publisher, an estimate of one month of designing the book. Informal contacts with scholars since 1975 as well as the discussions during the Symposium and after, have confirmed that this material, as well as the new recording system, are needed as an important tool for art historians.

The publication of the Plates before the entries or the text, has been and is, a common practice - among the most famous examples, see Orlando, Nea Moni, Chios, Deichmann's Ravenna, Underwood's Kahrie Djamii, Hamann-Maclean's Serbian Churches, Forsyth and Weitzmann's Mount Sinai, etc.
Regardless of the time elapsing between the publication of the Plates, entries and text, once the system has been set, the rest can follow in sequence.

The main, single value of the Mosaic Corpus project is precisely its illustration, especially the color photography and the detailed photographs which allow us to present the source as objectively as possible, and to make clear to the scholars what goals this survey had in mind. The publication should be, I believe, as complete as the survey, at least for the least known material (Torcello and al.) which happens to be also the oldest chronologically and of the highest quality for Byzantine Mosaics of the eleventh century, in general.

The publication of the photographs - a rough estimate of 300 - would be best used by scholars in the form of printed Plates and not of microfiche. However, this as well as other issues require an extended discussion for which this statement, as well as the proposal I made in July 1977, may serve as a useful beginning.

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreeescu
Assistant Professor, Byzantine Archaeology

cc The Faculty

PS Our letters crossed and I will be replying to you in due course.
Dear Giles:

I think it useful to place on record results of my inquiry into the professional level of photography for the San Marco and related projects. The question at issue is the competence and integrity of Herr Ritter. As you know, this issue arose from Sabine MacCormack's severe criticism of the color transparencies displayed during the Symposium, which you relayed to me and which I confirmed face to face with her immediately after our conversation.

She asserted that the absence of the color code strip and the grey patch from the color transparencies meant that certain publishers (i.e., the best like Phaidon) would refuse to print them. If true, this would place in grave doubt the most expensive part of our whole project. She also severely judged a photographer who would omit such controls, raising questions about how well the transparencies were developed (important for their length of life). She wondered if we were certain that our photographer had sent us originals and not copies; she gave us two tests for this, saying that the notches in the film should be in the upper left corner and the emulsion side on the back when the transparency is properly held to view. If we decided not to continue with our photographer, she recommended A. C. Cooper (Art Division: Gordon Robertson), used by Phaidon, whose transparencies, she said, "even the untrained eye could see are much better than these (the San Marco ones)."

I took about a dozen transparencies, randomly selected, to Richard Amt at the National Gallery Photographic Lab., where he, the Chief Photographer, and a third colleague on the staff scrutinised them very closely. I put to them all of Sabine's criticisms with the following results:

1. Color code: "not very useful since the colors on the code strip are so concentrated compared with their diffusion in the transparency that it is difficult to get an objective reading." "we have found them misleading on occasion,--since we always compare our work directly with the originals." "we pay little attention to the color code, which doesn't tell us much."

2. Grey patch: "more useful than the color code, because the white end of the scale (like zero base) is precisely the same whiteness which the professional light table has, on which the transparencies are studied." "be useful to add this to future work where possible."

3. Granted the absence of these "controls", are these transparencies publishable? "No question about that."

4. Should we drop this photographer and get another? "No reason to do that, judging from these examples"
5. Are these transparencies originals or copies? "Originals. The notches in the upper left are a code for the type of film used."

6. Please criticize them in general:
"Focus uniformly good. Camera position not always the best, but we do not know the conditions under which he worked. Surface lighting uneven in the transparencies from Hagia Sophia (ca. 8); what is surprising is that the lighting is uneven in those transparencies which give only a comparatively small detail area."

(I checked later with Andreescu on this point; learned that the electric power inside Hagia Sophia was so weak only one lamp could be used, hence one side is brighter than the other. Moreover power was also uneven, so that the photographer could not count on a steady level of brightness or intensity.)

"Too much blue, and somewhat under-exposed. This is better than if they were over-exposed, because the under-exposed ones can be brought up to par in the printing process; the over-exposed not. The coolness (too much blue) can be corrected by a standard, professional filter. No serious problem in publishing these."

7. The photographers were unanimous in defining the acceptable life of a color transparency as five years. They have no special storage for their own transparencies, feeling that this does not appreciably alter survival rate over the standard museum controls of temperature and humidity.

We should obviously select and prepare for publication as soon as possible those color transparencies destined for this.

As a further control, I will take another set of transparencies to the National Geographic Lab, for their reaction. Meanwhile, I think it necessary that this report be kept on record for future reference, or perhaps I should say, future attacks. I further suggest that when such heavy charges are put to you against this project in the future, that you ask the person to put these into writing and sign his name to it. Innuendo repeated in good faith is still innuendo.

Sabine's suggestion that Ritter might have sent us copies rather than the originals, based on no evidence and palpably false, defames his integrity and is clearly innuendo, perilously close to slander. Slander requires malice, but "the malice may be actual or constructive, that is, it is enough that the words were uttered intentionally, and are not justified, and that the occasion was not privileged." (Webster's New Intern., 2nd Ed.). If you feel it salutary to read Sabine this memorandum, I could not agree more.

Respectfully submitted,

William Loerke
May 26, 1978

Dr. Giles Constable
Director
Dumbarton Oaks
1703 Thirty-second Street
Washington, D.C. 20007

Dear Giles:

Thank you for your letter of May 23. I could not agree more with you that our responsibility both to NEH and to other scholars makes the completion of the photography (I will add the recording of data in Corpus form), as well as the organization of the Corpus for the wall mosaics of the N. Adriatic area (San Marco, Torcello, Ravenna, Trieste, Murano) our first priority. This is also the definition of our project in the proposal to NEH.

Our efforts, I believe, should concentrate on making this material available to scholars in an organized and virtually complete form—written entries as well as illustration, which in this comprehensive disclosure (as opposed to a subjective selection) will prove to be the "research tool" that the NEH has co-sponsored through its grant to us.

I hope that my conception of the project as well as the commitment to it have been demonstrated through the results achieved so far. I have been also seeking suggestions from other scholars and various potential users, in the desire to make this tool as long lasting a one as possible. To that end, despite or because of the continuous pressure of time and the sheer dimensions of the project, I have spared no effort and devoted, since 1975, all my time to the Mosaic Corpus.

Your last letter correctly says that my reappointment for 1978-79 was recommended by the Faculty in December 1976. I would like to point out, however, that they informed me then that they will recommend "at least one year" to work on the collected material. The element "terminal" was introduced in your letter to me (October 1977), confirming your intention to propose to the Trustees my reappointment for 1978/1979. The Faculty had also informed me that "the rights of publication of the material surveyed remain with me" (of course, the division of the lagoon material had already been achieved).
There has never been any discussion either with the Faculty or with you of what the completion of the project as described in our NEH proposal would involve in terms of time (i.e. organization of the material, my "final report" (the book on Torcello et al.), etc.).

In your last letter, I do not see how you envisage organizing this work in the future. Therefore, I can only give my comments for the year 1978–79, which you consider terminal to my appointment at Dumbarton Oaks.

I will be eager to do my job as described in the NEH project and want to assure you that all efforts will be made, as in the past, to insure the scholarly quality of the survey. I will point out however that the project has been conceived and approved with two investigators working on the study, recording of data, etc. for the Corpus (page 9, d of the NEH proposal). In fact, the co-(principal) investigator has not been involved at all and at no stage in the process of either directing the team or recording of data for the Corpus. His whole time was devoted to writing the first volume of his final report (the book on San Marco).

To ensure a proper continuation of the project, I do not see that I could do this work alone any longer. I hope that a second investigator will do a share of the recording on the forms (which have met with the approval of the scholarly community consulted). Although no effort will be spared on my side, I can give no guarantee that the project will be finished by June 30, 1979. I trust you will also understand that my work on the project will be done in the hours legally required by my appointment; having no other time left, my free time will have to be devoted to work of my own.

As for the schedule of the campaigns in San Marco, I will be glad to report there whenever arrangements have been made for the campaign.

I will also be glad to attend any meeting with Professors Demus, Loerke and yourself at any date that is convenient to you, as well as to discuss any aspects of the project.

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreeescu
Assistant Professor, Byzantine Archaeology

cc: Professor Demus
    Professor Loerke
Dear Miss Andreasen,

I do not think that the formulation of § 3 on p. 2 of your letter of May 26 to Professor Cookable is quite correct. You say that I have not been involved at all and at no stage in the process of (1) either directing the team or (2) recording the data for the Corpus.

As (1): It is true that I left to you the direction of the team when you were present, since I very soon realized that you insisted on being the "director" and that, given this attitude of yours a sharing of responsibilities vis-à-vis the team was impossible. However, you were repeatedly absent from Venice during the campaign, at times for several weeks at a stretch. During these absences it was I who did the "directing" once I supervised alone (since you arrived later) the erecting of the scaffolding in the choir chapels etc.

This is not to diminish your merit and your achievement for which I always gave you full credit.
publicly as well as privately, it would be fair if you gave some too the little credit that is due to me.

A U (2): I direct your attention to the wording of the original NHE Proposal of 1974/75, p. 3 & 6.1/2, where our respective obligations are set out quite clearly. Enclose a xerox of the two paragraphs.

To my knowledge this statement has never been revoked or altered; I should not have consented to an alteration in principle.

Sincerely,

C. Demus

copy to Professor G. Constable.
the sequence in the scaffolding will be (1) preliminary inspection, (2) cleaning crew, (3) photographer, (4) archaeological crew, consultants, and assistants, recording archaeological observations and making the required measurements. Scaffolding will be erected at a rate to keep these operations moving. Preparations for this work include the printing of standard forms on which to record archaeological data including measurements.

6. Individual Responsibilities:

1. **Professor Demus** -- General supervision of entire staff, including photographers; assignment of duties to staff; formulation of procedures by which photographs, archaeological data, documents, are organized for the archives; preparation of text on these mosaics for publication.

2. **Miss Andreeescu** -- To execute such responsibilities as Professor Demus may assign; in general, close daily checking on photography (i.e., selection of details, etc.) and archaeological observations.

3. **Research Associate** -- To execute such duties as Professor Demus may assign; in general, to work through the archives, identify significant documents and see to their transcription.

4. **Ernest Hawkins** -- Preparation of archaeological report on the state of the mosaics.

(for others, see notes attached to budget)
Dear [Name],

I ended a reply I drafted. If you think it uselessly adds fuel to the fire, suppress it. If you think I expressed things ineptly, I can redo the relevant bits. I couldn't resist (Webster 2nd ed. !!!!) - the last sentence, but am prepared to eliminate both. I think I said every thing that can usefully be said at this stage, though then...
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I. ANDREESCU, *The Corpus for Wall Mosaics in the N Adriatic Area*

The systematic recording of wall-mosaics on a large scale is a difficult undertaking, if not for anything else, because of the scaffolding required to reach the objectives and the costs involved. Several attempts in this direction have been made in the last four decades, starting with Th. Whittemore's reports on the work done in St. Sophia at Istanbul, (1), later reports by C. Mango and E. Hawkins, (2), P. Underwood and Hawkins, (3), R. Cormack and Hawkins, (4), and continuing with the publication of the Kahrie Djami mosaics (5) and those of Lythrangomi, Cyprus (6). The recording according to the requirements necessary for a corpus, as separated from the study of the mosaics at a later stage, has been one of the main goals of the project involving the churches decorated with wall mosaics of the N Adriatic area (7). This group of monuments preserves decorations from the XI-XIII centuries as well later as decorations. For the latter only the mosaics belonging to the XIVth century will be included in our survey.

This recording is done in writing and by photography. Descriptions follow a printed form (8) on which each mosaic figure is analyzed. Since these subjects are the overwhelming majority in the wall decorations, identifying numbers incorporated in a topographic system are ascribed only to figures, while ornaments are treated together with the general survey of the scene where the figures belong, unless the ornament has an independent function within the decoration.

The photographs are in black/white (13 x 18 cm. neg.), color transparencies (13 x 18 cm. or 5 x 7 inches) and color slides (24 x 36 mm. and 6 x 6 cm. In most cases the black/white coverage repeats the large color transparencies, though sometimes it supplements it. Color slides are taken additionally to record mostly details and close-ups of archaeological and technical value. At a later stage, after having tried to save time by reducing the transparencies into slides in the laboratory for lecture purposes, it was noticed that the colors of the slides obtained this way were unsatisfactory; since then more slides have been taken in situ. The unusual feature of this Corpus if compared with previous projects, is the extensive color coverage, as well as the emphasis on details. Color and materials are essential in our understanding and definition of the mosaics, as of all painting, and the chromatic and technical characteristics of a workshop are among the safest factors in correctly identifying it archaeologically and comparing it with other workshops on typological grounds.
The inscriptions are published with the indication of the restorations which might have affected them since they had been set on the wall.

Because of the impossibility of using more elaborate methods (requiring both time and funds), the measurements are taken according to an ideal vertical and several horizontal axes for each figure and scene. When possible, measurements of the architectural units on which the mosaics rest are also taken. Measurements are not exhaustive but numerous sample figures which are meant to serve as references are thoroughly measured.

The subsequent entry identifies the technical framework for the mosaic's execution. A subentry records the setting bed, mainly as it appears from superficial examination, with no tests made that would involve removal of the tesserae, and with the principal aim of establishing whether it is still the original one or if it has been changed at some later stage through restoration.

Other subentries record the background against which the figure is inscribed, as well as frames or accessory features connected with our figure.

The largest space is devoted to detailed recording of the figures themselves. Only the color scheme and the technical characteristics of the glass paste and/or stone cubes are stated. Attention is paid to the garments, the attributes and especially to the head, the hands and the feet. The head's features are each individually analyzed in detail. It has been possible to establish over a large number of recorded figures (and considering mostly the head, hands, and feet), the existence of several schemes and sub-schemes used in various combinations, either all through a workshop with subdivisions of "hands", or defining different workshops and allowing us to compare them on a technical, more objective basis, before stylistic interpretations are undertaken.

The state of preservation has been recorded in as far as visible changes have altered the original, but only by close examination of the object and without being able to use more elaborate testing systems. At this point, the research of local archives has proved indispensable and while important evidence of those restorations has been lost in time, much material came out as a result of our search. This information will be incorporated under the entry "state of preservation", in quoted or condensed forms, accordingly.

Finally space for an entry allowing for general observations, has been reserved on our form and has proved very useful in the process of making the first records on the scaffolding, allowing for visual associations to be jotted down to be checked further, and eventually incorporated or excluded from the final version of the form.
For the published version, to help place the figures in the monument's context, the larger units and/or compositions will be briefly introduced in the publication, following basically the same criteria of technical observations, and preceding the detailed presentation of the individual entries. A code has been tentatively conceived, identifying each figure by site, monument, part of the monument, composition, place in the composition vertical and horizontal, from top to bottom and left to right (for example: TO, SMA, W, III, 6 will be read as Torcello, Santa Maria Assunta, West Wall, 3rd register (Last Judgment), 6th figure (Apostle Peter)). To indicate the photographic coverage, the classification for the black and white negatives and the large color transparencies follows the one used at the Photo Collection of the Byzantine Center, Dumbarton Oaks, and is indicated at the beginning of the record. A separate numbering will be used to identify the small color slides. The photographs will be published as extensively as possible, and relative emphasis will be put on the color documents.

The publication of the measurements seems better served by graphically tracing the figures from the photographs and reconstructing the axes that have been used when the measurements were first taken.

As a last entry, pertinent remarks from literature concerning the unit which is dealt with, will be quoted when applicable.

To record the data on the scaffolding, a team has been working at the sites, basically one person recording on the forms and taking the detail photographs, one person covering the large photography, two or three taking measures. At times, an additional person has recorded data on forms. The records and the photographs have been consistently dated and identified by initials. Because of the short time allowed for the whole coverage, the pace had to be extremely quick and some of the less distinctive features have been left to be completed at the desk, form photographic evidence. To give an idea about progress in recording, the project started in January 1975 and is scheduled to end by the end of 1978. About ten months have been spent on scaffoldings in the N. Adriatic area and all monuments except for San Marco, have been completely recorded. To date (winter 1977/78) only the Atrium (except for one dome and arch), the Baptistry, the San Isidoro Chapel and the Wall with the Life of the Virgin in San Marco, have not yet been surveyed. Archives and public libraries (especially for local publication) have been researched all through this period.

The clean transcription and subsequent collation of the unedited records, the classification of the photographic material and the preparation of the final entries for publication, as well as the bibliographical research, is done
in Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D. C. The person who recorded the data on the scaffolding works in between field campaigns with a research assistant, an assistant to the Photo Collection and a technical assistant.

To allow valid comparative references for problems of attribution (cultural and possibly ethnic) and dating, as well as definitions of style, similar campaigns have been conducted in monuments decorated with mosaics roughly of the same period in the Byzantine area, in Turkey (Istanbul, the Church of St. Sophia) and Greece (Daphni and Osios Loukas). The complete photographic coverage in color of those monuments has emerged as the single most important research tool of the mosaic Corpus.

The organization for publication/public consultation of this huge amount of material (approximately 1200-1400 entries), will require a further effort, difficult to estimate at this time. Its full utilization as a research tool for the further scholarly investigation of the monuments (history, cultural history, art history) in the form of books and scholarly articles, has already started (9).
FOOTNOTES


6 A. H. S. Megaw and E. J. W. Hawkins, *Kanakaria*, DOS, 14 (in press). All the above mentioned projects have been undertaken by the Byzantine Institute of America and later, by the Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, which carried on the field work activity initiated by the latter. Another project started by Dumbarton Oaks is the Corpus of Sicilian Mosaics, director Ernst Kitzinger.

7 The project, sponsored by Dumbarton Oaks and generously supported by two grants (1975 and 1977/1978) from the National Endowment for the Humanities is directed by Otto Demus; field director and Corpus organizer, Irina Andreeescu.

8 See *infra*, Appendix,

9 O. Demus has hall but completed vol. I of his monograph on *The Mosaics of San Marco*. Several articles have already been published by I. Andreeescu. Both authors have also lectured on various aspects of this project's results. Future publication should include *The Mosaics of San Marco*, II (by O. Demus) and *The Mosaics of Torcello*, Ravenna (Ursiana), Trieste and Murano (by I. Andreeescu). The annual Dumbarton Oaks Symposium will be devoted in May 1978 to *The Byzantine Sources of the Venetian Mosaics* (symposiarch: O. Demus).
Appendix

VENICE, San Marco. Mosaics

I Emplacement; Identification

II Photographs

III Inscriptions; Palaeography (including measurements)

IV Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>group</th>
<th>vertical</th>
<th>horizontal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>figure</td>
<td>vertical</td>
<td>horizontal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>halo</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hands</td>
<td>length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V Material, color, shape

1. setting bed

2. grounds

3. ornaments, frames

4. architecture, vegetation, background
5. garments

6. halo

7. head  hair
       forehead
       cheeks
       chin
       throat/neck
       ears
       eyes
       nose
       mouth

8. hands

9. feet and footwear

10. attributes

VI  State of preservation

VII  Observations
June 5, 1978

Professor Otto Demus
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Mr. Demus,

Your letter of May 28, 1978, makes a statement about our respective attitudes towards directing the team and disagrees with some of my statements (letter of May 26 to Professor Constable and XC to you and Professor Loerke). I will try here to comment specifically on your text.

The leadership issue: while I do not recognize the quote "that you [I] insisted on being the only director", I would like to remind you that since the very beginning our conceptions and attitudes have been very different on issues like: how far should one pursue specific operations vis-à-vis the mosaics (cleaning, sounding the background, recording in writing and by photography), which in turn, raised the problem of the relationship with the local authorities (contract and day-to-day), with the scaffolding people, with the workers in San Marco, with our own team (Ritter, Hawkins, Bonajuto), the deadlines and the money in all aspects (negotiating, prices, administering the funds, accounting). It would require a lengthy statement to elaborate on all the above-mentioned, but I would simplify matters (and take responsibility for that) saying that basically your attitude was: never mind the quality of the washing—"it is not our business"; thorough recording is unnecessary (no architectural measurements); we (i.e. you) do not need so much time up on the scaffolding; let us not argue with the local authorities since they can kick us out at any time; stand the workers as they are (for comparable reasons); photographic coverage by Ritter only of the important parts (your selection was made at the beginning and did not include the "restorations"). I, on the contrary, have advocated thorough washing (requested also by Hawkins)—"it is our duty to the mosaics to insist on it, regardless of the attitude of the local owners"; thorough coverage by Ritter of parts that for you were not original—and of which I had different opinions; measurements as complete as possible (unfortunately, the time limit was an objective handicap); also I insisted on expressing strongly our views on the collaboration with the Procuratoria, with the authority of the scholarly viewpoint—not to put up with everything they wanted, unless it proved justified, and to have our own policy towards workers and their rapport with our team, irrespective of how they usually behaved during their office hours.

Our program was, I believe, a minimal platform in order to prevent being swamped by the overall bureaucracy and to be able to finish within the very rigid deadlines set by the Church. Letting things go in their pace just meant failure from the outset. We had several arguments, and it seemed that you realized that giving in for the sake of accommodation would just not work. This is why, very early in the campaign (before Rusoni's death, which occurred sometime around February 10-15) you asked me to establish our policy vis-à-vis the Procuratoria and the workers and carry it forth.
Mr. Demus
June 5, 1978

With our own team, you will remember that Ritter and Hawkins and yourself had on occasion a less than happy relationship. Their main complaints were that you spent little time on the scaffolding and therefore made unrealistic demands on them; they also felt patronized by you (I happened to witness Ritter's very violent blow-up directed at you).

These are some examples of how I had to direct the whole project: negotiating with the administrations, supervising the team, recording for the Corpus, etc. Of course, more could be said.

You express specific disagreements with my statement:

1) About my "repeated absences from Venice during which you directed the team" -- I will not consider it intentionally disparaging, but assume you are confusing two different situations.

In the winter 1973/1974 it took me two and a half months (Nov.-Jan.) to receive a visa to Venice. This incident was well known in Dumbarton Oaks, which had been contacted by the Italian Embassy. No scaffolding was involved.

The scaffolding started January 1975. From then to date, my record of absence from Venice has been:

- 5 working days March 17-21, 1975 (trip to Paris, to defend my dissertation. Proof: visas of France, Italy, Switzerland, on my passport, both ways).

- 1 working day sometime in February or March 1975 to Torino, at the Hasselblad representative, to have the camera repaired (the trip was by night trains both ways. Proof: vouchers in Financial Office).

- 3 days in Rome, Mary 21-23, 1977 (Proof: my signature in the Vatican Library register). I spent the mornings in the manuscript section researching Byzantine manuscripts, as can be checked through the request slips.

In March 1975 you asked me--and I complied with the request--to leave detailed written instructions for everybody's work schedule: Ritter, Pino Fioretti, the scaffolding (Dalmine), the board team, the washers. Two copies were made; one for you in case you would need it, to settle arguments, one for Pino, whom I left in charge in my place. I got from him the report--confirmed by you--that since nothing had occurred, there was no need to disturb you at all during that period of time.

In February 1977, immediately after Professor Loerke's resignation, at the beginning of the "troika's" administration, I arrived in Venice later than Ritter and yourself. I had asked you both (and Berton) to indicate the the workers the levels of the board platforms to be set in the choir chapels. The
whole organization of the scaffolding (negotiations, etc.) however, had been done through correspondence from here and through several telephone conversations with both Del Pizzol and Ritter (proof: Dumbarton Oaks telephone record bill of that period).

I will refrain from commenting on your Venetian schedule but will welcome any documented corrections to my statement.

2) On the NEH job description, I enclose the current one (1977-present). The modification of the 1974-1975 description (an ideal one, which had been submitted obviously before the real work began) was done after a telephone conversation between us (you called from Vienna) sometime in November 17-19, 1975 (proof: in the Financial Office, your charge of the conversation to Dumbarton Oaks, about the [page]). I had asked you to call, because the description did not seem accurate, nor satisfactory to me. If you disagree, I said, you could find somebody else to do the job as described. You insisted it was just a mechanical carry-over and agreed to the change as it appears in the current NEH project.

I gladly give you credit for what is due to you in this Project. I believe your book will bring a major contribution to our discipline. And I also full-heartedly acknowledge that you always gave me credit for my leadership in the Project.

But I believe, however, that what is now at stake is not the past history, but the completion of the Project and its public availability.

On the actual scope of our campaigns our positions have always been different.

To simplify again, you felt that the whole recording was a service for a book. I believed since the beginning in a less personal, more objective, complete public record of the material. This view prevailed in the description of our Project to NEH, which sponsors it as a "research tool". To have them sponsor your/my writing of a book based on supporting material was not acceptable to them in this setting.

Your attitude towards the Corpus has been, at best, indifferent. You did not involve yourself either in its planning, or in its progress; its results are not familiar to you (to judge by some of your statements). Neither do I believe that you have an accurate view of the time and the effort involved--having always refused to take specific responsibility for covering any given area in Corpus form. I could never count on your solid contribution for this work -- you have limited your involvement with the Project in order to devote your time to your own work and not waste it with the frustrating chores of administration.

The credit you did not give the Project is the scholarly aspect of this coverage: I have numerous reactions to both forms and the already published data, both verbal and in writing, which I would be willing to pursue in front of any larger inquiry group.
In other words, I believe in the detailed publication—or availability to scholars—of this data. I believe that the coverage is unprecedented in our discipline (in fact it owes considerably to archeological methods) from a methodologic point of view, and I also believe that a complete, less personal presentation of material does not exclude personal views expressed in books; but gives a broader documentary context for any different approaches and/or other books, now or in the future.

Those are the lines along which, I believe, we could ask outsiders to our Project to comment or judge our work.

I would have hoped that after my consistent involvement with the very time-consuming establishment and administration of the framework for research, you would yourself make the case that a fair fraction of time should be secured for me as well (as it had been stated in our current NEH description), to write my scholarly final report. Not only is the final report the occasion for the author to communicate the material, but it also allows him to explain his methodologic approach and to interpret the evidence from the scholarly point of view. I would have believed this to be supported by you, not only because of our working partnership, but also because, as you graciously admitted, I had clarified or invalidated some of your own opinions on different matters.

Sincerely,

Irina Andreescu

XC: Professor Constable
Professor Loerke

IA/aa

Encl.: NEH Proposals (1973-74 and 1977) Job Descriptions
Offprint from Bulletin de l'AIEMA, 7 (1978)
10 June 1978

Miss Lucy Baglia
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Lucy:

Please do not pay for any travel for Professor Andreeacu in the future, or allow her to charge any travel to Dumbarton Oaks at Adventures in Travel, without my prior knowledge.

Please keep this instruction confidential unless it becomes necessary to use it.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable
Dumbarton Oaks
Trustees for Harvard University
1703 Thirty-second Street, Washington, D.C. 20007

Office of the Director

10 June 1978

Assistant Professor Irina Andreeacu
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Irina:

I believe that some progress was made during our meeting last Wednesday morning and by my subsequent talks with Professor Demus and Professor Loerke. I feel it is desirable, however, to put into writing a few basic facts.

I am compelled to say first that your insulting attitude and abusive remarks to Professor Demus, made in the presence of Professor Loerke and myself, were unprofessional and make difficult, in my opinion, your continued presence in a scholarly community of which he is an honored member. I insist that during the remainder of your term at Dumbarton Oaks you must make an effort to show greater consideration for your colleagues.

The facts are as follows:

(1) The stated object of the 'Project San Marco' funded jointly by Dumbarton Oaks and the National Endowment for the Humanities is 'a photographic, architectural, and archival campaign devoted to certain medieval mosaics in San Marco, Venice'. Any work not in San Marco (aside from the research trips specified in the application) is outside the terms of the grant and must not be funded by monies either from the NEH or from institutional cost-sharing. (So far as I can see the work done at Torcello during the second campaign, which was funded by the NEH Grant R-21995-75-121, was beyond the terms of the grant/was, I hope, paid for independently by Dumbarton Oaks.)

(2) The grant under which we are at present operating is specifically to complete the photographic and archaeological work in San Marco begun in 1974 and to assemble the data so gathered into a Corpus to be 'prepared and maintained at Dumbarton Oaks as a research tool for qualified scholars'. This is the end result of the grant, which includes no provision for the publication or study of the material gathered in the Corpus.

(3) Your explicit responsibilities under the grant, as specified on pp. 8–9 of the application, are (a) to make a preliminary investigation, together with Professor Demus and the Proto of San Marco (or his representative), (b) to direct, together with Professor Demus, the photography, (c) to study and record archaeological data, together with Professor Demus, consultants, and assistants, (d) to direct and supervise the recording of data on a printed form prepared by yourself, and (e) to direct the erection and moving of the scaffolding 'at a rate to maintain an efficient flow of work in all its operations'. A refusal on your part to perform any of these
responsibilities would constitute, in my opinion, a breach of our commit-
ment to the NEH and require a re-negotiation of the grant. Personally I
would expect you to continue to perform the responsibilities that you
have regularly performed since the inception of the project and for which
no one else is specifically responsible, but the five responsibilities
listed above are a sine qua non.

I am cheered by the sentence in your letter to me of May 26 that,
'I will be eager to do my job as described in the NEH project and want
to assure you that all efforts will be made, as in the past, to insure
the scholarly quality of the survey.' To avoid any possible misunder-
standing, however, I should like to have from you within a week both a
written acceptance of the terms outlined above (or, should you reject
them, a written explanation of why you do so) and a written estimate of
the time you consider necessary to complete the photographic work (which
you said you would give me last Wednesday afternoon) and a proposed
time-table for your work both at San Marco and on the Corpus during the
coming academic year.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable

cc Professor Demus
Professor Loerke
Dean Rosovsky
Schedule for 1978-79

The following is my proposed, tentative plan for the 1978-79 San Marco campaign, if I were to direct it, based on prior experience and preliminary consultations with some of the parties involved. The actual plan will depend on the outcome of the negotiations with the authorities in Venice. If someone else wishes to direct the campaign according to a different plan, I would be happy to follow the instructions of the Field Director.

I. Date of the San Marco Campaign

A. Controlling factors

1. Procuratoria

   a. categorically and automatically prohibits any date between Easter and September 15 due to tourism, even for their own work in the church.

   b. after September 15, Procuratoria begins its own most pressing repairs in San Marco.

   c. the earliest possible date permission could be granted for a campaign would be October 1. However, this would have to be a short campaign as Del Pizzol, the accountant and bookkeeper who pays the workers and makes concrete, day-to-day arrangements for the materials, goes on vacation always on October 15.

2. Photographer

   a. Ekkehard Ritter is available only from January to April. During the fall he carries a double teaching load (the equivalent of two semesters) which enables him to spend the winter in Venice on the project. This special arrangement, which Ritter worked out with his Director in 1974, has not been changed since that time.
b. Reasons desirable to continue with Ritter

1. pace: to break in a new photographer at this stage would slow down enormously the pace of the work. It is highly questionable that another could be found who would be willing to work 16 hours a day, as Ritter does now, and as the demanding time schedule of the project has always required.

2. quality and consistency in coverage.

3. legal concerns: Ritter has an exclusive contract with Dumbarton Oaks for this project.

3. Climate

Between November and the end of March, no worker will work outside the church (in the open atrium) due to the bitter winter cold.

4. Conclusion: the only possible campaign dates are January to April. With great difficulty, a short two-week campaign might take place in October (This is exactly what was done last year. It would allow for a hurried, round-the-clock coverage of bay #2 in the atrium in October).

B. Sequence of coverage: considerations and conditions that have generally been in effect since the first campaign.

1. Cappella San Isidoro: a closed, protected space. Therefore ideal for the colder months. The possibility of beginning work there however depends on the church schedule for winter services in the Cappella.

2. Baptistry: cold but at least with no doors open to the outside
and therefore another possible area to begin work.

3. Cappella Zeno: work in the Cappella Zeno would depend on the works of the Procuratoria itself. They were replacing certain brick walls the last time I discussed the matter with the Proto. But the Proto is now seriously ill and possibly not expected to return to his job; nobody really knows what the work schedule in the Church of the Procuratoria itself will be.

4. Atrium: open to the outside and can prove impossible before April because of the bitter winter cold. No worker, I was told, would accept to work there during that season.

II. Duration of campaign: to be determined

I have tried to get an estimate, in terms of time involved, as recently as the beginning of this week (June 11 and 13) but this is, officially, a lengthy procedure. It will take only physical presence to negotiate (if permission is granted of course, before which, they claim, no estimate can be made) the sequence and the length of time that will take to cover our remaining units (which have been already indicated to them by myself). The following however, is suggested as an ideal work schedule, in order of priorities:

A. Work in San Marco, Venice

Jan.-Mar. 1979 (approximately)

- Baptistry and museum fragments: 2 weeks to erect scaffolding
  3 weeks coverage; a) forms (2 persons)
  b) measurements
  c) photography

- Cappella Zeno: 1 week scaffolding
  1 week coverage (see above)
- Cappella San Isidoro: 10 days scaffolding
  2 weeks coverage (see above)

- In between, if possible, coverage of arches in main nave of the Church.

Mar.-Apr. 1979 (approximately)

- Atrium: bay 3 and arches: 1 week scaffolding
  1 week coverage (see above)

  bay 4: 1 week scaffolding
  1 week coverage

B. Remaining time

Work on Corpus (AI and RA)

Before the campaign

- Analysis of archival material (pertinent to the material recorded in 1975 -- restorations in San Marco)

- Computation of measurements for the Corpus (material recorded in 1975 campaigns)

- Analysis of photographic material for Corpus entries (material recorded in 1975 campaigns)

After the campaign

- transcription and proofing of the new field notes

- classification - inventory of the new photographic material

Research trips (AI - see NEH description)

Vacations (AI and RA)

III. Materials and scaffoldings (if permission is granted)

A. San Marco resources

1. advantages: relatively low cost

2. disadvantages: availability of scaffoldings not insured. The Procuratoria does not want to promise anything solid. Their policy has always been conditional, so that they can play it as the moment will dictate. So far, the balance has been more on the positive side, despite some falling short of expectations on occasions.
B. Ponteggi Dalmine

1. advantages: competence, and availability of materials (Ponteggi Dalmine erected the scaffolding in previous campaigns)
2. disadvantages: a) much higher cost, which would have to include rental and water transportation of materials from Padua.
   b) Ponteggi Dalmine is (off the record) far from eager now to work in San Marco as the commission is too small. They generally work on a much larger scale. In addition, they are in great demand and are not looking for clients.

C. Conclusion: aim for using San Marco resources for financial reasons.

IV. Workers

A. San Marco workmen

1. advantages: less expensive. Official Italian workmen's wages = 7000 Lit. According to private contacts, the absolute minimum required to erect the scaffolding for one atrium bay would be 4 workers for 4 or 5 days. Nothing less could be envisaged and one must be prepared for delays caused by the Procuratoria needing the workers elsewhere.

2. disadvantages: a) continuous availability of workers not guaranteed. Generally, the Procuratoria makes them available to the project when they are not needed elsewhere.
   b) overtime work no longer possible because of: 1) trade union movements (generated by envy among the workers); 2) lack of an insurance policy for nationals outside office hours.

B. Ponteggi Dalmine workmen

1. advantages: more professional and more reliable once hired.
2. disadvantages: more expensive -- no less than 9-10,000 Lit/per hour plus travel expenses of the team and chief engineer from Padua, Este, Trieste etc. to Venice.
(also Ponteggi Dalmone might not accept the job due to small commission, by their standards)

C. Conclusion: aim for San Marco workmen, financial reasons

V. Staffing

Two investigators on the scaffoldings recording the technical data on the printed forms (simultaneously, but in different areas) are essential for the completion of the work within the allotted time. I recommend that Mrs. Arensberg participate in this campaign since she is very familiar with the process through which one distinguishes the materials and techniques of the original mosaics from those of different phases of reconstruction.

VI. Negotiations

It is advisable that the negotiations with the Procuratoria should start in July. No official answer should be expected before six weeks to two months have elapsed. This time period allows for the Procuratoria to consult with their own hierarchy, (the Patriarch, the Chapter, and the Curia). No negotiations could take place during August when no one is available.
## Count of Figures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(animals, etc.)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*C animals, architecture, ornament and landscape details are all excluded from this count*
Time Estimate for Cataloguing the Mosaic Corpus

To bring the Corpus for Wall Mosaics of the North Adriatic Area into a consultable form for scholarly usage after data has been recorded in the field (See Appendix, A) requires a cataloguing process (See Appendix, B).

For the latter, some operations are more routine (i.e. computation of measurements) than others (description entries, establishing the restored areas, cross-referencing the entries of the Corpus among them, etc., which imply interpretation and going back and forth through comparisons, etc.)

Approximate computations of the operations involved in B, which take different amounts of time from unit to unit would require, on a tight schedule, 3 days per figure, in order to bring the documentary material into a final product, the complete individual entry. General entries introducing the units and subunits are also needed. A preface, explaining the scope of this recording, its methodology as well as the results achieved (foreseen at the outset as well as acquired later) should be written finally and constitute the Guide to Consult the Corpus.

A short estimate would require two and a half years (AI, RA and typist) to bring the whole material surveyed from scaffolding into this shape. Though not chronologically the earliest, the material resulting from the survey of San Marco is by far the overwhelming part of the Corpus (2 years estimate).
Outline of Work Process for Corpus

A. Field work, done from scaffolding and in local archives
   1. Study of the mosaics in situ and recording of descriptive and technical data on printed forms devised for the project (AI)*
   2. Photographic coverage
      a. general photography, requiring constant direction (AI - 95%) of the photographer to establish frames (large transparencies, black and white)
      b. detailed photography, done after the study of the mosaics, to provide visual documentation to support particular points, discoveries, etc. (photographer, AI)
   3. Selection of areas of mosaic decoration to be measured, working with ideal zero points, and establishment of the breadth of the coverage (AI). The measuring requires two assistants: one to measure and one to record measurements.
   4. Archival research to locate and identify materials pertinent to the mosaics (i.e. inscriptions, restorations, etc.) (AI) Relevant documents are transcribed by an archivist.

B. Cataloguing process
   1. Transcription of handwritten field notes (see step A.1.) by a typist, typed notes proofread (RA).
   2. Inventory and identification of the photographic coverage (slides, transparencies, black and white photographs) done by the staff of the Photographic Collection.
   3. Computation of measurements (from ideal zero point system) and the recording of measurements on tracings to be taken from photographs and transparencies (AI and RA, with assistance for tracings from Photographic Collection).
   4. Projection of slides for the analysis and interpretation of the material. This projection also provides the opportunity to study mosaics which, for reason of insufficient time, could not be described in detail from the scaffolding, but were purposely recorded photographically. (AI and RA)
   5. Inscriptions - paleographic and epigraphic analysis based on material supplied in steps A.1-4. (epigrapher).
   6. Bibliographic research for previous publications, history and restoration of the mosaics (RA).
   7. Graphic renderings on tracings and/or photographs showing chronology and extent of the successive restorations (AI and RA)
   8. Blending of notes from the scaffolding and from the slide projection with archival and bibliographical information, measurements, and photography to produce the final catalogue entry. (AI and RA)

*Code: AI = Associate Investigator
RA = Research Assistant
June 15, 1978

Professor Giles Constable, Director
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Giles,

Thank you for your letter of June 10. I, too, feel that progress is being made and hope that this letter will contribute to our understanding.

I have already in my letter to you of May 26 stated in writing that "I will be eager to do my job as described in the NEH project, etc..." This clearly implies everything that is my required job in the NEH project, of which the original wording in the description is precisely quoted as follows:

"a. Preliminary inspection by the Investigators (Demus, Andreeescu) and the Proto of San Marco (or his representative).
b. [washing mosaics by San Marco cleaning crew]
c. Photography by Mr. Ritter and an assistant under the direction of the Investigators.
d. Study and recording of archaeological data by Investigators, consultants, and assistants. Data will be recorded on a printed form prepared by Professor Andreeescu, who will direct and supervise this work. [n.b. These are all part of one operation and should not be broken down into separate items.]
The scaffolding will be erected and moved, under the direction of Professor Andreeescu at a rate to maintain an efficient flow of work in all these operations."

I have always agreed to perform my job as described above and I will, at your request, repeat in writing my acceptance of the terms written in the NEH project.

Your statement (in your letter to me, June 10, 1978) that I should "continue to perform the responsibilities that you [I] have regularly performed since the inception of the project and for which no one else is specifically responsible" needs clarification. The most important issue centers on the overall responsibility for the project and for conducting the negotiations with the Church of San Marco and the Soprintendenza ai Beni Culturali e Ambientali. These must take place before one can begin any part of the work plan as stated in the NEH proposal (items a-d, quoted above). The negotiations, as always, must result in 1) permission to begin work; 2) satisfactory conditions for the work to proceed smoothly and efficiently; and 3) good, ongoing rapport with the Church and the Soprintendenza.

Simple as these objectives may sound, they require constant vigilance and enormous amounts of time in order to assure good will and to reconcile the various
factions within the above-mentioned institutions which often turn the project into a battlefield for their own purposes. On the side of the ecclesiastic authorities and of the workers, there is a general indifference to the project, as there is to many other activities in Italy nowadays; and less than friendliness for American institutions. Anyone working in international organizations in Venice will confirm how frustrating dealing with the local administrations can be because of long delays and unpredictable responses.

As a result, the negotiations must be handled with great delicacy. They require perseverance, an understanding of the personalities and concerns of the institutions involved, and an ability to meet new crises as they arise. While I have handled these difficult tasks in the past, I want to make clear that they have never been one of my formal responsibilities vis-à-vis NEH. Nonetheless, as no one else on the project has felt confident to take charge of this diplomatic mission, I am willing, for the sake of the project, and at your specific request, to take on once again this additional responsibility, provided that you formally recognize and support my status and activities as Field Director for this Project as was done in the past. While I am willing to agree to this expanded job description, I would also like to repeat my desire, expressed in our previous meetings, to protect my scholarly interests, which, as for any scholar, are to see his results, documents and the study resulting therefrom, presented to the public. The intention of Dumbarton Oaks to publish my work is clearly stated in the NEH proposal.

Professional trust and full support from the home institution are sine qua non requirements for the success of the project. I have had both during the previous administration and some difficult crises were successfully overcome. A very stimulating pace was established thanks to the understanding of the exceptionally delicate ground of such missions from Dumbarton Oaks at that time.

In the last year, however, you have brought to my attention criticisms of various natures, directed at my activities as Field Director. These seem unfounded since not only have I fulfilled the terms of the grant, I have also taken on additional time-consuming responsibilities and have filled the void suggested by the phrase "responsibilities for which no one is specifically responsible." The project has produced results at a consistently brisk pace. To achieve those campaign results I have spent an average of 16 hours a day either on the scaffolding or in activities closely related to the project, 7 days a week, cutting down on the one thing left: my sleep. I have spent lately a great deal of time gathering my evidence in support of this project, (scope, methods, policy etc.) and my role, and I hope to have answered the criticisms to your satisfaction. But the general feeling is one of depression and harassment, and of unnecessary time consumed in the defense.

To sum up: my work on the project as has been carried forth in the past has included 1) a full time job (by the NEH job description), as any job-analyst could certainly confirm; 2) unrequested by NEH, an additional amount of work directing the team and recording alone the data for the Corpus (NEH proposal allowed for two investigators to record, and two investigators are essential to the completion of the campaigns within reasonable time limits) on the form used throughout all our mosaic projects, from 1974 to date, using a methodology for which I take entire responsibility; 3) unrequested by NEH, negotiating with
various levels of administration for permissions to do the actual work; and
4) unrequested by NEH, establishing the policy vis-a-vis those institutions,
carrying it forth, and being solely responsible and liable for deadlines, agree-
ments (many times with little choice), participation of workers, salaries and
compensations.

In conclusion, I repeat my willingness not only to fulfill my specific ob-
ligations to NEH (I fail to understand how, having already repeatedly accepted
them, most recently in writing on May 26, this could have been interpreted as
"a breach of our commitment to the NEH"), but also to take on the additional
roles discussed above. I ask only for support from Dumbarton Oaks and for for-
mal recognition of my role as Field Director for this Project.

It appears from your letter that in the course of our meeting, the discussion
at times became too emotional. Please understand that I have been under consider-
able strain lately and if, in the course of defending my view of the project, I
said anything that sounded offensive, I wish to apologize, since this was certain-
ly not my intention.

Sincerely yours,

Irina

Irina Andreescu

IA/aa

Attachments
- Proposed Schedule for 1978-1979 with Count of Figures
- Time Estimate for Cataloguing the Mosaic Corpus
- Appendix: Outline of Work Process for Corpus

XO
- Professor Loerke
- Professor Demus
- Dean Rosovsky
June 19, 1978

Mr. Giles Constable,
Director,
Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies,
1703 Thirty-second Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Dear Giles,

At our meeting on June 7 on San Marco problems (present: Constable, Demus, Loerke, Andreescu), I agreed to provide a report with recommendations on how to bring this project to a successful conclusion. Meanwhile, I have read your letter to Assistant Professor Andreescu of June 10 and her response, with attachments, of June 15.

I. Recommendations:

A. Field Work

2. Ask Assistant Professor Andreescu to serve as Field Director for this period.
3. Provide for a second person on scaffolding to record data for the Corpus (Ms. Arensberg).
4. Decide on plan of work, priorities, and, if necessary, a cut-off point - recognizing that the execution of any plan depends on what can be negotiated in Venice.

B. Corpus


2. On basis of their recommendations, plan on completion of Corpus, including the possibility of publication with outside funding.
C. **Final Reports:**

1. Secure cost estimate for Professor Demus' vol. I when footnotes and list of plates is completed. Project costs for vol. II and begin seeking outside matching funds for the whole.

2. Contingent on B. 2 above, plan for support for Torcello volume.

II. **Summary Background and Comment:**

1. Dumbarton Oaks began this project as part of its own Field Work program. The point of departure was Professor Demus' 1960 volume on the History, Architecture, and Sculpture of San Marco, which was meant as a preliminary to a study of the Mosaics.

2. We applied for Kress funds (in vain) and for NEH grants (successful) when we realized that a systematic and comprehensive campaign of study, photography and archival research was essential. From the outset it was agreed that the campaign should embrace the Veneto as well as San Marco. Two grants for work in San Marco were made from the Research Tools Program of NEH, the only sector of NEH in which we had a chance of success. The research tool in this case was the Corpus. (Grant periods were September 1, 1974-June 30, 1975 and January 2, 1977-December 1, 1978).

3. The entire project may be considered in two parts: (a) San Marco, the most expensive part, in which Dumbarton Oaks is in tandem with NEH. (b) Torcello, Murano, Trieste (i.e., the Veneto) and related campaigns in Greece (Hosios Lukas and Daphni) and Istanbul (certain mosaics in Hagia Sophia), which were entirely supported by Dumbarton Oaks.

4. Expenditures relating to NEH grants can, of course, only be made according to the budgets approved. Copies of these budgets are kept in the Harvard Research Grants Office and at NEH where they are carefully scrutinised. For example, at the conclusion of the first San Marco campaign, we cable $4,000 to Venice (April 3, 1975) to pay for transferring scaffolding from San Marco to Torcello. This sum came from a surplus in the Dumbarton Oaks publications budget and appears nowhere in the NEH budget.

5. Recommendations for the remaining Field Work are based on the following considerations:

   (a) The Narrative Report prepared by Professor Demus and submitted by me at the end of the first NEH grant period, states that Assistant Professor Andreescu "acted as field director". This she did on behalf of Professor Demus and myself, since one would normally expect the P.I. to perform this function unless otherwise specified. Neither NEH grant description states who should do this, - an obvious defect. In the case of San Marco, this
work involved two heavy tasks, in addition to the creation of the Corpus and recording its data. These two tasks were:

(a) to secure permission to carry out the work (complicated negotiations with the Procuratoria, - the Soprintendenza, the Dalmine firm, etc.);

(b) to direct and coordinate a work force of some size, as well as authorize expenditures and see to it that fiscal records were kept in good order. This administrative load would normally justify a separate post. (Striker at Kalenderhane normally acts as a coordinating field director, not directly engaged in gathering data).

I understood from our June 7 meeting that Professor Demus does not wish to act in this capacity, - and I believe we all agree that his time is best spent preparing the text of vol. II. New complications now exist in the serious illness of the Proto, new labor regulations, not to mention continuing inflation and the usual massive apathy of the Italian bureaucrats. In view of all this, I think the best solution is to ask Assistant Professor Andreescu to act as Field Director, formally recognize this, i.e., so she can represent Dumbarton Oaks in Venice as Striker, Harrison et. al. do elsewhere. Also, I think we should recognize the administrative load involved and add Ms. Arensberg to the team to insure steady collection of data at a faster rate than could be expected of a person who is also responsible for running the whole show. This would also fill the gap created by the fact that we do not expect the P.I. to engage in work aimed directly at the Corpus.

III. Dumbarton Oaks commitments:

1. Dumbarton Oaks commitment to this project is the same as to any other: i.e., to carry field work to completion and publish the results. In practice, this commitment to publish results is made in two phases:

(a) an unwritten assumption when field work begins;

(b) faculty (or other professional) acceptance of a complete text submitted for publication, which has been professionally vetted.

2. This general commitment relates to Professor Demus' 2-vol. study of San Marco, and to Assistant Professor Andreescu's study of Torcello et al. It is our practice to support the writing of these books also when the authors are not on our faculty (e.g., Winfield, and to cite only academic year 1978-79, Striker, Kuban, Megaw).

3. Item 4 above commits us to assemble and maintain a Corpus in consultable form at Dumbarton Oaks for the benefit of interested scholars. This Corpus has been the work of Assistant Professor Andreescu, who planned its structure, designed the forms for data recording, and recorded the data.
Professor Demus believes the scope to be far more detailed than is necessary. I believe it is of the nature of Corpora to be comprehensive, detailed, and as objective as possible, so that they can survive the historical changes in the history of art itself. Their real test comes twenty-five years later, when a scholar consults them with a question none of us can now think of, but still finds data enabling him to answer that question. We should think of this Corpus, not in terms of Byzantine art history as currently practiced, but in the category of the Corpus Vitrearum, the Corpus of Tunisian Mosaics (supported by Dumbarton Oaks), the Corpus of Roman Sculpture, etc. The idea is much more acceptable and at home in Ancient Archaeology than in Mediaeval Art History. This is one reason it will make a significant contribution to Mediaeval Art History, both methodologically and substantively. It will do this if case on the scale of existing Corpora, with which it will surely be compared when completed. Since its scope and scale is a matter of disagreement within Dumbarton Oaks, I recommend and urge that we continue work on it on the present scale until a definable section has been completed (e.g., Torcello), at which time it should be submitted to the judgment of competent scholars (both art historians and archaeologists). This review could take place during the coming year.

4. We have completed part of our commitments. We have held a Symposium which offered scholars at least a preliminary view, in historical perspective, of the fresh material deriving from this project. Also, we all take great pleasure and pride in the fact that Professor Demus has completed the text of vol. I of his San Marco study. It must also be said that both accomplishments, though they took place within the existing grant period, were not supported by those NEH grants, which were aimed at photography, archival research, data for the Corpus, research for final reports, but not the actual writing of them. This last is a distinction NEH makes, an unrealistic one I believe, but nonetheless they make it, particularly in connection with Research Tool awards.

Yours sincerely,

William C. Loerke

xc: Dean Henry Rosovsky
   Professor Otto Demus
   Assistant Professor Irina Andreescu
June 19, 1978

Dear Giles,

Thank you very much for your letter of June 6 which arrived 3 days ago during a brief respite. Thank you for taking the trouble about San Marco. I do hope that Miss Andreeva will ultimately realize that it is in her own interest to collaborate.

With kind regards

Yours,

Otto
Dr. Giles Constable  
Director  
Dumbarton Oaks  

Dear Giles:

I had to cancel my reserved trip on Sunday and reserve a seat for Monday as an emergency solution because a) you did not authorize the ticket until 3:15 PM Friday, June 23, but b) mainly because the sum of money authorized is grossly insufficient, and I have no funds of my own to subsidize the operation. The budgeted amount has not been spent, is still available for this purpose and the false impression that the NEH column is low on money comes, I gather, from the substantial sums of money (i.e. per diem in Venice Demus and Andreescu, etc.) incorrectly charged against it, instead of against our column.

I hope this will be resolved on Monday in time for my departure.

As for the rates of per diem, Ms. Markebrooke at Harvard said that they follow the rates of the State Department which are periodically updated; she gave me the necessary rates for all the places I intend to visit.

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreescu

XC Miss Baglia  
Files
June 23, 1978

Dr. Giles Constable
Director
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Giles:

I am concerned for the sake of the Project that you have not conveyed to me your decision regarding the next campaign. Were you to decide you want me to direct it, I would like to point out that unless I receive confirmation immediately, there would not be enough time to set up July negotiations with the Venetian authorities (see my statement of June 15).

Since I am leaving on Monday and will be difficult to reach (my objectives are mainly small villages), I hope to receive word at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Irina Andreescu

XC Files
Professor William C. Loerke  
Dumbarton Oaks  

Dear Bill:

I tried to reach you by phone yesterday from Cambridge and hope to see you as soon as possible after your return to Washington in order to discuss the matters of Irina's title and travel expenses. She is pressing me to make at once decisions which are not mine to make and which can, I fear, hardly be made in less than some weeks or even months.

On the matter of title, I fully accept the point made in her letter of June 15 that she deserves recognition and support for her responsibilities in conducting the negotiations with the civil and ecclesiastical authorities and with the point made in your letter of June 19 that she has in the past been described as acting as field director of the project. I am ready to start proceedings towards formal recognition of this fact, but since it involves a change in her relations with Professor Demus and in the arrangements with the NEH, the agreement of both must be obtained. The matter will then have to go before the Senior Fellows and then be presented for approval by the Administrative Committee and the Trustees. Provided the preliminary steps have been gone through, I shall myself support the step, and I feel sure the Trustees will give their consent; but there is no possibility of the process being completed until long after the negotiations in Venice must be initiated.

On the matter of expenses, I was told in Cambridge that according to their accounts all but $2700 of the $11,720 to be paid by the NEH for travel and per diem has been spent. This may well be (as Irina says) because some expenses have been incorrectly charged to this account, but we cannot exceed that sum until we discover exactly how much really remains and how much is needed for future work. Ms Marquebreuck says that she will send some one down within a month to study the records and establish what expenses should be (or should have been) charged to what accounts. I therefore authorized Lucy over the telephone to pay for Irina's ticket to Cyprus ($1305) and to give her an advance of $1250, which should cover her expenses for at least a month. Meanwhile we would conduct the audit and send her any extra available funds. Even this is a risky course, since should it turn out that the previous expenses were correctly charged, we would be left with literally only $145 of NEH money for all future travel and per diem.

On the matter of the per diem rate, Irina tells me that Ms Marquebreuck said that Harvard follows the State Department rates. These, as you know, are the rates up to which, but not above which, the government
auditors will accept expenses, and we can indeed authorize expenses up to these amounts. As I understand it, however, we can under no circumstances exceed the total on the bottom line. Thus if the NEH has allowed us $3600 for the photographer's per diem (four months at $30 a day), we can authorize up to $54 a day (the Venice rate) but will then have to reduce the amount of time from 120 to 67 days. The same is true of Irina's own expenses. She can spend more than $30 a day but she then has a smaller total number of days abroad. Ms Marquebreuck also gave me copies of the attachment to the San Marco Project grant award specifying (a) that foreign travel must if possible be via U.S. carriers and (b) that 'Foreign travel costs are allowable only when the travel has received specific prior approval. Each separate foreign trip must be specifically approved.' This seems to me to exclude the possibility of paying for travel to Belgrade and Cyprus out of funds granted for travel to Venice.

Two further points arise out of your letter of June 19. (1) The support for writing the Torcello book, as the minutes of the Faculty meeting of December 9 1976 and your memorandum to Mr Tyler of 31 January 1977 make clear, has already been given to Irina by the extension of her appointment to 30 June 1979. I am certain that Dumbarton Oaks will be ready to publish the results when, as you put it, a complete text is submitted for publication and has been professionally vetted. (2) I fully agree that the real test of the value of the Corpus will come after twenty-five years, and that in view of the predicted five-year life span of the color slides, we should therefore concentrate on this time on the black-and-white photos and on completing the Corpus and should keep down the number of color photos to those required for publication in the near future.

My own feeling, as you know, is that our time and resources should be husbanded as much as possible for the San Marco Project and that this summer Irina should therefore work on the Corpus here, going to Venice for only as long as is essential to make the necessary arrangements. The research travel could then be made, time and funds permitting, at the end of the year, immediately prior to the actual writing of the book.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable

cc Otto Demus
Irina Andreescu
Dr. Giles Constable  
Director  
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Giles:

You answer my two memoranda of June 23 through a letter to Professor Loerke of June 24. Here are my further comments.

In the first place, I want to stress the spirit of efficiency and cooperation that I encountered at both the NEH and the Harvard financial offices. Both interlocutors (Ms. Lowitz and Ms. Marquebreuck) believed that it is important to protect my research schedule; i.e., the trip that should have started on Sunday, June 25. They both believed that the paperwork could follow after my departure and the sums which were budgeted in entry III A disbursed now.

You had already tried to cut my per diem rate down to $30.00. (Your phone conversation with Miss Baglia, memo to me, June 23) and the duration of my stay and offered $1250.00 saying that we will keep in touch later. Nobody suggested to account above the rates of the State Department. Also, regulations about U.S. carriers have been well known to me ever since the first NEH grant.

I do need the whole sum now; as you might know, nobody honors a personal check abroad (the one you might send later), and I do not have any way of cashing it in Yugoslavia and Cyprus. The rental of a car and gas, plus other travel expenses, as well as per diem make the budgeted sum of money indispensable.

I am also discouraged about the slow pace you yourself foresee for your formal support to my directing the campaign but which is to me indispensable before I start any involving action. I have been under severe harassment and intimidation (your threat to fire me in three weeks lest I accept to direct the campaign) and feel, at the moment, that you expect me to do all the difficult and responsible parts of the job, while the concrete, active effort of the administration doesn't seem to follow.

Auditing the project is certainly an excellent idea -- I have informed you on our very first conversation when you took office, and several times since, that I had on occasion caught mistakes in the way the expenditures were handled in the financial office. I feel it is grossly
unjust that I should have to suffer the consequences of a situation of which I complained repeatedly. Besides, the money does exist and I suggest, on the strength of the attitude of the NEH and Harvard Offices that the budgeted sum should be given to me today, therefore making some of the arrangements made for this trip still possible.

If these and similar problems cannot be solved while we are all in Washington, I have no confidence that the San Marco campaign could be properly supported once I am in Venice.

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreescu

XC: Professor Loerke
    Professor Demus
NEH Research Grant, Project San Marco, Budget Jan 2, '77 to Dec. 1, '78
Revision of Section III. Staff Travel, Per Diem & Living Allowance

A. Staff Travel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEH</th>
<th>Harvard</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wash.-Venice ret.</td>
<td>$4,100</td>
<td>$4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4 persons at $1,100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Venice-Vienna</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4 rets. at $175)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Venice-Belgrade-</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicosia, incl. local travel in Yugoslavia &amp; Cyprus (Assn. F.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL STAFF TRAVEL</td>
<td>$5,920</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Per Diem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEH</th>
<th>Harvard</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) III. A. 3</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60 days at $31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Per Diem</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Living Allowance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEH</th>
<th>Harvard</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. P.I. &amp; Assoc. I. in Venice (6 months each at $900; time not continuous &amp; daily rate may apply)</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>10,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Photographer</td>
<td>$4,250</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4/3 months at $900; time not continuous &amp; daily rate may apply)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LIVING ALLOWANCE</td>
<td>$4,250</td>
<td>10,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TRAVEL &amp; ALLOWANCE</td>
<td>$11,320</td>
<td>$12,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 26, 1978

Dr. W. Mutschlechner
Director
Hohere Graphische Bundes-Lehr- and Versuchsanstalt
Wien XIV
A 1140 Wien, Leyserstrasse 6

Dear Dr. Mutschlechner:

I am pleased to see from your letter of April 24, 1978, (1585/78/La) that you are using some of the photographs of Venetian mosaics, taken by Herr Ritter for our San Marco project, in a Calendar which will mark the 90th anniversary of your institution.

May I offer our congratulations on the occasion of this anniversary and also our best wishes for the future.

Sincerely yours,

William Loerke
Professor of Byzantine Art
Dumbarton Oaks
Sehr geehrte Frau Doktor!

Für die Genehmigung, Mosaik-Motive für unsere Jahresgabe verwenden zu dürfen, möchte ich Ihnen im Namen der Direktion recht herzlich danken.

In der Beilage haben wir die von Ihnen mit Herrn Ritter besprochenen Vereinbarungen schriftlich dargestellt.

Gleichzeitig geht ein Schreiben an Herrn Univ.Prof.Dr.O.Demus mit der Bitte, ein Vorwort zu dieser Bildserie zu schreiben.

Sollten Sie Ihre Reisen nach Wien führen, würden wir es sehr begrüßen, wenn Sie unserer Schule einen Besuch abstatten könnten.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen verbleibe ich

hochachtungsvoll

Dr.W.Mutschlechner
Direktor
Höhere Graphische Bundes-Lehr- und Versuchsanstalt, A-1142 Wien

Frau
Dr. Irina Andreescu
Field Direktor for the San Marco Projekt
Dumbarton Oaks
1703 Thirty second Street
Washington DC 20007

Betrifft: Jahresgabe 1978/79 anlässlich des 90 Jahr-Jubiläum
der Höheren Graphischen Bundes-Lehr-u. Versuchsanstalt.

Die Höhere Graphische Bundes-Lehr- und Versuchsanstalt in Wien
druckt im Rahmen des Schulunterrichtes in schuleigenen Werk-
stätten eine Jahresgabe in Form eines Kalender 1979 mit den
fünf vereinbarten Motiven von Mosaiken.
Diese Jahresgabe dient ausschließlich zur Demonstration der
Leistungsfähigkeit der Schule und wird als Geschenk für Absol-
venten, Freunde und Förderer unserer Anstalt verwendet und nicht
handelsmäßig vertrieben.
Sämtliche Exemplare werden als Gesamtkalender abgegeben und ent-
halten folgende Angaben:
Hinweis auf Herstellung in der "Graphischen"
Aktion und Genehmigung von Dumbarton Oaks (inkl. Vorwort)
Bildunterschriften: Motiv, Dumbarton Oaks/Havard University/Foto
Ekkehard Ritter

Belegexemplare erhalten: Dumbarton Oaks
San Marco
Prof. Demus
Herr Ritter
Förderer der Herstellung (Papier)

Die Verantwortung der Abbildung und der Einhaltung der Bedingungen
liegt bei der Direktion der Höheren Graphischen Bundes-Lehr- und

Der Direktor:

Dr. W. Mutschlechner

Wir bitten, Zuschriften unter Angabe unseres Zeichens an die Direktion und nicht an Einzelpersonen zu richten.
Dr. W. Mutschlechner  
Director  
Höhere Graphische Bundes-Lehr- und Versuchanstalt  
Wien XIV, Leyserstraße 6  
A-1140 Wien, Leyserstraße 6

Dear Dr. Mutschlechner:

I am pleased to see from your letter of April 24, 1970 (1585/18/4a) that you are planning using some of the photos of Venetian mosaics, taken by Herr Pittt for our San Marco project, in a Calendar which will mark the 900th anniversary of your institution.

May I offer our congratulations on the occasion of this anniversary and also our best wishes for the future.

Sincerely yours,

William Becker
g. 13 F - 0
To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that

Dr. Sina Anderson, Assistant Professor of Byzantine Archaeology at the
University of Washington, is authorized to conduct
negotiations as in previous years.

on behalf of Dumbarton Oaks, within the limits of its established budget.

for completing the work on the Project San Marco
during the academic year 1978-79.

That she has the full support of myself and Dr. Principal
Investigator, Professor William C.
LeBrecht, of the Director of
Dumbarton Oaks in carrying out
this important responsibility.

III  A1 + 1500  1100  ticket
     A 3  620  travel to Yugo.
     2  200  Algad-Venini
     5  200 (ticket)  750  travel in Cyprus

III  B 1 6  1800  travel per diem
        2970

III  B 1  a  250
        2220
Your issues are being resolved as we agreed. I hope for one, we are willing to start negotiating! Have a good summer!
June 28, 1978

Prof. Otto Demus
Kunsthistorisches Institut der
Universität Wien
Universitätsstrasse 7
A 10 10 Wien
Austria

Dear Otto:

You may have heard from Ritter that I tried to telephone you. The reason was to obtain your consent to a letter Irina wants me to write as a condition of her being willing to undertake the preliminary negotiations in Venice (cf her letter to me of June 15, of which she sent you a copy). The proposed text is as follows: 'Dear Irina, This letter will confirm that we are in agreement that you will act as field director on behalf of Dumbarton Oaks in conducting the negotiations and carrying out in Venice the field work required by the San Marco Project during the coming academic year.' I told Irina and Professor Loerke that I could not write this without consulting you. I hope it will be acceptable. If so, I believe that Irina is prepared to do everything she has in the past and to bring the Project as close to completion as possible by the end of the grant period.

Irina has now left on the research trips to Yugoslavia and Cyprus. I should have preferred, as you know, that she remain here working on the Corpus, but in the course of these travels she will visit Venice in order to conduct the preliminary negotiations. She plans to be there on July 18 and my letter, if you approve, should reach her there.

I also enclose a copy of a letter from Professor Loerke to the NEH, and their reply. I hope that this, too, has your approval.

With all best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable
Director

Encl
Mr. Giles Constable, Director  
Dumbarton Oaks.

Dear Giles,

This is in response to your letter of 24 June. I attach two fiscal statements:

(a) Revised version of NEH San Marco Grant Budget, Section III

(b) Statement of recent disbursements and their proper assignment to Section III as revised.

Item (a) reflects changes authorized by Amy Lowitz June 16 in response to my request of May 23 (copies in San Marco file).

Item (b) clarifies these disbursements with respect to the NEH Budget, showing where they are to be charged (all within Section III). Several problems arise from the fact that some items charged against the NEH column should have been charged against the D.O. column, while other items cannot be charged against either column. Since the sums were disbursed in fiscal year 1976-77 and the corrections have to be made in fiscal year 1977-78, I suggest this sheet become the basis for the discussion between Miss Baglia and whoever comes from the Research Grants Office, Cambridge. The sum not chargeable to the San Marco Project budget could be covered in one of two ways: either by D.O. Field Work Contingency, or by some of the Hidden Administrative Cost item to be retrieved from NEH, and assigned to Field Work for this purpose.

I believe these two statements respond to fiscal points raised in your letter of June 24. Your final points were:

(1) Support for writing the final report on Torcello;
(2) ratio of black and white to color in the remaining photography.

Both of these could be dealt with by the Review Committee, which I suggested earlier could meet around November 1. On the first half of these points, a basic fact of archival and archaeological work is that final reports are normally written after material has been gathered and placed in order.
The Torcello material is now being assembled in order, and Assistant Professor Andreescu is currently on the last of a sequence of research trips whose fruit we expect to see in the Torcello study. Her study should reflect the results of these trips and hence be written at their conclusion.

I think the next order of business should be to invite perhaps three persons from the list suggested to scan the Corpus, and the San Marco project as a whole, if you like.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

xc: Professor Otto Demus
    Assistant Professor I. Andreescu
July 4, 1978

dear Giles,

Thank you very much for your letter of June 28. I have also received copies of Roeker's and Mrs. Andreescu's letters, as well as a letter from Mrs. Bras, confirming my appointment for the Spring term of 1978. I am very grateful to you and to the Trustees for this appointment.

As regards the San Marco campus 1978/79, I am quite agreeable to Miss Andreescu being officially recognized as Field Director, provided that my position is not compromised by this. That it is made clear to Miss Andreescu that I continue to be the Principal (or First) Investigator, and that I am not under her command or supervision, it there is to be any kind of the kind it should be the other way around. Furthermore, that Miss Andreescu is not to publish a field report on San Marco in the DOP or any other publication.

As to the schedule for 1978/79, I should like to make the following comments:

Camilla Reno: 1 week scaffolding and 1 week coverage seems to
The mosaics are almost completely renewed and are thus primarily of iconographic interest. Something similar applies to the mosaics of the Campella Sant' Ildo. 10. Of the time stipulated for the two chapels, one week could, I think, be saved.

It is not at all important for the work in days 5 and 6 of the Attony, which in Miss Anderson's schedule (attached to her letter to you of June 15) are not provided for. Actually, these two days are the most important both iconographically and stylistically; they are also among the best preserved of the atrium mosaics.

Otherwise I am in accord.

With many thanks,
yours sincerely

Otto

PS My address for the time from July 5 to July 27 will be
Sach universität,
A-5350 Strobl, Wolfgang,
Tel (best between 12 to 130)
06137/343
July 10, 1978

Prof. Irina Andreescu  
c/o Rag. Emilio Del Pizzol  
Via Monte Cengio, 1/C  
30191 Venice  
Italy

Dear Irina:

I have now heard from Professor Demus, and he is quite agreeable to our agreement that you will act as field director on behalf of Dumbarton Oaks in conducting the negotiations and carrying out in Venice the field work required by the San Marco Project during the coming academic year.

He specified, however, that this should not be taken to prejudice his position as Principal Investigator or to imply that he would be under your supervision, and also that you should not publish any field report on San Marco. He also made some important suggestions concerning the proposed time table, including that a week might be saved from the time allotted for both the Cappella Zeno and the Cappella Sant' Isidoro and that provision should be made for bays 5 and 6 of the atrium.

I enclose a copy of a letter recently received by Father Meyendorff.

I hope all is going well with you and your work.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable  
Director

Encl: as stated

xc: Prof. Demus  
    Prof. Loerke
HAVE NOT RECEIVED ANY LETTER INDICATING AS AGREED YOUR DECISION ON FIELD DIRECTION STOP LEAVE VENICE EARLY SATURDAY MORNING MY ADDRESS ALBERGO LA FENICE TELEPHONE 704164
IRINA ANDREESCU

COL LT 704164

/DO NOT TELEPHONE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY RESEARCH
LIBRARY AND COLLECTION DUMBARTON OAKS
1703 32ND ST NW
WASHINGTON DC 20007
THIS MAILGRAM IS A CONFIRMATION COPY OF THE FOLLOWING MESSAGE:

TDMT WASHINGTON DC 07-21 1132A EST
INT ANDREESCU
ALBERGO LA FENICE
VENICE (ITALY)
AGREED LETTER SENT CARE OF DEL PIZZOL WITH COPY TO DEMUS ON 10 JULY GILES

COL 10
11:33 EST
MGMCMP MGM

TO REPLY BY MAILGRAM, SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR WESTERN UNION'S TOLL - FREE PHONE NUMBERS
Dear Prof. Constantine,

Greetings from Yugoslavia. As you know I am now in Europe gathering material on depictions of Byzantine Church musicians on frescoes, icons, and book illuminations. After seeing my professor in Hamburg, I visited Paris at the end of June and obtained some important material from S. Dufrènne. Upon my return from Paris I found a telegram from Irina Andreescu about meeting in Skopje at a certain date in order to drive the car for her as part of the San Marco project. In J.O. she told me she didn't get the money for the projected tour—probably because she disliked my association with Damla Monti-ki—but apparently she wasn't sure of Tom + John Maxciner who were also to drive and she could again use me.
Well—to make a long story short dear Miss Irina left me sitting in the middle of the tour. I had voiced my disapproval of some of her remarks about foreign peasants and also proved that I could get permission to see parts of a church in the altar area without Romanian intervention and she didn’t like it. So after seeing Zica, Studentica, Peć... she and the Majeimers went on to Debarnik. For the tour to monasteries around Skopje I’m not invited.

But I’m pleased to see that scholars in Belgrad know about her manners. I’m just in the line of people Miss Irina fixed. To be sure, I was well aware of her character but how am I to carry on my research without a position or grant. I’m sure Irina promoted her tour as a D.O. project. Perhaps it might be interesting for you to learn from her why she left one of the D.O. people by the roadside in the middle of the tour.

Respectfully, K. Moran
July 26, 1978

Dr. Neil Moran
Musikwissenschaftliches
Institut der Universität Hamburg
Neue Raben Strasse 13
D-2000 Hamburg 13
Germany

Dear Neil:

Your letter from Belgrade deeply distressed -- but did not, I must admit, entirely surprise -- me. I fear that Irina has become accustomed to using both people and institutions, without always even being aware of the impression she is making. I hope in any case that you were able to do what you needed to, even without Irina's help (?)! I hope, too, most earnestly, that a suitable position emerges so that you can continue your research.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable
Director
Mr. Charles Parkhurst
Assistant Director
National Gallery of Art
Washington, D. C. 20565

Dear Charles:

In November, 1974, we confirmed an agreement whereby the National Gallery would purchase black and white negatives taken by our San Marco Project. I understand from Mrs. Philbrick that the Gallery wishes to withdraw from this agreement and is willing to return to Dumbarton Oaks the 392 negatives in its possession. With this letter, Dumbarton Oaks agrees to terminate the 1974 agreement, granted the return of the negatives.

Reviewing the correspondence on this matter has reminded me of the key role this agreement had played in our getting the first NEH grant for this Project. All those concerned are grateful to you and the Gallery for this timely assistance.

Sincerely yours,

William C. Loerke

cc: Mrs. Ruth Philbrick
Miss Judith O'Neill
TO: Giles Constable
FROM: Bob Van Nice
SUBJECT: Recent photographs of mosaics in St. Sophia

Hereewith the comments you wished me to set down.

To do so took a lot longer than the 20 minutes you suggested I spend, for it's hard to condense the feelings generated by watching -- always from the sidelines -- opportunities of great promise simply wasted.

After you've had a chance to glance at this, I would like to speak with you again on a couple of matters barely touched upon when we last spoke.

And, my thanks to you and "vhy for last Monday's pleasant lunch."
These are remarks I recently made concerning the distressingly poor quality of the few colored slides of mosaics in St. Sophia that were projected during last May's Symposium. Similar concern was, I gather, expressed independently by others, and understandably so. The spectacular figural representations which received world-wide publicity during their uncovering beginning some 56 years ago are of artistic as and historical interest distinction/to justify expectations of interested and knowledgeable persons that they would receive best possible treatment. In view of notable advances in color photography over the last few decades it is therefore inexcusable to find most recent photographs inferior to color reproductions made many years ago, to exposures made 20 years ago at Mount Sinai, and to superb color shots made more recently of the Virgin and Archangel in St. Sophia.

The first objection to one of the views projected of a panel of Imperial portraits was its poor and misleading color. A reddish cast overall completely altered the subtle gradations of flesh-colored marble cubes commonly used for delineating faces and changed even the impression of background gold.

A second and equally strong objection results from photographing the mosaic surface in a raking light. This kind of lighting casts shadows in recesses where cubes are missing, giving a face the appearance of being pockmarked. In this connection and despite charges of several kinds that may justifiably be leveled at the inadequacy of Whittemore's preliminary reports (which are the only kind ever published by the Institute) he must forever be given full marks for one decision: he sacked within a year the Italian "technicians" whom he first brought from Venice
on the accepted assumption that they were foremost in mosaic restoration when in the tradition that/many of the finest mosaics in their own country they started to "restore" figures by replacing missing cubes. Thanks to his perception in this aspect of the work, every tessera remains today in its original position, and where one has been lost, fresco color of the underlying/cartoon can still be seen. When a figure is photographed in appropriate light that does not cast shadows, not only is true color retained but minor flaws due to missing cubes are hardly apparent. These latest pictures taken in a raking light, instead of minimizing flaws, actually exaggerate them. For a person privileged to have observed these fine works of art at close range over a long period of years it is disturbing to see them receive such thoughtless treatment. And even more so to learn that more of the same cavalier efforts my be centered on other mosaics in/ not to fulfill inadequacies only in our knowledge or records of them, but/for purposes of comparison with others also incompletely studied in other areas of the Mediterranean.
Dear Giles,

Henry has telephoned me in some puzzlement about a conversation we had in Venice which seems to have become strangely tangled in the grapevine, on its way to Washington, and seemed to you as something else. (There was a leafy grapevine over our heads, now that I think of it, and the lunch was very good—but not so good that I can't tell you firsthand if you are interested, what it is that we discussed).

We had just been to Torcello with Giana, who shared her knowledge and her questions about the cathedral with our Courtauld Summer School group. She had invited us to meet Sir Ashley and Lady Clarke, and it was a pleasure to hear from them about some of the progress that is being made in the preservation of Venice (their hopes for a new reason that has been developed to protect the stone from outside corrosion while letting dampness out, for instance, and the good news that after recently stopping the export of fresh water for industrial use, Venice has actually begun to rise from the lagoon).

And having seen the results of their project in the now pristine church of Sta. Maria della Zita, we were glad to hear of the proposal for a major international...
project at Torcello. Poking the technical expertise of the various national teams should permit a very thorough and informative investigation of this mysterious building, and give new answers about art and architecture, and the currents between East and West throughout a crucial period (not least revealing in the light that may be thrown on S. Marco by comparative details).

Sir Ashley expressed concern in planning such a project as a technical laboratory for documenting the most useful methods of exploring a medieval building and ensuring its continued soundness, that there should be some official scholarly guidance and approval of the work in progress. He would turn, by choice, for the guidance to Dumfartan Oaks. We agreed, then, that he ought to write to you to tell you of the scope and nature of his plans.

I wish you could visit Venice now and be impressed, as we were, with the whole atmosphere of respect for monuments that distinguishes it from so many other Italian cities - in Vicenza we saw Palladian palazzi crumbling in a setting of visible, and far from picturesque, decay. It was a delight.
to be able to read with one’s own eyes the newly cleaned mosaics at S. Marco, instead of having to take them on faith.

Needless to say, in such a conversation there was no place for the naming of persons to be involved in any plans, much less their specific funding.

Henry says everyone flees quickly who comes to D.A. this summer. I hope that means you have some respite from work, if not much peace and quiet.

Greetings and best wishes to all your family, for a pleasant summer’s end —

Eunice Maguire
Dear Giles,

Thank you for your letter of July 12, which reached me at the end of August, forwarded from Venice, when it had arrived after my departure at the end of July.

There has never been any doubt, in fact, according to the Nuffield Project description, Prof. Deanes and Prof. Locke is "Co-Principal Investigators."

It was accepted since 1975 that, as his request, Prof. Deanes will devote himself to this book, having his time and energy consumed, mostly with this administrative and organizational work in Deans Park, and that myself will direct the field campaign and organize the corps, before writing up our book on foresters and all. The title of field director described in my understanding, work and responsible since 1977, without the original field director for Deans Park, Deanes licked since my involvement with the Nuffield Project has been so far engaged at all levels, from establishing the framework of the recording of data to its execution in detail. I do expect, as any field director, to make this evidence available to scholarly consultation, as stated in the Nuffield Project description. For this purpose I have already entirely agreed with your idea that a wider professional debate on the ultimate presentation of the material would be necessary and will be held to present for this discussion a sample-textual code of the project.

Of course, standing by the initial agreement as for the division of the material for publication, I do agree that it is possible any field report or San Marco which falls into Mr. Deanes role as long as he intends to do himself.

Also, thank you for conveying me his suggestions for the next campaign. I feel as though would be, I have very self spend much time in very careful consideration of the uncountable aspect (scholarly and less scholarly) involved in the enterprise. As you read
to you is an ideal, as well, but I believe, more realistic plan. However, were anybody willing, even at this point to take over the whole organization, I would certainly not oppose his chance for first hand experience in Venetian matters.

Having arrived from your telegrams in Venice that in agreed on the general matter, I have started formal negotiations and had informal talks as well, for our next campaign.

The unexpected election of the Cardinal Berti and to the diocese of St. Peter is fortunate as it is for higher reasons. He, personally, is at this moment, of a long-time, effective, local support, about the festivities in Venice.

Sending on clearer signals about the structure of power of the new vacancy, and the lack of an sole ultimate authority I might need several preliminary encounters in order to mildly reassess the general principle of the large campaign I intend to do so in one way back, staying in Venice from 10th to 20th of September. I will then be in a better position to inform all those concerned about our future schedule. You could, if you wish, contact me by mail at that time.

The public interest for the project in its various aspects seems quite encouraging, as I found out from discussions with scholars, restorers (and even a publisher which even mentioning potential interest i.e. subscribers) from UNESCO.

I look forward to fully inform you about this matter upon my return in October, and mean while, to keep in touch about the developments.

I hope you had a good summer and that all goes well at Ducbenton Oaks.

Sincerely yours,

IRINA ANDREESECU

nc: Prof. Coeck
Prof. Driano
21/10/78
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October 12, 1978

Telephone conversation with Professor Andreescu

She has a campaign planned for ten days commencing November 9 and is writing a full report to me, Professor Loerke and Professor Demus. She said that the time estimates for her campaigns are said to be short but that she has or hopes soon to have the permission for the spring campaigns.

Practical details: She will go to Paris Monday the 16 in order to settle her visa problems and plans to be at Dumbarton Oaks on Friday, October 20 or possibly on Monday, October 23 if there are difficulties. I told her that I would be leaving on the evening of the 17th and not back until the 31st and would see her after that. She told me to tell Miss Baglia to send Del Pizol the money he asked by telegram and I said she should include in her letter to Loerke an explanation of why this money was needed, since it was he, and not myself or Miss Baglia, who had the responsibility as principle investigator to authorize these payments.

GC
September 26, 1978

Professor William Loerke
Dumbarton Oaks
Washington, D.C. 20007

Dear Bill:

I spoke with Alice-Mary about the Collegium, and she will be in touch with you concerning the 'Suger chalice' talk, which should be scheduled for Wednesday, May 11 (the Wednesday before the Byzantine symposium). I hope you and she will also investigate the possibility of an exhibition of liturgical textiles at the Textile Museum.

I forgot to mention when we were talking that I feel that library resources are one of the main areas on which the Collegium should concentrate, in addition to joint projects. I am told that there is a plan (even potential funding) for a union list of fine arts periodicals in the Washington metropolitan area, but that it lacks a formal sponsor. This would seem to me a 'natural' for the Collegium, and I shall let you know when I hear more about it.

I am glad that we are in agreement that we should press as hard as possible to advance the Corpus this coming year. Its progress would indeed have been promoted if, as you said, Irina had been able to spend the summer here working with Susan Arensburg and providing the 'glue' to tie together the data and could be speeded in the future by recording less detail and taking fewer color photos. Since there is really no chance of a further appointment for Irina here, we must make every effort to use her unique capabilities and knowledge while she is here in order to advance the completion of the Corpus. The best time to consider how actually to complete and use it will, I think, be when we have seen how far we can get during the coming year. I look forward to discussing this with Susan and yourself at your convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable
DEL PIZZOL INSISTS INCASE YOU NEED ANY INFORMATION NOT TO HESITATE TO CALL HIS DAUGHTER AT 959056 OR 951995 AFTER OFFICE HOURS TO GET INTOUCH WITH HIM

IRINA

16/0: backed w. Locoke or will take check (+ account no.) if he does not let me know
November 2, 1978

MEMORANDUM

TO: William Loerke
FROM: Giles Constable

Dear Bill:

Thank you for your letter regarding the Washington Collegium and the announcement of the meeting. With regard to the first question you ask, the person and topic for the lecture on the chalice should be chosen in consultation with the National Gallery which, in turn, will consult with us concerning the person and topic for their lecture. Once that is clear I think you can invite whomever you wish, so long as Alice-Mary agrees to the costs. With regard to your second question, I am enthusiastic for scheduling a performance of liturgical chants on Thursday or Friday evening, whichever fits in better with the schedule of the Symposium and with Ruth Steiner's commitments. I am uncertain what the cost to us, if any, would be but this again can be settled in consultation with Alice-Mary.

My visit to Venice with Otto Demus went off well. I also saw Irina there and hope that she and Demus will be able to agree on both a schedule and a scale of priorities. Demus, as you know, is quite agreeable to taking somewhat fewer photographs and to omitting certain sections of the mosaics, so long as others are completed.

I heard on my return from Europe that the Trustees had finally voted on the Senior Fellows for this year. Since they did not want to enlarge the overall size of the committee, which is short one member since Ernst's resignation last year, and accepted the principle agreed upon from the beginning that membership in the Committee should rotate, they decided to appoint the new members (Alice-Mary Talbot and Oleg Grabar) for three year terms and to rotate the original members off, in alphabetical order, beginning with yourself, followed by John, Kenneth and Emily. I still, of course, look forward to discussing with you matters relating to the Center, and particularly the appointment of a new curator.
November 6, 1978

Prof. Otto Demus
Kunsthistorisches Institut
Der Universität Wien
A-1010 Wien 1
Universitätsstrasse 7
Vienna, Austria

Dear Mr. Demus,

Thank you for your October 24 letter. I had also received a letter from Dr. Kloos himself in the meantime.

About your trip to Venice, October 20 to 23, unfortunately, there is no place in the NEH project where it can be identified.

It has been neither scheduled initially, nor granted prior permission from NEH, as the regulations require.

As there is a chance that your trip was granted by Mr. Constable personally, I will turn your vouchers over to him, for him to take care of.

With best wishes, yours,

Irina Andreescu

cc: Mr. Constable
    Mr. Loerke
November 7, 1978

MEMORANDUM

TO: William Loerke
FROM: Giles Constable

Dear Bill:

I really do not understand Irina's letter of November 6 to Otto Demus, of which she sent you a copy. In the first place, it is for you, as Principal Investigator and not for either myself or Irina, to approve or disapprove payments from the NEH grant. Second, I see in the revised version of Section 3 of the budget, dated 26 June, 1978, provision for four return trips between Venice and Vienna, which are, I presume, for Professor Demus. There is also allowance for living expenses in Venice. Third, half of the money budgeted for these trips comes from Dumbarton Oaks and not from the NEH, and Patricia Benfari tells me that Harvard does not require prior approval for spending its own matching funds. I see no reason, therefore, that Otto's expenses for this trip, which are directly related to the project and, after all, very modest, should not be covered.

Please let me know whether or not you agree.

Yours

cc: Irina Andreeescu
    Otto Demus
The request for a check for Mr. Kloos was part of a memorandum dated June 14 for various checks -- on which memorandum we had many many discussions.

I am reasonably sure that I would have asked for some kind of an invoice to support the payment.

There was one other request on that memorandum on which no action had been taken; namely, the $300 per diem payment for Foto Ritter. There was no request from him for the payment. There is no Dumbarton Oaks policy that we pay $47 a day in Venice. Six times $47 is not $300. And there is no identification of the days for which per diem was being paid.

The request for 3,000 shillings to be paid to Foto Ritter was acted on because there was a request from Foto Ritter for it although it was not signed by him. Technically, it should be signed by him. Anyone could type it and mail it. His signature would make it a request for payment.

cc: G. Constable
NEH regulations state that written records should be retained for three years after the period of the grant.

Harvard policy is that records should be retained for three years after the last transaction.

However, Harvard has been audited up to seven years after the period of the grant. Once when it tried to wiggle out of it, the Government Auditors asked for the date on which the records had been destroyed. We could not provide such a defense because we have the records and have been working with them more actively during the past month than we did three years ago.
TO: Miss L. P. Baglia  
FROM: Irina Andreescu  
DATE: November 9, 1978  
SUBJECT: Your Memorandum of November 7, 1978

I have no recollection of any comment you might have made to me, nor is there any evidence for this in the files, on the subject of my memorandum to you (June 14, 1978) where, among other things, I requested that you send a check for Mr. Kloos, archivist in the amount of DM 433.50, charge against San Marco, I,B,3 and another check to Mr. Ritter, $ U.S. 300.00, charge against III,C,3.

When I found at my return to Washington in October a letter from Prof. Kloos expressing his astonishment at Dumbarton Oaks not having honored this obligation, I came to see you, to find out about the matter, before I could answer his letter.

As for Mr. Ritter, since I expect to meet him in Venice next week, I will ask him to submit a signed statement, in case he has not done so yet. The rate of per diem for him is the same that has been used by myself, in my accounting, which has been accepted by Mr. Constable.

About the general policy on per diem rates, etc., I enclose a xerox copy of a paragraph from Mr. Constable's letter to Professor Loerke (June 24, 1978).

I believe that had your comments been made between June 14 and June 27 (when I left this country), we could have avoided one more instance in which Dumbarton Oaks displays an unfavorable image with outside associates because of retarded payments.

cc: Mr. Constable  
Prof. Loerke
TO: Miss Baglia
FROM: Irina Andreescu
DATE: November 9, 1978

Please pay £5 to Lord Crawford of Balcarres, Colinsburgh, Fife and charge against NEH grant, IV, B (colour slides for research). Thank you.
November 10, 1978

Mr. Giles Constable, Director
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Giles,

Since we are now entering the final phase of work on the "San Marco" project, I feel it is imperative to clarify quickly the extent of Dumbarton Oaks' commitment to this project and our obligations to NEH. The central issues to be considered are a definition of the final product, the format in which this product will be presented to the public, and a realistic assessment of the period of time necessary to bring this project to a conclusion that is satisfactory to both Dumbarton Oaks and to NEH.

Last spring you suggested to me that these issues would best be resolved by an outside review committee composed of scholars in the field. Among possible candidates for such a committee, you mentioned Dr. Robin Cormack and I mentioned Professor Kitzinger. In his letter to you of June 19, Professor Loerke independently made the suggestion for such a committee. In my letter to you of September 4, I expressed my continuing interest in a professional review. I now urge that this committee be established as soon as possible so that by resolving the issues mentioned above, we may make most efficient use of the time remaining.

The grant awarded from the Research Tools Program of NEH was to support the Corpus, "a complete photographic and archeological record of the medieval mosaics in San Marco and in the Veneto." In the past, the terms of this grant have been interpreted with flexibility, the result being that Professor Demus' book, though not directly sponsored by NEH, has been given priority. This reordering of priorities, though it is justifiable on scholarly grounds and enhances the value of the project as a whole, nevertheless imposes a moral obligation on Dumbarton Oaks to fulfill the original terms of the NEH grant. The change can be justified to NEH only if it does not jeopardize completion of the Corpus, for which they gave financial support.

This change has also necessarily affected the progress of the Corpus. While NEH provided for two full-time investigators (Demus and Andreescu), the Corpus has been carried on by only one (Andreescu), thereby reducing considerably the rate at which the Corpus could be completed. This fact must be taken into consideration in reviewing the status of the project and outlining our future course of action. In my judgment, these are issues which should be resolved by a committee of the sort that you, Professor Loerke, and I have all proposed.

Sincerely,

[signature]

Irina Andreescu

xc: Senior Fellows, Dean Rosovsky,
    Prof. Loerke, Prof. Demus
Dear Irina:

Thank you for your letter. I agree that we must consider the question of the 'final product' of the San Marcos project (whether or not by a committee), though it may be premature to do so before it is clear how much will be accomplished in the coming two campaigns.

With this in mind, I should remind you that Susan Orensberg's appointment runs out at the end of this year. Please let me know before you leave whether or not you wish to keep her as your assistant. Personally, I am very favorably impressed by her.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

cc Professor Loeske
Dear Giles,

Thank you for your letter of Oct. 10. In answer to the paragraph concerning Susan Heissberg’s appointment, I want to confirm in writing that, through the time of our association, I have been very pleased with her performance as my research assistant. Therefore, I recommend that her appointment be extended.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
TO: Irina Andreea
FROM: Lucy P. Baglia
DATE: November 14, 1978

So that there be no future misunderstanding as to what I did say to you yesterday about the money "left over" from the so-called "Hagia Sophia" project of the fiscal year 1977-78 --------

There was no authority to write checks as of June 30, 1978 (the close of the fiscal year) except for invoices on hand in the financial office as of June 17.

If the decision is made to do any further work on the Hagia Sophia project in the future and additional expenses are incurred, it will be the responsibility of the Director and this office to find the funds with which to pay for such authorized future work.

cc: Giles Constable
Dear Bill:

I have looked for you several times since going left and am sorry to have missed you. I hope that you had a chance to speak with her before she left about the priorities of work to be done and the number of photographs to be taken.

I gather there was some confusion in her mind over the photographing in St Sophia. You will remember that this was discussed at the Senior Fellows meeting last May (of which I enclose a copy of the relevant page of the minutes) that it was left to you to write her. Since there is now little chance of completing the San Marco St Sophia project, I have even less chance of doing anything about the St Sophia photographing.
I am confirmed in this opinion by Bob Van Nie's view of the quality of Bitter's photographs there (see enclosed copy).

Have you received a confirmation of the cable from Dina, which is (to me) almost incomprehensible as it stands? I hope that you know what to do about it.

Susan Arnsbury's appointment runs out soon. Dina before she left said she would like her continued. Is this also your view? Is there sufficient money in the budget for her salary?

Best wishes

Giles

P.S. I enclose a form from ORC to be filled out.
Cable from Irina Andreescu:

Please approve additional return wien Venice ritter.

Weekend strike railroad trip airplane via Millan,

Ritter agree return finish work week later.

Very high invoice for procuratoria.

Recommend recap per entries and general review.

Thanks, letter follows.
I understand from Mr. Constable that you have agreed that Susan Arensberg's appointment should be renewed to June 30, 1979 and that the salary should be charged to the field work budget for San Marco.

I would appreciate a copy of whatever appointment renewal she receives and a new salary rate (if it is different from the present salary rate) in time for the January payroll.

I should discuss with you the use of her leave prior to June 30 so that there will be no charges after June 30, 1979, when there will be no budget to absorb the cost.
Susan Arensberg

Dear Susan:

This letter will confirm the extension of your current appointment at Dumbarton Oaks as Assistant in the San Marco Project, from January 1, 1979 to June 30, 1979. For this period your salary will be calculated at an annual rate of $11,235. The leave to which you may be entitled should be taken by June 30. As you know office hours are from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. with one hour off for lunch.

May I say that I am most pleased with the quality of your work and the exercise of your good judgment in the assistance you provide Miss Andreescu in the preparation of the Corpus.

Sincerely yours,

William Loerke

cc: Giles Constable
    Lucy Baglia
Dear Miss Baglia:

I record here our understanding that Susan Aronsberg salary, Jan. 1, '79 to June 30, '79 will be charged against Field work sums budgeted for San Marco.

Sincerely yours,

William Loerke

cc: Giles Constable
December 19, 1978

Ms Irina Andreescu
Dumbarton Oaks
1703 Thirty Second Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20007

Dear Irina:

In order to prevent any misunderstanding, this letter is to make clear that your term of appointment at Dumbarton Oaks will come to an end at the conclusion of the present academic year (30 June 1979). This, as you know, is the result of the decision made by the Faculty of the Center for Byzantine Studies on 9 December 1976 and communicated to you two days later and not of any subsequent developments, either personal or professional. You will naturally retain the right to publish the Torcello and Lagoon material and Dumbarton Oaks is fully prepared to consider for publication any book or article you write arising out of this material. You will also have the rights of a former fellow and be welcome to work at Dumbarton Oaks in the status of an outside reader, but you will not be entitled to an office, or to any special privileges.

I had hoped to have from you before now some indication of how much was accomplished on the recent campaign. As I wrote in my letter of 10 October, we shall not be able to assess how best to put the corpus in final order until we know just how much has been photographed. Clearly our first responsibility is to photograph as much as possible within the terms of the grant and then to see about putting the corpus in the form where it can be used by scholars. Obviously it would be best if you can find a position that will enable you to maintain an interest in the undertaking and I stand ready, as you know, to do whatever I can to assist in this.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable
December 22, 1978

Mr. Giles Constable
Director
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Giles:

In connection with your letter of December 19th, (received December 21st), I would like to inform you that my Narrative Report concerning the recent campaign has been presented December 21st to Prof. Loerke, Principal Investigator, together with my Comments on the Present State of the Project.

Would it be possible for us to meet as early as January 2nd or 3rd at your best convenience to clarify some of the problems raised in the above-cited documents?

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreescu
Assistant Professor
Byzantine Archeology

IA:js
cc: Prof. Loerke

1-3-79 2:30 w/Loerke.
The campaign started on November 16th, scaffolding having been finished the day before, in the Abraham cupola and the Noah-Babel Tower arch, in St. Mark's atrium. The usual recording on forms for the Corpus, photography and measurements took place until December 1st. The Field Director was in residence in Venice throughout the campaign. Mr. Ekkehard Ritter, photographer, as has always been the case in the past, could not stay for the whole "fall" campaign, but came twice from Vienna. Work was carried out on an intensive schedule, often till 10 and 12 p.m.

Professor Demus was also present, taking his own notes, and left the scaffolding on November 17th.

If, technically, this was a routine campaign, I believe that a number of problems concerning the Project should be mentioned and discussed without further delay!

(1) Working conditions in Venice. Bitter cold and flood tides, which occurred in the last 10 days, accounted for very poor working conditions. Paddling in the chilly waters both in the Piazza and in the atrium (which is particularly subject to this phenomenon: as often as twice a day the floor is submerged beneath a foot and a half of water) and the fact that the atrium is an open space (windows have no glass), account for the team's reluctance to undertake another similar venture in the atrium in the winter since, as a result, we were all sick to various degrees.

Moreover, my initial theoretical estimate for work in the atrium's dome proved to be too optimistic. The time actually spent at work was 1 week for the scaffolding and 16 days for the recording of data.

(2) The negotiations with the Procuratoria di San Marco and problems in collaborating with Dumbarton Oaks' Administration. While in Venice last October to carry forth the complex and lengthy negotiations for this and another campaign, I found out by accident that Mr. Constable had planned a visit to Venice, "to see for himself how are things going," as he told me over the telephone (conversation Venice -- Washington, Oct. 12, 1978). Our Venetian partners and other people in Venice read this visit of the Director of Dumbarton Oaks, of which the Field Director had no knowledge, as a lack of confidence and lack of communication within the institution. After some hesitation, I accepted the advice of friends who suggested I stay a few more days in Venice to welcome Mr. Constable and cut short speculation.
At the time of Mr. Constable’s visit, the Procuratoria di San Marco had not yet worked out the details of the cost estimate for the 1978-79 campaigns. When later their office presented us with a very inflated estimate for labor and materials for both campaigns, unprecedented in all my years in Venice, I could not explain this sudden change in attitude, until I heard the rumor that "I no longer had negotiating status with my institution".

I pointed out to Mr. Constable as long ago as last June that it would be impossible for me to negotiate for an institution which does not trust and support me, and that unless that were the case, I could not accept the Field Directorship of the remaining campaigns. Mr. Constable reassured me then of "his fullest support and confidence".

In the face of these problems, I gave the approval only for the first, short campaign which was already upon us, and stalled further action. I wrote a letter in response to their estimate and said that under those circumstances, it might prove materially impossible to carry forth the rest of the work. At the present stage, the deal needs to be renegotiated.

Irina Andreescu

December 21, 1978
COMMENTS ON THE PRESENT STATE OF THE PROJECT

Problems Connected with the Original Project Description

In the way the project had been originally planned, the terms of the
NEH grant were used with flexibility, since Dumbarton Oaks intended to
bring the Project to completion: the Corpus, the books (1) on San Marco
(2) on Torcello et al. and the Symposium. To date, one investigator alone
worked on the Corpus funded by the NEH, while the other investigator wrote
a book and engaged in some unrelated activities during his residence in
Venice.

Also, the secretary-typist, Mrs. Aston, assigned for this Corpus, has
spent her time mostly on typing the book on San Marco, neglecting the
Corpus. When she was officially relieved of the latter task in October,
1977, I was told by Mr. Constable to resort to temporaries, though no
special provision was made in the budget for this extra expense.

Since 1977/78 there was no clear, open discussion neither of the
comprehensive needs of the Project, nor on the Aya Sofia - Greece project
(fate of the material already collected, completion of the survey in Aya
Sofia). When, at the end of the fiscal year 1977/78 I instructed Miss Baglia
to draw a number of checks for the balance of the budgeted figures, she
failed to do so without explaining the reasons or even informing me of this
at the time. It is only in October 1978 that she told me that she knew
"I had been unaware of the change in policy", which ultimately led to
losses of money for both projects.

When confronted with the injustice of the whole Project being produced
by only one investigator, responsible for scholarly matters as well as for
negotiations and for directing the team, Mr. Constable assured Prof. Loerke
(letter of June 2) that he would undertake "necessary steps" towards the
formal recognition of my title as Field Director. I was surprised to
notice, when finally the 1978/79 Who's Who was distributed a few days ago,
that, against all his statements and our correspondences, neither my role
as Field Director for the San Marco Project (in charge of the Corpus), nor
the one of Director for the standing project of Torcello, Trieste, Murano,
Ravenna were mentioned, in a list which otherwise included every other
possible associate with Projects, defined in a very broad way. Since my
activities in the above cited projects are a fact of common knowledge, this
omission reflects only on the accuracy of the Who's Who author and not on
the matter of Dumbarton Oaks' obligations towards those projects. It does,
however, make difficult further negotiations for the next campaign in Venice.

I will not continue this list. There is a general feeling of demoraliza-
tion in front of the slow-down of the scholarly work, provoked by time
wasted on paperwork (the second half of May and the whole month of June
until the 27th were spent on estimates and statements required by or on
correspondence with the Administration), while more time (over a month in
1978) has been wasted on negotiations in Venice which became partly
unsuccessful (see Narrative Report). In addition, further time is being
lost in the processing of the material because of the constant refusal to
discuss the final product of our Project.
The policy of intimidation of the scholar in charge of the Corpus, and the attempt to solve Dumbarton Oaks' obligation in this respect behind her back, as well as the lack of open communication and failure to define the expected results of this work, and make appropriate provisions for them, have been clearly detrimental to the Project. The hard physical conditions of the work on the scaffolding in Venice and the consistent understaffing, the high costs of the recording operation (scaffolding, workers, custodians, photography, living costs for investigators), cannot, in my opinion, be justified in the future, unless proper processing of the materials is insured.

The Final Format of the Product

This problem cannot be delayed any longer. It has been pointed out to Mr. Constable repeatedly since June 1977 when he first came to Dumbarton Oaks as Director, that failure to envisage the quick publication of the photographs, especially the color ones, will expose them to deterioration and will inflate publishing costs. I presented him then and again a year later with a plan of the proposed format and sequence for publication of the Project's results. Neither ever received an answer. Now, the very principle of the processing of materials resulting from the field survey is in jeopardy. If no decision is made for the final product and no time and staffing provided, this costly material will deteriorate in boxes and fail to achieve its purpose, i.e., to be available for public consultation.

If the institution has now no intention to undertake the final step, as it originally intended to do, i.e. to organize the material in consultable form, I believe that the NEH should then be informed and a review of the Project recommended to them. I now recommend also that no further recording be undertaken in Venice until all the pending problems are solved.

In addition to the moral obligation that Dumbarton Oaks has toward this project in all its parts, whether undertaken by the Byzantine Center alone or cosponsored with the NEH -- there is now in Venice a concrete interest in the publication of the material from the Corpus. An important Venetian organization would like to know whether we are willing to hand over to them the product of our Project for printing, at their expense. Because of their deadlines, the answer should be given to them within the month of January. Before their offer could be accepted or rejected, I believe we need to know exactly what our final product is expected to be.

Irina Andreescu

December 21, 1978
December 27, 1978

CONFIDENTIAL

Professor Otto Demus
Kunsthistorisches Institut der
Universität Wien
Universitätsstraße, 7
Vienna A-1010
Austria

Dear Otto:

This letter brings you (among other things) all best wishes from Evvy and myself for the coming year. We hope very much that you had a Merry Christmas.

It looks as if we may be approaching a crossroads in the San Marco project. I have not yet discussed with Iriná about the progress of the last campaign, but I have written to her formally notifying her that her appointment at Dumbarton Oaks ends on June 30, 1979, and Bill Loerke tells me that she may present us with the alternative of either completing the corpus for the material outside San Marco or conducting a spring photographic campaign in San Marco during the coming six months. From a purely scholarly point of view Bill and I lean towards the first alternative, provided we can find some way to fulfill our obligations to the San Marco project as originally defined. The purpose of this letter, therefore, is to ask whether you think that Ritter and Del Pizzal would be able to complete the photography in the atrium, (and perhaps also the baptistry) under your supervision and with whatever financial support is necessary from the NEH and from Dumbarton Oaks. It would be necessary to do as much of this as possible before the NEH grant runs out at the end of this academic year, but if this could be done while Iriná is bringing the Lagoon material into order here at Dumbarton Oaks, we will have fulfilled a respectable portion of our obligations. Your reply to this question will obviously affect your spring plans, since your presence in Venice will be required if the photographing of the atrium continues under your direction. It might make sense for you to call me (reversing the charges, of course) when you have had a chance to consider this possibility.

With all best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable
29 Dec., 1978

Dear Giles,

From your letter of Dec. 19 to Miss Andreescu, I learn that you "had hoped to have before now some indication of how much was accomplished on the recent campaign." I attach a copy of her report, dated Dec. 21, i.e., 16 days after the conclusion of the campaign in Venice. We will receive in due course the negatives and prints. Photographer Ritter has been developing and printing in Vienna, during this same period.

The most serious problem is the ultimate disposition of the material we have been collecting at great expense. In view of the volume of photography already completed, i.e., domes, apse, major vaults, walls in San Marco, and Torcello et al., I do not see the remainder of the Narthex as determining the format of the Corpus. In view of the magnitude of the data, I would feel more secure if a format could be adopted with the approval of several experts, like Kitzinger, Hjörtil, Wær-Davis. A format "in consultable form" should not differ much from one ready for publication. I attach an additional statement in which Miss Andreescu mentions interest in publication in Venice.

The final disposition of the collected material will require work beyond the end of the current grant period. I trust a way will be found to bring this material into the form of a research tool.

Sincerely yours,

William Loerke

cc: Prof. Demus
Asst. Prof. Andreescu