Dear Irina:

Thank you for letting me see the calendar, which I gave to Bill Knowles to return to you. The color on the whole seems to me very good (though perhaps slightly yellowish). The lighting seems less good, especially on the St. Sophia mosaic, where the raking light overemphasizes the holes of the missing tesserae and creates a few jagged edges in the holes.

Yours,

[Signature]
Jan. 2, 1979

dear Giles,

I had a letter from Miss Andreessen complaining that her name does not appear in the recent D.O. staff list in connection with the San Marco project. Since my name is the only one mentioned there and since I am now her Côte noire, Miss Andreessen believes that I was responsible for this omission, in order to rob her of the credit due to her.

Would you, please assure her that this is not the case? As a matter of fact, I should have thought it right, and should have been glad, if
Miss Andrews's name had appeared there in her (now official) capacity of Field Director.

Yours sincerely,

抄送：Miss Andrews

[Handwritten note]
Jan. 2, 1979

Dear Giles,

Please excuse my handwriting - I have now no secretary (nor typewriter!)

As the beginning of the spring term is approaching, I should be most grateful for your help in establishing the San Marco timetable for 1979 - so that I can make plans whether to go to D.O. now in February, prior to the San Marco campaign, or afterwards.

I am almost halfway through Vol. II, having dealt with all mosaics of the 13th century in the interior.
About the narthex, I hope Kurt Werzmann will contribute a chapter on the relationship of the Old Testament cycle to the Cotton Genesis—a topic on which he knows more than any other person. Giving, I am very glad about this.


Yours sincerely,

Otto
January 9, 1979

Professor W. L. Loerke
Dumbarton Oaks
1703 Thirty Second Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20007

Dear Bill:

Irina's latest report and comments indicate that there are still some serious misunderstandings concerning the responsibility for the San Marco Project, its purpose and scope, and its future.

1. It is my understanding that Professor Demus is and always has been in charge of the project. He appeared as Principal Investigator on the 1974-75 NEH application and as Co-Investigator (and also as Principal Investigator) on the 1977-78 application, for which (as I understand it) you agreed to serve as Principal Investigator in order to free Professor Demus from administrative responsibility for the grant. In both applications Irina is described as Associate Investigator. You will remember that Professor Demus asked me to make it clear in my letter to Irina of July 10 that her acting as field director on behalf of Dumbarton Oaks should not be taken to prejudice his position as Principal Investigator. I myself, as Director of Dumbarton Oaks, am not responsible for administering the project and should not get involved in planning its future.

2. The purpose and scope of the project, as described on both applications, is (a) to photograph certain medieval mosaics in San Marco, (b) to record various data concerning them, and (c) to gather relevant documents, to which was added, in the 1977-78 application, (d) to complete the palaeographical study of the inscriptions. The total number of photographs was estimated in the first application at 1800 (1000 black and white, 500 color transparencies, 300 35mm slides) and in the second at 7000 (1600 black and white, 1400 transparencies, 4000 slides). (I have been informed that, except for black and white photographs, these totals have already been exceeded and that the number of color transparencies on hand last summer amounted to 2659.) According to the applications, this material was to be organized into an archive or corpus for the use of scholars. The only references to publication were (in the 1974-75 application) to the publication 'in the
future' of 'about one tenth of this archive' by Professor Demus and (in the 1977-78 application) to two studies respectively by O. Demus on San Marco and by I. Andreescu on the remaining mosaics of the Veneto. The photography of these mosaics in Trieste, Murano, Torcello, and Ravenna was listed as part of the San Marco project in 1977-78 application, where it was said that they had all been studied, recorded, and photographed as of November 30, 1975. The 'Aya Sofia-Greece project', as Irina calls it, was also part of the San Marco Project. You will remember that it was discussed by the Senior Fellows at their meeting last May, and that you were asked to communicate to Irina their decision concerning its funding.

3. With regard to the future of the project, we are faced with two facts and several possible courses of action. The facts (both of which, as you know, are the result of decisions with which I had nothing to do) are that (a) the NEH grant runs out on June 30, 1979 and (b) Irina's appointment at Dumbarton Oaks will come to an end at the same time. It is also my understanding that Professor Demus and yourself will be unable to assume further responsibility for the project after that time. Under these circumstances it is proper for the officials responsible for the project to propose a way to bring it to a satisfactory conclusion. My own inclination, as you know, is for the time being to push ahead with the San Marco photography, in order to provide at least a full photographic archive/corpus of this material, and meanwhile to bring the Lagoon material into the finished form of the corpus. It is clearly not my business to work out a specific proposal, however, and I fear that my efforts to help have been misinterpreted. You may of course consult with experts if you see fit, though you have more than once said that you believed that their advice would be more useful when part of the corpus was completed and when it was clear how much of the remaining work had been completed. I also believe that any proposal should take into consideration Irina's plans for next year. I am ready to accept any realistic proposal, to discuss it with the Senior Fellows, and to present it, insofar as it has budgetary implications, to the Trustees. (I may say, however, that the publication of over 2500 color transparencies, in spite of the risks of deterioration, does not at first sight strike me as realistic.)

There are two further points that concern me. (a) The first is my visit to Venice in October, which was brief (inside a weekend), informal, and in the company of Professor Demus. Neither of us were aware of Irina's presence in Venice until the evening of my first day there, and I went to see her the following morning. Nothing was said or done that could suggest any lack of confidence in the San Marco project on the part of Dumbarton Oaks. On the contrary, my visit can only be seen as a sign (as in fact it was) of my personal interest and support. (b) The second also concerns my interest in the project and willingness to meet with you to discuss its future. The appointment with Irina and yourself last week was cancelled, as you know, owing to your responsibilities at the Catholic University, but I was ready to see you the following day. No one is more anxious than
I am to find a way to bring the San Marco material into a form where it can be consulted by scholars. So long as I am not expected personally to work out a plan (or, I may say, blamed for not doing so!), I shall do all I can to make possible any realistic plan proposed by those who are properly responsible for the project.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable

cc: Professor Demus
    Professor Andreescu
GILES CONSTABLE 1703 32 STREET NW
WASHINGTON/DC/20007

SHALL DO MY BEST IN VENICE IF NECESSARY STOP LETTER
FOLLOW

OTTO

COL 1703 32 WASHINGTON/DC/20007
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January 10, 1979

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

Dear Bill:

As a personal (and confidential) addendum to my letter of yesterday, I want to express my serious concern at what Irina says in the documents you sent me about my visit to Venice with Otto, 'the constant refusal to discuss the final product of our Project', and 'the policy of intimidation', all of which suggest that Irina is attempting to shift to Dumbarton Oaks (and, to some extent, myself) the burden of responsibility for failing to complete the project and, even now, to continue recording in Venice. My policy is, and always has been, that Dumbarton Oaks stands ready to fulfill any obligation, financial and otherwise, that it undertook in the application to the NEH. On the matter of the secretary, therefore, the Project is entitled to the $4,000 of cost-sharing provided for in the application, whether the actual work is provided by Mrs Aston, Mrs Nordbye, or another secretary. How the budgeted money is spent is outside my province. I enter in only when extra funds or services, not provided for in the budget, are needed. I then seek the advice of the Senior Fellows and make a recommendation to the Trustees. This is the procedure I shall follow with any proposal for putting the San Marco material into final order. I feel that any such proposal must have the support of Otto, who is in charge of the whole project. If it is further endorsed by Kitzinger, Hjort, Weyer-Davis or other authorities, so much the better.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable
Dear Giles,

Thank you for your letter of December 27 which reached me yesterday - Xmas mail! I immediately sent you a cable which you will have received in the meantime.

Thank you very much for your and Evelyn's kind wishes which I reciprocate cordially. I had a bout of bronchitis but am much better now.

Now for the problems:

1. As I said in my cable, I am ready and willing to conduct the photographic spring campaign with Ritter and Del Pizzol. I shall also make descriptions of the mosaics treated in this campaign and have some measurements made (with the help of Pino who also worked for Miss Andreescu). I want to make it quite clear, however, that I shall not be acting under Miss Andreescu's orders or be subject to her criticisms. I would concentrate on the few missing parts in the interior and, in the main, on the rest of the narthex (with a few shots in the Capella Zeno), possibly leaving aside the 14th century mosaics of the Baptistery and the Cap. Sant'Isidoro.

2. I think it would be necessary for you to write officially to:

   a) Msgr. Marcato,

saying that I shall now conduct the work, which will not entail large scaffoldings in the interior, and to ask very politely for the same assistance he gave to the campaign before.

./.
b) The Procuratoria, and

c) The Proto
in the same vein,

d) Del Pizzol,

e) E. Ritter.

Letters a – d should be written in Italian; perhaps Mrs. Bonaiuto would be good enough to prepare the translations.

3. Please, let me have the Tel. number and home address of Del Pizzol.

4. I shall need information about the budget for the work to be done and, especially, detailed information about the cost of the work done in 1978 in the narthex (two Domes and vaults), specified as to scaffolding, workers, photography, travel, per diem etc.

In working out the budget for the remaining four bays of the narthex, attention should be paid
a) to the fact that three of these bays contain also wall mosaics in addition to those in the Domes, and,
b) to the sad fact that US currency has been sadly devaluated during the last year.

5. Work in the narthex could hardly begin before, say, the second week or the middle of March. Something might, however, be done in the interior in the beginning of March. This would give us for the narthex 4 – 5 weeks before Easter (when we should have to pause for a week or so), and another 4 weeks after Easter – that is until the second week or the middle of May.

6. As regards my coming to D.O., it would be more practical, I think, to postpone this to May. It will, in any case, take some time for the preparations to be made for the Spring campaign.
campaign; it may even be necessary for me to go to Venice for a few days some time in February, to look after these preparations. In addition, my going to D.O. in May would be more practical for the final preparation of the material for vol. I for the press - since only then I shall have the still missing photographs from the interior which will still have to go into the first volume; and also for sifting and preparing the illustrative material for vol. II which by then will be complete (or so we hope).

I think this is all for the time being. It only remains for me to thank you for the interest you are taking in the San Marco project and to wish you and Evhy a happy and successful 1979!

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Professor Dr. Otto Demus
Dear Giles,

The first arrived in the mail. I thought you would like to take a look at the chairs. They seem suitable to me. When you are finished, would you please return them to me?

Yours,
Dear Giles,

Thank you for your note of today.

The emphasis of the letter of the missing tombs is intentional, because the photographs were taken for scholarly purposes more than for artistic ones (the photographer can "fake" easily the state of the material, but this was not desired).

Enclosed are 3 pages from a forthcoming article ("Photography as Document for Roman Restoration.")

Yours, J. [Signature]

JAN 19 1979

DUMBARTON OAKS
TRUSTEES FOR HARVARD UNIVERSITY
1703 Thirty-second Street, Washington, D.C. 20007

CENTER FOR
BYZANTINE STUDIES
in November 1921 and show the decay of the stone tesserae, destroyed by the salinity of the Lagoon's atmosphere. However, this same eroded limestone is still visible in photographs of the same mosaic surface, taken in September 1975 (figs. 16 and 17), which indicates either that the restoration proposed in 1921, if it took place at all, did not replace the decayed limestone, or that, if this stone actually was replaced in situ in 1921, the new stone deteriorated drastically again in the fifty years which have elapsed since then.

3. Sometimes photographs are the irrefutable argument which settles a scholarly controversy. My example here concerns the different dates ascribed by two scholars to a restoration visible in the golden mosaic ground of the hemicycle, in Venice's Church of San Marco. More specifically, the figure of St. Mark, one of the four large saints represented in the hemicycle of the main apse, appears to have been cut off at some time from the golden ground (fig. 18). This is demonstrated by a line that follows the body but shows no trace of the hard grid-like pattern used in some modern restorations, where the mosaic is detached from the wall in square sections and replaced on a new setting bed.

One scholar believes that the restoration is medieval and that the Mark now visible is later than the other three saints, and substitutes an earlier Mark who belonged to the original series, but was destroyed by some calamity and remade some thirty years later than the rest. The principal proof to support this theory is considered to be the shape of the seam, which is, according to this scholar, medieval.

Tempting and appealing as this reconstruction might be, this writer, after having carefully compared Mark to Peter (the apostle whose type in this scene is closest to that of Mark), believes that the materials used for both figures
are identical, as are several features in the faces of the two saints. 13

On technical grounds, the mosaics are contemporary. The problem of the date
of the patron saints in the main apse and the restorations they might have
suffered, has been stated and argued several times in the last decades. 14

The scope of our analysis here is not, however, to discuss their chronology
per se, but to introduce, in accordance with the title of this paper, "photography
as a document for mosaic restoration".

The seam around Mark does not appear in older photographs (as for instance,
those in publications of 1935, or 1956, or in photographs taken prior to the
1960's), but the light in which the photography is taken, one could argue,
might have masked a seam, instead of emphasizing it. For the Corpus of
wall mosaics in the North Adriatic Area, 16 the photography aimed specifically
to document the archeological aspect of the mosaic with all of its irregularities
and scars, instead of choosing to work with the more "cosmetic" light which
gives a smoother look and masks the accidents and texture of the surface
photographed.

Fortunately, to cancel all doubts and discussion about the type and quality
of existing photographs, where the celebrated seam does or does not show up,
here are three photographs (figs. 19 - 21) which illustrate the modern
restorations undertaken in 1964-65, when this seam was cut around the figure
while work on the other figures was carried forth as well. The mosaics
representing St. Mark and the other saints of the hemicycle were left in situ,
while the golden ground, the inscription running above, and the setting bed around
them were completely removed, laying the bricks bare, and later replaced. The
photographs published here document different phases, including that of the
protective covering of the figures during the work on the golden ground
surrounding them. 17
10 "Torcello I – II", 222-3; "Torcello III", 312.
11 "Torcello III", 336-338.
14 F. Forlati, "Lavori a San Marco", Arte Veneta (henceforth, AV), 18 (1964), 213-214; AV, 19 (1965), 199; S. Bettini, in the catalogue to the exhibition Venezia e Bisanzio (Venice, 1974), 71; F. Forlati, La Basilica di San Marco attraverso i suoi restauri (Trieste, 1975), 142-146 (figs. 8 - 13);
I. Furlan, "Aspetti di cultura greca a Venezia nell'XI secolo, la scuola di Salonico e lo stile monumentale protoocommeno," AV, 29 (1975), 34.
15 Demus, Die Mosaiken von S. Marco in Venedig (Baden - Vienna, 1935) (fig. 1);
W. Weidlé, Mosaici Veneziani (Milan, 1956), pl. I, and photograph, Böhm, neg. #3186 (probably the one used by Demus in 1935, see immediately above).
17 cf. Forlati, La Basilica, (supra, note 14).
Ref. No. 14210/79/BMF/EA

Rome, 19 January, 1979

Mr. Giles Constable,
Dumbarton Oaks,
1703 Thirty-Second Street,
Washington, D.C. 20007.

Dear Colleague,

When I was in Washington last September I much regret that my schedule did not permit me to call on you. We have, in fact, several interests in common in the broad field of conservation and museology and also our work together with Irina Andreescu as joint consultants to the Soprintendenza and Venice in Peril Fund with Sir Ashley Clarke. In view of the importance of this work we would be interested to know when the Corpus Project for North Adriatic Mosiacs is likely to be published.

My Council wishes organizations such as yours to become Associate Members and I hope you will be interested so I am sending, by separate post, details of ICCROM's constitution, training programmes and publications.

Yours sincerely,

Bernard Feilden
Director
Mr. Giles Constable, Director  
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Giles:

It is in my capacity of Field Director for the San Marco Project that I am answering your letter of January 9th, addressed to Professor Loerke, Principal Investigator, and copied to me.

I am glad that you now state your readiness "to accept any realistic proposal, to discuss it with the Senior Fellows and to present it, insofar as it has budgetary implications, to the Trustees." Considering the important sums of money invested by both Dumbarton Oaks and NEH, and the work of the scholars involved, we are all eager, I'm sure, to have this issue resolved.

Since July 1977, the Project has suffered from the need for much paperwork to document its different aspects for the new Administration and from the uncertainty of its future: no decision was made on the proposals Prof. Loerke and I sent you (July 1977; May 24, 1978; June 19, 1978; July 3, 1978; November 10, 1978; December 21 and 29, 1978), concerning the final product and its presentation to the public.

While this final product was already stated in 1976, in our NEH Project Description (p. 7) and work in progress repeatedly discussed with colleagues, you have expressed several times your views, which differ from the original plans made when the Project was conceived. Among others, these concern the exclusion of all the material not specifically covered by one of the two NEH grants, from our obligations (parts of San Marco, as well as Torcello, et al.; letters of May 23, 1978 and June 10, 1978) and the implication that work on the Corpus will terminate on June 30, 1979, as no provision has been made by you so far for work to continue after that date (your letter of May 23, 1978; my answer of May 26, 1978; our meeting of June 7, 1978; your letter of December 19, 1978).

Prof. Loerke and I have long felt that your idea of a review committee (in Spring 1978) would be an effective way to clarify these issues. A professional group might have been very helpful for you in reaching a deeper understanding of the Project and its implications and a realistic, appropriate resolution of its future. We were disappointed to see later that the idea of the review committee was abandoned and that the only two views on the Project which you chose to put on record were limited to photography and were both negative, and misleading. (See letters and comments on them by W.C. Loerke; from S. MacCormack, May 29, 1978; and R. Van Nice, undated, the latter hardly professional, which accompanied your letter of November 22, 1978.)
If the Project needs a review, in order to determine what its final presentation to the public would be, then this should come, I believe, from a professional body, informed of the facts, appointed with this scope in mind, and not be replaced by occasional, out-of-context criticism. A review could be staged easily at the end of this month for either the Senior Fellows, or for an ad-hoc group, selected from scholars participating in the College Art Association Meeting in Washington, or for both groups. With this in mind, a group of entries is now prepared to stand discussion.

The decision on the future of the project should be made now, as soon as possible, to permit a better planning of the work, i.e., to determine whether further recording shall take place in Venice within the NEH grant period (this, of course, being dependent upon proper scholarly treatment of the resulting material). This decision is also essential for a reply to the Venetian organization interested in publishing the Corpus, before their deadline of January, 1979. I feel this decision must come from you, since you control the funding. Attached is the Proposal*, based on our previous ones, cited above. It has been enlarged, to include technical entries not any longer covered by house services (i.e., research photography, photo collection assistance, typist, drafting, supplies). While it is tentative, the proposal has cut to a minimum the work involved. We are looking forward to any comments you and the Senior Fellows might have on this matter.

Let me now make just a few comments (some of them only on details) on specific issues raised by your letter of January 9.

Paragraph 1, page 1. Your understanding is not quite supported by facts and is also somewhat incomplete.

The (1977 to present) current NEH Project lists Prof. Loerke as Principal Investigator and Prof. Demus as Co-Investigator. There is no question, of course, of Mr. Demus' seniority, but the title of Principal Investigator in connection with him does not appear in any official documents for this grant period. If, for the time being, we would only state the facts, they indicate:

(1) The grant was given by the NEH for the Corpus, from the Research Tool Division. (For the full definition of the Corpus, see Project Description, p. 6.)

(2) Since 1975, Mr. Demus has never expressed interest in this particular subject, nor in the organization of the Project in general. He chose to devote his time to his book. We are all, of course, very happy that he all but completed his book. This does not, however, cancel our obligations towards the Corpus, as recipient of the grant. On the contrary, it was our assumption that the completion of the Project was the normal development of our campaigns, publicly known and generously funded by Dumbarton Oaks and the NEH grants. I believe it is both unrealistic and counterproductive for this Administration to declare the Project closed as of June 30, 1979. Any Review Committee (scholarly or appointed by the NEH) will immediately realize that this is not really true. As for Profs. Loerke and Demus' attitudes, recently Mr. Loerke writes to you again (December 29, 1978) that, "The final disposition of the collected material will require work beyond the end of the

* Appendix 1
current grant period. I trust a way will be found to bring this material into the form of a research tool." Also, there is not, to the best of my knowledge, nor do I believe there can be, a document from Mr. Demus indicating that the Project will or should be finished June 30, 1979.

(3) Since 1975, I was the only investigator (out of two scheduled in the Project) to work on the Corpus. This I did willingly, in agreement with both Dumbarton Oaks and Mr. Demus, to protect Mr. Demus' time, better spent on his book. But this does not cancel Dumbarton Oaks' obligations towards the Corpus or my Field Report (book).

(4) The format of the Corpus, and that of the Final Reports on San Marco and, respectively, Torcello et al. are closely related. Not only should the components of the Final Report for the whole Project be treated as an entity (the authors have always agreed about the scholarly division of the material), but the treatment of illustration and the references to the Corpus should be unified.

(5) Last, but not least, the final stages (Corpus and Final Reports), after the completion of the recording of data, need now to be organized and funded.

A discussion with the two authors (Demus and Andreescu) would have been indispensable, I believe. Whatever differences exist between the two viewpoints, they can, I believe, be worked out to the point of mutual agreement, as in the case with the Kalenderhane.

In reference to your #3, about the "two facts and several possible courses of action", I would like to offer what I believe to be a constructive comment on both:

(1) The NEH grant runs out June 30, 1979. This affects only the recording of data in the field as sponsored by the NEH and has no bearing on the preparation of the material at Dumbarton Oaks, beyond the current grant period. The Byzantine Center has every latitude to sponsor the completion of the Project, the same way it has funded it independently in the period between the two NEH grants.

(2) My appointment does come to an end June 30, 1979. But according to Harvard regulations, there is no technical obstacle in having it renewed, for at least another two years. (My association with Dumbarton Oaks has been the following: 2 years as Junior Fellow/Graduate Student, which legally does not count against employment; 2 years as Research Assistant/Fellow; 4 years, by June 1979, as Assistant Professor.) The continuation of my employment for 2 more years by an institution which is not likely to consider me for tenure is, of course, detrimental to my own career. But given the importance of the project, and my intimate connection with it, I could consider spending time towards its completion now, when all the structures are still active and the material fresh in my mind. No future employment, unless specifically worked out on a joint basis with another institution, at Dumbarton Oaks' initiative, will give me the time to come back to this Corpus before several years.
Were you, however, willing to negotiate a joint appointment with an academic institution, in the trend of the appointments of this type now under consideration, I believe mutual satisfaction could be drawn from the unique accumulation of data concerning mosaics at Dumbarton Oaks. I am now well-prepared to offer a course or seminar on this basic topic, based for the first time on a wealth of visual evidence. This would be another viable form through which the material collected for the Corpus could reach a wider academic audience. Also, Mrs. Arensberg's performance as Research Assistant has been excellent in every respect. Starting again with a new Research Assistant would waste the investment made in Mrs. Arensberg, not to mention the state of the color photography, its soaring costs, and no guarantee that the opportunity for publication which seems to take shape now will come again. It is now that an important Venetian organization would consider our Project for publication, and because of their deadlines, our answer has to be given immediately.

The considerable sums and the scholarly effort invested in this Project by both Dumbarton Oaks and the NEH would be fruitlessly wasted if the material is not turned into the Research Tool it is expected to be.

In conclusion, I believe that the moment to bring the Corpus into consultable form is now. However, the decision is for the Administration to make.

I agree with you that the publication of over 2500 color transparencies would not at first sight strike anybody as realistic. Fortunately, this is not the case, since when counted properly and correctly identified, the color transparencies to be considered in connection with the North Adriatic area (excluding other types of research slides) come down to 1055, i.e., less than two-fifths of the figure quoted by you (2659 transparencies). My computation is based on the data compiled for you by C. Vess and collated by J. O'Neill (summer 1978). Moreover, as I have mentioned above, this important operation could be subsidized by the Venetian organization that is willing to consider our Project for publication.

You have repeatedly suggested how the photographic coverage should be conducted (letters June 24, 1978, November 22, 1978, January 9 and 18, 1979). Most art historians will not recommend, however, "to push ahead with photography", unless it is done in the framework of a proper recording campaign, as has been done in the past, and as our commitment to the NEH Project Description binds us to do. The photographic coverage is only one part of the recording, and remains insufficient if it is not supplemented by the observations in situ. Maximum advantage should be taken of the special opportunity to erect scaffolding in the church. It is on the scaffolding that the material is first studied. The second phase of the study is in the office. Unless the investigators know that the material will be properly processed, photography per se is a partial waste. My recommendation, if the Project were to be cut at some point, is to make the existing material available to the public, taking full advantage of the investment already made.
Finally, to comment on one of the points of concern to you, i.e., your visit to Venice, during which you believe "nothing was said or done that could suggest any lack of confidence in the San Marco project on the part of Dumbarton Oaks" and which "can only be seen as a sign (as in fact it was) of my [your] personal interest and support", I have to say that unfortunately nobody in Venice, Italian or non-Italian, including myself, read it this way. Not to lengthen the letter, I attach the facts which lead to this opinion on a separate page (Appendix 2).

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Irina Andreescu

cc: Prof. W.C. Loerke
    Prof. O. Demus

Enclosures
Appendix 1: Additions to the Budget

The following items should be included in the budget for the Corpus of Wall Mosaics in the North Adriatic Area:

1. Compensation for epigraphical research already undertaken and completed by Dr. Rudolf Kloos at the request of Prof. Demus* $2000

2. English translation of epigraphical entries to be prepared by Dr. Kloos in German

3. Draftsman for line drawings on which measurements and restorations can be noted. Inscriptions also should be professionally rendered. (3 months work)

4. Typist, 3 days a week for the duration of the Project**

5. Research Photography, for the duration of the Project***

6. Photographic Collection Assistance, labeling and identifying slides and photographs, for the duration of the Project.

7. Supplies and contingencies

* Item (1): Dr. Rudolf Kloos, Professor, University of Munich and Director of the Munich State Archives expects this $2000 to be paid before he prepares the epigraphical entries for the Corpus. The money which is now in our budget was granted specifically for Corpus entries.

** Item (4): The original budget did not include a budget line for typing since an in-house typist was made available at no extra cost to the project. As this is no longer the case, and we must hire temporary workers, a provision needs to be made in the budget for this extra expense. The amount would be dependent on whether the typist is from a temporary agency or whether he/she could be shared with someone else in the building.

*** Item (5): The entry "Research Photography" in the NEH grant proposal was intended to cover the costs of acquiring slides and photographs from sources other than Dumbarton Oaks for research and comparative purposes. It was never intended to cover Dumbarton Oaks photo laboratory work, cost of photographic paper for printing negatives, duplicating slides, etc. If the project is now to be billed for this in-house work, a provision in the budget needs to be made accordingly.
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
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).
Appendix 2

In retrospect, your and Mr. Demus’ visit appeared to have been planned a month earlier. When I arrived in Venice on October 3rd to negotiate the fall campaign, Mr. Ritter, as well as the people at the German Institute, who had received a request at the end of September from Mr. Demus asking for lodging arrangements for the weekend of October 21st, were aware that I had no knowledge of this arrangement.

I found out that you, too, were coming to Venice at the same time only by accident, when I telephoned you on October 12th to say that the principle of the agreement had been worked out (but not the details, nor the estimate) and that I hoped that a week later I might be in Washington (if all worked well with the Ufficio Tecnico and, respectively, with my isai) and see you then. At this point, you informed me that you would be coming to Venice on October 21st "to see how things are". Surprised, and realizing that your coming right after my departure when the deal had not been settled yet with the Procuratoria, might cause speculation, I tried hurriedly to give you some details over the telephone about who to contact while in Venice.

But the suddenness of your visit and the vagueness of your plans as stated to me over the telephone, did not give me a good starting point from which to prepare both our allies and our opponents for this development. How could I have explained your unforeseen arrival, or else, have pretended to ignore it altogether, have planned to leave a few days before your coming to Venice, and still have retained credibility for the negotiations?

Moreover, the Clarkes, with whom I have been associated for some time, telephoned me when they received your telegram on Tuesday, October 17th, announcing your visit. When asked, I could not tell them why you wanted to see them, but I could offer some guesses, which proved roughly correct. Also regarding the "Torcello subject", Dott. Zattera, the Director of the Museum, later reported your visit there on Sunday, October 22nd, well aware that I had no knowledge of it, though Torcello has always been exclusively my project and I had seen you on Sunday morning in Venice. None of the people mentioned above felt that the procedure was either professionally fair towards me, or very helpful in the San Marco negotiations.

Wednesday, October 18th, I decided, on the advice of friends, to remain in Venice during your visit (telegram to Washington, October 18th) to cut short speculation. In such a small city, all moves of foreigners are reported and "interpreted". You have to understand that at least "we" are supposed to present a united front in the negotiations with the unreliable and basically uninterested Procuratoria (which is, however, very good at detecting flaws and weaknesses in the other camp).

The rest you know from my report. To prove my statements, I refer you to the letters from the Procuratoria (specifically, the Ufficio Tecnico), my response and their answer to my letter (which I only received in a XC forwarded by Del Pizzol). You will notice that they appear to resent what they call our imposition on them. i.e., having the scaffolding in the Church at all. I could answer back and point out some of their weak points here. But I am not myself assured any longer, unless I am given concrete proof, that Dumbarton Oaks now feels much differently about the need for the Corpus than the Procuratoria does about the scholarly work on the church.
20 Jan., 1979

Herr Ekkehard Ritter

Dear Herr Ritter,

In response to your query about providing the Art Historical Institute, University of Vienna, with a second set of photographs from the San Marco Project, I can report that officials at Harvard University, Cambridge, and at the National Endowment for the Humanities have no objection. Indeed, the NEH officials were especially pleased with the availability to scholars of a second set, and would have urged us to do this, had we not already done so.

With best regards,

William Loerke

cc: Prof. Constable
Prof. Demus
Asst. Prof. Andreescu
San Marco file
Jan. 20, 1979

Dear Prof. Demus,

Enclosed you will find my response to Herr Ritter's query about the second set of San Marco photographs. Officials at MEH are as pleased as I am that a second set is available to scholars with appropriate interests in the material. We all assume of course that this availability extends to such scholars whether they have a connection with the University of Vienna or not.

I look forward to seeing you at Dumbarton Oaks and hope this letter finds you in good health.

Sincerely yours,

William Loerke

cc: Prof. Giles Constable
    Asst. Prof. Irina Andreescu
Dear Giles,

This is in response to your letter of Jan. 9.

1. I agree that Prof. Demus is and has been Principal Investigator of the San Marco Project. I only took the title pro forma and per forza to accommodate requirements of Harvard University and also of Prof. Demus, who did not wish to assume fiscal responsibility for the expenditure of the funds.

2. NEH made their grant to us from the Research Tool Program, for which we qualified by undertaking to assemble a Corpus of Medieval Mosaics in San Marco (adding on our own the Veneto) "in consultable form". If there is an opportunity to publish this Corpus, so much the better, as I believe we all agree. Any arrangements for this lie in your hands.

3. Prof. Demus being in fact the Principal Investigator, and being publicly listed in the D.O. "Who's WHO" as in charge of the Project, it is naturally his decision and responsibility "to propose a way to bring it to a satisfactory conclusion."

4. It is my belief that any concluding campaign in San Marco should continue to collect data for the Corpus, in order to fulfill our responsibilities to the NEH grant.

Sincerely yours,

Bill

cc: Prof. Demus
    Asst. Prof. Andreeescu
January 23, 1979

Professor Otto Demus
Kunsthistorisches Institut der
Universität Wien
Universitätsstrasse, 7
Vienna A-1010
AUSTRIA

Dear Otto:

Thank you very much for your cable and recent letters. Enclosed you will find copies of some further documents relating to what I begin to think of as the affaire rather than the project San Marco.

I am particularly sorry that you should have been bothered over the listing in the Who's Who, which was of course not your responsibility. The explanation, which is given in my letter of January 9 to Bill Loerke, with copies to Irina and yourself, is that I understood that you are in charge of the San Marco project and that the position of field director was an administrative one within the project. The Who's Who lists only those in charge of projects, as I explain in the final paragraph of my latest letter to Irina.

I am also sorry that Irina should put the interpretation she does on our visit to Venice in October. It is her interpretation, however, not ours; and if the authorities she mentions did indeed see the visit as in some way indicating a lack of confidence in the project on the part of Dumbarton Oaks, I can only imagine that she put the idea into their heads.

I have discussed the plans for this spring several times with Bill Loerke, and he is writing to you with his ideas on the subject, which I believe correspond with mine, i.e. that Irina should work here completing the Lagoon section of the Corpus and that you should direct the photography and recording in Venice. I am pleased that this seems a feasible plan and trust that it can be arranged along lines satisfactory to you. The situation on this end, as you can imagine, is delicate, but we shall develop plans as soon as possible and let you know. Meanwhile I think your best course of action is to remain in Vienna, though we shall miss you here. I apologize for the uncertainty. I am delighted that your work is going well and that you are half-way through Volume II. So you will
not be wasting your time. Meanwhile, I have spoken with Miss Baglia and she will arrange for the payment of your stipend into your bank account unless you give instructions to the contrary.

With all best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable
January 23, 1979

Assistant Professor Irina Andreescu
Dumbarton Oaks
Washington, D.C. 20007

Dear Irina:

Let me assure you, in response to your letter of January 19, that there neither is nor ever has been (so far as I know) any intention, let alone a declaration, on the part of Dumbarton Oaks to close the San Marco project as of June 30, 1979. On the contrary, it is and always has been my desire that a realistic plan be developed for bringing the material that has been collected into a form in which it can be used by scholars. "The Administration", however, as you put it, cannot make "the decision" to bring the corpus into consultable form until there is a definite proposal, presented by those in charge of the undertaking, with regard to what needs to be done. Such a plan should include specific needs and predictions, which in my view can be made only when it is known approximately what work remains to be done at the end of the present year. The purpose of the professional group or body you mention is not to help me reach a "deeper understanding of the project" but to help those in charge of it (if they need help) to formulate a realistic proposal for its completion. You will note that both my letters to you of 19 December and Professor Loerke of 9 January envisage your continued involvement with the project, but it is not my role to make a specific proposal.

There are a few specific points in your letter that require comment. (1) The respective roles of Professors Demus and Loerke in directing the project is their concern. Professor Loerke tells me that he was listed as Principal Investigator on the 1977 application owing to (a) Professor Demus's reluctance to take responsibility for the fiscal and administrative details of the grant and (b) Harvard's requirement that the principal investigator hold a Harvard appointment. As a matter of record the three references to P.I. in the budget of this application clearly refer to Professor Demus. (2) Personally I consider that to publish 1,055 color plates is not much more realistic than to publish 2,659, but if the Venetian organization to which you refer wishes to do so Professor Loerke and I will be happy to listen to any concrete proposal. (3) Specific provision for the costs of a secretary and research photography is made in the budget of the 1977 application. It is standard practice to count what you call in-house work as part of cost sharing. It is my assumption that Dumbarton Oaks intended to contribute up to $4000 for a secretary and $1000 for photography, whether inside or outside the institution; but this is a matter to be settled with the auditor.
Finally, I should make clear that the Who's Who lists those who are "in charge of projects", not all those who are involved in them, even in responsible and important positions. The listing this year reflects my understanding, as stated in my letter of January 9 to Professor Loerke, that Professor Demus is in charge of the project.

I showed this letter to Professor Loerke, who permits me to say that he agrees with its contents.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable

cc: Professor O. Demus
    Professor W. Loerke
Mr. Giles Constable  
Director, Dumbarton Oaks  

Dear Giles,

Thank you for your letter of Jan. 23, assuring me that the Project will not be closed on June 30, 1979.

The core of the Project is, as far as our NEH grant describes it, and for the time being, the Corpus.

It is as the one "in charge of [this] undertaking" that I have already presented you with a "definite proposal (--) to bring the Corpus into consulta-ble form" (June 15, 78; enlarged version Jan. 1979). The proposal includes an estimate of "specific needs and predictions", calculated on the basis of the number of mosaic units, a format for the Corpus, a time cut- off, and the necessary staffing plus budget items.

In my opinion, this proposal covered all the major points. However, if you need additional information before you can take it into consideration, please feel free to let me know. I am eager to supply any data you might require, since with the approaching budget deadline for the fiscal year 1979/80, we should act quickly.

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreeescu

Prof. Locate
Prof. Demus
January 25, 1979

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

Dear Bill:

I have talked to Lucy about the general question of the per diem, and we are agreed that you are entitled, as I wrote you earlier, to authorize up to the State Department maximum so long as you are satisfied, on the basis of the evidence presented, that this amount (or more) has actually been spent. Technically, I gather, we are required to report a per diem to the I.R.S., which can then require the tax-payer to show that the money has been spent as expenses and not pocketed as income, but so long as we ourselves have evidence that as much or more has been spent we can treat it as a reimbursement and thus maintain the principle that Dumbarton Oaks pays the actual costs, within prior-established reasonable limits, of expenses incurred on its behalf.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable

cc: Lucy Baglia
January 25, 1979

Assistant Professor Irina Andreescu
Dumbarton Oaks
Washington, D. C. 20007

Dear Irina:

I regret to say that the plans outlined in your letters of 15 June 1978 and 19 January 1979 do not constitute the type of proposal I need, which must include specific estimates of time and money linked to a clear indication of what will remain to be done after 30 June 1979 in order to bring the Corpus into consultable (if not complete and ideal) form. This proposal must come from, or at least with the explicit approval of, Professor Demus and Professor Loerke, who (rather than yourself) are in charge of the San Marco Project; and it must take into account the facts (which are beyond my control) mentioned in paragraph number 3 of my letter of 9 January to Professor Loerke. I have been pressing for months to get a proposal that takes into consideration all the factors involved, and Dumbarton Oaks cannot be held responsible either if less is accomplished than should be this year or if realistic plans are not presented for next year.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable

cc: Professor Otto Demus
Professor William Loerke
January 26, 1979

To: Assistant Professor Irina Andreescu

FROM: William Loerke

RE: Part-time typist for the Corpus of Medieval Mosaics in San Marco and the Veneto

Part-time typing assistance may be engaged for the remaining 22 weeks of the NEH grant period under the following conditions:

a) at an average rate not to exceed ten hours per week;

b) none of this time is to be spent after normal hours, i.e., under overtime conditions;

c) the typing performed during this time is to be devoted exclusively to the text of the Corpus.

cc: Professor Demus
    Professor Constable
    Miss Baglia
This will confirm that I will wait for word from you about the possibility of authorizing outside secretarial help for the San Marco project for next week.

The $4,000 originally budgeted for secretarial help will, undoubtedly, have been spent after this week (the balance at the end of last week was low).

If you decide to divert funds for secretarial assistance from other parts of the San Marco budget, at the going rate of $8.25 an hour, each $1,000 will buy 12½ hours of work. Spread over the remaining life of the contract (22 weeks) this will buy approximately 5½ hours of secretarial work per week.
26/1/79

Dear Bill:

I have just spoken with Bob Jawadhe and he will come down on Tuesday afternoon to see Lucy them. He will meet with me briefly on Wednesday morning and would like to meet with you and Gina from 10:30 for as long as necessary. I shall arrange for him to be a guest at lunch in the Fellows Building. He asks that any further financial documentation be brought, if it exists, to that meeting.

Yours,

[Signature]

cc: Gina Andresen, Lucy Boglia
January 26, 1979

Prof. Otto Demus
Kunsthistorisches Institut
Der Universität Wien
Wien 1, Universitätsstrasse 7

Dear Mr. Demus:

Giles' letter of January 25 indicated that the proposal he needs for the Project's continuation after June 30, 1979 should come either from you, or have your explicit approval. Would you please either write this proposal yourself or delegate me the authority to do so?

Looking forward to your answer, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreescu

IA:ja

cc: Giles Constable
January 26, 1979

Prof. W. C. Loerke
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Bill:

Giles' letter of January 25th indicated that the proposal he needs for the Project's continuation after June 30, 1979 should come either from you, or have your explicit approval. Would you please either write this proposal yourself or delegate me the authority to do so?

The meeting we had scheduled with Giles, which was cancelled due to his illness and your commitments at Catholic University, should be rescheduled, as far as I am concerned, at your earliest convenience.

Looking forward to your answer, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreescu

IA: js

cc: Giles Constable
Mr. Giles Constable  
Director  
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Giles:

My response to your letter of January 25, 1979, in which you state that the proposal for the future of the Dumbarton Oaks - NEH sponsored Corpus, which I submitted on June 15, 1978 and resubmitted with amendments in January 1979, does not, in your words, "constitute the type of proposal I [you] need" I can only wonder why you did not inform me of this problem seven months ago. Since 1977, and more insistantly, since June 1978, I have repeatedly pressed for a response from you. To wait for over half a year before informing me that different procedures and additional information are required is to waste invaluable time and money. I would have been pleased to receive your recommendations last June so that the time that has elapsed since then could have been used to put together the proposal you require.

You specify three areas in which my proposal is deficient or unacceptable:

(1) "This proposal must come from, or at least with the explicit approval of, Professor Demus and Professor Loeber." I will discuss this with Professors Loeber and Demus, though as you well know, Prof. Demus has never been interested in the Corpus and since 1975 has wanted nothing to do with it. As a result, he is totally unfamiliar with the material we have collected, the present stage of processing, and would find it impossible to provide specific estimates of what remains to be done to bring it to consultable form. Of course, as he is in Vienna and has not been in Dumbarton Oaks since last spring, it has not been possible to provide him with the information he would need to make a thorough, realistic, and responsible proposal.

(2) and (3). The proposal "must include specific estimates of time and money." However, a time estimate was included in my June 15 proposal and resubmitted to you since then. Another copy of this section of my proposal is attached. You rightly point out that my proposals have never included specific sums of money, since I would not be able to establish Dumbarton Oaks' policy for in-house work or hired work from the outside. I did, however, list the items that need to be covered by the budget.

In general, I am worried that, despite your stated interest in the Corpus, on the factual level, this is not backed up by action. I can only interpret the seven month delay, as well as the several side issues, which I do not list here again (see Report and Comments, December 21, 1978) as an unsupportive attitude, if not as a desire to stall the Project altogether.
Giles Constable  
January 26, 1979  
Page 2  

As for the facts which, in your words, "are beyond my \[your\] control", I do believe, on the contrary, that you, as Director of Dumbarton Oaks, are the only person who does control them. I also believe that some of your decisions (i.e., about secretarial services, research photography, negotiations in Venice, etc.) would suggest that you in fact do take an active part in this Project, even though at the considerable expense of the scholars involved and of the actual work.

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreescu

cc: Prof. W.C. Loerke  
   Prof. O. Demus
This enclosure goes with my letter of January 26, 1979.

I. A.

Irina Andreescu
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).

June 15, 1978
I. Effective employment of photography and recording of archeological data

b) what Miss. Anderson does next year is extent of her availability

Remarks
Asst. 11,000
Comm. ant. 5,000
Travel 1,000
Typing 5,000

II. Possible for future
Expected at least 2 years to get
Copies to: resolvable form

Letter to Bill L.

Copies to JA and GC
CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Bill:

In view of the approaching meeting of the Senior Fellows, I decided to telephone Otto, and he will send you a letter along the lines of that of January 10, which you have seen. He agrees, I believe, that Irina should try to complete the Lagern part of the Corpus here this spring while he conducts the final campaign in San Marco. With regard to next year, we discussed the wisdom of making provision (depending on what gets done this spring) for a research assistant consultant doing) for a research assistant consultant. Unless I hear from you along these lines, I shall proceed something to the contrary. I shall prefer something along these lines to the S.F.'s.

Yours.

[Signature]
January 29, 1979

Dear Loerke,

I understand that you and Professor Constable would like me to make a positive proposal as to how to get out of the impasse in which San Marco, Torcello and the Corpus find themselves at present. I shall treat separately of the work to be done I) this spring and II) later.

I. To make it possible for Miss Andreescu to concentrate on work for Torcello during this spring, I shall try to cope alone with the work in San Marco, that is to conduct the photographic spring campaign with Ritter and Del Pizzol. I shall also make descriptions of the mosaics treated in this campaign and have some measurements made (with the help of Pino who also worked for Miss Andreescu). I want to make it quite clear, however, that I shall not be acting under Miss Andreescu's orders or be subject to her criticisms. I would concentrate on the few missing parts in the interior and, in the main, on the rest of the narthex (with a few shots in the Capella Zeno), possibly leaving aside the 14th century mosaics of the Baptistery and the Cap. Sant' Isidoro.

I think it would be necessary for you as the head of the project to write officially to

a) Msgr. Marcato,
saying, that I shall now conduct the work, which will not entail large scaffoldings in the interior, and to ask very

.\.
politely for the same assistance he gave to the campaign before.

b) The Procuratoria, and

c) The Proto

in the same vein,

d) Del Pizzol,

e) E. Ritter.

Letters a-d should be written in Italian; perhaps Mrs. Bonaiuto would be good enough to prepare the translations.

Please, let me have the Tel. number and home address of Del Pizzol.

I shall need information about the budget for the work to be done and, especially, detailed information about the cost of the work done in 1978 in the narthex (two Domes and vaults), specified as to scaffolding, workers, photography, travel, per diem etc.

In working out the budget for the remaining four bays of the narthex, attention should be paid

a) to the fact that three of these bays contain also wall mosaics in addition to those in the Domes,

and,

b) to the sad fact that US currency has been sadly devaluated during the last year.

Work in the narthex could hardly begin before, say, the second week or the middle of March. Something might, however, be done in the interior in the beginning of March. This would give us for the narthex 4-5 weeks before Easter (when we should have to pause for a week or so), and another 4 weeks after Easter - that is until the second week or the middle of May.

II. As for the continuation of the work in D.O. - i.e. getting the corpus into a consultable form - this will depend on how much can be done until the end of June and what will be the
possibilities for Miss Andreescu to continue this work after that date - which means what sort of position she will get and to what extent this position will allow her to continue working on the corpus.

To get the Corpus into a usable shape within a reasonable period (or, in fact, at all), it seems to me necessary that provision be made for

1) a research Assistant,
2) a consultant (whoever this may be),
3) a certain amount of travel,
4) typing and secretarial work of other kinds.

This could be done, I believe, with a budget of about

1) $ 11.000.--
2) $ 3.000.--
3) $ 1.000.--
4) $ 5.000.--

**Total** $20.000.-- for one year. It is difficult to say whether work could be completed within one year - it might be necessary to make provision for some more time after that.

This is, of course, only a rough proposal. I should be most grateful if you could attend to it with all possible urgency so that matters could be settled and work proceed both in Venice and D.O.

Yours sincerely

[C. Demus]

Prof. Dr. Otto Demus

Copy to

1) Professor Constable,
2) Professor Andreescu.
January 29, 1979

Professor
Giles Constable
Director
Dumbarton Oaks,
1703, 32nd street NW
Washington 7, D.C. 20007

Dear Giles,

Enclosed you will find a copy of the letter to Loerke which you suggested for me to write in your telephone call of January 27. In the meantime, that is this morning, I got your letter of January 23, a copy of Loerke's letter to you, of the same date - which latter I disregard according to your tel. instruction.

I do hope that the "affaire" San Marco will now develop into something more peaceful and productive!

Thank you for all the trouble you are taking!

Yours sincerely

Enclosed:
1) Copy of letter to Professor Loerke.
2) note of thanks to Judy; would you be so kind as to hand to her?
Home

To  W.C. Loeks
From  Karen Andreesen
Date  Feb. 3, 1978
Subject: see below

Please let us know whether the outstanding bill connected with the "San Marco 6" should be sent to Mr. Demers to viscous, if not how to deal with, or if you will take care of them.

Also kindly please inform us what is the situation for the bills presented since December 1978.

Thank you.

W.E. Giles, Constable.
February 5, 1979

Mr Daniel Steiner
General Counsel
Harvard University
Massachusetts Hall
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Dear Dan:

No sooner do I consult you on one matter than another - smaller but no less tricky - has arisen. Bob Gawlak of the Internal Audit Department has been looking into the finances of our San Marco Project, for which the NEH grant runs out at the end of this fiscal year, and has unearthed the fact that at some time past Professor Otto Demus (Professor Emeritus of the University of Vienna, who is in charge of the project) was reimbursed about $600 more than he claimed in actual expenses. Tony Woodworth suggested that we consult you as to whether Dumbarton Oaks must reclaim this sum from Professor Demus or whether it can absorb this sum, as some sort of extra compensation to Professor Demus. If you need further information on this matter, you should consult either Bob Gawlak or Bill Loerke, who as Principal Investigator for the NEH grant is responsible for the administration of the funds.

Yours,

Giles Constable

cc: William Loerke
Robert Gawlak
February 5, 1979

Mr Bernard Feilden
Director
ICCRON
13, Via di S. Michele
00153 Rome
ITALY

Dear Mr Feilden:

Thank you for your letter concerning our work on the mosaics in San Marco and the north Adriatic region. As I am sure you know, the principle purpose of this project is to assemble at Dumbarton Oaks a corpus or archive of photographs and archaeological data in a form in which it can be consulted by scholars. The only plans for publication that exist at present are the two works on the mosaics in San Marco and in the places outside Venice to be written respectively by Professor Otto Demus and by Assistant Professor Irina Andreescu.

I shall read with interest the material you are sending me concerning ICCRON, but you should know that the present feeling of the Trustees for Harvard University is that Dumbarton Oaks should husband its resources so as to carry out its obligations to established projects.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable
February 9, 1979

Prof. W.C. Loerke
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Bill:

During our meeting of February 8, 1979 you and Giles asked me to put into writing my comments on Mr. Demus' plans for the completion of the San Marco campaign within June 30, 1979, as expressed in his letter to you, copied to Giles and myself, of January 29, 1979. I will preface my remarks with two questions: (1) Does Dumbarton Oaks really want the final campaign? or (2) Does Dumbarton Oaks want simply to prove, in the final report, that efforts were made to complete the Project, but failed "due to no fault of the institution" in order to claim a clean bill of health from NEH? Since I believe that Prof. Demus' proposal is unlikely to succeed, I am led to suspect Dumbarton Oaks' attitude is reflected by the second question. I feel that Prof. Demus' proposal is unsatisfactory in regards to the negotiations, the recording process, and from an ethical standpoint, as explained below.

The negotiations. From Mr. Demus' letter, it appears that he is not really aware of the factors involved in this action:

. Msgr. Marcato and the Procuratoria are the same body, but other organisms, not connected with the above, like the Curia and the Chapter, have an important word to say.

. Time schedule -- to be ruled out after Easter.

. Present situation -- complicated after his and Giles' visit to Venice in October (see my Report and Comments plus attachments).

To start a new correspondence with the people involved above, for the benefit of a new Field Director, will require the usual, very long delay and will raise, in addition, disproportionate speculation among Venetians involved about what is really going on here. By the time the correspondence will have been answered, the "Easter" deadline will be invoked by the Procuratoria and the campaign pushed over to next winter.

The recording. I do not believe, even assuming that Mr. Demus were to operate on an ideal schedule, that he is able to record all the data needed for the Corpus, in its present format. He has never so far done this type of recording, nor is he familiar with the final product, which he considers, offhand, as too detailed.

While the job is very time consuming, and requires far longer stays on the scaffoldings than Mr. Demus might be aware of, it also requires a Field Director, a scholar and an administrator to keep a strong hand on the team and insure permanent coordination of all aspects of the action -- scholarly and nonscholarly.
None of the components of the team could, in my opinion, produce the information so far obtained, in the absence of this supervision which has been until now insured on the scaffolding by myself. The materials brought home will, I believe, be insufficient for an acceptable Corpus entry.

The ethics. Since our first scaffoldings, in January 1975, I have alone organized the recording of data for the Corpus while recording 99% of the observations myself on the scaffolding (Mr. Hawkins' contribution, in the first campaign, will have to be somewhat incorporated in our format). Unless I am given a professional criticism which questions the way the data has been recorded so far, it will be inconceivable on professional reasons that I be replaced at this late stage of the project, after doing this job all by myself for several years. This would, among other things, prejudice my professional image both in Venice and in the scholarly community. And, if this were to be attempted, I will certainly take exception to it.

If disagreeing as I do with Mr. Demus' proposal, I would just lean back and let his action fail, without mentioning my reservations to you, I might prove my point in an indisputable way. I would, however, consider this attitude morally wrong and destructive to the Project, and I believe you should be informed about my views before you make a decision on this matter.

Moreover, Mr. Demus' request not to undergo any criticism for his recording is not only unrealistic (no scholarly work is undertaken on a criticism-free assumption), but also weakens the standpoint from which he intends to replace me -- obviously not for professional reasons, while it is by now clear that we disagree on some scholarly issues, starting at the very level of recording of data.

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreeacu

IA:js
cc: Prof. G. Constable
    Prof. O. Demus
February 9, 1979

Prof. William C. Loerke
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Bill:

This letter puts into writing my comments (made in your and Giles' presence on February 8, 1979) on the second part of Mr. Demus' letter of January 29, that is, on his "rough proposal" for the completion of the Corpus.

Not only does Mr. Demus' proposal seem vague and ambiguous (you, yourself, expressed this feeling during our meeting), but it betrays the author's lack of familiarity with the Corpus, its format and the time involved per unit.

Moreover, the starting paragraph of II (pp. 2-3) ("As for the continuation of the work in D.O. - i.e. getting the Corpus into a consultable form - this will depend on how much can be done until the end of June and what will be the possibilities for Miss Andreescu to continue this work after that date - which means what sort of position she will get and to what extent this position will allow her to continue working on the corpus.") repeats Giles' sentence (cf. letter of January 9, 1979), though the latter claims he does not want to make a proposal himself, but just to be receptive to the proposals coming from those involved in the Project. (I believe, be it said in passing, on the basis of text criticism -- form and content -- that Mr. Demus' proposal paraphrases a text offered by Giles.) However, it is not clear from his Proposal who, in Mr. Demus' view, will have the scholarly responsibility for completing the Corpus, and since the Corpus in consultable form is the requirement made by the NEH Project, this responsibility (concretely linked to himself, to myself, or to whomever he may have in mind) seems to me to be the main issue.

For the whole process involved, as I see it, kindly refer to the Proposal I made to Giles June 15, 1978 (resubmitted in my January 19, 1979 letter to him). I also give there a tentative time estimate, based on the computation per unit. Therefore, I believe, a general idea of time and means involved can be deduced even before, or if, the actual recording in the church is finished. There is already a huge amount of material in house, waiting to be processed. How this will be done concretely is a different aspect. In addition to not specifying who he believes should be responsible for the Project (i.e. the Corpus), Mr. Demus does not give, in his Proposal, any concrete indication or suggestions for the staffing (research assistant, consultant, etc.). To this reader, it appears unclear what the role of the consultant would be, why travel and for whom, and how did Mr. Demus altogether reach his figures (typist calculated with how much material to be processed in mind?, etc.).

I attach for your information two entries to be keyed to my own proposal, which will illustrate a possible version of the final product, ready for consultation: the form description, coded data for photographs, measurements, restorations, etc.
Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreescu

IA:js
Enclosures

cc: Prof. G. Constable
    Prof. O. Demus
Mr. Giles Constable, Director
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Giles:

Yesterday at the meeting with you and Bill, I presented in more detail the possibility of our material being considered for publication by the Venetian organization, provided we would obligate ourselves to hand them in a finished product (for example, entries of Corpus and plates). I pointed out that if we were prepared to put in two to three years of work to present a final product for publication, whatever we decide about its format, this could fit very well into the schedule of this potential publisher. In the example I quote above, a sample fascicle and a tentative mockup, which we could supply, would be, for the time being, sufficient for their consideration. This seems to me an ideal and unique opportunity both in terms of saving money and in terms of quick distribution of the material to the public.

Your comment that Dumbarton Oaks has a long history of unrespected deadlines and commitments that were not honored might be true in general, but it did not seem reasonable or relevant to me that you should use this argument as an excuse to prevent Dumbarton Oaks' commitment to this particular project.

Indeed, as I pointed out to you, I am not aware of any other field project of this size in the history of Dumbarton Oaks which has established such a sustained pace of work.

While you added that this "project is already two years behind", I would like to point out, as I did repeatedly in correspondence, the reasons which might explain a delay in the original proposal.

-- One investigator alone -- out of two which were scheduled -- has fulfilled the stipulations of the grant. You have, however, consistently refused to consider the implications of this situation, personally favoring the investigator who is not working on the Corpus above the needs of the Corpus (i.e. even now, Mr. Demus has special typing privileges for his book, while the amount of typing for the Corpus has been restricted and arbitrarily determined without consulting me about the Project's needs).

-- The most productive time in terms of this Project was between 1975 and the end of the academic year 1976/77. The new Administration was slow to understand its needs or was unsupportive altogether. The amount of time spent on red tape and on explaining the definition, scope, and expected results of the Project has been disproportionate. Moreover, no resolution has yet been made by the Administration! Since the investigator working on the Corpus had to spend so much time on the above-mentioned matters (for example, see the matter of my proposal, first submitted June 15, 1978 and not yet answered), the Project has suffered.
Finally, any reader of this redundant correspondence (chiefly with the Administration) will realize the appalling lack of communication at Dumbarton Oaks. I, myself, believe that the attempt to exclude the actual investigator working on the Project from any decisions regarding the completion of the Project (see letters of January 19, 23, 24, 25, 26) has proved both unrealistic and expensive, not to mention insulting to me. As I was aware that you had some prejudice against field work, I repeatedly cautioned you that a frank discussion about all aspects of the Project and its implementation would be needed in order to determine the most professional completion of this enterprise which involved much work, money, and concern, and which, in addition to scholarly and educational purposes, is now needed for use in restoring some of the monuments surveyed. I do believe that if this Project is not brought to completion, the overwhelming responsibility lies with this Administration, which not only did not support it, but actually undermined it.

Your claim that you have nothing to do with administering this Project can hardly be accepted when one realizes your constant refusal to consider any proposal made by myself (as Field Director and, moreover, the only person familiar with the Corpus from July 1977 to the present), while Mr. Demus' proposal clearly reflects your views, which are per forza totally foreign to the real needs of the Project, as any reader of the correspondence will realize.

Your practice of discussing behind my back some relevant aspects of the Projects future (such as asking my research assistant if she were willing to continue working on the Project and giving her details of the tentative Proposal which you have not yet discussed with me) leads me to question whether you genuinely want to complete the Project, since your handling of its administration has jeopardized the professional credibility of the Project and the investigator who has worked on it.

While I believe that the Venetian opportunity is certainly well worth considering, and that Dumbarton Oaks might find it advantageous to both the Project and to this institution, I feel that the remarks you have made about the performance of the Project should be specific and addressed to the persons responsible for any delay. They become insulting when they are addressed to the only investigator who not only fulfilled the obligations which Dumbarton Oaks has toward the NEH in connection with this grant, but also, under the very difficult conditions created by your Administration, is also offering you the only concrete and responsible Proposal, so far, for the completion of the Project.

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreeescu

cc: Prof. W.C. Loerke
    Prof. O. Demus

IA:js
February 12, 1979

Assistant Professor Irina Andreescu
Dumbarton Oaks
Washington, D. C. 20007

Dear Irina:

Thank you for your letter of February 9 and the copies of two letters of the same date to Professor Loerke. He will doubtless write to you on the substance of your letters, but several points call for comment on my part. I have shown a draft of this letter to Professor Loerke in order to make sure that it differs in no essential respect from his understanding of the situation.

When I came to Dumbarton Oaks in the middle of 1977 I had no fixed views on the San Marco project, about which I knew very little aside from the facts that it was under the direction of Professor Demus, that the NEH grant was for specific purposes and a finite time-period, and that your appointment would end on 30 June 1979. It both was and is entirely proper that I should have consulted with Professor Demus concerning the future of the project, and there is nothing surprising or, as you imply, sinister in the fact that some of the formulations in his letter of 29 January resemble mine (as, for instance, in my letter to Professor Loerke of 9 January, of which both Professor Demus and yourself received copies) or in his rough figures, which were proposed by myself, since I needed an approximate total to lay before the Senior Fellows as part of the field work budget for next year. Your letters, and some of your remarks at the meeting last Thursday, compel me to remind you that with respect to the San Marco Project your position is subordinate to that of Professor Demus, who is in charge of the entire undertaking, including the Corpus, aside from the administrative and fiscal aspects of the second NEH grant.

The fact that your views have not been followed in toto does not mean that they have been disregarded, let alone that the project has been abandoned. On the contrary, the proposals in the second part of Professor Demus's letter coincide approximately with those in your letter of 15 June 1978, where you estimated that it would take two years of work (apparently from the time you were writing) by yourself, a research assistant, and a typist to bring the San Marco material into shape and two and a half years for all the material. Since you were fully aware that your appointment here would end on 30 June of
this year, you presumably expected any subsequent work by yourself to be on a part-time basis, as a consultant. In my view it is absurd for you to call unethical a proposal that allows you to work full-time on the Corpus for the remainder of the year, (while Professor Demus does the work in Venice, which you have previously complained he was unwilling to do) and subsequently to continue working on it as a consultant.

With regard to the time schedule for completing the Corpus, and its possible publication, I can only point to the facts that (a) the great increase in the planned number of photographs in the Corpus was owing to your initiative and was not fully in accord with the expressed views of Professor Demus, Professor Loerke, and other scholars, (b) your absence from Dumbarton Oaks for four months last year, was contrary to the opinion of Professor Loerke (and myself, in writing) that you should spend at least part of that time working on the Corpus, and (c) the time wasted on what you rightly call redundant correspondence and other politicking could better be spent on the Corpus. Your record of scholarly activity so far, furthermore, suggests that your talents lie in the direction of observation and organization rather than of writing. For these and other reasons it is impossible for Dumbarton Oaks to commit itself as an institution to producing a publishable work within a given time period. So far as I am concerned, you may inform 'the important Venetian organization' to which you have referred that (a) Dumbarton Oaks is prepared to make a financial commitment of up to $20,000 a year for two years to support a consultant (or consultants), research assistant, typist, and travel in order to bring the Corpus into consultable shape and (b) there will be no difficulty with regard to the publication of photographs belonging to Dumbarton Oaks. Any specific time commitments, however, must be made, as in all such undertakings, by the scholars who will actually be doing the work.

Yours sincerely,

Giles

Giles Constable

cc: Professor Loerke
Professor Demus
February 12, 1979

Professor Otto Demus
Kunsthistorisches Institut der Universität Wien
Universitätsstrasse, 7
Vienna A-1010
AUSTRIA

Dear Professor Demus:

This is in answer to your letter of January 29, 1979.

I am pleased that you have decided to organize and conduct the final campaign in San Marco. The mission of this campaign, as I understand it, is to complete the research and photography in the Narthex, and in such other places as you designate and time permits. May I recall your attention to points two and four of my letter to Giles dated 29 January 1979 and copied to you. To assist you in this task, I attach the following:

1. Copies of recent correspondence between Miss Andreescu and Mons. G. Marcato, together with a letter from Rag. E. Del Pizzol. These items will acquaint you with the current state of the negotiations, which, as you know, were begun by Miss Andreescu last fall.

2. Copies of letters to Mons. G. Marcato, the Proto, Rag. E. Del Pizzol and Herr Ritter informing them that you are in direct charge of the Spring campaign.

Del Pizzol's telephone number and home address is printed on his letter enclosed.

Major charges against the NEH-Dumbarton Oaks budget are now being processed. I will report to you in a few days on balances available, together with identification of outstanding commitments.

Be assured of my cooperation for this campaign. From today's date I will approve, within the limits of the NEH budget, those authorizations and expenditures which come to me over your signature.

Helen joins me in sending our best regards and kind wishes,

Sincerely,

William Loerke
Professor of Byzantine Art

cc: Professor Giles Constable
    Assistant Professor Irina Andreescu
February 13, 1979

Reg. Emilio Del Pizzol
Via Monte Cengio 1-c
30171 Venezia-Mestre
ITALY

Caro Ragioniere:

I sottoscritti desiderano informarLa che il Professor Otto Demus ha acconsentito di organizzare e dirigere l'ultima e definitiva campagna nella basilica di San Marco questa primavera.

L'assistenza professionale che Ella ha data al nostro gruppo è stata preziosa in passato e speriamo vivamente che vorrà continuare a darcela nella campagna che stiamo organizzando per questa primavera.

Voglia gradire i nostri migliori saluti,

Giles Constable
Director

William Loerke
Professor of Byzantine Art
February 15, 1979

Herr Ekkehard Ritter
1180 Wien
Bastiengasse 50
AUSTRIA

Dear Herr Ritter:

The undersigned wish to inform you that Professor Otto Demus has agreed to organize and direct the final campaign in the basilica of San Marco this spring.

The professional assistance which you have given our team in the past has been much appreciated and we hope that you will continue to provide this essential help in the campaign now being organized.

Sincerely yours,

Giles Constable
Director

William Loerke
Professor of Byzantine Art
February 15, 1979

Monsignore G. Marcato
Segretario
Procuratoria di San Marco
Venezia
ITALY

Egregio Monsignore,

I sottoscrittii, a nome del National Endowment for the Humanities e di Dumbarton Oaks, si pregano informarLa che il Professor Otto Demus ha acconsentito di organizzare e dirigere l'ultima campagna di studio e di documentazione fotografica nella basilica di San Marco.

Nelle convenzione secondo le quale il National Endowment for the Humanities ci fornisce un aiuto finanziario è stabilito che la campagna suddetta sia completato definitivamente entro il 30 giugno 1979. E quindi nostra speranza che essa possa averinizio it più presto possibile e continuare fino a quando il lavoro sia terminato.

Siamo estremamente grati a Lei per la collaborazione che ci ha gentilmente dato nel corso delle campagne passate e apprezzereemo molto qualsiasi assistenza Ella potrà dare al Professor Demus per ottenere i permessi necessari e per stabilire le date appropriate che consentano di portare al suo completamento quest'ultima fase dei lavori.

Il Professor Demus Le scriverà presto per prendere accordi su questo argomento.

Voglia intanto gradire i nostri ringraziamenti più sentiti per il Suo aiuto in passato, insieme ai nostri più distinti saluti.

Giles Constable
Director

William Loerke
Professor of Byzantine Art
February 15, 1979

Architecto Angelo Scattolin
Proto
Procuratoria di San Marco
Venezia
ITALY

Egregio Architecto:

I sottoscritti, a nome del National Endowment for the Humanities e di Dumbarton Oaks, si pregano informarLa che il Professor Otto Demus ha acconsentito di organizzare e dirigere l'ultima campagna di studio e di documentazione fotografica nella basilica di San Marco.

Nelle convenzione secondo le quale il National Endowment for the Humanities ci fornisce un aiuto finanziario è stabilito che la campagna suddetta sia completata definitivamente entro il 30 giugno 1979. È quindi nostra speranza che essa possa averinizio il più presto possibile e continuare fino a quando il lavoro sia terminato.

Siamo estremamente grati a Lei per la collaborazione che ci ha gentilmente dato nel corso delle campagne passate e apprezzheremo molto qualsiasi assistenze Ella potrà dare al Professor Demus per ottenere i permessi necessari e per stabilire le date appropriate che consentano di portare al suo completamento quest'ultima fase dei lavori.

Il Professor Demus Le scrivera presto per prendere accordi su questo argomento.

Voglia intanto gradire i nostri ringraziamenti più sentiti per il Suo aiuto in passato, insieme ai nostri più distinti saluti.

Giles Constable
Director

William Loerke
Professor of Byzantine Art
February 16, 1979

Professor Otto Demus
Kunsthistorisches Institut Der
Universitat Wien
Universitatsstrasse, 7
Vienna A-1010
AUSTRIA

Dear Professor Demus:

Enclosed you will find the originals of letters addressed to Herr Ritter and appropriate persons in Venice, informing them that you will be organizing and directing the final campaign in San Marco this spring. I also enclose your copy of a letter from Miss Andreescu. Giles and I felt that you should have the opportunity to read this letter before sending on the letters to Venice and to Herr Ritter.

Sincerely yours,

William Loerke
February 16, 1979

Mr Giles Constable  
Director  
Dumbarton Oaks  
Washington, D. C. 20007

Dear Giles:

Thank you for your letter of February 12. I am glad that our meeting of last Friday, the first in almost eight months, has allowed us to exchange some views about the future of this project, a matter of common concern, which can't be resolved professionally, I believe, unless all parties involved agree on collaboration.

1. About the future of the Corpus, our grant recipient from NEH, important misunderstandings have been perpetrated and time wasted because of the lack of direct discussion over its format, goals and way of processing data.

For example, I can assure you that your exegesis (February 12, 1979) of my proposal of June 15, 1978, is wide apart from what I believe the proposal really states. I talk in fact about objective, solid time needed for this work, to complete the project, in the way both designed and executed since the beginning, which was approved by the NEH, and which requires certain specific operations, aiming at specific results. The staffing suggested has been keyed to this approach, and gives you, I believe, the most economic and quick solution for the project.

You are, of course, free to reject it. But in case you have any plans to ask me to help complete it, after June 30, 1979, I think I should make it clear that I expect a professional, specific offer on your side, stating your views exactly as for the responsibilities involved (who is in charge of what, etc.) and what role would you like me to accept within your designed framework.

I can not do any guesswork on a subject which has generated already a large folklore: the apocryphal Bok-Clarke correspondence, the status of the project and the credibility of its different participants, as a result of your and Mr Demus' October weekend visit to Venice (e.g. Sir Ashley Clarke has understood, as a result, that the project will end as of June 30, 1979 and has officially announced this at the Soprintendza, as I can read in the minutes of the January 1979 meeting of the ITC). Moreover, the day we met in your office, you mentioned specifically in front of Bill Loerke and myself among potential consultants Belting, Cormack or Bill. Neither of us understood that you wanted to offer me the consultancy. Mr Loerke's understanding was, actually, that this whole proposal as stated in Mr Demus' sybilinic version was meant in addition to my participation which he saw as indispensable.
The same afternoon, Susan Aresnberg received a different impression of her conversation with you.

After your letter to me of December 19 specifying that after June 30, 1979 I will not have any special Dumbarton Oaks connection other than those associated with any former fellow, I cannot but repeat that if you really want me to participate in the project, your desire should be expressed directly to me, in a professional form that will allow me to think it over and to give you a professional answer. Before this happens, I will refrain from any speculation about my potential role in your plans on completing the project.

Some specific comments to your last paragraph on page 2: my "record of scholarly activity" naturally so far points towards observation and organization. This is, we will all agree, a prerequisite for a large enterprise as the San Marco campaigns and Corpus, which I did all by myself, both for recording the data and for organizing all related activities. It is fortunate that my scholarly opinions, which will be expressed in my final report, should be based on a source edited as thoroughly as possible, as well as on first hand knowledge of as many related monuments as possible acquired in the course of scholarly travel. This spares me the need to come back on the same subject every so many years and to speculate in the absence of well established documents. Just in case somebody might have drawn the conclusion that my scholarly record is shaped in the wrong direction, I could suggest that the consultation of the entries already finished for the hemicycle of San Marco within the Corpus could spare public embarrassment to the author who might otherwise proceed with a possibly more appealing approach but factually partly wrong.

The four months spent out of Dumbarton Oaks were, as you know, accounted for in my narrative report submitted to Professor Loerke on November 14, 1978 and accepted by him. The breakdown shows that time was devoted to comparative travel for my book on Torcello et al, to Cyprus and Yugoslavia, provided for by the NEH grant, as well as to Greece, on my own expense. A month was spent to negotiate – at your request – the campaign in Venice. Professor Loerke has since the beginning realized the need for those research trips to be scheduled, in order to support my research for the book: he is in fact the author of the proposal, as well as the amendments, which have all been granted by the NEH.

While I was surprised that you did not ask me to present the sample entries I had prepared for scrutiny of the Senior Fellows at their January 1979 meeting (my letter to you of January 9) I have now scheduled for Wednesday, February 21, 1979 a seminar-type session to last about two hours, to which a nucleus of art historians and historians have already enthusiastically agreed to participate. A whole group of finished entries (the 12 apostles on the west wall in Torcello), with the preface, and the conclusions reached so far will be offered for examination, to be followed by the discussion of the methodology used in recording the data.

I hope that Thor, Alice-Mary and youself among the Senior Fellows, as well as Bill, who has not yet taken up my invitation to scrutinize the entries already resolved, will be able to participate.

This might be only the first of other professional groups invited to scrutinize this work: the Senior Fellows as a group who make decisions about it, and participants to the Symposium and/or the Byzantine Conference (connected or not with the Instrumenta Studiorum session) should be informed of its
availability for discussion of its methodology and other aspects.

It is only from such professional groups, transcending personalities involved so far, that constructive criticism should be fully expected. If a fair review of this project is envisaged, I am fully prepared to accept its recommendations.

2. Finally, here are my further comments on the issue of the next campaign:

While Bill has several times expressed to you and to me serious doubts about Mr Demus' chances of succeeding in his Venetian Campaign, he has also made it clear to us all that he wants nothing to do with a project which only wastes his time and which brings him no gratification. His chief aim, as stated by him, is now "to get out of it".

Crucial, again, appears the question of responsibility:

- towards the corpus and NEH
- towards the participants in this project
- and above all, to the best interest of the monuments

I will not take up again the tedious subject of our legal obligations towards the NEH, and all the questions which have not yet been clarified in this connection. But I must insist on the damage that the letter issued by your office that Bill signed today in my presence does to my professional image in Venice. I do intend to continue my professional association with Venetians for many years to come. After my official appointment as Field Director for this campaign (your letter to me of July 10, 1978) to offer no professional explanation of this change to Msgr. Marcato and to Proto Scattolin, or to Mrs. Del Pizzol and Ritter, all of which I have closely known and with some collaborated for many years while directing our campaigns, will raise a natural reaction, which cannot be but damaging to everybody. Since none of the three of you who are involved with this letter are likely to have any further dealings with Venice, the matter does not appear as serious to you, I gather, as it does to me. But since my professional expertise is required for the current restoration programs or expected for the future, Dumbarton Oaks' inconsistent action is certain to have a consequence, as was already the case after the "October weekend trip". To return to the Corpus, raison d'être of our campaigns, if by any chance I am expected to have to continue work on it towards its completion after June 30, 1979, I have to strongly state again that I consider Mr Demus' recording system insufficient for producing the factual data needed nowadays for both the text editing and the concrete aspects of conservation. I will not, nor would anybody else, believe, be able to produce this information on the basis of Mr Demus' recording. A solution to the last campaign, would be for me to continue to cover, with Susan Arensberg's help, whatever the weather and the ecclesiastic calendar allow us. This specific solution, already considered by you several times, though not a perfect one, is, I believe, a more professional one if keyed to the needs of the Corpus. To head for doubtful results and ultimately prevent the Corpus from serving its stated purpose, touches in more than one way on the issue of ethics.

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreeescu

cc: William Loerke
Otto Demus
Dear Bill:

Today's meeting at Giles' office seemed to have been very helpful for the clarification of the situation involved and for clarifying some previous misunderstandings. I had wanted, as I remember it, that (1) it would be counterproductive to send the letter (for breach of trust) Del Pietro (Rutter) in your present version (which doesn't explain my dismissal) had suggested and Giles agreed that they be replaced by a version (eventually approved) that you would indicate to me. Because that the responsibility of hiring P. was his, while Giles and you had only complied with his specific request, without an automatic endorsement.

I am surprised to realize that the debate version was sent out without amendment (no copy was sent to me, which indicates I am still excluded from that word). And that by your own admission the cover letter to Mr. Dewey was not as clear as it should have been.

While I have tried to help as much as possible in our meeting, I must point out to you that as far as I am officially concerned, Giles' letter to me & July 10 still stands, with no indication of your change in which (as dismissal from the capacity of Field Director of the Second Project) was given to me.
I must protest, therefore, your careless and ill-informed handling of this issue, which is obviously crucial and urgent, and which it does not reflect the spirit of the meeting. It would cancel much of the progress made to date towards mutual trust.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

IRINA ANDREESCU

X.C. Girls, Constable

M. Denues
Memo
To: W. C. Hoekse
From: Nina Andreassen
Subject: San Marco Project, see below
Date: Feb 17, 1979

Please: resolve - the Kloos situation (I have to write to him, and we are waiting) for a answer.

- the Annenaduzzi expenses
- the Ritter expenses
- my expenses
also - clarify status of photographs in Vienna (despite your "intentional mistake" when you mentioned the "Kuenstlerisches Institut", no answer has come so far from Mr. Deen's and Ritter feels it should be resolved. So do I, and so did you when you intentionally spelled out what the assumption of NEH (Harvard + DO would be). Thank you.

XC files compiled.
February 27, 1979

Professor Otto Demus
Kunsthistorisches Institut der Universität Wien
Universitätsstrasse, 7
Vienna A-1010
AUSTRIA

Dear Otto:

I must apologize for not writing earlier to thank you for your letter of January 29, with the accompanying note for Judy (which I handed on to her) and the copy of the letter to Professor Loerke. By now you will have received a number of letters and copies of letters showing that your letter produced a flurry of activity and, I believe, some constructive steps, including the letters you requested to the authorities in Venice. Professor Loerke plans to telephone with the financial information you need, but I think there is no question that there are sufficient funds for a spring campaign.

I should also have written to you to report that the Senior Fellows approved in principle at their meeting on January 30 the proposals we discussed over the telephone and you outlined in the second part of your letter of January 29. Specifically they agreed to recommend that the San Marco project be supported for one year beginning July 1, 1979 with the possibility of no more than two renewals subject to a satisfactory report. The budget should not exceed $20,000 per year for the expenses of research assistant, typist, travel by consultant to and from Dumbarton Oaks only, and consulting fees paid on a per diem basis. This proposal leaves open the question - to which Irina draws attention in her letter of February 16 - of who the consultant or consultants should be. I assume that this was in order to allow yourself and Mr Loerke to propose consultants to advise on different aspects of the undertaking, but there is no doubt in my mind that the principle responsibility should be entrusted to Irina. She should, as in the past, be responsible to yourself or, perhaps better, since you will not be here, to Professor Loerke, who will be in ultimate charge of the Corpus, but she alone, I think, is capable of compiling the entries and interpreting the evidence. Please let me know what you think about this.

Meanwhile I hope your plans are progressing and that you will let me know your plans and decisions and whether there is anything we can do here in Washington to assist you.

Yours ever,

Giles Constable

cc: W. Loerke
    I. Andreescu
MAR 7 1979
KUNSTHISTORISCHES INSTITUT
DER UNIVERSITAT WIEN
1010 WIEN, UNIVERSITATSSTRASSE 7

Dear Professor Roeke,

First difficulties: Herr Ritter is a little nervous about not having had his payment for the East campaign. It is true that there were some adjustments in January but this was more than a month ago. Would you, please, see to it that he gets his money? The sooner the better!

This leads me to the other problem, the resolution of accounts with the Procuratoria. I fear that no new accord can be reached and no permission be got unless this has been settled first. (I gathered from what you said to-day on the phone that this is still pending—I may, however, be misunderstood). Would you, please, see
to it and let me know about it. Time is short as it is and any further delay would be serious!

Thank you!

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Cops to

Prof. Constable
March 6, 1979

Professor Otto Demus  
Kunsthistorisches Institut der  
Universitat Wien  
Universitatsstrasse, 7  
Vienna A-1010, AUSTRIA

Dear Professor Demus:

From our telephone conversation of today's date, I understand that you expect to go to Venice by the 15th and hope to begin the campaign by the 19th of this month. In response to your query about scaffolding costs, I mentioned that these had not yet been resolved with respect to the campaign last Fall, a matter which Marcato would doubtless bring up.

With respect to the campaign about to begin, I offered to send data sheets, such as had been used in past campaigns, but this proved unnecessary since you already have them. In this connection, may I state again (see my letter of January 23):

a. that you are head of the project for all scholarly purposes, and as such have decided to organize and direct this campaign;

b. that I act as fiscal officer and as pro forma head vis-a-vis Harvard and NEH;

c. that our current NEH grant comes from their Research Tool Program;

d. that the Corpus is the Research Tool we are creating, hence justifying the grant. From the point of view of NEH, to collect data for this Corpus is the primary object of these campaigns.

We recognized that work would have to cease about April 7, but hoped that it could resume after Easter.

With best wishes,

William Loerke

cc: Giles Constable
    Irina Andreescu

P. S. I enclose an example from the Corpus dealing with the west wall of Torcello to give you an idea of the present level of data in the Corpus.
Dumbarton Oaks
1703 Thirty second Street
Washington DC 20007

Wien, 1979 03 09

Betrifft: Venedig/Mosaiken/Kampagne 1979

Sehr geehrte Herren!


[Unterschrift]
Egregio Signore
William C. Loerke
c/o Dumbarton Oaks Center
1703 - 32nd Street
WASHINGTON,D.D. 20007

e
Egregio Signore
Giles Constable
c/o Dumbarton Oaks Center
1703 - 32nd Street
WASHINGTON,D.C. 20007

Mi scuso per il ritardo con cui rispondo alla loro gentile lettera ma ero fuori sede, per cui solo ora ne sono venuto in possesso.

Li ringrazio per la prova di fiducia dimostratami riconfermandomi l'incarico che accetto e che mi propongo di assolvere nel modo migliore. Resto comunque in attesa di disposizioni più precise.

con osservanza

Emilio del Pizzol
DUMBARTON OAKS
TRUSTEES FOR HARVARD UNIVERSITY
1703 Thirty-second Street, Washington, D. C. 20007

CENTER FOR
Byzantine Studies

To: Miss Baglia
From: Wm. C. Loerke
Subj: Field Campaign, San Marco
Date: March 13, 1979

Please send $5,000 to the D.O. account (Del Pizzol) in Venice.

/\ Loerke

cc: Prof. Demus
    Prof. Constable
    Reg. Del Pizzol
Dear Bill:

Attached you have the two notes from Mr. Kloos and my answer to him. Apart from the payments due to him, which in this case need discussion as I long ago mentioned to you but, I believe, should still be resolved, especially since part of it goes back to the past budget (1977-78) (see my memos to Miss Baglia on June 14 and Nov. 9, 1978).

The photograph issue needs urgent resolution, since Mr. Kloos cannot do his work for the Corpus without them and there is no guarantee that I myself will have access to the material collected in Vienna, which appears to be Mr. Demus' personal property. You yourself have told NEH and Harvard that this material belonged to the Kunsthistorisches Institut and believed therefore, that it was accessible to qualified scholars.

I would be most grateful if this issue could be resolved for all materials existing connected with this Project, be they in Vienna or in Washington.

Thank you.

Irina Andreescu

cc: Prof. Constable
    Prof. Demus
March 16, 1979

Herr Prof. Dr. Rudolf M. Kloos
Koblenzer Strasse 1b/VI
D-8000 München 50
Germany

Dear Dr. Kloos:

Thank you for your notes of March 3 and March 12.

Let me start by thanking you for your very useful datation of the inscriptions on the Pala, which reached me in time and which confirms the stylistic observations made on the few preserved plaques.

About the entries for the Corpus, after taking this matter up with Mr. Sevcenko as well, I believe that you should start drafting them on a little more detailed basis than the 4 Church Fathers sample from Torcello. Granted that our Project (the recipient of the NEH Grant which pays for this Corpus) needs to use the entry-format for presenting the data, the chapter that you gave Mr. Demus, at his request, does not fit into the "Research Tool format". I enclose here a few entries of mine (the Inscriptions, supposed to be Item III are in this case missing from the original) which will allow you to see how the problem of cross-references is resolved within the same group of subjects. (A General Entry and individual ones, in which the first of its kind is more detailed and the rest are treated with emphasis on their specific features).

About the expenses and your honorarium, while I know that we budgeted and do have the available funds for your Corpus entries (i.e., the work which I would like you to do now, giving it top priority if possible), the matter of the documents of your compensation for the Venice research of last year and your honorarium for the chapter for Mr. Demus have been out of my hands with the Administration for several months now. I will, however, check again on that matter. Meanwhile, do please excuse us for the delay.

Finally, on the photographs matter that Mr. Demus asks you to return to him, as being his personal property, I will present this problem once again to Prof. Loerke, who is our "liaison" with the NEH and I hope that he will finally clarify with Mr. Demus what the status of the documentation is, including the access to it of qualified scholars.

With many thanks for your continued interest in our Corpus, I remain,

Cordially yours,

Irina Andreeascu
Assistant Professor
Byzantine Archaeology
This came onto my desk. Aside from paying the bill it requires no reply, I suppose, but it might be wise to let him know that the change in the team, as he calls it, was in order to enable Irina to finish a section of the Corpus while Otto finished the photography.
Than you for your letter of March 19 and enclosure. As to the letter, which you mentioned, I believe it should have been more germane to the present task, and not so much designed to squash me as point referring to the Abraham Downing would have been more helpful but I quite understand that this was not intended.

I shall, however, do my best according to my lights, even if this poor best is condemned in advance.

I had talks with Marzano, Neve, del Pizzolo and Pino. It will not be possible to get a debate on the sum asked for the last campaign. The “mancie generali” are, as Neve explained to me, the “mancia” or bonus for the workers, without which they will not function at all. They are a lazy lot and has been repeatedly stated by Miss Andreeva.

May, however, be possible to economize a little by combining the scaffolding for two adjoining cupolas - it saves work and material, and a group of support being shared by two domes (my idea - believe it or not).
Ritter arrived tomorrow and will start immediately; the first scaffolding is already standing.

Climate conditions were awful during the last few days, the Diezga and the Atio were deep under water on Friday.

Please let me have the budget as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely,

Otto Lessius
Dear Giles,

Thank you very much for your letter of February 27 which arrived in Vienna after my departure (March 15) and was forwarded to me in Venice, where I got it today.

I agree of course with your plans and the recommendations of the senior fellows. I hope that peace will now enter Dumbarton Oaks and Venice, where I am very much the scapegoat, bad boy and Côte noire. However...

The $ca$ holding ("the $ sign at the beginning of the word was not intended but is quite appropriate") for the
Just come to be processed in the factory (the hard in the sequence, too, having been done last year) stands. Ritter, who was held up by his school for a day, will arrive tomorrow (just had a telephone call from him) and will be able to start immediately.

I am writing to Loeske, you will find a copy of my letter attached.

With many thanks and kind regards to Ewy.

Yours sincerely,
Otto

PS I just see from a stamp on the back of the envelope your letter that it went to Warsaw!! Where it arrived on March 14, isn't it fun??
Irina,

Thank you for the opportunity to go through some of your Torcello entries. The following are not criticisms, rather questions that arise from the entries themselves and from common experiences on the scaffoldings.

I. Our common problem: how detailed should the descriptions be? My feeling is that you are as close as possible to a reasonable solution in this case. I have compared with some of my own entries and note that our level of information is about the same. Your entries are more succinct and shorthand like – obviously necessitated by the Corpus form; I tend to write the descriptions out in full sentences (but I will surely have to cut down on that!).

I hope you decide to keep this level of information and stick to the approach presented here. I had some doubts about your very detailed measurements; again, I think that simply the fact that this is a Corpus speak in favour of your approach. It must be as comprehensive as possible within the given limits of a publication. Although some of the information conveyed may seem superfluous now it may be useful and important for scholars and others (restorers) at a later stage. The Corpus must anticipate new approaches, different objectives.

One more thing speaks in favour of the detailed and comprehensive information you have chosen to present: the degree of deterioration and decomposition of the mosaic surface in the Adriatic area caused by the proximity to the sea.

This being said I urge you not to attempt further condensation of the descriptions, this is as far as you can go without becoming cryptic. Your phrasing is sometimes too abbreviated or shorthand like to be absolutely clear and intelligible (but this impression may change when one has been through the introduction and general remarks).

II. The division and sub-division of the entries are all clear; the layout work very well. It is easy to find one's way around.

Also, the cross-references are extremely useful (e.g. IV.7). You must keep them in the entries at least to the same degree as we find them now; their value will immediately become apparent when all the entries has been worked out and the whole wall can be surveyed.
III. Some details.

ad IV.2. Does 'yellow/green' mean yellow and/or green or yellowish green throughout (cf. IV.7. yellow/ochre; amber/purple).

ad IV.5. 'Electric' blue. Is this your own invention or does it refer to some new kind of color in fashion these days? Is it some kind of 'Neon' blue? The designation is not clear to me.

ad "Line of incision". Is this the same as a 'joint' or a 'seam' or does the term indicate a different kind of operation?

ad IV.9. (Feet), "For materials, see flesh tones..." Does this refer to analysis of face or do you intend to have a general tabulation of colors at the beginning that we are referred back to in this case?

ad gold tesserae: are they gold on sealing wax red (I don't have the right term for it, I guess - lacquer red, perhaps?) or on transparent bottle green?

And a minor point: I am not too happy with your designation code for the churches. SHA is too easily confused with SH, I'm afraid, even when you have TO or VE there, too. Is there a way of differentiating between main location and church in the lettering - capital letters and small letters, perhaps?
Venice, March 25
1979

Dear Miss Andreescu,

Thank you for the copies of the Letter to Kloos and of the Note to Prof. Kaeberle, both of March 76.

Access to the material paid for with the funds granted to me by the Austrian authorities will be open to all qualified scholars at the ETH Zurich until the Institute in Vienna, after I have been there with it myself. As to the special case of Dr. Kloos, he can (after having returned the borrowed material) use the photographs even now, but only in the ETH Zurich Institute and after having written to me which material he wants and at what date. I shall then make arrangements that he can work in the Institute. I certainly will not let any of the San Marco material go abroad, at least not as long as I need it myself.

On the other hand, I am willing to lend you personally on request (and after you have given me an assurance that you will respect the Austrian property rights) for a stimulated period the Torcello and Tintoretto material.

As regards Dr. Kloos’ chapter for the San Marco monograph which, as
you well know, what envisaged from the very beginning and which Mr. Kees himself wished to be published, this is a very brief summary of the work done for the corpus, as he wrote to me himself; his additional claims result from the additional work he had to do on your request. Even your letter to him of March 16 contains such a request. I do not criticize this (though I was never even told about this) but I find it hard now to be blamed for additional expenses.

Yours sincerely,
C. J. Lewis

Copies to
Prof. van Gennep
Prof. E. W. Ke
To: Irina Andreeva
From: Gerhart Ladner

I read with great interest the Torcello specimens of the Corpus of North Adriatic mosaics, which you showed me. I find both the system adopted and its execution precise and illuminating. The detailed descriptions and the exact analyses of the state of conservation of every part of these mosaics will no doubt make the work extremely useful. The "anatomy" of a "Corpus" requires many elaborate "sections" such as the ones given here. The same holds true for the large amount of illustrative material. In a work like this one all the evidence has to be presented — therefore, the more photographs the better.

A few suggestions as to the arrangement of the entries are set down on a separate sheet.
Suggestions

(1) A list and explanation of all abbreviations used in the work is indispensable.

(2) Each main section of entries (e.g., W wall, Register III) might have a brief preface outlining the principal facts of the history of this part of the church and its decoration.

(3) In each individual entry, the main results of field work and research should be condensed in a Résumé, which should be separate from Documentary Evidence and from Bibliography.

(4) It may be sufficient to list Bibliography only at the end of each of the main sections rather than at the end of each entry.

(5) Introduce into the chart of symbols a symbol for tentative dating's and related assumptions.
58 Van H. rn St.  
Demarest, N.J. 07627  
30 March 1979

Dear Giles,

I want to thank you for the hospitality of Dumbarton Oaks last week and tell you that I thoroughly enjoyed my visit. I wish you would thank Evvy for me too for the delightful gathering at your house. I was really very pleased with the response of whole group to my lecture. It is the first chance I have had to talk about some of these ideas and it was most encouraging to get such positive reactions.

One matter of business that came up during my visit--Irina Andreescu wanted to talk with me about her problems on the Venetian project and she gave me a xerox sample of how she is preparing her catalogue for my criticism. I have written to her my reactions, and I want to let you know I told her since obviously you are very much involved in it all.

In the first place I repeated the criticism that I tried to voice at the symposium last year, that is that if progress is to be made in a scientific study of mosaics beyond our traditional methods one needs more than a trained eye to analyse the materials. Laboratory analysis of the mortar, tesserae, etc. might have solved some of the doubtful attributions and would tell us a great deal about artists' methods. Moreover a much more accurate description of color could have been had with use of some such color code as the Munsell system.

Regarding the format for publication of the material, I don't see who would be served by publication of the whole corpus of mosaics with the kind of detailed tessera-by-tessera description that she has in her notes. I recommended that this kind of detail would be most useful in establishing the method that has guided her in her analysis, but that if certain sample mosaics were published in this fashion she might proceed to a more summary description of the rest. Meanwhile her archive of notes could be made available for whoever needs more detail.

I don't know if she will accept any of this criticism, but since she requested it I felt I should oblige.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas F. Mathews
April 3, 1979

Ms Irina Andreeescu  
Dumbarton Oaks  
Washington, D. C. 20007

Dear Irina:

I believe that our talk last Thursday cleared up several misunderstandings.  (a) Mr Tyler explicitly told me before I came to Dumbarton Oaks that responsibility in the matter of your appointment rested not with himself but with the faculty, which had already decided not to renew your appointment and to offer you instead a final additional year. (b) Everyone listed as 'in charge of projects' in this year's Who's Who is director or co-director of a current independent project funded by Dumbarton Oaks. In all official descriptions of the San Marco project, your position is described as subordinate to that of Professor Demus. (c) While I have made clear my general views concerning joint appointments, I have never taken the initiative in favor of a particular individual. (d) In the time estimated for completing the Corpus that accompanied your letters to me of June 15, 1978 and of 26 January 1979 you said that '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.' This was the basis upon which the Senior Fellows, after a long discussion, made the specific recommendation outlined in my letter of February 27 to Professor Demus, of which you received a copy.

I have heard now from Professor Demus that he agrees with the recommendation (as worded in the minutes) 'that the San Marco project be supported for one year beginning July 1, 1979, with the possibility of no more than two renewals subject to a satisfactory progress report. The budget should not exceed $20,000 per year for the expenses of a research assistant, typist, travel by consultant to and from Dumbarton Oaks only, and consulting fees paid on a per diem basis.' The proposed division of this money is $11,000 for the research assistant, $5,000 for the typist, $1,000 for travel, $3,000 (at a rate of $100 a day) for consulting. The main purpose of this letter, therefore, is formally to offer you the position of consultant, with specific responsibility for completing the Corpus under the general supervision of Professors Demus and Loeber. The sum envisaged by the Senior Fellows would allow for thirty days to be spent at Dumbarton Oaks working on the Corpus, in addition to responsibility for directing the work done by the research assistant and typist, but there will naturally be some flexibility in this arrangement, which can be adjusted to suit your location and convenience. It would probably be best if you could come for a two week period every four months in order to direct the work done by the research assistant and typist, but just how the schedule worked out would be up to you.
You asked me to put in writing my thoughts regarding the sections of the Corpus you showed me. Not being an art historian, I do this hesitantly, but there are, as I told you, two questions that seem to me to need consideration: (a) the degree of detail and to what extent it will make the Corpus more or less useful to other scholars and (b) the introduction of essentially subjective scholarly judgments (as, for instance, with regard to dating) into the body of the Corpus.

Yours sincerely,

J

Giles Constable

cc: Professor Loerke
    Professor Demus
April 4, 1979

Mr Thomas F. Mathews  
58 Van Horn Street  
Demarest, New Jersey 07627

Dear Tom:

Thank you very much for your letter and for your useful comments on the San Marco project. Now that Irina has completed some of the series of entries for the Corpus, I am anxious that these should be examined by competent authorities to assist in planning for the future, and I therefore particularly welcome your views. The Senior Fellows, as you may know, have recommended to the Trustees that provision be made for up to three years of further financial support for the project in order to bring the material which has been gathered into consultable shape, and it is therefore of great importance that the form of the entries correspond to the real needs of scholars in the field.

Alice-Mary has also given me a copy of your letter concerning the nature of junior fellowships. Dumbarton Oaks has never aspired to provide support for graduate students throughout the entire period of thesis writing, which must remain the responsibility of the degree-granting institution, but I myself, as you know, would like to see the establishment of two year junior fellowships which would allow the recipient to spend, say, up to a year in study and research away from Dumbarton Oaks. We have arranged for two joint fellowships with the Academy in Rome and the School in Athens, but at present these are not tied to any time also spent working at Dumbarton Oaks. So long as we have just one year fellowships, whether or not renewable, I fear that there will always be pressure to spend time here. Your letter raises just the sort of questions that the Senior Fellows should discuss, and Alice-Mary will raise some of them at the meeting on May 9.

We all enjoyed your visit and lecture and hope to see you here again soon.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable
April 4, 1979

Dear Giles,

I am both surprised and puzzled at your letter of April 3, since it does not jibe with what we agreed upon in our conversation of last Thursday, in particular with the conditions of our association after June 30, 1979. Obviously, these matters must be both clarified and confirmed before an agreement can be reached. I am willing to help you with any information you might need and hope this can be resolved at your early convenience.

Sincerely yours,

IRINA ANDREESEAN

Dr. W.C. Loewe
O. Dewey
April 6, 1979

Professor Otto Demus
Kunsthistorisches Institut
Universitätsstrasse 7
A 1010 Wien, Austria

Dear Mr. Demus:

Thank you for your letter of March 25.

The matter of the access to the material which has been gathered during the NEH - DO Project should be, I believe, resolved in a more objective way than the one you suggest, i.e. a specific date for the access to the San Marco material be set for public availability, while the access of the participants to the Project should not be restricted at any time (actually, the San Marco negatives from the first 1975 campaign, acquired by the National Gallery are already available for public orders since 1978, according to the conditions of their purchase back in 1975).

Though not funded by NEH money, I believe the same should apply also for the rest of the Lagoon material. However, it seems that the final decision to execute NEH and Harvard policies lies in this case with Mr. Loerke who administers our Project.

Concerning Mr. Kloos’ work for this Project, his chapter which you mention is not the product required by the format of the Corpus. While there is no doubt about our obligation toward this Corpus, for which the money has been budgeted, I trust Mr. Loerke will find additional funds to pay for the narrative chapter requested by you. While you have never wanted to become involved with the processing of the Corpus data, I have to reassure you that no additional request outside the Corpus was made by me to Mr. Kloos. The information for which I thank him in my letter of March 16 and which you quote as "additional work" leading to his "additional claims", was a purely collegial, quick exchange of opinions, a work for which he told me he does not charge anything. I would like to point out to you that this is not the first time that you reach a hurried conclusion, unsupported by facts and damaging to me (see also your letter of May 28, '78 and my answer of June 5, '78).

I will make no comment on your clause concerning the "respect (of) the Austrian property rights".

Sincerely,

Irina Andreescu

Cc: W. C. Loerke
G. Constable
4/11/19

Dear Shina:

I hardly see how anything I said last Thursday could have disagreed with what I put in my letter, which puts the situation as agreed by Mr. Senius, Fellows, or approved by Professor Demus or howler.

I shall be away till next Tuesday, but would be happy to hear what you believe here is a disagreement.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
April 9, 1979

Dear Bill,

Please do consider at your earliest convenience the issue of the letter to be addressed to the Roman Text, the Sto, Del Pizzi + Ritter, which should come the one you and Giles sent out (dated March 12), not copied to me, which damages my professional image in Venice.

We have agreed, as I recall it, that there was no reason for sending in their attempt to which I took and took exception. Thank you, nice.

cc Giles, Constable
Dear Bill,

This is to put in writing the request that Mr. Terent'ev (who helps for all inscription matters related to this corpus) be employed for the drafting of the entries concerning Greek inscriptions (less than 15)-

Now has promised to supervise the work himself and to help establish the basis for attribution: yes/none or yes/inscription - Before we approach Mr. Terent’ev your approval is however needed.

Thank you, Nicole

PC Gile, Curator
April 10, 1979

Dear Bill,

The drafter is supposed to draft figures from existing black-and-white prints so that measurements and restoration, as well as attributions, could be graphically indicated.

This aspect of the corpus was explained at length most recently during the "seminar" on Feb. 22.

Xc. Giles Constable
April 13, 1979

Professor Otto Demus
Centro Tedesco Per Studi Veneziani
Palazzo Barbarigo
S. Polo 2765A
30125 Venezia
ITALY

Dear Otto:

Thank you for your recent letters. I enclose a copy of a new letter to Irina dealing with several points that came up in a recent, somewhat heated, conversation. The basic point is that she said she was willing to continue working on the Corpus, on the terms we proposed, for a first provisional year, after which the situation would be reviewed. I hope that this will deal both with the substance of the matter — getting on with the Corpus — and with her wounded pride and will thus mean that she will spend more time on the Corpus and less time attacking you, me, Loerke and almost everyone else in sight.

I am needless to say delighted that the work is progressing well and that you will be able after Easter to finish photographing the main medieval mosaics. Needless to say, we all look forward to your coming and regret the circumstances that have made it impossible for you to be with us for the whole term. Joan Aston asks me to tell you that the typing of your manuscript should be completed by the time you arrive.

You will remember the sconce for which we vainly tried to find a repairer in Venice and which I left with the secretary of the German institute. I should be most grateful if you could check with her on the progress of the work on this item.

With all best wishes from Evhy and myself, and looking forward to seeing you in May,

Yours ever,

Giles Constable
April 13, 1979

Professor Irina Andreescu  
Dumbarton Oaks  
1703 32nd Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20007

Dear Irina:

This note is to clarify a few points that came up in our talk on Wednesday. (1) The reappointment of Professor Demus was part, as I should have remembered, of the extension of the NEH grant, which requires his cooperation. (2) The idea of an outside review was proposed by Professor Loerke in his letter of 19 June 1978, in which he recommended that when a definable section of the Corpus had been completed it should be submitted to the judgment of competent scholars. In my opinion, as I told you, that time has now come and I would be happy for Professor Loerke or yourself to consult scholars whose views may be of use. But how this is done — whether formally, by bringing together some of the scholars attending the symposium, or informally, as I gather you have already done by showing examples of the completed entries to individual scholars, — is up to Professors Demus and Loerke and you. (3) The question of sending further letters to the Procuratoria, the Proto, Del Pizzol and Ritter is likewise up to the three of you. I informed Professor Loerke some time ago that it would seem to me reasonable to inform them that Professor Demus took direct charge of the final photo campaign in order to permit you to work here on the Corpus, but I do not regard this as necessary, since this step seems to me within the scope of Professor Demus’s authority as defined in my letter to you of 10 July 1978, which specifically protected his position as Principal Investigator for the entire project.

I was happy to hear that you are prepared to work provisionally under the terms proposed in my recent letter. You should of course feel free to express your reservations and, in the future, to propose changes that may help achieve our common goal of bringing the Corpus into consultable form. Meanwhile I shall raise with the Senior Fellows the question of the supervision of Professor Demus and Professor Loerke, though I am not certain that they will be inclined to exclude from future participation in the project two scholars who have been involved with it from its inception.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable

cc: Professor Otto Demus  
Professor William Loerke
I hope to arrive in D. O. in time for the Symposium.

With kind greetings

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Giles,

Things in Venice went very well with the exception that I contracted a bad virus infection (Vulgogrippe) which handicapped me during the last three days down there and followed me to Vienna, where I spent 11 days in bed. Today is my first day out.

I intend to go back to Venice at the end of this week (or Monday 23 at the latest) to complete the work on the nordthek, Can. Zeno and façade.
April 18, 1979

Professor Giles Constable
Director, Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Giles,

Let me first tell you how pleased I am to see that our meeting of last Wednesday seemed to address crucial points connected with the Project. Thank you also for your note of April 13. We have both realized, I believe, that despite the important differences which still exist in our understanding of this Project, there is a mutual desire to see it brought to its best conclusion. We agreed, as I remember it, that I will specifically comment on parts of your offer, that is its general framework and if this can be resolved in a satisfactory way to both parties, we can then proceed with the practical details. I will try to keep my comments here to a minimum, but am willing to discuss them further with you, at your convenience.

As you know, we disagree now on mainly two subjects: 1) the nature of our product, the NEH grant recipient; 2) the actual participation of the investigators in this Project. These disagreements, I trust, could be resolved through mutual understanding.

As I already said, the proposal on which the 1979/80 budgetary provisions have been based, makes no sense to me from the scholarly point of view, since it does not consider the nature of the material involved. At this point, in a desire to keep the Project alive, and since your budget for the next year has already been set, I offered to you to work for one year on this limited, almost experimental scale (which even so requires rethinking), provided that during this year the Senior Fellows will reconsider the needs of the Project, on the basis of the scholarly evidence, and that we will all try now to reach the best solution for the Project's conclusion. Once this premise is established, I trust that some good ideas will develop in the process of an open collaboration, including e.g. the problem of the final publication. Of course, one of the main requirements for taking responsibility after July 1, 1979 will be to have a clear, detailed, written statement at the conclusion of the NEH grant period, from those in charge with this Project at this time, so that no misunderstandings about the nature and the amount of work already produced should occur later. I am fully prepared to collaborate with the Senior Fellows or with yourself throughout the preparation of a new proposal.

As for the general supervision of Professor Demus and Professor Loerke at this stage, I do not really see the need to burden the Project with more administrative apparatus since the experience of the past year has, I believe, much slowed down - through red tape - the pace of the Project. Moreover, I have strong objections to the supervision of Professor Demus, and since you
"are not certain that the Senior Fellows will be inclined to exclude [him] from future participation in the Project", I am prepared, if necessary, to talk directly to them and to document the above mentioned objections.

While more work remains to be done in order to make this collaboration as successful as possible, I trust that we will have the opportunity to discuss now between the two of us (as we had agreed at our meeting of March 29) or with the Senior Fellows as well, all aspects that need clarification. Let me assure you again of my desire to see this Project brought to its best conclusion, a desire shared, I know, with several people.

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreescu

X-c.: Professor Loerke
   Professor Demus
19/10/79 to E. W., W.E. who will telephone 00 tomorrow to tell him DA is coming on Sat. We learned this yesterday & she has no mandate for Corpus or project work except possibly discussion w. potential publishers. She can write "To whom it may concern," letter saying she is working on Corpus at 00 but not referring to her as "field director"
April 20, 1979

Architecto Angelo Scattolini
Proto
Procuratoria di San Marco
Venezia
ITALY

Egregio Architecto:

A scanso d'equivoco circa l'impiego della Assistente Professoressa Dottoressa Irina Andreescu per il nostro Progetto San Marco (il Corpus dei mosaici medioevali a San Marco e nel Nord del Adriatico), vogliamo precisare che Ella non ha potuto partecipare ai lavori dell'ultima campagna perché ritenuta a Washington dalle necessità del Corpus, che dirige e organizza, preparandone il testo per la pubblica consultazione.

Giles Constable
Director

William Loerke
Professor of Byzantine Art
April 20, 1979

Reg. Emilio Del Pizzol
Via Monte Cengio 1-c
30171 Venezia-Mestre
ITALY

Gentile Ragioniere:

A scanso d'equivoco circa l'impiego della Assistente Professoressa
Dottoressa Irina Andreescu per il nostro Progetto San Marco (il Corpus
dei mosaici medievali a San Marco e nel Nord del Adriatico), vogliamo
precisare che Ella non ha potuto partecipare ai lavori dell'ultima
campagna perché ritenuta a Washington dalle necessità del Corpus,
che dirige e organizza, preparandone il testo per la pubblica consultazione.

Giles Constable  William Loerke
Director       Professor of Byzantine Art
Monsignore G. Marcato  
Segretario  
Procuratoria di San Marco  
Venezia  
ITALY

Egregio Monsignore,

A scanso d'equivoco circa l'impiego della Assistente Professoressa Dottorezza Irina Andreescu per il nostro Progetto San Marco (il Corpus dei mosaici medievali a San Marco e nel Nord del Adriatico), vogliamo precisare che Ella non ha potuto partecipare ai lavori dell'ultima campagna perche ritenuta a Washington dalle necessità del Corpus, che dirige e organizza, preparandone il testo per la pubblica consultazione.

Giles Constable  
Director

William Loerke  
Professor of Byzantine Art

April 20, 1979
April 20, 1979

Herr Erkehard Ritter
1180 Wien
Bastiengasse 50
Vienna, AUSTRIA

Dear Mr Ritter:

To clarify Assistant Professor Irina Andreeescu's position in our Project San Marco (the Corpus of Medieval Mosaics in San Marco and the Veneto), we wish to state that she has not been able to participate in the last campaign, in order to prepare, at Dumbarton Oaks, the text of the Corpus, which she has organized (and directs), for public consultation.

Sincerely yours,

Giles Constable

Sincerely yours

William Loerke

cc: Professor Otto Demus
April 24, 1979

Professor Irina Andreescu
Dumbarton Oaks
1703 32nd Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Dear Irina:

I am sorry that our meeting on Friday ended on a note of disagreement, but I am sure that upon reflection you will realize why I was unable to sign a letter that, first, equated the Project San Marco with the Corpus and then stated that you direct the Corpus. I have looked again at the Research Grant application to which you referred and verified that Professor Loerke is described as Principal Investigator, Professor Demus as Co-Investigator (as well as Principal Investigator in III.A.3, B.1, and C.1) and yourself as Associate Investigator. By no stretch of the imagination can this be interpreted to mean that you direct the Project. It is for this reason that I believe the letters written at the request of Professor Demus did not require any reference to your own activities, since he assumed direct charge of an undertaking for which he was officially responsible. My signature on these letters was simply a confirmation of the commitment of Dumbarton Oaks funds. No such signature, in my view, is necessary on a letter explaining your role, which is an internal matter to the San Marco Project. I consider it reasonable, however, as I have said before, that Professor Loerke write a letter, if you wish it, explaining that you have been working on the Corpus at Dumbarton Oaks while Professor Demus conducted the spring photographic campaign in San Marco. I am pleased, as you know, that you will continue to work on the Corpus, and you should not assume that my unwillingness to sign a letter saying that you direct the Project indicates any lack of support for the Corpus or for your contributions to it.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Giles Constable

P.S.: May I remind you that since Professor Loerke wrote the letter to Herr Ritter for me to co-sign, it should not be used as it is without his permission.

cc: Professor Loerke
    Professor Demus
Dear Professor Constable,

As Professor Andreescu will have informed you, a project for the conservation of the wall-mosaics of the Basilica of Torcello has for some time been in progress under our supervision with the approval of the Ministry of Cultural Heritage and with the financial support of the International Torcello Committee.

At our joint meetings we became aware of the valuable documentation assembled at Dumbarton Oaks under the direction of Professor Andreescu in the Corpus for Wall Mosaics in Venice and the Veneto (the Torcello section), which would be a great help to our study group.

We should be most grateful if you would kindly supply us with a copy of the final entries concerning this monument as well as the Bibliography concerning Torcello as soon as they are ready for public consultation. They are, obviously, needed in order to insure the best results for our planned action on this outstanding Venetian monument.

I am sending a copy of this letter to sir Ashley Clarke, Chairman of the International Committee for Torcello, as well as to the National Endowment for the Humanities, as the co-sponsor of the Corpus for Wall Mosaics in Venice and the Veneto.

Counting on your cooperation, already promised by your predecessor, the Honorable WR Tyler (in a letter of April 1977) and thanking you in advance for your help in this matter, I am, with best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Professor Giles Constable
Director
Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies
1703 32nd St. NW
WASHINGTON DC 20007
U.S.A.

p.c. Sir Ashley Clarke
Fondamenta Bonlini, 1113
VENEZIA

p.c. The National Endowment for the Humanities,
WASHINGTON DC.
(Att. Ms. Amy Lowitz – previous grant no RO 21995-75-121)
Venice
April 29, 1979

Dear Professor Loerke,

Your letter of March 28 which I found in Venice on my arrival (delayed because of sickness) astonished me a great deal. Somehow along the line there must have been an error, for somebody must have mistaken me for an undergraduate to ask me these questions. Besides, the antiquarian from whom you learnt that you have to ask these questions left out one of the – from the point of view of NEH – most important aspects of my work during the last few years, namely the close study of the mosaics in situ. I shall be happy, eventually, to contribute the results of this study to the corpus, either to be incorporated or added to it as an appendix to these notes (which fill 31 note books) will, of course, take some time since I have no secretary or assistant.

I could not possibly make an estimate of the percentage of work I spent on the study of the mosaics, research, writing my monograph (which, without notes runs to more than 1,000 pages typed for the first volume without the tituli) on other work connected with San Marco: all my work during the last years (which may well prove the most unhappy years of my life), dealt with the mosaics of San Marco as an entity. I have certainly not made any notes about how much time I spent on any aspect of this comprehensive
In one respect only I can give you a clear answer (and this is probably the most important part of the Questionnaire): I have spent very little time in supervising work in San Marco. There were a few days (e.g., when the scaffolding in the choir chapel were on it) when I was in charge. Even now, when I was on my own, there was no mind to supervise. I made a plan with and for Mr. Ritter, told Fioretti what I wanted in the way of measurements (conforming to the program applied to the preceding domes of the narthex), had a few talks with Del Pozzo, Neve, Fantella, and Scavolini; everything went smoothly, thanks to the routine set up by Miss Andreescu (for which I have always given her full credit).

One last question: I have no files here but I believe that for all the time I had appointments as Visiting Scholar, by the Trustees of Harvard University, so far they have not sent me a Questionnaire.

This is all I can tell you. Should I NOT now be satisfied with this, let them write to me directly.

Yours sincerely,

Otto Venus

Copy to
Professor Constable.

(Another job in the back for Miss A!)
Venice, May 1, 1979

Dear Giles,

Thank you for your letter of April 13.

With reference to your letter of April 13 to Mrs. Andreescu, of which you enclosed a copy in your letter to me, I should like to repeat what I said in my enclosed letter to Prof. Coebergh, namely, that I have made (and am still making) copious analytical notes of the mosaics of San Marco and their state of preservation, notes made on the scaffolding — not to speak of the ones which I have written the last half century, some of them also on scaffolding. I am perfectly willing to help with the corpus but only if Miss A., herself, asks for it or at least agrees to be helped and advised. I certainly will not intrude myself in any way.

However, so as not to waste that part of the work done on the spot, I am ready (after transcription which will take some time) to deposit a succession of these notes as an addition to the corpus, a kind of corpusculum.

One urgent request: please see
to it (by giving orders) that all San Marco photos, color and otherwise (including the most recent ones which will be needed for my talks with Knut Weizmann) be placed in my study for the 5 weeks of my stay in D.O. — so that I have not to fight for their use.

Thank you very much!

Yours ever

C. H.

P.S. Unfortunately, there is no hope for the sooner — Nobody will take the trouble to make or mend a thing of this sort.

Perhaps they are already there; at least they were in my study last year!
May 8, 1979

To: Prof. Otto Demus
From: William Loerke

Subj: Present state of the text of the Corpus

1. In its present state, the text of the Corpus consists of the following:
   a) Identification codes and color code for two registers of the West Wall, Torcello (Register II: Anastasis; Register III: Apostles and Deesis); The color code is in handwritten preliminary form. These codes accompany outline drawings of these registers with the numbers inscribed and the color code indicated.

   b) Typed entries:
      i) 27 typed entries for these two registers (ca. 94 pp.), (except that there are no entries yet of the Christ, John the Baptist, and seraphim of the Deesis).
      ii) two typed entries for two of the saints in the hemicycle of the main apse, San Marco: St. Peter (ca. 7 pp) and St. Mark (ca. 7 pp)

2. By means of the codes and outline drawings, one can
   a) identify all figures
   b) identify areas surviving from the XI cent. workshop, together with four different restorations in these areas:
      i) 12th cent. restorations
      ii) Moro's rest. of 1850's
      iii) Salviati's rest. of 1870-72
      iv) Berchet's rest. of 1896-77
   c) identify areas of XII cent. workshop, in which two hands and restored areas are identified.
   d) identify 19th cent. copies, not based on medieval originals, which have been inserted.
3. Photography:
The entries in the Corpus list b/w photographs and color transparencies as follows:

Register III, Last Judgment:

b/w Apostles:
General views: Apostles 1-6; 7-12
Details: one for each head

Deesis:
General views: Total; left figs.; right figs.
Details: Heads of each

color transparencies:

Apostles:
General views:
one of Registers II and III
Apostles 1-6; 7-12; 1-3; 4-6; 7-9; 10-12.
Details: one for each head

Deesis:
General views: total; left side; right side.
Details: heads of each

Register II: Anastasis:

b/w
General views: three
Details: nine

transparencies:
General views: three
details: eleven

Hemicycle, San Marco:
St. Peter: & St. Mark
color: two general views:
one full fig. each plus 7-8 details each.

b/w: two general views
two full fig each
one head each plus four details each
In the text of the entries, the item III is not present, and will, I believe, appear as a general entry at the head of the group.

Editing is still required for these entries, particularly to make sure that each photograph is identified in the same way each time it is cited, and also to systematize the vocabulary for color descriptions.

I append comments from Prof. Ladner and from Prof. Hjort with which I agree.

I suggest we discuss these matters when you have had time and opportunity to examine these materials.

cc: Prof. Constable
    Asst. Prof. Andreescu
Alleghiamo alla presente la nota-spese sostenute da questa Procuratoria per la costruzione e demolizione delle armature metalliche, da Voi richieste per le riprese fotografiche eseguite nell'atrio (ala nord) della Basilica di San Marco.

Ci permettiamo di rammentare le copie fotografiche (n.1 copia 18x24 per ogni soggetto ripreso).

In attesa di cortese riscontro, salutiamo distintamente.

IL SEGRETARIO
(Hons. G. Marcato)

[Stampa o timbro]
Days in which expenditures were made (i.e. labor performed)

- Nota spese (gg. 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 22, 23, 26 e 27 Marzo; 2, 6, 9, 10, 17, 18, 19 e 30 Aprile; 3, 4 e 7 Maggio):

1) Manodopera per costruzione, modifiche, demolizione e sgombero materiali p. impalcature ai 4 cupolini a la nord atrio Basilica, compresa assistenza anche serale o notturna:
   - ore 545 x £ 5.800 = (£ 3161.000 = £3809

2) Personale di custodia p. operazioni svolte dopo la chiusura della Basilica:
   - ore 22 x £ 5.800 = (£ 127.600 = £1548

3) Misurazioni (gg. 20, 28, 30 e 31 Marzo; 3, 6, 23 e 26 Aprile):
   - ore 57 x £ 5.800 = (£ 330.600 = £3988

- Spese generali (10%):

- TOTALE NS/CREDITO: ........................................... £ 3981.120

---

Current rate £ 8.296.86 /$ 1 (26 May, 1979)

$1 = 0.101.205 lire = Basis of calculation

1. Manual labor for erecting, altering, removal of scaffolding for 4 little domes in North Atrium of the Basilica, including assistance in V. evening or night.
   - 575 hours @ £ 5.800 ($ 469) per day

2. Charge for guards during periods of work when the Basilica was closed
   - 22 hrs. @ £ 2.600

3. Charge for taking measurements (of figs. in the masonry)
   - 57 hrs. @ £ 5.800

Compilatore

Approved,

[Signature]
May 14, 1979

Dott. Arch. Renato Padoan
Ministero per I Beni Culturali e Ambientali
Soprintendenza per I Beni Ambientali e Architettonici di Venezia
Palazzo Ducale
Venezia 30124

Dear Dr. Padoan:

I was very pleased to receive your letter concerning the project for the conservation of the wall mosaics in the basilica of Torcello and to know that this work is progressing under your supervision, with the approval of the Ministry of Cultural Heritage and with the financial support of the International Torcello Committee. I am happy to reaffirm the assurance of Mr. Tyler in his letter to Sir Ashley Clarke of April 6, 1977. He wrote then that, 'I have discussed with my successor, Professor Giles Constable, your request that the study group be permitted to use Dr Andreescu's documentation in its survey of conditions in the Cathedral of Torcello. He fully agrees with me that we should authorize this, on the understanding that Dr Andreescu is willing to make the documentation available, and that she is satisfied that her publication rights will be fully protected.' In my view this letter constitutes official authorization on the part of Dumbarton Oaks for Dr Andreescu to make available to you any photographs belonging to Dumbarton Oaks, and she in fact wrote, in a memorandum to Mr Tyler dated April 22, 1977, that, 'After your correspondence with Sir Ashley Clarke (on behalf of the Save Venice Committee), I agreed to supply the documentation collected from Torcello on our scaffolding in 1975.' It was therefore with some surprise that I received in February of this year copies of two letters, one from Sir Ashley to Dr Andreescu, dated February 5, asking for a selection of photographs (and the cost), and another from Mr Rollin Hadley to Sir Ashley, also dated February 5, saying that, 'I shall ask Giles for a price on duplicate photographs of the Torcello mosaics and also some estimate of how long it will take to get them ready for mailing.' I immediately consulted with Professor W. C. Loerke, who has responsibility for the administration of the grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, and wrote to Mr Hadley on February 8, 1979, that there was no objection on the part of Dumbarton Oaks to providing duplicates of the Torcello mosaics and that the initiative in the matter rested - as Mr Tyler's first letter made clear - with Dr Andreescu. I have now further consulted with Professor Otto Demus, who is in overall scholarly charge of the project, and he agrees that you should be allowed to use any Torcello
material made available to you by Dr Andreescu.

I am happy to be able to inform you that Professor Demus was able this spring to complete successfully the final photographic campaign in San Marco. I know how much he and Dumbarton Oaks owes to you and to your office for your assistance and support, now over many years, in carrying out this important undertaking and I hope some day to be able to express our appreciation to you in person. The task of bringing the research material now gathered into a consultable Corpus still needs to be completed, and you will be glad to know that the Senior Fellows of the Center for Byzantine Studies have made provision for the continuation and, it is to be hoped, completion of this work over the next three years.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable

cc: William Loerke
Otto Demus
Irina Andreescu
Rollin N. Hadley
May 14, 1979

Assistant Professor Irina Andreescu
Dumbarton Oaks
Washington, D. C. 20007

Dear Irina:

The Senior Fellows met again on Friday afternoon and discussed the future of the San Marco project in light of your presentation. They asked me to let you know that they see no reason at present to change the proposal they have already made but that they will be ready to review the situation after a year, to hear a progress report at that time, and to recommend a different arrangement if it appears best suited to the needs of the project. They believe that the project will continue to benefit from the collaboration of Professors Demus and Loerke, who have been associated with it from its inception. Professor Loerke should have general responsibility for the project under the Senior Fellows. They recognize your desire not to work specifically under the supervision of Professor Demus and are ready to accept this provision on condition that Professor Demus is fully consulted on matters within his area of expertise, that the material he has collected is used in a form that seems suitable to him, and that he has access to all materials gathered for the corpus.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable

cc: Otto Demus
William Loerke
16 May, 1979

Prof. Dr. Rudolf Kloos
D-8000 München 50
Koblenzer Strasse 1h/NI

Dear Dr. Kloos:

I enclose a cheque in the amount of $413.30 in response to your statement of Jan. 11, 1979. I am sorry that so much time has elapsed before payment was made. However, for the purposes of our accounting, we need to know the dates of your stay in Venice for which this cheque is re-imbursement, and the items (hotel & meals etc.) re-imburged. Our auditors require such a statement in our files.

I recognize that this by no means concludes the matter of your proper honorarium. I have read your past correspondence with Prof. Andreescu (in particular, your letter of Dec. 3, 1978), and recognize that your participation has been seen differently by Prof. Demus and Miss Andreescu. I believe we can best clarify the matter, if you will send me, in briefest outline form, the following data:

a) time spent in Venice (include dates and remuneration received)
b) completed work sent to Prof. Demus
c) " " " " Andreescu
d) expenses incurred in connection with b) and c)

If you can send this as soon as possible, I will re-imburse you for such outstanding expenses as still exist. We can then conclude the matter of your honorarium. I learn from Prof. Demus that your text sent to him will appear, as sent, in his volume. We are grateful for your expertise, which has been valuable for our project.

Sincerely yours,

William Loerke

cc: Prof. Demus
Prof. Constable, Director, Dumbarton Oaks
May 16th, 1979

TO: Irina Andreescu

FROM: Gary Vikan

RE: San Marco Research Materials

The significance of the San Marco mosaics themselves and the value and potential importance of your archaeological notes for their future study cannot be doubted. Nor can one question the significance of that study for the development of Mid-Byzantine art history in general. The real question is this: How does one go about making this massive body of material available to the scholarly community?

On should, I think, consider the number and range of prospective research "clients" and the most cost-effective way of bringing them in contact with your work. Those sections of the corpus that I have seen are detailed, voluminous, thorough, and by necessity, somewhat repetitive. Their publication *en masse* would be impossible.

But why not instead create a "San Marco Research Archive"--a room or part of a room where the rendered monument--the photographs, slides, and the corpus of notes and measurements--would be at the fingertips of the researcher. A more limited, more popular publication might still be undertaken, and the money saved in cutting back used to help off-set the costs of scholars using the archive.

Such a project would, I think, readily foster a "second-generation" of synthetic scholarship from the first-generation of primary scholarship that has already been undertaken. It would, moreover, preserve a distilled and frozen rendition of San Marco against the destructive forces of time.
May 16, 1979

Mr. Giles Constable, Director
Dumbarton Oaks
Washington, D. C.

Dear Giles:

Thank you for your letters of April 24 and May 14 and the copy of the letter to Architettto Padoan; I will answer them in turn.

While the understanding of the relationship between investigators in our Project has become incredibly entangled in the last year or so and your exegesis of the Project description does seem to contribute to the situation, which has by now materialized literally in a voluminous folder, I would like to reassure you on one matter: I did not use the paragraph addressed to Mr. Ritter by Mr. Loerke on April 20 and not signed by you, to which you refer in your letter of April 24.

I had repeatedly insisted that for our mutual professional image in Venice, that of Dumbarton Oaks and that of the investigators, it was a mistake to exclude me altogether from both the last campaign and the letters written in that connection to our various associates. The speculation and comments this omission was bound to raise are not in any way beneficial, I believe, to the image of professional rapport at Dumbarton Oaks.

As for myself, I have been greeted on my recent trip to Venice with amused comments on this issue, as well as with comparisons between the last and respectively the previous campaigns, made by my associates of several years. Everybody in wider circles as well knew of course, that I had come now to Venice at the expense of the ITC; moreover, my trip coincided with the last photographic campaign in San Marco for the Dumbarton Oaks Project, as I learned from those longtime associates. The well-known Venetian pragmatism, however, has by now shelved the whole issue. While I will continue my close association with Venice in the future, I still believe that the exit of Dumbarton Oaks from the Venetian scene could have been handled in better ways.

After my return to Washington, and despite repeated efforts, I have not been able to arrange a meeting with Mr. Loerke, about some long-standing and unresolved issues regarding our Project. I had also suggested several times to him that we, the investigators, meet together with you, since the NEH Grant is coming soon to an end. As has been the case for the whole academic year, Mr. Loerke has once again informed me that he has no desire to waste his time discussing these matters. Would it then please be possible for you to handle these issues as well as organize as soon as possible a meeting at which I hope loose ends will be tied up?

Thanking you in advance, I am,

Sincerely yours

Irina Andreescu

XC: W.C. Loerke
O. Demus
May 22, 1979
Re: RC-25547-76-982

Giles Constable
Director
Dumbarton Oaks
1703 32nd Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20007

Dear Professor Constable:

I am writing to follow up our discussion of the Project San Marco grant referenced above. Margaret Child, Assistant Director for the Research Collections program, has reviewed the file and agrees with me that Professor Demus' expenditure of time on preparing the results of the work at San Marco for publication is entirely within the spirit of the grant. Specific reference was made in the original project description to the publishing of two studies, one by O. Demus on San Marco and one by I. Andreescu on the remaining mosaics of Veneto.

With regard to the financial question you raised, our Grants Office has informed me that the Project Director keeps the salary certifications as part of his records.

I hope that this information is sufficient. If there is further clarification that is needed, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Marjorie A. Berlincourt
Deputy Director
Division of Research Programs
May 23, 1979

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

Dear Bill:

I am sure you will agree that the letter from Marjorie Berlincourt, of which I enclose a copy, is good news. It clearly establishes that we have not used NEH funds to pay Demus improperly, and it helps clarify the salary certifications issue. Salary certifications certainly have to be kept, but only as part of your records.

I have looked over the text of your letter to Irina which incorporates the principal points we discussed. I still think it would be wise to define somewhat more clearly the type and amount of material that may be taken to Atlanta and to stress the need for its proper care. Some reference to Otto's participation in the formulation of these proposals would also strike me as suitable.

I think it would be suitable, once Irina has received this letter, to arrange a meeting between the three of us - and, of course, Otto if he wants to come - in order to discuss both her plans and other matters which I gather from her last letter she wishes to raise.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable
May 24, 1979

Assistant Professor Irina Andreeescu
Dumbarton Oaks
Washington, D. C. 20007

Dear Irina:

We believe it useful to come to a more detailed understanding of how your work on the text of the Corpus will proceed during the coming fiscal year. After consultation with Professor Demus, we felt that the work should proceed with the following points in mind:

Since you have made a beginning on the Torcello section, it seems obvious that it would be best to press on with Torcello, Trieste, Murano and Ravenna until all that material has been organized and provided with a text in "consultable form".

We assume that you will wish to take certain material to Emory University for this purpose. Our understanding is that these will consist of transparencies, photographs and slides produced by our campaigns in Torcello, Trieste, Murano and Ravenna. We believe these should be limited in number and assume they will be maintained and returned in good condition, and that you will provide the Photo Collection with a list of what is taken.

With respect to potential publication of our color transparencies and/or black and white prints produced by our various campaigns, let it be said that such arrangements require approval of the Senior Fellows and the Administration of Dumbarton Oaks. It is understood that such arrangements would protect the interests of your volume on Torcello and Professor Demus' volumes on San Marco, and would also conform to any restrictions imposed by the NEH.

We would appreciate receiving from you a plan of work for 1979-80, so that specific arrangements can be made within the fiscal terms stated by the Senior Fellows.

Sincerely yours,

Giles Constable
William Loerke

cc: Otto Demus
Mr. Giles Constable, Director
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Giles,

Thank you for your letter of May 24th, in which you apparently assume that I have already accepted your offer for a consultancy to the Corpus for Wall Mosaics in the N Adriatic Area (Venice and the Veneto), starting July 1, 1979. This assumption is not quite correct. In my letter of April 18th, my acceptance was conditional, among other things, upon a clear, written statement of what has been achieved to date under the NEH Grant, in as much as I am already on record as disagreeing with the way this Grant has been administered. I have not yet received this statement.

I also thank you for the opportunity on May 9th of briefing the Senior Fellows on the background of the Project. In this connection, I would appreciate receiving an excerpt of the Minutes pertinent to the subject.

While your last letter of May 24th helps to clarify your view of how the Project should proceed this coming academic year, the omission of San Marco from your list is completely unacceptable on scholarly grounds. My access to the material collected for the Corpus from San Marco under my supervision is indispensable to the completion of any of its sections since, as we all know, the mosaics from all these churches are intimately related.

I also await your reaction to the unexpected and extraordinary opportunity already welcomed by the NEH, for the publication, full color coverage, of the Corpus (circa $800,000), at the expense of a distinguished Italian publishing house.

Since the expiration of this Grant is imminent, as I hope you know, i.e. June 30th 1979, your earliest resolution of the foregoing is essential to my acceptance of the consultancy.

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreescu

xc: Prof. Loerke
    Prof. Demus

Senior Fellows: Prof. Grabar
               Prof. Meyendorff
               Prof. Setton
               Prof. Ševčenko
               Dr. Talbot
               Prof. Vermeule
May 29, 1979

Assistant Professor Irina Andreescu
Dumbarton Oaks
Washington, D. C. 20007

Dear Irina:

Thank you for your letter, to the various points in which I shall reply seriatim. (a) The clear written statement of what has been achieved under the NEH Grant will form part of the final report to be submitted within 90 days from June 30. You may, if you wish, delay your acceptance of the consultancy until this is prepared. (b) The minutes of the meeting on May 9, when they are prepared, will be circulated to all members of the Committee in order to insure their accuracy but are not customarily shown to witnesses. You may if you wish, however, see the section relating to your appearance when it is ready. (c) The letter of May 24 from Professor Loerke and myself, prepared in consultation with Professor Demus, was intended to propose a modus operandi for the coming year and not in any way to exclude you from using the San Marco material. (d) With regard to publication, we cannot reply to a proposal we have not received. Professor Loerke and I have already made clear that we would welcome an overture from any serious and responsible publisher, subject to the provisos mentioned in our letter of May 24.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Giles Constable

cc: Professor Otto Demus
    Professor William Loerke
Mr. Giles Constable, Director
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Giles:

Many thanks for your prompt answer of May 29. Since you inform me that "the clear written statement of what has been achieved under the NEH Grant will form part of the final report to be submitted within 90 days from June 30 [to the NEH]", I accept your suggestion of delaying my acceptance of the consultancy until I receive a copy of that statement.

As for the minutes of the meeting on May 9th, after they have been circulated for accuracy, I would indeed appreciate receiving, as I already indicated in my letter of May 28, the excerpt concerning this particular Project.

I also note with satisfaction that there is no problem concerning my access to the San Marco material.

I would have hoped to have before now, an answer to my repeated requests of a meeting between the investigators of this Project, with your participation, to discuss among other current problems, the priorities in the publication, i.e., the Corpus and the volumes on San Marco and respectively Torcello et al. I still look forward to this meeting, while we are all here in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Irina Andreescu

xc: Prof. Loerke
    Prof. Demus

Senior Fellows: Prof. Grabar
               Prof. Meyendorff
               Prof. Setton
               Prof. Ševčenko
               Dr. Talbot
               Prof. Vermeule
Prof. W. C. Loerke  
Dumbarton Oaks  

Dear Bill:

Before this NEH Grant comes to an end, I would like to bring once again to your attention a number of standing, unsolved issues. I do not know whether you gave them any thought in these last months, since you have not communicated with me, but I believe they are crucial to the Corpus and they deserve to be at least considered.

I realize that the design of this Corpus has become only recently more familiar to you (after I organized the February 1979 seminar), while your memo of May 8 still lacks factual information, but had you found the time to discuss these matters with me in the last academic year, I believe many delays could have been avoided.

With respect to the Corpus proper, still unsolved, to my knowledge, are the issues of:

--- The epigraphic subentries (for the Latin inscriptions see my correspondence with Kloos since 1978 and the memos to you since 1978; for the Greek inscriptions, see my memos to you of April 1979).

--- The drafting of the figures – for graphically indicating measurements and restorations (see memos to you of March 9, March 19, March 29, April 9).

--- The status of the photographs for the Corpus (in Vienna and Washington) resulting from the NEH campaigns (see memos to you since December 1978).

--- The payment of Mrs. Amaduzzi, the Italian typist (see her letters of Nov. and Dec. 1978 and my subsequent memos to you).

Among other unsolved issues, as noted recently in my letters to Giles (May 16 and May 30), is the setting of priorities for the Corpus and the books respectively (and all related problems).

Finally, I would like to tell you that Mr. Kloos once again today considered that his lack of access to the scaffolding for his work, as well as the repeated requests that he return the photographs to Vienna (with which he had to comply) seemed "strange" to him and definitely handicapped his work. He has not yet started the work on the epigraphic subentries.

Looking forward to your solution of these matters, I am,

xc: Prof. Constable  
Prof. Demus  

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreescu
May 31, 1979

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

Center for Byzantine Studies

Asst. Prof. Irina Andreescu
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Irina:

In response to yours of today's date:

-- I am awaiting a letter from Mr. Kloos.

-- Payment for drafting was not provided for in the NEH budget; I will not recommend additional expenditures for drafting, until the text of Corpus entries is complete in final form, so that the draftsman will have a clear idea of how much data will have to be shown on the drawings.

-- I am concerned about the status of photographs in your office, i.e., their physical condition and "consultable order". Photographs elsewhere are not your concern.

-- Please provide me with a statement on the importance for the San Marco Project of the two ms. typed by Mrs. Amaduzzi and her assistants, and also why these ms. had to be typed rather than Xeroxed. Please indicate also the line in the budget you had in mind when you authorized her to begin work.

-- A priority is that which comes first. The text of the Corpus comes first. Until you have completed this text, discussion of priorities is pointless.

Sincerely yours,

William Leek

cc: Prof. Constable
Prof. Demus
June 1, 1979

Assistant Professor Irina Andreescu
Dumbarton Oaks
Washington, D. C. 20007

Dear Irina:

I have discussed the question of a meeting with Professor Demus and Professor Loerke. Mr. Loerke has already written to you on the subject of priorities, and we do not believe that there are any questions in this regard that are not already clear in writing or would benefit by discussion at a meeting. If there are other specific topics that need to be discussed, we would be happy to consider calling a meeting. I myself, as you know, am ready to see you at your convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable

cc: Otto Demus
William Loerke
Prof. William Loerke  
Dumbarton Oaks  

Dear Bill:

Dr. Kloos has sent me both your letter to him of May 16 and his answer of May 28. Apart from the substantial issues raised in his letter, I would like to bring up here a point of information. You say, "I learn from Prof. Demus that your [Kloos'] text sent to him will appear, as sent, in his volume." It might be useful to know that Ihor Ševčenko, in a comment on Dr. Kloos' work of May 24, addressed to me, says "I find Dr. Kloos' German text excellent, if used as archival record material. Any publication would have to involve substantial shortenings, by about 3/4 to 2/3."

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreescu

xc: Prof. O. Demus  
Giles Constable
Mr. Giles Constable, Director  
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Giles:

Thank you for your paragraph of June 1. I am very surprised to see that not only do you consider the issue of priorities in our Project (Corpus versus books) answered by Bill Loerke's reply to my memo of May 31 ("a priority is that which comes first"!!), but you also feel that everything in this connection is "already clear in writing."

As far as I can see, the only clear thing about the priorities is that at the end of our NEH Grant period, supposedly meant to produce a Corpus, a book already in the editing process now, has been produced instead; meanwhile, because of issues I raised many times and most recently in my memo above-mentioned, none of the Corpus entries is yet ready to be consulted. In this connection, Dr. Kloos' letter of May 28 proves illuminating as well.

I do not know how you intend to reconcile this situation as well as the obvious lack of a working relationship between the investigators (see also my letter of April 18), with the statement in your letter to Architetto Padoan, "that the Senior Fellows of the Center for Byzantine Studies have made provision for the continuation and, it is to be hoped, completion of this work over the next three years."

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreescu

xc: Dean Rosovsky  
Prof. Loerke  
Prof. Demus

Senior Fellows:  
Prof. Grabar  
Prof. Meyendorff  
Prof. Setton  
Prof. Ševčenko  
Dr. Talbot  
Prof. Vermeule
Mr. Giles Constable, Director
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Giles:

Here are my further comments on two of the subjects taken up when we met yesterday.

1. Concerning the final report on the NEH Grant: if the views of the two scholarly investigators cannot be reconciled, I would consider it only fair that both views be represented and identified in this report for any future reference. This will help also avoid factual misinformation.

2. Given the imminence of my next trip to Venice (where, in addition to the Torcello restoration, I was invited by the Rotary Club at the Proto's suggestion, to lecture about the mosaics), you asked me to pursue the matter of the publication of the Corpus. This is one of the subjects, which I would have thought, would benefit from a discussion between investigators, i.e., the format of the Corpus publication and the cross-reference of any of the books resulting from these campaigns to the full photographic coverage. To publish the photographs and basic technical data does in no way threaten, in my view, any interpretative study of the material. Since you have just started the editing of the volume on San Marco, a discussion at this early stage, and the following resolutions, could spare a costly duplication of printing (the illustration of the books should be cross-referenced to the Corpus system, as is customary for similar enterprises.) It would also be consistent with our stated scope in the NEH Grant application.

I am, as you know, at your disposal and that of the other investigators, for further consultation.

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreescu

xc: Prof. Loerke
    Prof. Demus
June 7, 1979

Assistant Professor Irina Andreescu
Dumbarton Oaks
Washington, D. C. 20007

Dear Irina:

I have discussed the second point raised in your recent letter with Professors Demus and Loerke and we are in agreement that it is pointless to consider the publication of the Corpus until we have a firm proposal. There is no reference to the publication of the Corpus in the NEH proposal, and our first responsibility is to get the Corpus into consultable shape.

With regard to your first comment, the final report to the NEH, as I understand it, will be a factual statement by the Principal Investigator of what has been accomplished under the grant and will not include assessments of the success of the undertaking by the various collaborators.

I did not realize that the telegram you showed me included a bill. It was opened by Miss Baglia because your name did not appear on the address, and she consulted Professor Loerke in order to ascertain whether the bill should be charged to the San Marco project. There is no policy of opening other people's mail at Dumbarton Oaks and anything addressed to you in person will be delivered directly to you.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable

cc: Professor Demus
    Professor Loerke
June 7, 1973

Dear Bill,

to answer yours of to day:

1) The travel advance of $900, issued on 15
November '73 has been accounted for on Dec 21.
I gave you both the Narrative Report and the Financial Statement.

If your note of May 31 is unacceptable to me, both in substance and tone. My questions addressed to you on May 31 have not yet been answered.

I do take exception to your unfounded
handling of the administration of this grant, a situation about which I have complained repeatedly. Should you decide upon an acceptable, responsible attitude I will very willingly take up the matter concerning the broad ones, among other issues.

Sincerely yours,

IRINA ANDREEVA

[Handwritten note: On file, can return]
Dear Irina:

I have checked the Regi-la-Ville saints in the Bibliotheca Cluniacensii, Cantant. I have verified and ascertained that no one of them was specially honored at Cluny except Consortia, whose cult (according to De V.) was characterized by Cluniac, or who De V. erected. Consortia appears on the Cluniac calendar on March 13 or June 22. Denis had an altar in Cluny III, but that does not mean much. Abdon and Sennen appear on July 30 in October. 24 December is Geronimus on Sept. October 23 or December is Geronimus. (Though whether we not De Bala-V saint?)

Even an in the earliest Cluniac even an in the earliest Cluniac.

There are in the customary of Bernard (late 11th c.) who included many SS not previously honored at Cluny. So far
as I can see the martyrs of Sebastia
— as I take the 2 Sebastian's to be —
do not appear. Though a Fabian or
Sebastian were honored on January 20.
In other words, the group is reasonably
distinguishable, but not very so. They
may have been introduced into the
churches calendar in the late 11th c.,
but again not necessarily so. The
only distinguishable thing I see about
them is that they were all martyrs
in the early church (but so many
SS were!).

Sorry to be so unhelpful, but
that it is.

Yours,

[Signature]
Dear [Name],

Thank you for your elaborate foot-note of yesterday, and most of all, for the very enjoyable session we had on Friday. At least you eliminated much of the speculation about "Chamic in general" and left us only with a hapax (or chimer?) state and the trail of Pons to follow!

The reason I left you the illustration of Aineas was because this represents a real Byzantine style preserved in the West (via Italy?) which Pons is one or two steps removed from it, and definitely Romanized.

With many thanks, again,

[Signature]
Riceviamo dal Rag. Emilio Del Pizzol la somma di £ 3.981.120= a riferimento spese per esecuzione fotografie da Voi richieste.

IL SEGRETARIO

[Signature]

Mons. G. Marcatò
Sehr geehrter Herr Professor Loerke,


Ich bin mit freundlichen Grüßen
Ihr

[Signature]

[Additional handwritten note in English]

In view of Andreason's egregious note of June 16, copied to you, you will wish an copy of this clear response from Prof. Kloos.

[Signature]

JUN 18 1979
None of the original color transparencies of San Marco should leave the premises, except to be sent to the publisher for plate layouts, or to a photo laboratory for duplication or reduction. They should be kept in a locked facility at all times. For proper storage conditions I recommend housing all the color transparencies in the Photograph Collection with other similarly classified material.

Once chosen for publication, color transparencies must not be redistributed to other interested parties. I suggest that, if Demus gives his approval, that copies of his list of illustrations, particularly the color, be given to interested persons. Also, I think the Photo Collection should have this list. Then, if necessary, duplicate transparencies could be made of a small number. It would be necessary to specify that these color transparencies are FOR STUDY PURPOSES ONLY and must be returned within a specified time period. A legal agreement would be appropriate viewing the importance of the material.
Dear Giles,

Permit me to say a final word about the latest note of Miss Andreae on:

1) There is no need at all for the San Marco material to be used by Miss A. for completing the Torcello Corpus. The corpus should contain descriptions of the Torcello mosaic only; comparisons with other mosaics have no place in a corpus.

2) Once disrupted, the sequence of illustrations for the San Marco monograph could not be reconstructed by anyone but myself.

3) There is good reason to fear that the material would be kept from use for my book for a long time—which would mean a long delay of its publication.
I therefore implore you to be firm and tell Miss A. that she can have the San Marco material earmarked for my book only after the reproductions (plates) for the San Marco monographs have been made.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

O. H.
June 18, 1979

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

Center for Byzantine Studies

From O. Demus
to Prof. G. Costabile,
Director.

Dear Giles,

With this note I submit for your consideration the material for Gloss, the text and the plates volume of part one of a monograph on the mosaics of San Marco (11th and 12th centuries). Text and illustrations were prepared in the hope that they would be published in the series of Dumbarton Oaks Studies.

The material consists of:

I. Manuscript and Notes II - XXI, the last chapter being a contribution by Dr. R. M. Kiloos on the Palaeography of the
San Marco inscriptions. It is written in German, since it is largely technical, it would be extremely difficult to translate.

2) The illustrations
   a) of "Figures", to be printed in the text volume, showing brachial views, planes, sections, technical details and later (back mediaeval) mosaics,
   b) of color transparencies, to be printed in the "plates" volume, preceding the black and white plates. They are to be numbered in bold type,
   c) of black and white plates, to follow the color plates, numbered in normal type;

3) The material for the illustrations themselves
   a) for the "Figures", contained in a blue folder. Among them is one color transparency which could appear as frontispiece;
   b-d) for the plates volume
consisting of:

b) Color transparencies in three boxes

c) Black and white photographs in three boxes

d) Outsize photographs in orange folder; their place is marked by the letter F in the list and by pieces of paper (numbered) in the boxes of c).

II To be supplied later:

1) Manuscript of I, Preface
2) Bibliography
3) Index

I apologize for the shape of the manuscript which is not as tidy as I could have wished. The reason for this is that the various chapters were written over a long period by an author whose knowledge of English is
somewhat shaky, especially if he writes in a non-English
ambient and, finally, that
some parts of the manuscript
were written by a Vienna typist
not sufficiently familiar with
the language. Should some
parts have to be retyped, I
suggest that they, or execrable
of them, be sent to me. I shall
then try to have them redone
by an able typist.

Let me conclude this accom-
panying note by thanking you
(and this goes also to Professor
E. Verhe) for the understanding
and assistance my work (which
I regard as my life's work for
excellence) has been accorded. I
shall be most grateful if the pub-
lication could be effected so that
I can still see it through the press
and that it does not appear as an
opus posthumum.

Yours gratefully
CDDO
June 15, 1979

Mr. Giles Constable, Director
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Giles,

Thank you for your lines of today. I believe it is necessary to have at least a list of photographs unavailable to the Corpus at the moment, while they are used for "the publication of [Prof. Demus'] book". I would also like to know for how long they will be unavailable since no progress can be made on working out the code for San Marco, which sets the standards for the lesser churches, without the photographic material. I have checked with Judy O'Neill and she informed me that the Photo Collection also does not have a list of the unavailable photographs.

Hoping that the question of "priorities" can be resolved quickly so that the establishment of the identification codes can proceed, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreescu

Xc: W. Loerke
    O. Demus
    J. O'Neill
June 15, 1979

Assistant Professor Irina Andreescu
Dumbarton Oaks
Washington, D. C. 20007

Dear Irina:

I've looked into the matter of the transparencies and photos put aside for Professor Demus's book. I am told that they represent only a small percentage of the total number of photographs, of which the remainder are fully available, and that their present order must be preserved in order to make progress with the publication of the book. They should be available by the time you are working on the San Marco Corpus and your Torcello book.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable

cc: Otto Demus
    William Loerke
June 16, 1979

Professor W. C. Loerke
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Bill,

I spoke today on the telephone with Mr. Kloss on the subject of the epigraphic sub-entries. He told me that he had received a check of $2,000 from Dumbarton Oaks with no explanation, and he assumed it was for the work requested by Mr. Demus for his book. Mr. Kloos also informed me that he considered you owe him an answer to his letter, on the subject of the Corpus entries. The $2,000 have been budgeted in our NEH Project for the Corpus and I find it very upsetting that at the end of the Grant period, this commitment for the inscriptions as well as for other operations has not been honored.

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreeescu

Xc: O. Demus
    G. Constable
June 18, 1979

Mr. Giles Constable
Dumbarton Oaks
Washington, D. C. 20007

Dear Giles:

With respect to Irina's note of June 15 in re the photographs for
for Professor Demus' book, you may recall from my description of the
present state (May 8) of the Corpus-Archive, that identification and
color codes for 27 entries in two registers on the West Wall of
Torcello have been made without benefit of the San Marco photos
now requested. A list of the photographs will of course be prepared.

Sincerely,

William C. Loerke
June 19, 1979

Dr. Giles Constable, Director
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Giles,

Yesterday, Judy O'Neill informed me that she was instructed by you to keep under key the illustrations set aside for Mr. Demus' book and not to let any one, including Susan and myself, have access to it.

While I believe that the issue "book versus Corpus" has still not received the proper responsible attention, nor has the problem of access to the materials resulting from our campaigns been professionally addressed (Mr. Kloos still has nothing to work with for his entries, neither can we proceed here with the codification of the material), I suggest that at this stand-off point, to ease things for now, Mr. Demus should send his duplicate set of illustrations which could then be used temporarily in lieu of the master set. Awaiting for your answer, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Irina

Irina Andreescu

Xc: W. C. Loerke
    O. Demus
    J. O'Neill
I do not feel that the first sentence of that letter is wholly correct, or rather, does not seem complete. Let me explain. When I spoke with you (and ultimately with Susan also) at the xerox machine yesterday, I remember stating the same matter in more detail. That is, no one would have direct access to the illustrations set aside for Demus' publication.

*The same goes for all San Marco material—negatives, b/w prints and color transparencies not set aside for Demus' publication.

*The material is kept best under the best conditions D.O. can provide, that is, in the dark and locked.

In sum, it appears then, that I am at variance with the rephrasing of my conversation with you. I stressed that when you would be provided with lists of which material was where, then you could make your specific requests known.

I have been compiling lists of material removed for publication so that we will know specifically which items are where. I have collated the color transparency list, a) those in files b) those set aside for O.D. publication (82) c) those unaccounted for (c.36)

of the 959 numbered and described transparencies. Lists of the recently received 101 color transparencies will follow, as soon as Claudia can get to it. I will finish collating the b/w print lists, in similar three divisions, sometime tomorrow. I will then copy and distribute these lists, as we have done with all lists of North Adriatic fieldwork.

The reason I feel your first sentence is not wholly complete is that it lacks the phrase, such as, "without Constable's permission," a conditional clause that I state this now so that no one will misinterpret another's word.

cc: G.Constable, W.C.Loeber, O.Demus
TO: Giles Constable
FROM: Judith O'Neill
DATE: June 19, 1979
SUBJECT: PRICE OF DUPLICATE 5x7" TRANSPARENCIES (COLOR)

Please pardon my stupidity: the going prices for duplicate color transparencies, 5"x7" size are as follows:

at DUNLOP Lab:

one dupl. $32.50; or—c. twenty or more $22.50 each dupl.

or—c. eighty or more $17.50 each.

at COLORFAX Lab:

one dupl. $10.70 or—c. eighty, $9.00 each dupl.

$140.

$720.
20 giugno 1979

Monsignor C. Marcato
Procuratoria di San Marco
30124 Venezia
ITALY

Egregorio Monsignore,

Ora che abbiamo portato a compimento, per quanto rientrava nelle nostre possibilità, il progetto di fotografare, misurare e descrivere i mosaici medievali della basilica di San Marco, desideriamo di proferire i nostri ringraziamenti più vivi per la Sua cooperazione e valida assistenza, le quali ci sono state di prezioso aiuto per il raggiungimento dei fini che ci eravamo proposti. Particolare riconoscenza merita il Suo spirito di collaborazione nel far pulire i mosaici prima che fossero fotografati e nel concederci di far uso delle impalcature in Suo possesso per fotografare e studiare i mosaici dell'atrio. Siamo convinti che l'opera che abbiamo condotta sui mosaici mariani e la pubblicazione che seguirà serviranno a mantenere in primo piano la giustamente famosa decorazione musiva della Sua illustre basilica sia negli studi di storia dell'arte, sia nell'apprezzamento e nell'amore del pubblico in generale.

La direzione di Dumbarton Oaks e i membri del gruppo che ha partecipato al progetto si uniscono a me nel ringraziarLa sentitamente per i favori che ci ha concesso e nell'inviare a Lei e ai Suoi colleghi i migliori auguri per l'avvenire.

Con la massima stima,

William Loerke

cc: Professor O. Demus
Professor C. Constable
Professor I. Andreescu
June 20, 1979

Prof. Giles Constable, Director
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Giles,

Your note of today indisputably shows that the photographs are not treated as study material, if they cannot be used by the very investigator who had them made on the scaffolding (i.e. myself), without your specific permission which requires several memoranda. What Profs. Demus and Loerke (as reported by you) believe in this respect is clearly wrong.

It is intolerable that all my scholarly requests have to be cleared through conferences (involving overseas communication?), only to be denied in the end. It has been obvious for quite some time that none of you really understands what the work on the Corpus involves (see also for lack of information Mr. Loerke’s memo of May 8 to Mr. Demus).

Also, it is an unacceptable practice by professional standards that my research assistant is being repeatedly asked by those who exert "administrative control" to clarify scholarly points which occur in my correspondence and are not clear to them.

Sincerely yours,

Irina Andreeescu

Xc: Mr. W. Loerke
    Ms. J. O’Neill

P. S. Thank you for your intervention which got me the prints from Ursula.
June 20, 1979

Dr. Marjorie A. Berlincourt  
Deputy Director  
Division of Research Programs  
The National Endowment for the Humanities  
MS 350, 806 15th Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20506  

RE: GRANT II RC 25547-76-982

Dear Doctor Berlincourt,

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to take up with you, in some detail, the problems connected with our Grant for the Corpus for Wall Mosaics in Venice and the Veneto. I would also like to extend my thanks to Dr. Margaret Child and to Ms. Amy Lowitz.

As agreed at our meeting of two days ago, I am sending you my Report to date on the work done over the last years (1975-79) in San Marco and the churches in the North Adriatic Area (since the term "Veneto" does not, strictly speaking, apply to Ravenna or Trieste). Indicated with an asterisk are the sections accomplished under the present Grant. This work has been done solely under my direction and my supervision as detailed in the Project description (item 5, Plan of Work, p. 9). Professor Demus, the co-[principal] investigator, however, has had no input in this particular work (see enclosures). Also, please find enclosed copy of the first page of the Project description (item 1, Purpose), with my identification of what has not been surveyed to date.

Item 1. 3 in this list, "The Atrium", has been only partly surveyed in Corpus form by me in 1977 and 1978 (two domes, two arches and five adjoining lunettes). The remainder of the Atrium has been surveyed by Mr. Demus alone in 1979. While I have not seen his field notes, I do happen to know that the corresponding photographic coverage might be more appropriate for the needs of a book's illustration but is not thorough enough for the needs of the Corpus. (See also enclosures).

I do object to the way this Grant has been interpreted and administered by Dumbarton Oaks for the following reasons:

- Only one investigator (myself) out of the two listed in our Grant application has worked on the Corpus. Instead, Mr. Demus has written a book. At the end of the Grant, no provision to make up for this "redistribution of tasks" has been as yet made.

- While Mr. Demus' book (clearly not within the scope of this Grant) has been given priority and every support by the Dumbarton Oaks administration...
throughout the Grant period, the Corpus has suffered in the last two years both from an appalling time-consuming red tape attitude and neglect. Among other "results", the epigraphy (see attached correspondence from Mr. Kloos) and the graphic presentation of the material of the Corpus on which the chart of the restorations and the measurements should be indicated, have not been taken care of, and to date, none of the entries are yet ready either for public consultation or for use by restorers (see correspondence with Arch. Padoan).

- No professional discussion among investigators to resolve those disagreements and to establish the priorities in the process of the work has taken place in over a year, despite my repeated requests for it (see enclosures); neither have the problems concerning the publication been considered: the relationship between the format of the Corpus and that of the books (e.g. - the printing of the illustration).

- Even at the present, the question of the availability of the material to the scholarly collaborators on the Project is not yet resolved (see enclosures). In one word, the poor professional relationship impeded progress on the Corpus and sapped the morale of the team working on it.

Despite Mr. Constable's statement that "provisions have been made for its continuation and - it is to be hoped - completion of this work over the next three years" (see enclosure), the prospect of the Corpus now is grim. It is indeed unrealistic and unacceptable that a prepackaged "Diktat" from people who are not familiar with the Corpus (see enclosures) should be considered a satisfactory remedy to a complex, deteriorated situation. The offer made to me of a consultancy, 30 day/year for no more than three years, with the responsibility of finishing the Corpus within 90 days, is clearly ignorant of the work involved. Since last January to date, 45 entries have been catalogued, and 16 are in progress, involving a full-time research assistant and restricted typing assistance in addition to myself working full-time. The entries still to be finished are in the hundreds. I have repeatedly urged for, and also offered a working solution to the completion of the Corpus (see enclosures).

But despite all my struggle to fulfill the purposes of our Grant, I have met, as is obvious from the enclosures, with constant indifference and resistance.

I now hope that the National Endowment for the Humanities will be able to convince Dumbarton Oaks to respect the terms of the Grant, even retroactively, and to complete the Project as originally intended. As for myself, I am, as in the past, entirely desirous of bringing this Project to its best professional conclusion. Should you have any questions concerning the above, I will be happy to be of assistance to you.

Xc: Dean Rosovsky  
Prof. Constable  
The Senior Fellows  
Prof. Loerke  
Prof. Demus

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Tina Andreescu
Associate Investigator
Asst. Prof., Byzantine Archeology

Enclosures
1. **Purpose**

   a. To photograph, systematically and comprehensively, certain medieval mosaics in San Marco, Venice. These mosaics are in the interior, the Baptistery and Cappella Sant'Isidoro, and in the Atrium.

   1) **The Interior:**
   - Two presbytery chapels (St. Peter & St. Clement Cantoria above);
   - The west walls of the N. & S. transepts;
   - Several panels on various walls (see plan);
   - Many isolated figures of saints in arches of the arcade, lower level.

   2) **Baptistery, Cappella Zeno, and Cappella Sant'Isidoro.**

   3) **The Atrium**

   Photography will consist of about 700 color transparencies (13x18 cms), 700 b/w negatives of the same size with prints enlarged to 18x24 cms, as well as ca. 3,000 color slides, chiefly of technical details.

   b. With an archaeological team on the scaffoldings, to make and systematically record measurements and observations on techniques used, areas of restoration, the date of the restorations, and the present condition of the mosaics.

   c. To complete the searching and xeroxing of relevant documents in the Venetian archives; this to be done by Miss Frizziere, paleographer and archivist.

   d. To complete the paleographical study of the inscriptions; this to be done by R. M. Kloos, archivist and specialist in monumental inscriptions, Inschriften Kommission der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

2. **Significance**

   The mosaics of San Marco constitute the largest mosaic program extant. We propose to photograph and study only medieval mosaics. Restored on a number of occasions, these mosaics have not been studied at close quarters, or photographed on the scale we propose. The photographic archives of this program together with the technical data we are collecting and recording, will constitute a major and permanent resource of incalculable value for research scholars. Here will be found criteria for defining and dating areas of restoration, and for distinguishing the work of several teams of mosaicists which were involved in the course of creating this vast complex of scenes. The work of individual mosaicists will also emerge. Taken as a whole, the data we shall collect, systematize, record, and publish, will advance immeasurably one of the major issues of later medieval art historiography: the role of Byzantium.
Field Notes and Corpus Entries

Torcello, Santa Maria Assunta, Main Apse.

Register I  See TO, SMA, museum for fragments
II  all field notes typed in Corpus format
III  field notes typed in Corpus format
IV  all field notes typed in Corpus format

entries in progress: IV, 1-2, 4, 7, 10-12

TO, SMA, W. Wall

Register I  not surveyed. See TO, SMA, sacristy for fragment
II  all field notes typed in Corpus format
completed entries: II, '1-8, 12
III  all field notes typed in Corpus format
completed entries: III, A1 - A12
D1 - D2, D4 - D7

IV-VI  all field notes typed

TO, SMA, S. Apse

Register I  all field notes typed in Corpus format
completed entries: I, 1-3
II  all field notes typed in Corpus format
completed entries: II, 1-4

TO, SMA, S. Vault

Register I  field notes typed in Corpus format
completed entry I, 1
II  all field notes typed in Corpus format
completed entries: II, 1, 2, 4
2a - 21
entry in progress: II, 3

TO, SMA, Museum and Sacristy - all field notes typed in Corpus format.

Musée de Cluny - field notes typed in Corpus format
Rochester, Memorial Art Gallery - field notes typed in Corpus format
Balcarres, p.c. - field notes typed in Corpus format

Murano, San Donato, Main Apse

Register I  all field notes typed in Corpus format
II  all field notes typed in Corpus format

Ravenna, Museo Arcivescovile

Basilica Ursiana fragments - all field notes typed in Corpus format
Trieste, San Giusto, North Apse

Register I    all field notes typed in Corpus format
II          
III         

TR, SG, South Apse

Register I    all field notes typed in Corpus format
II          

Venice, San Marco, Main Apse

Register I    not surveyed (Renaissance)
II          
completed entries II, 2 & II, 3  
entries in progress II 1 & II 4  

VE, SM, Atrium Portal

Register I    not surveyed (Renaissance)
II          
completed entries II, 7-8  
entries in progress II, 1-6  
III         
all field notes typed in Corpus format

VE, SM: Field notes have also been typed in Corpus format for the following mosaics in San Marco:

Large Domes: Central (plus 4 pendentives)
E.
W. (plus 4 pendentives)
N. (plus 2 pendentives)

Arches supporting large Domes:

S. Arch of C. Dome
W. Arch of C. Dome
S. Arch of W. Dome  

Walls: South wall of Main Nave  
Lower panels of W. wall of S. Transept  

Gallery level: N. arch and wall of E. Dome  
S. arch and wall of E. Dome  
Lower arches in Main Nave  

Atrium: Two Domes, two supporting arches and five lunettes**

*(This list does not include mosaics covered in spring campaign of 1979).

Zen Chapel: Conch of apse.
Only the text of these entries is complete. Each entry still awaits:

1.) a professionally rendered drawing on which measurements and areas of restoration will be recorded.

2.) epigraphical comments.

In addition, general comments on the mosaics of each register will be made in a General Entry.
Measurements of mosaics recorded on preliminary drawings.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Drawings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TO, SMA, MA, II</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO, SMA, MA, III</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO, SMA, MA, IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO, SMA, SA, I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO, SMA, SA, II</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO, SMA, SV, I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO, SMA, SV, II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO, SMA, W, II</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO, SMA, W, IV</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO, SMA, W, V</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO, SMA, W, VI</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA, MA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR, SG, NA &amp; SA</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU, SD, II</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE, ** SM, AP, I &amp; II</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE, SM, MA, III</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE, SM, E. Dome, I &amp; II</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A professional draughtsman is to be commissioned for the final drawings.

** All other measurements of mosaics taken in the church of San Marco exist in field work notes, but are not yet recorded on drawings.
Research photographs (for full photographic coverage, see lists compiled by the photograph collection)

50 photographs to scale (b & w)

11x14" : TO, SMA, W, II, 9 (full figure)
   TO, SMA, W, III, A1-A6; A7-A12 (2 general views)
   TO, SMA, W, III, A1-A12 (12 full figure photographs)

8x10" : VE, SM, MA, L-4 (4 full figure photographs and 4 details of heads)
   TO, SMA, MA, 1-12 (12 details of heads)
   TO, SMA, W, II, 9 (head)
   TO, SMA, W, III, A1 (head), A3 (head), A5 (head), A6 (head),
   A7 (head & full), A8 (head), A11 (head),
   A12 (head).
   D1 (head & full), D4 (head & full), D5 (head)

57 prints of color slides (b & w)

5x7" : TO, SMA, MA, II & IV (details)
Archival Documentation

File of xeroxes of various 19th & 20th c. documents from archives in Venice and Trieste on restorations undertaken in TO, SMA; MU, SD; TR, SG; and VE, SM.

Typewritten transcriptions in Italian accompany most of the xeroxes of handwritten documents.

Many of these documents were published in entirety or in part in Dumbarton Oaks Papers 26 (1972) 207-223 and 30 (1976) 277-341.

1978

Xeroxes of two unpublished manuscripts with typewritten transcriptions:


1978

Architectural drawings of TO, SMA

1 ground plan

4 elevations: W. facade, E. end, N. side, S. side

1 lateral cross section across the nave, looking east

1 longitudinal cross section through the nave, looking north
20 June, 1979

Dr. Marjorie A. Berlincourt
Deputy Director
Division of Research Programs
The National Endowment for the Humanities
MS 350, 806 15th St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506

Dear Dr. Berlincourt,

I am in receipt of Miss Andreescu's "Report" and letter to you of today's date. I propose to ignore it for the present. In due course, I will be sending you the Final Narrative and Final Fiscal Reports of this grant. Once those reports have been sent, I will examine Miss Andreescu's remarks, send you such comments as seem necessary, and also respond to any further inquiries you may then have.

Sincerely yours,

William Loerke

cc: Dean Rosovsky
Prof. Constable
The Senior Fellows
Prof. Demus
Asst. Prof. Andreescu
June 20, 1979

Assistant Professor Irina Andreescu
Dumbarton Oaks
Washington, D. C. 20007

Dear Irina:

A list of the photos needed for Professor Demus's book is being made. I cannot say how long they will be unavailable, but if any specific photos are needed we shall endeavor to have copies made.

I just received your latest letter. Judy O'Neill will reply to you about the accessibility of the photos, which were set aside for their own safekeeping. Professors Loerke and Demus inform me that they are not needed for present work on the Torcello Corpus, and this matter is still under their administrative control.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable

cc: Professor Loerke
    Judith O'Neill

P.S. I spoke with Linda this morning.
    The photos you need will be prepared.
Photo Collection has some black and white prints of the Creation (Genesis) cycle BUT NONE OF THE NEGATIVES.

We do have one black and white photo of the Cain and Abel series, and we do not have negatives of this series either.

We expect to receive more prints, and all sorts of negatives from Ritter but we have no "expected date of arrival".

I would like to add that the Alinari and Böhm photos of these two subjects, Creation and Cain and Abel, are not so "awful" that they could not be used in a publication. Also, unless D.O. received Alinari and Böhm photos at a reduced price, the print cost is within line of the "going rate". Our Ritter photos are superior in quality as well as detail but it is impossible for us to fill Bergman's request when we do not have the material in hand.

* Excuse the strikeovers — called to tell me of more prints just received
June 25, 1979

Professor Otto Demus
Kunsthistorisches Institut der Universität Wien
Universitätsstrasse, 7
Vienna A-1010
AUSTRIA

Dear Otto:

By now you will have received a copy of Irina's letter to the NEH. In view of the opinions she expresses there concerning the workability of the proposal for completing the corpus worked out by you and me and approved by the Senior Fellows, I wonder whether we had not better fall back on the suggestion of entrusting the bringing of the Corpus into consultable form to yourself, excluding Irina except for any work she wants to do, on her own, on material she has gathered. I do not visualize your using any of 'her' material except the measurements, which can properly be considered as belonging to Dumbarton Oaks, so there could be no basis for her to say that you used her material. Since your first priority is, naturally, to complete your second volume, what I envisage is that you might work as the consultant envisaged in the proposal and work on the volume while directing a research assistant working on the Corpus. Or, if you prefer, you could plan to come after the volume is completed. Needless to say, the prospect of a further visit would be most pleasing to your many friends here.

I should be grateful if you would call or cable me after you receive this letter in order to let me know your reactions, because if we are to follow this course of action it might be wise to decide to do so before Irina returns to Washington in mid-July.

Evvy joins in sending all best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable
June 26, 1979

For the San Marco Project File

Statistics provided by Susan Arensberg show that during the period from January to the present pages of the Corpus typed by the typist from the Doyle Personnel services, inc., amounted to about 500 in draft (double-spaced) and about 165 in final form (single-spaced).

During the period from Feb. 1, '79, the record shows that payments to this agency amounted to $2,295.08. The rate is $3.14 per page and 2-1/2 pp. per hour. The average typist types 6 pp. per hour.

William Loerke

cc: Giles Constable
    Irina Andresseu
    Susan Arensberg
June 29, 1979

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

Dear Giles,

With regard to the latest "San Marco corpus" developments, I have given considerable thought to the question, and must admit that I have some reservations about the wisdom of entrusting the work of completing the Corpus to Professor Demus. On the one hand, I was very pleased to learn that he is willing to take on this task (contrary to Irina's repeated assertions of his total lack of interest in the Corpus); I would like, however, to have more information on his definition of a "corpusculum", i.e. what would be included in each entry, before I come to any final conclusion.

I have several concerns about Professor Demus' preparation of the entries for the Corpus:

1) In view of his primary obligation to complete volume II of his book on San Marco, when would he be able to start work on the Corpus?

2) is it wise to entrust sole responsibility for such a project to a man of his age?

3) What are Demus' estimates on time and money required? Would he need a research assistant and typist?

4) How much information would he include in each entry? Would this information be based on Irina's notes? How complete is the data he has in Vienna? Since, as I understand it, his conclusions about the dating of certain panels, based on stylistic criteria, differ from Irina's dating based on archeological evidence, would this difference in opinion be noted? Would epigraphic entries be included? If so, how is the disagreement with Mr. Kloos to be resolved?

5) NEH and DO have spent considerable money to gather very detailed photographic coverage and archeological data on the mosaics of San Marco and the northern Adriatic region, and as much as possible of this material should be made available in "consultable form".
A number of scholars (whom I consider to be impartial and objective in this particular controversy) feel that this material is extremely important, that those entries which Irina has completed provide invaluable information, and that ideally the Corpus should be completed in the detailed fashion envisaged by Irina.

I am of course all too aware of the difficulties posed by Irina's continued involvement in the project. Somehow she must be made to see that D0's offer of a consultant's fee for 30 days' work does not mean that she is only permitted to work on the Corpus for one month a year (!), but that she has a scholarly obligation to devote her spare time throughout the year to the completion of this project, if she is truly committed to her "vision" of the Corpus. I myself shall write her stressing this point.

If indeed it proves impossible to reach an agreement with Irina, then some other method of completing the Corpus will have to be worked out. I for one would hate to see such an important decision made in haste without further discussion by the Senior Fellows at their fall meeting. And I do think the Senior Fellows need more complete information on Professor Demus' plan for a Corpusculum, before they can make such a decision.

Sincerely yours,

Alice-Mary Talbot

cc: The Senior Fellows Committee
Dear Dr P.: and I apologize for the lateness of your reply.

Your letter of July 2 arrived only today, after about two and a half months. The questions you raise can, I fear, be answered only by Dr Andreescu herself. Over two years ago, as you know, full permission to use any material relating to Torcello belonging to Dumbarton Oaks was given by Mr Tyler, and adequate provision was made for completing the work. Dr Andreescu has now accepted a position at Emory University and declined to continue her work on the terms offered by the Senior Fellows of the Center for Byzantine Studies, on the Project San Marco, of which the completion has been entrusted to Professor Demus. Dr Andreescu has, I believe, been retained as a consultant by the International Torcello Committee and is therefore in a position to continue her work there. All our material is available to her, as it is to you, but she alone can tell you when it will be in fully consultable shape.

Would delete - since she would merely say she has nothing to do with it anymore.

---

Dear Bill: Will you please comment on Mr. A's.

I would add - with ref. to his specific requests:

His TP 1: 5. Chapel drawings & restoration charts.
His TP 2: W. Wall entries, drawings "clasts. all Torcello entries can be consulted. charts of restored areas" as left by I.A. - can be consulted. All measurements have been recorded on drawings.
Would it be too pointed to suggest that we need not send copies of a letter requesting information to NEH in order to secure cooperation?

It might be useful to remind him, that all information in the Corpus on Torcello derives from I.A.'s field notes, that we provided her with full time Res. Ass. for 4 1/2 years, who transcribed and clarified I.A.'s comments made from slides + photos of details, all typed and available. We have a restoration chart (small scale) of W. Wall giving areas + dates (so far as known) of restored parts. All this is also, I do not doubt, in I.A.'s head.

Bill
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July 10, 1979

Assistant Professor Irina Andreescu
Dumbarton Oaks
1703 32nd Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20007

Dear Irina:

After careful consideration and consultation and in the light both of the progress made on the Corpus during the past year and of your views concerning the workability of the plan proposed by the Senior Fellows, we have decided to entrust the task of bringing the Corpus into consultable shape to Professor Demus. He will arrange the photographs, together with notes derived from his own observations and with measurements and other purely objective data gathered during the campaigns. He will not make use of your scholarly materials which will be made accessible, with due credit to yourself, either as they are at present or as you bring them into final form, since we hope that you will continue to contribute independently to the undertaking.

A primary reason for making this difficult decision was our desire to make available to scholars as quickly as possible the research material and information that has now been gathered, in great part owing to your own energy and determination. The rate of progress in organizing the Corpus so far has been disturbingly slow, however, and since Professor Demus will be free to work on it after completing his second volume, which is already about half finished, it seems wise to have him bring the material into consultable form while allowing you to work on your Torcello book and later to supplement the Corpus with any additional material you feel should be included.

Yours sincerely,

Bill
William Loerke
Professor of Byzantine Art

Giles Constable
Director
Dear Otto:

Many thanks for your cable or letter or for your previous letter, or more personal letters. I do hope you are all well and well now.

The enclosed letter to Ginz has the support of
Mr. Senior Fellows or presents.
I think, the best hope of getting the Archiv/Copus
into consultable shape. I
am most grateful you are
willing to do this.

Esley joins me in sending best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
July 25, 1979

Professor Irina Andreescu  
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Irina,

Because I will be on annual leave from July 27 through August 16 and as a result of our brief talk yesterday I am here outlining the procedures for viewing the black and white and color material now in the care of the Photograph Collection.

All listed b/w and color material as well as some site-sorted (but otherwise still unlisted) color material can be viewed and can be set aside for future use. We will discuss the unlisted b/w prints now in the care of the Photo Collection when I return.

Nothing can be removed from the Photo Collection during my absence. Please use your lists before contacting Claudia so she can get out only the relevant material. Claudia (X247) must be contacted at least 24-hours prior to your coming to the Photo Collection. She will gather the relevant material into the photo archives for you. (We haven't finished moving into our new quarters yet.) The material must be used in the Photo Collection because it has taken quite some time to sort it all out again, and we must keep it organized.

All questions regarding ownership, duplication, future accessibility, etc. should be referred to me.

I have not had time to finish listing the "gaps" (things which should be here but cannot now be located.) Your copy of this sort of list will probably have to be sent to you in Georgia. I was relieved to locate "missing" San Marco color transparencies in your files, so please disregard the note I sent you on June 22, 1979 concerning these.

Regarding old-mounts (Böhm and Alinari photos) which used to be in your office: these photo mounts are in the lower two drawers of a "Mosaic, Ceiling and Wall" file cabinet. Photo Collection staff can point these out to you. You may take these up to your desk if you wish, but it might be easier to use them down here.

Also, Claudia is making lists of the recently received San Marco narthex material and she will make copies of these lists for you when complete.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Audith O'Neill  
Head, Photograph Collection

cc: C.Vess  
M.Fisher  
G.Constable
July 31, 1979

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

Dear Bill:

Susan Arensberg spoke with me yesterday about the amount of research material Irina may want to take with her to Atlanta. This is a matter that I shall leave up to you (and, of course, Otto were he here) and Susan since I do not know the material or the precise needs of those working on the project. In principle it seems to me that research material (including notes and photographs) taken at Dumbarton Oaks expense belong to Dumbarton Oaks and should remain here, especially if there is a chance that it will be needed by more than one researcher. In practice, however, this policy will have to be applied with some flexibility, as it has in the past, in order to allow progress to be made on projects by scholars working elsewhere. It would seem to me reasonable, therefore, to allow Irina to take a certain amount of Torcello material with her, perhaps for a specific period of time, but just how much and for how long I leave up to you. I hope it will be possible to put off definitely settling this question until after Susan's return, since I understand she will have nothing to do if the material is removed before then.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable
Aug. 1, 1979

Prof. Giles Constable
Dumbarton Oaks

Dear Giles:

I attach a draft of the Final Narrative Report, which you will see I am sending to Otto for comments etc. PP. 9-12 I am asking Irina to correct and supply omissions. I agree with the contents of your note (July 31). Judith O'Neill has put a freeze on the photographic material until her return from vacation, which is shortly before Irina has said she will leave for Venice, and about the time that Susan will return. I believe no material should go to Atlanta until we make certain that Susan's material for her continuing work on the Corpus has been identified and stays here. My attached note to Irina makes this point.

Yours Sincerely

Bill
Aug. 1, 1979

Dear Irina,

For the final Report (Narrative), I need to report on the current state of the Corpus, in factual terms. Would you please update my May 8th statement? i.e., how many entries, how many pages, which parts of the whole are now complete? Would you also give me a list of your talks and articles which make substantial use of the material and data gathered in these campaigns? I need to report on "Dissemination of Results". Thirdly, would you check the attached sheets for accuracy? (pp. 7-12) You will note that I have no figures for certain entries; I hope you can supply these.

Sincerely yours, 

Bill
Aug. 1, 1979

Dear Otto:

I am sending you a draft of the Final Narrative Report for your correction, alteration, addition, deletion etc. Do not hesitate to add whatever you think necessary, perhaps a concluding paragraph on the significance of the whole. I have separated, as you will see, San Marco from the other campaigns, since our NEH grants were in support only of that; the other 'spin-off' campaigns are described in a separate section. I see that Mr. Ritter was able to make another trip to Venice on our behalf. I hope all goes well with Vol. II.

Best wishes,

Bill
Dear Professor Constable,

Thank you for your letter of May 14th. While Professor Andreev has arrived at our meeting of last Saturday with the descriptive part of the documentation concerning the mosaics in the S. Chanel and some of the photographs, she has informed us that still missing for this area were the drawings and the restoration chart. I understand that no provision had been made for this work by Dumbarton Oaks so far.

Professor Andreev further informed us that for the West wall only the two upper registers had been almost completed, while still lacking were the drawings, as well as the entries for the remaining three registers and the tympanon.

It was not quite clear from your letter when will these materials, as well as the bibliography, be brought into consultable form and specifically be made available to us.

Since, as you know, the restoration of the Torcello mosaics awaits this documentation, I would appreciate your cooperation on these matters at your earliest convenience.

Thanking you in advance, I am

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Professor Giles Constable
Director Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies
1703 32nd St. NW
WASHINGTON DC 20007
U.S.A.

cc. Sir Ashley Clarke
Chairman of the IFC
VENETIA

cc. The National Endowment for the Humanities
(att. Dr. M. Child)
Grant No. RG 3547-76-932
805 15th St. NW
WASHINGTON DC
U.S.A.
September 17, 1979

Dott. Arch. Renato Padoan
Soprintendenza per i Beni Ambientali e Architettonici di Venezia
Palazzo Ducale
Venezia
ITALY

Dear Dr. Padoan:

Please excuse my lateness in replying to your letter of July 2, which arrived on September 14, after almost two and a half months!

The questions you raise can, I fear, be fully answered only by Dr. Andreescu herself. Over two years ago, as you know, Mr. Tyler gave full permission to the International Torcello Committee to use any material relating to Torcello belonging to Dumbarton Oaks, and adequate provision was made for completing the work, including a full-time Research Assistant to transcribe and classify the material gathered by Dr. Andreescu. Professor Loerke, who has overall responsibility, with Professor Demus, for the San Marco Project, informs me that we have a small-scale restoration chart of the West Wall, giving areas and dates (so far as they are known) of restored parts, and that this and all other Torcello entries and charts of restored areas, as left by Dr. Andreescu, are available for consultation. All measurements have been recorded on the drawings. The bibliography is now also in consultable form.

Dr. Andreescu has now accepted a position at Emory University and has declined to accept the terms offered by the Senior Fellows of the Center for Byzantine Studies for continuing work on the San Marco Project, which will be completed by Professor Demus. She has, I believe, been retained as a consultant by the International Torcello Committee and is, therefore, in a position to continue her work there and to provide you with the information you need. All our material is available to her, as it is to you.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable

cc: Professor Demus
    Professor Loerke
Discussion concerning the materials assembled at Dumbarton Oaks for the Torcello Corpus

Date: November 23, 1979

Present: Giles Constable and Irina Andreescu

Record by IA:

1. Access: It was agreed that IA has access to all the materials assembled for this purpose by her and under her direction and supervision now stored at Dumbarton Oaks (including all photographic material, entries, field notes, drawings, measurements, bibliography). For the purpose of study, she proposes that the above material be handed over to her with an inventory. She agrees to be held liable for it until she returns it with an inventory, no later than five years from July 1, 1979. As an immediate precedent, she cites the Dumbarton Oaks' material (photographic and notes) used by Otto Demus at his home in Vienna since 1975. GC does not object to this arrangement.

   Also, GC and IA agree that the Torcello Study Group (Arch. Dott. Padoan) be given access to the Torcello material, as requested by Padoan and agreed to by IA (i.e., photograph, notes, entries, bibliography). Considering the length of time since Padoan's request, IA offers to check at her early convenience (December or January) if the request still stands and to what extent.

2. Publication: GC agrees to lend the materials above mentioned for publication of the Corpus fascicule by an Italian publisher. IA, editor and main author of the fascicule, will negotiate with the publisher in order to reach a preliminary agreement, to be eventually formalized with Dumbarton Oaks.

   The materials in question will be safely returned to Dumbarton Oaks with all due guarantees, no later than five years from July 1, 1979.

   While GC states that the issue of royalties is secondary, the publisher will be asked to make a proposal to Dumbarton Oaks either for a lump sum or for a percentage, in the event that the publication will make a profit. This calculation should consider the percentage of the expenses supported by Dumbarton Oaks on this particular project, after the general expenditures, supported by other institutions or persons have been considered as well.

   IA expresses her intention to submit at a later date the text of the Torcello monograph for publication with DOS as originally intended.

3. Records for expenditures during the project: IA complains formally at having been denied access by WCL to her financial statements, as well as to the statements made by Photo Ritter over photographic supplies. IA's photography have been arbitrarily sequestered after July 1. Also, mistakes have been made in paying bills to Ritter of which IA has been informed but has been denied access to statements involving her name. GC agreed to contact WCL.
Notes by GC:

This is an accurate and acceptable record of our conversation subject to the following clarifications and provisos.

1. The present discussions and agreement apply to the Torcello material only.

2. The agreement in accordance with which the written research material will be handed over to IA is subject to annual renewal, so that Dumbarton Oaks will be aware of its location.

3. The photographic material is made up of 3 categories: (a) color transparencies (5 x 7) made by Ritter; (b) research photos and slides (2 x 2 and 6 x 6) made at Dumbarton Oaks’ expense and belonging to Dumbarton Oaks; and (c) research photos and slides made at IA’s expense and belonging to her. IA is clearly at liberty to dispose as she wishes of category c. Category b can be included in the research material covered by the agreement in proviso 2. Category a—the 5 x 7 transparencies—will be subject to a special agreement in view of their fragility and uniqueness.

4. GC will write to Arch. Dott. Padoan saying exactly what materials have been handed over to IA and that he should settle with her what is wanted. IA is agreeable that copies of any material remaining at Dumbarton Oaks can be provided at cost to the International Torcello Committee.

5. Any formal agreement concerning the use of the transparencies and other material in the Torcello publication and for any payments will be concluded between Dumbarton Oaks and the publishers on the basis of negotiations conducted by IA, who will be duly informed.

Supplementary proviso (28 November):

IA will take the transparencies with her to Venice for the purposes of comparison and determination of what is needed for (a) the publication and
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This is an accurate and acceptable record of our conversation subject to the following clarifications and provisos.

1. The present discussions and agreement apply to the Torcello material only.

2. The agreement in accordance with which the written research material will be handed over to IA is subject to annual renewal, so that Dumbarton Oaks will be aware of its location.

3. The photographic material is made up of 3 categories: (a) color transparencies (5 x 7) made by Ritter; (b) research photos and slides (2 x 2 and 6 x 6) made at Dumbarton Oaks' expense and belonging to Dumbarton Oaks; and (c) research photos and slides made at IA's expense and belonging to her. IA is clearly at liberty to dispose as she wishes of category c. Category b can be included in the research material covered by the agreement in proviso 2. Category a--the 5 x 7 transparencies--will be subject to a special agreement in view of their fragility and uniqueness.

4. GC will write to Arch. Dott. Padoan saying exactly what materials have been handed over to IA and that he should settle with her what is wanted. IA is agreeable that copies of any material remaining at Dumbarton Oaks can be provided at cost to the International Torcello Committee.

5. Any formal agreement concerning the use of the transparencies and other material in the Torcello publication and for any payments will be concluded between Dumbarton Oaks and the publishers on the basis of negotiations conducted by IA, who will be duly informed.

Supplementary proviso (28 November):

IA will take the transparencies with her to Venice for the purposes of comparison and determination of what is needed for (a) the publication and (b) the International Torcello Committee. They are entrusted to her personally and will not be handed over to any third party without explicit agreement.
November 29, 1979

Dott. Arch. R. Padoan
Soprintendenza per i Beni ambientali et
architettonici dà Venezia
Palazzo Ducale
Venezia, Italy

Dear Dr. Padoan:

I am happy to report that Dr. Andreescu and I reached an agreement concerning the Torcello material during her recent visit to Dumbarton Oaks. All this material, including photographs, entries, field notes, drawings, measurements, and bibliography, has been entrusted to her for five years, beginning 1 July 1979. She will check with you to see what is needed and make it available to the Torcello Study Group. I understand that this material will be used for the purposes of study only and will not be published without the agreement of Dr. Andreescu and of Dumbarton Oaks.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable

GC/aw

cc: Dr. R. van N. Hadley
Dr. Irina Andreescu
December 5, 1979

Professor Irina Andreescu  
Department of Art History  
Emory University  
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Dear Irina:

Since your departure, two points have come to my attention that require clarification.

1. The material that you are permitted to take with you covers only Torcello—not Murano, Trieste—or other mosaics.

2. A remark by Judy O'Neill implied that I had expressed agreement with the points made in the record of our conversation. My initials on the first page of the document indicate only that it is "an inaccurate and acceptable record of our conversation," not that all the points made are accurate or acceptable, let alone that I agree with them.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Constable

GC/aw
December 7, 1979

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

Dear Otto:

I met on December 5 with Herb Kessler and a representative of the Chicago University Press in order to discuss the possibility of publishing the San Marco Corpus (or archive) in microfiche. The Chicago University Press have considerable experience in this type of work and have published two works on our own collections illustrated by microfiche, of which I enclose a sample, and I gather they would be interested in publishing the San Marco material in this form as an academic publication and at no expense to Dumbarton Oaks. Since there are eighty frames on a fiche, and they estimate about ten cents a frame, the entire collection of color transparencies could be made available on about twenty fiches at a cost of about $150. From every point of view, this impresses me as a promising possibility, which would at the same time make accessible to scholars the material that has been gathered and help safeguard it for the future, since the master microfiche can then be kept under the best possible conditions. It raises some practical questions, however.

1. We agreed that the microfiches should be accompanied by a volume of explanatory material that will presumably correspond to the material you plan to incorporate into the archive, i.e., measurements, iconographical notes, archaeological notes on conditions, restoration, techniques, materials, etc. I have never discussed with you in detail just what you plan to include and am therefore uncertain how much should go into the volume accompanying the microfiches, but it would obviously form an admirable complement to your own volumes. I know that you will not be able to devote full attention to it before you have completed your present volume, but I am hoping that you will be at Dumbarton Oaks in the coming academic year (1980-1981) so that Susan Arensberg or another assistant can work on it under your direction. Is there any chance that she could begin work before you get here? If necessary, I would arrange for her
to visit Vienna to discuss the material with you in person. Herb Kessler has also kindly expressed his willingness to supervise her work on this project, under your general direction, so as to enable her to get started as soon as possible.

2. If we go ahead with this plan, as I hope we shall, the Chicago University Press may wish to publish the accompanying scholarly monographs, both yours on San Marco and Irina's on Torcello, when it is written. We are already, as you know, getting estimates for your first volume from the Princeton University Press as well as from Augustin and hope to hear from them before the end of the year. Any indication you can give us both of the planned completion date for the second volume and of when the material to accompany the photos might be ready would be most helpful.

You will be interested to know that Irina appears to have a potential publisher for a fascicle on the Torcello mosaics and that the Senior Fellows have given her permission, subject to certain conditions, to use the research material, both photographic and written, for a work on Torcello only. I shall keep you informed how this progresses, but meanwhile, she appears to have accepted the arrangement by which San Marco is entirely your domain.

Evby joins me in sending you all best wishes for the progress of your work and for the coming Christmas season.

Yours ever,

Giles Constable

GC/aw

cc: Professor William C. Loerke
    Professor Herbert Kessler
    Miss Julia Warner

P. S. Since the sample microfiche is taken from a set, could you please return it . . . .? G.C.
Dear Giles,

Thank you very much for your letter of Dec. 7 which reached me only on Dec. 19, probably owing to the Christmas mail glut. I am, of course, very much interested in the idea to publish the San Marco archive together with several sheets of micro-films. My only reservation is that the color fidelity of the films is so far not all that could be desired. Some of the pictures on the sheet (which I return enclosed) seem almost colorless, e.g., the two repro's of the D.O. mosaic icon of John Chrysostom (2 G 7, 8); the miniatures of the D.O. Psalter (2 F) are very pale. I have the impression that these repro's are indeed a welcome help for remembering the originals but perhaps not quite good enough to serve as a basis for study. However, the quality may have improved in the meantime?

As to the (accompanying) texts for the archive, I shall soon send a specimen. As a matter of fact, I have almost completed the material of the first campaign (= the north wing of the atrium). It is, however, in handwriting, since it is very difficult (and costly) to find somebody here in Vienna
to transcribe it. I shall have a few pages typed and shall send them together with the handwritten original (which is already a transcription of my notes taken on the spot). Miss Arensberg will soon see whether she can work from the handwritten material alone.

I think I shall be able to complete the text of Vol. 2 in fall and shall be glad to come to D.C. afterwards, to direct the work on the corpus (and, I hope, to work on the [final?] proof of Vol. 1.!).

I am very glad that Herb Kessler is willing to supervise the work in the meantime, and I do hope that Miss Arensberg will continue to do it, since she is certainly the most competent person for it. Among the three of us, we should certainly be able to get the work done within a reasonable length of time.

My very best wishes to Evah and to you for the New Year — may it be less stormy than the East! — and many thanks for your helpful interest in the San Marco problems.

Yours ever,

[Signature]