

## INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

SCHOOL OF HISTORICAL STUDIES

December 8, 1952

Dear Ralph, Chevalier,<sup>1</sup> and Friend,

On October 31, I started to write to you to thank you for your detailed information about the burials, which you sent me in summer; very helpful they were, and I decided that on my death you will have to conduct the service in some Little Chapel of Flowers. I wanted to tell you also that Bobchen [Benson] and I were most pleased, and often amused, to get your personal news, and that I felt a little sorry for you on account of Mlle Jacquot<sup>2</sup> who launched that terrible blow against young Mr. Giesey's soft underbelly.

Don't let me waste time with apologies for not having continued my letter. Let me apologize for something else, that is, that apparently my faith in the *corpus mysticum Radulphi*<sup>3</sup> has been far less great than it should have been, because your dissertation<sup>4</sup> is infinitely much better and so much more interesting than I ever expected it to be. This is really a very good piece of work, and you know me well enough to know also that I [am] not easily inclined to be that positive. Others know very different songs, and got to hear other stuff about what they had been doing.

I read part I on the train and was furious that it broke off where I really got interested in the details of the problem. Part II then finally arrived, complete though the wrapping had gone to pieces. It is, on the whole, well written and reads fluently. There is enough tension in it to keep your interest alive. Some descriptions of the parade itself tend to be too lengthy, but that can be easily remedied for the print; for the dissertation committee it is all right. The composition - your crawling back from the safe ground of Francis I to the unsafe of the earlier period, instead of starting from the unsafe only to lose yourself in a chaos - is very prudently chosen and a priori convincing. All you have to do is to trace back every feature of the Francis period so that your whole book is, de facto, an analysis of that later burial. You could not have done better, because such as it is the whole problem is neatly rounded out and there are no loose ends dangling about which you would have forgotten to pick up again. The material has been collected in a mature

---

<sup>1</sup> Stefan George gave Eka the sobriquet *chevalier* (or *cavaliere*), which I would guess referred to Eka's having served in the German cavalry in World War I. I rather doubt that Eka was likening my relationship to him with his to George when he called me *chevalier*, but had in mind the notion (for which I recall he had a medieval source) that scholars should be accorded noble status: *in nuce*, he was knighting me as a French scholar.

<sup>2</sup> Head of the Cabinet des Médailles at the Bibliothèque Nationale. I has just learned that she had been given personal custody of the archives of the "petite académie" of scholars who prepared the medallic history of Louis XIV; I thus had to give up the study of a project to which I had already invested many weeks of work.

<sup>3</sup> A play on the term *corpus mysticum*, a legal fiction designating the dignity a person enjoyed (in my case, that of a scholar) apart from his *corpus naturale*.

<sup>4</sup> *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France*. Eka had approved the topic in his last year at Berkeley and was still in every way my mentor; Gordon Griffiths, however, was an almost ideal replacement, for I had studied with him and developed a personal friendship that lasted until his death in 2001.

scholarly way. The reader feels that "Giesey knows more than he says,"<sup>5</sup> and the conclusions you draw are sound and correct, in the second part excellent and convincing by simplicity. The importance of the funeral of Henry IV comes out beautifully, and your discussion of the development of the two cries in St. Denis is a "thriller." Again, very clever to leave that acme for the end. I noticed also with pleasure how many little research work about the sources can be found in the footnotes. Whether you are always right in those cases, would have to be controlled later on. But they show your intimacy with the authors, and they are - as [is] the text - full of factual information which is both interesting and elucidating in view of the real problems.

There are minor errors and misunderstandings, but they do no harm for the present purpose and few others would notice them anyhow. For example p. 80, n.1 ("not buried as king of France") is sure to be wrong: Louis XI was *Ehrenkanoniker* as most kings and emperors were (see Schulte, in *Histor. Jhb.*, 54, 1934; Nottarp, *Zs.f.Rechtsgesch., kan.Abt.*, XIV, 1925, 174ff), but this does not encroach upon his being buried as king, unless you have something in mind that you do not say.

P. 81, line 2: Perhaps you should expand upon the contrast between "family" and dignity" if there is one.

Apropos p.82, n.3, the miniature: Here you have to give a reproduction; see below on the question of archeological material.

P.83, last line, and throughout: the technical formula is *Dignitas non moritur* (Gierke, *Genossenschaftsrecht*, III, 271f, 595f, with the footnotes), but we shall have to discuss that later.

P.80,109, and passim: "a votive offering to God" etc. You are using, it seems to me, "offering" in a peculiar sense. I would call offering a priestly function - but what does it mean to make the effigy a votive offering? Perhaps I am only misunderstanding you.

P.140ff, the "empty chariot." Fulgentius, *Homily 56* (Migne, *PL*, probably 65?) talks about the fact that "imperatores terreni inter carrucas diversas, quarum sessione utuntur, habere carrucam, in qua nullus sedet, quae vocatur Angelica." This empty cart was Roman imperial ceremonial. What it meant, I do not know. But could this have affected the ceremonial? For Noël see Du Cange, s.v. *natale*, where you find earlier places.

P.163: "Ceremonial interregnum." Baldus demands a *triduum* after a king's death on account of three days of Christ: "Quod rege mortuo filius eius non debet de honestate coronari nisi post triduum, quia post tres dies Christus resurrexit a mortuis; ego in filio non facie temporis distinctionem, quia corona continuative descendit in ipsum..."

The *fainte* is a strange thing. Could it mean some trappings or even a throne—or some illusionistic props which were painted?

I don't think I should go into more details. For the print you will have to reshuffle and revise many things anyhow, and once you are back in the States we shall have to get together to make it shipshape for the press. Such as it is it will easily pass as a dissertation. I assume, however, you will have to produce a clean Library copy, though that is up to "them." Gordon Griffiths was very positive about your work which by far surpassed—I repeat it apologizingly—all my expectations.

The last section, on the tomb images, which is not as matured as the others, reminds me of something important. For the printing, the dissertation must (and I mean 'must') be expanded because the archeological or iconographical material has to be worked in. You yourself have felt that need, since you have added a few plates. But they are quite insufficient, both in number and quality. Stop purchasing those insipid postal cards unless they are first rate photos (which happens); buy instead really good photos of a good size which you can use for reproduction. Of the Mantegna in Hampton Court (if you consider that so important) you can get real photos; the same must be true with the Saint-Denis tombs. You should build up your image files. I am sure that the image material will allow you to understand your texts better and they will certainly make it easier for the reader to get some idea what was going on.

---

<sup>5</sup> A reversal of "X says more than he knows"—see the letter of 10 June 52, note 4.

Let us take the *Chapelle ardent* as example. You will know the reproduction in Montfaucon (cf. also W.H.Forsyth, "A Head from a Royal Effigy," *Metrop. Mus. of Art Bulletin*, N.Sér., III, 1945, 214ff), and may have come across Leroquais, *Les Livres d'Heures manuscrits*, I, p.338, n.158, Plate XXXIV; see also Durrieu, *Les très-belles heures de Notre-Dame*, pl. X. (Some notes come from [Erwin] Panofsky). You will have to run through the books of MS-Miniatures (reproductions) to find more, far more, material of that kind. To illustrate things, you may also use later reproductions such as those in the big book on Louis XV which you showed me in the Berkeley Library, or etchings and engravings of the kind Denkart, *Undying Faces*, published in his introductory chapter. You should get that material together, not in absolute completeness, but in reasonable completeness, and for every phase of the funerary ceremonial. Whether you wish to publish all, or only a selection, is a different matter to be decided later. At present, while you are still on the spot, do cram photos of anything you can get hold of into your files, or take the notes down of those works which you would expect to find in America (e.g. that Louis XV and similar publications). You will need lots of photos also for your numismatic stuff. I wonder whether it would not be clever to get a Leica, provided you know anything about photographing. In that case you could take the images right on the spot. How much does a Leica cost in Germany? Perhaps it would be worth your while to cross the frontier.

The photos you purchase would cost some money in the long run. Gordon, however, can get it for you, since there is that special Social Science Research Fund, about which Walter Horn<sup>6</sup> would know all the details. Gordon has to get the original bills because UC then pays them. Ask Gordon about the procedure. It would be a pity if you should not be able to get photos of everything you might consider valuable for your work. Unless one sees, e.g., those miniatures of the *Chapelle ardente*, one simply does not know what you are talking about. That image business will not be needed for the Diss. committee copy - but if you do add pictures, don't let them be those stupid postal cards or folders.

However all that may be, your excursions into art literature show that you yourself have felt what should be done; that methodologically you are on the right way, and that you have realized what art material is able to yield as a source. What you are fooling about with are the right bricks and it is the right method. That is what pleased me most: that you have learnt the "trick". And I may assure you that some learn it never. I am very content not only with the work, but with your whole approach which is definitely the right scientific approach.

[By the way, p.191, n.5. Mâle is right: "la *familia* au sens antique" means "the household" of the Duke, just as the *familiars* are the counsellors and councillors of a king. That is exactly what you say and what Mâle says. But who the "princes of the family" of Clement VI could have been, I do not know—have you not misunderstood something?

At any rate, your whole development in scholasticism allows me also not to be too disturbed about your Jacquot-groginess. I am sorry we came too late. But the very fact that our original problem now is worked on shows that it was needed, that there was a gap, and that we were on the right way. As a numismatist she will be interested mainly in the weight and alloy of the coins. But of course she will know the Roman models and all that stuff, so that there is no use, as you call it, to try to un-sew that "drum" or unscrew the screw. Besides her Corpus of medallions, if ever it gets done, may turn out to be frightfully useful.

However, I think you are correct to turn right now to what you would have had to do anyhow: to the age of Henri IV. Your outline is, in most respects, beyond my proper judgment, because I know far too little about the scholars of that age except Rascas [de Bagarris],<sup>7</sup> [Nicholas

---

<sup>6</sup> Professor of Art History at Cal, fellow German exile and close friend of Eka's.

Fabri de] Peiresc, perhaps [Guillaume] Dupré.<sup>8</sup> Nevertheless your outline makes sense to me, and your section V (Rascas) is certainly important because it leads directly to the central problem of official coin propaganda. Perhaps you should concentrate on that problem altogether: The Beginnings of French Coin Propaganda. There is nothing of that kind in the Middle Ages. When and how does it begin? A difficult problem is the Italian influence. You cannot neglect it completely, but perhaps you may postpone it. I believe that the *Imprese* (devices) of the Renaissance would yield at least something. Take a look at Jacopo Gelli, *Divise, Motti, Imprese di famiglie e personaggi italiani*, Milan, 1916. You will be surprised how much Le Moyne (under Louis XIV) has been influenced by that art. By the way, Mario Praz (belonging to the Warburg group) has worked on the *impres*e, which might be a help to you, at least bibliographical. The Dupuys are certainly interesting, too. You will have to pick your own way, however, and just pull into your nets whatever fish you may get. (Oriens Augusti is *not* a Byzantine theme, but a Roman Imperial; it actually stops with Constantine and survives only in a strange Christian guise. So watch your step).

Since you last wrote we have gone through the elections. I was sad and disgusted and felt again like struggling against Hitler or Neylan<sup>9</sup> (Nixon [just elected vice-president] is that gang). We all were frightfully depressed, and the two generals Eisenhower and McArthur mixing cards together is more than ominous. Also the Regents' defeat may be news that has reached you. Yesterday I got a letter in which they offered me re-appointment. You will be happy to hear that Neylan at the Regents' meeting ranted for hours to give his interpretation of the Supreme Court decision: the Court has *condemned* us to take the Levering Oath.<sup>10</sup> Of course, he did not mention that the same Court found his action unconstitutional nor did he have the decency to resign from the Board of Regents - but why should that sinister character ever show decency?

Bobchen is working, hard and systematically, as usual. He has recovered from his exam shock. Do you know that he took it *summa cum laude*? It had not happened here in the Dept. for many years and it is quite an achievement. But he still is very tired, gets colds, and is not quite as pert as he was in his good old "Oppenheimer" days, when he was juggling umbrellas.<sup>11</sup> - Last week I met Weckmann<sup>12</sup> in New York, where I gave a lecture at Union Theol. Seminary for Tillich.<sup>13</sup> Weckmann is there with the Mexican delegation to the UN, and he was very cheerful and nice indeed. Also, a week ago I finally visited Michael and Lucy [Cherniavsky]. They have a

---

<sup>9</sup> John Francis Neylan, attorney, one of the regents of the University of California, who designed the loyalty oath, not signed by Eka, leading to his departure from Cal. See *Ekaica* on the Oath.

<sup>10</sup> A new requirement, by the state legislature, that all state employees swear allegiance to the United States and the state of California; to a degree, this made up for the State Supreme Court's having declared unconstitutional the anti-communist loyalty oath which the Board of Regents had imposed upon the faculty of the university.

<sup>11</sup> "Oppenheimer days" does not refer to Robert Oppenheimer, director of the Institute for Advanced Study, but to a scholar, Philip Oppenheimer, whose work was relevant for Bobby's study of the use of canopies in ritual processions (wherefore "juggling umbrellas").

<sup>12</sup> Lewis Weckmann, Mexican diplomat, who did his doctoral dissertation with Eka in the mid 1940s.

<sup>13</sup> Paul Tillich, the famous Lutheran theologian, who had been Eka's colleague at Frankfurt in the early 1930s. Eka and his students partied with Tillich on a Saturday night in Berkeley in 1950, and heard him preach at a church service the morning after (see my *Reminiscences*, @"Berkeley years").

charming and big apartment, everything very well settled, and no longer Bohémien-like, which is good for both. Michael's study is very impressive. The books look like lecture-preparing, that strange mixture of second-hand stuff and odd sources. He gets a tremendous lot out of his own courses, has his various responsibilities for others and himself, and seems to do very well in his classes. The place is charming; good classicism of the 19th century, and in the center of one of those buildings Lucy is thriving, beautiful as ever, and is playing secretary and hostess to a teachers' seminar attached to Wesleyan. His chairman told him already that he is going to stay there next year as assistant professor. So all that is settled in a most pleasant way and in a nice atmosphere. The History Dept is excellent and Michael admires his colleagues. which means something.

Spike<sup>14</sup> is in Washington, but I have not seen him yet. I am doing quite well. Next spring I shall be going to Greece and Constantinople. But when I arrive in Paris, late in summer, the Gieseys<sup>15</sup> will have gone. What are your plans? I am keeping my eyes and ears open for an Early Modern demand, but the slave market has as yet not been starting.<sup>16</sup>

All my best wishes to the Gieseys for Christmas and New Year, and an additional very good wish to you.

Love  
EKa [Signed]

[Handwritten note in the margin of the last page:] What am I supposed to do with your Dissertation? Can I keep it? Do you want it? I wish I could have a copy to peruse it and check some stuff I need. Can you spare it? Love, EKa.

---

<sup>14</sup> Schafer Williams, who studied with Eka in the mid 1940s.

<sup>15</sup> For the record, I had married a fellow Fulbright student in Brussels early in 1952, but it lasted little more than a year.

<sup>16</sup> Not until May, when Bobby Benson got a grant to do research in Germany in the next academic year, was Eka free to have me become his assistant at the Institute; up to that time Eka was on the lookout (on the 'slave market') for a teaching position for me.