

Technical Note:

This PDF document contains the text of the lecture, with hyperlinks to the illustrations that were originally shown as slides when the lecture was delivered. The links point to JPG image files that reside on the Web site. The images have not been incorporated into this PDF file because they would swell it to an unmanageable size.

The most efficient way to navigate between text and images is to download (“Save”) this PDF file to your local drive and then open it in the Adobe Acrobat reader [to download the free Adobe Reader, go to www.adobe.com and click the “Get Adobe Reader” button]. When you click on a link to a figure, the image will open in your Web browser, and you can then refer back and forth between the text in Adobe Reader and the image in your browser. If you set your browser to open new files in new tabs or windows, you can keep several images open at once.

FUNERAL EFFIGIES AS EMBLEMS OF SOVEREIGNTY:

EUROPE, 14TH TO 18TH CENTURIES

Ralph E. Giese

Professor of History, University of Iowa

Lecture delivered to the

Collège de France

June 10, 1987

FUNERAL EFFIGIES AS EMBLEMS OF SOVEREIGNTY:

EUROPE, 14TH TO 18TH CENTURIES

Ralph E. Gieseey

Of all the iconographical representations of the subject of today's lecture, devoted to the use of effigies at the funerals of kings or other sovereign (or would-be sovereign) princes, one is clearly the most grand: (Fig.1) the effigy of Charles III, Grand Duke of Lorraine, as it reposed on the lit d'honneur set up in the ducal palace, in Nancy in the year 1608. This large tableau (Fig.2), one of several illustrating Charles' funeral, depicts the climactic moment in a ritual which preceded the celebration of the obsequies burial: (Fig.3) a meal service is about to be performed in the presence of the effigy, following the fashion customary when the Grand Duke was alive. This particular meal, the last of many served over two weeks' time, is designated as being *à la royalle*. That is to say, this meal will imitate a custom practiced at royal funerals in France since the death of Francois I^{er} in 1547. When the ritual meal was completed, the mise en scene was changed overnight. (Fig.4) The great hall of honor with the effigy was closed, and the ceremonial activity shifted to another hall in the ducal palace, denominated the *salle de deuil*, entirely draped in black; *au fond* one sees featured the coffin containing the body of the deceased, surrounded by giant candles which constituted the "chapelle ardente". This, too, copies the French royal practice.

My goal has always been to establish the relationship between ceremonial and public law. As we shall see, the Lorraine ducal funeral did not dramatize the same principle of public law that the French royal funeral did, but each of them dramatized in its own way the deceased's status in the hierarchy of worldly rulership, concomitantly with the delivery of his immortal soul to its divine maker. In late medieval and early modern times, a secular motif symbolizing the power of rulership was inserted into the religious rites of Christian burial, which otherwise were the same for all believers.

The *service de table* in the presence of the effigy occurred only in French royal and Lorraine ducal funerals. Effigies of rulers were displayed either in the funeral convoy or in a palatial or church setting in four other countries of Europe from the fourteenth through the eighteenth centuries, but nowhere other than France and Lorraine was a meal service performed in the presence of the effigy.

Art historians—those who have done most of the research on effigies—have been concerned hardly at all with the ceremonial symbolism involved in using lifelike effigies, at least not with the symbolism of public law that interests me. This paper represents the results of my efforts to fill that gap. The chart I have distributed (Fig.5, below) allows one to see at a glance the broad dimensions of the problem. This simple ordering of places, dates and personages suggests that the first four cases are somehow separate from the last two: going from left to right, each case begins later than its predecessor and ends before it, suggesting the spread of a custom from England that grew weaker, in terms of its impact upon local traditions, as it crossed the channel from England to France, moved then to Lorraine and finally had a brief life in Tuscany. Venice and Prussia, on the other hand, fall almost completely outside the chronological nexus of the first four.

This general impression acquired from the chart at first glance turns out to be quite true: the group of four, which I shall call the "Renaissance quartet", represents unquestionably instances of conscious transmission, or borrowing, of a single ceremonial form, from one to another, in the sequence they appear on the chart. I shall treat them two fashions: first in visual terms, as dramatic phenomena used in the princely funeral ceremonies, then in terms of the political symbolism that was invested in the effigy, per se, or made manifest in the way they were treated. Venice and Prussia will be dealt with separately at the end of the paper.

The first indisputable use of a funeral effigy anywhere Europe since antiquity was that of Edward II of England in 1327. To all appearances, that effigy had no other purpose than to provide a substitute for the body of the defunct during the funeral service. It had long been the custom, on the continent as well as in Britain, to carry the corpse of the ruler exposed in the funeral convoy, with the successor present as first mourner. This was possible, of course, only when the funeral could be accomplished rather quickly, within the restricted period allowed by the primitive embalming customs of those times. But Edward II was murdered, it was widely rumored then and generally believed to be true still, so that his body might not have provided a comely sight. Also, his son was far away, making it desirable to postpone the burial until he could return—which was sure to extend beyond the talents of the morticians. Such are the reasons usually given to explain the making of a funeral effigy of Edwards II. Recently, however, new credence has been given to an old story that Edward II actually escaped his murderers, went secretly to the continent, and lived out his life in a monastery near Rome. If this be true, the first funeral effigy was a substitute for a non-existent royal corpse, introduced by conspirators who had fumbled an assassination plot. I must confess that I am not at all disturbed by the idea that an object to the study of which I have given some years of my scholarly career began as a *fraude*.

EFFIGIES FUNERAIRES DES SOUVERAINS (EUROPE, XVI - XVIII siècle)

	ANGLETERRE	FRANCE	LORRAINE	TOSCANE	VENISE	PRUSSE
1327	Edouard II					
1377	Edouard III					
1400						
1422	Henri V	1422 Charles VI				
		1461 Charles VII				
1483	Edouard IV		(1481 René d'Anjou)			
		1498 Charles VIII			1485 Giov. Mocenigo	
1500						
1509	Henri VII		1508 René II			
		1515 Louis XII				
			1546 François			
1547	Henri VIII	1547 François I				
1553	Edouard VI		1550 Claude de Guise Jean de Guise			
1558	Marie	1559 Henri II				
		1574 Charles IX				
				1575 Côme I		
				1587 François I		
1600						
1603	Elizabeth I		1608 Charles III			
		1610 Henri IV				
1625	Jacques I				1623 Ant. Priuli	
					26 Doges 10 effigies?	
1700						
						1740 Fréd. Guil. I
						1786 Fréd. le Grand
						1797 Fin de la répub.

However new ceremonial devices come into being on a given occasion, time itself imparts to them the aspect of sacred tradition. When Edward III died fifty years later, an effigy of him was prepared as a matter of course. And so it was to be, as our chart shows, for most English sovereigns over a span of almost three centuries. The English kings' funeral effigies remained much the same over that time: attired in royal fashion, it was carried in convoy atop the encoffined body to the church of burial, where it was placed inside a "hearse", the English equivalent of the French "chapelle ardente". There it remained through the performance of the last rites, being removed only when the coffin was taken to the *caveau* prepared as its final resting place.

Funeral effigies may have been regarded in England as an exclusively royal privilege up to 1500, but after that they were occasionally used also for the funerals of members of the royal family. The same is true of the French royal and Lorraine ducal effigies in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. These "familial" funeral effigies are an interesting phenomenon in their own right, related to the spread of dynasticism in early modern times, but they always lacked certain features that were reserved for the sovereigns' effigies alone. For that reason we do not have to deal with them in this survey.

The funeral of Henry V of England, in 1422, was decisive for the French adoption of the funeral effigy. The English ruled over northern France at that time; Henry V died at Vincennes, and his funeral cortege, with an effigy atop the coffin, passed through Paris on its long journey home to England; less than two months later Charles VI of France died, and it makes no difference whether the English forced the funeral effigy custom upon French or the French adopted it voluntarily: Charles VI's funeral effigy established what we might call an "instant tradition", which was observed for most of the kings of France for almost two centuries afterwards.

In the hands of the French, the funeral effigy underwent an evolutionary change that made it, far more than it ever was in England, the showpiece of the entire royal funeral. Already in 1422 (Fig.6) some spectators may have sensed that the effigy was more than a replacement of the royal corpse, which in earlier times it had been customary to display openly in the funeral convoy: the Presidents of Parlement, who marched at the corners of the funeral litter, holding the corners of the pall on which the effigy lay (and hiding the coffin beneath it) did not wear mourning robes as did all others. The effigy in full regalia and the Presidents attired in their usual costume—in token, as the Parlementaires themselves declared, that justice does not cease by the death of a king—moved along as an island of red in a sea of black.

By 1500 the greatest difference between the English and French practices had appeared: the French king's effigy began to be treated as if it were the king alive. By 1461 the effigy was surely "lifelike", for in that year a death mask was used to make its wax visage; and perhaps already then the royal artist—none other than Jehan Fouquet—doctored the final product by opening its eyes. (What I can show you, because they survive, are [Fig.7] the death mask of Henri IV and a wax head [Fig.8] made from it for use as a funeral effigy but now mounted in armour for display purposes). By 1498 Parlement could declare that it was an ancient custom (a *summa vetustate*) to treat the dead king as if he were alive until his body was finally interred. After 1500, then, the French effigy ritual separated itself in kind from its English parent. First, in 1515, the body and the effigy were physically removed from each other in Louis XII's funeral convoy. This woodcut (Fig.9) shows the effigy being carried on a litter; the body went separately on a chariot. The effigy, attired in full regalia and attended by the red-robed Presidents of Parlement, had now acquired its own distinctive place in the ceremonial. The reports we have from 1515 onwards that various personages vied for positions close to the effigy—even trying, though vainly, to replace the Presidents of Parlement—proves that it was the star performer in the ceremonial drama.

In 1547, then, there was introduced the ultimate distinction, juxtaposition of body and effigy in the pre-convoy display, in a palatial setting, which we saw at the outset: the effigy served meals for some days in a brilliant *salle d'honneur*, changed overnight to the funereal exhibition of the corpse in the *salle de deuil*. Four kings of France received the full "Renaissance" funeral: Francis I, Henri II, Charles IX, and Henri IV. Only the last of them was ever portrayed for us to appreciate (Fig.10): Henri IV's effigy reclining on the *lit d'honneur*.

In the duchy of Lorraine, according to our chart (Fig.5, above, following p.2), the official duration of the effigy custom runs from 1508 to 1608, practiced, as I suggested at the outset, in close imitation of the French royal practice. It began, as a matter of fact, as a royal custom, for its originator, René II, the powerful and ambitious Duke of Lorraine, claimed to be a king—King of Sicily and Jerusalem. His grandfather, René d'Anjou, had held that title, and had received an effigy funeral in 1481, probably with the blessing of the King of France at that time, Louis XI.

The pomp and circumstance of the Lorraine funerals was such that, as reported by an historian of the early nineteenth century, "C'est un proverbe en Lorraine que le couronnement d'un empereur a Francfort, le sacre d'un roi de France a Reims, et l'enterrement d'un duc de Lorraine a Nancy sont les trois ceremonies les plus magnifiques qui se voient en Europe." More effort was expended publicizing the Lorraine funerals than is true anywhere else, and there is no reason to disbelieve that at least as much money was spent on them as elsewhere.

By following closely the details of Lorraine funerals from 1598 to 1608, one can see how deliberately successive ducal ones mimicked the last preceding French royal one. The meal service in the presence of the effigy, for example, appears in Lorraine in 1550, three years after it was invented for the funeral of Francois I^{er}. We must, nevertheless, note three differences that existed between the two customs. In Lorraine, the effigy was always carried on top of the coffin in the convoy, foreclosing the possibility (if it was ever considered) of contrasting triumphant with lugubrious elements such as the French kings achieved.

Secondly, the Lorraine effigy did not have an entourage of red-robed high justices to impart to it the symbolism of some undying principle of rulership--although, as if by compensation, the Lorraine funeral convoy did have something the French one lacked: a very long train of heraldic devices, glorifying the ancestry of the deceased and the living dukes, was carried in the convoy and displayed in the church at the time of the obsequies.

But the third difference turns out to be the greatest: the new Lorraine duke was most conspicuous participant at his predecessor's funeral, acting as the foremost mourner (*prince de grand deuil*), whereas the new French king, like the new monarch in England, never participated in the funeral ceremony.

In Tuscany, funeral effigies appear only in the period of the Grand Duchy, by which time, to the north, in royal and ducal practices, the *service à la royalle* in the *salle d'honneur* had become the most notable feature of the entire effigy practice. But the French manner of pretending that the effigy represented the prince alive, and all lesser ways of doing so, were eschewed in the funerals of the Medici Grand Dukes Cosimo I in 1574 and his son Francesco in 1585.

The effigy of the Grand Duke did not appear until the day of the convoy, which traveled from the Pitti Palace by a circuitous route throughout the city, to get the maximum public exposure, ending up at San Lorenzo, the Medici church. The coffin, with the effigy on top, was carried on a litter, followed closely by the new Grand Duke, dressed in mourning, his face barely visible beneath its heavy hood. Having arrived at San Lorenzo, the litter was put inside--one might say "lost inside"--a great catafalque built for the occasion (Fig.11); later on I shall show a closeup to prove that the effigy is indeed there, on top of the coffin. The new prince occupied a conspicuous position, sitting near the effigy during the funeral service; and when the service was over and the funeral party left the church, all attention focused upon the new prince. The effigy and body were simply left there; the burial of the body took place later, apparently in private.

For the most part, this ceremonial resembles the English practice: the effigy was a substitute for the body in the coffin below, in no way juxtaposed to it. But the attendance of the deceased's son and successor, which I have just emphasized, brings the Tuscan ritual closely in line with the Lorraine practice—and for similar motives, as we shall see as we turn now to consider the political symbolism behind the ceremonial use of the Renaissance quartet we have just examined.

The attendance, in Lorraine and Tuscany, of the new ruler is the first issue we much consider: for, as little related as it may be with the use of a funeral effigy, our principal concern, it provided the basis for public-law symbolism, even function, in ducal funerals at large that separates them from royal funerals. Inauguration is the key issue: the Grand-Ducal funerals that concern us utilized the funeral as a means to celebrate the transfer of authority from the dead to the living prince, but royal funerals did not. Kings had coronations for that purpose, but dukes not.

Ducal funerals were used for inaugural purposes at least as early as the fifteenth century. In Burgundy in 1466, for example, the officials of the deceased Philip le Bon put the ducal emblems on the coffin after it had been lowered into the grave, but immediately they were taken up by the officials of his son, Charles le Téméraire, who had participated in the obsequies throughout, and were carried before the new duke, in a triumphal manner, as he left the church. We find something very similar to that in Nancy, in 1608, as we can see from another tableaux (Fig.12) of the famous set depicting Charles III's funeral that shows the emblems that had been associated with the deceased duke, especially during the display of his effigy—crown, sceptre, and *main de justice* (yes, even that!, lying alongside the effigy during the convoy) and in addition the ducal sword, all of them specified as "dites de la souverainete"—being carried processionally in front of the new Grand Duke of Lorraine, Henri I (let us zoom in on the scene [Fig.13], the last of the ten great tableaux) as the party proceeds, after the *mise au tombeau*, to the ducal palace for the traditional post-funeral repast. In Florence, in 1574, a variation of this post-funeral inauguration was worked into the funeral of Grand-Duke Cosimo I: when his son, Francesco, left the church after the obsequies, he doffed his mourning hood and went bareheaded, with the Grand Ducal flag unfurled before him. He was acclaimed by the crowd as he proceeded to the Palazzo Vecchio, where the funeral hangings with which the cortile of the Palazzo had been decorated, when the funeral convoy had marched through earlier that day, were no longer to be seen; also, Cosimo's coat of arms had been removed from the entrance, and as Francesco passed through, a cord was pulled, some canvas fell away, and the arms of the new Grand Duke were

revealed. Finally, the Tuscan military officers swore allegiance to him, and he received the oath of loyalty from ambassadors of the subject Tuscan towns.

The new duke had to attend his predecessor's funeral if the inaugural element was to have maximum dramatic impact. For the same reason, in reverse, it would have been totally inappropriate for a king of France or England to have attended his predecessor's funeral and departed from the graveside with the emblems of authority carried before him: the visible attributes of royal dignity were gained by the new king only at the coronation.

Kings abstained from funerals, according to sixteenth century sources, "n'estant convenable a leurs sacrees personnes s'entremettre des mortuaires." The symbolism of the proposition that "le roi ne porte pas le deuil" fits well into the complex of maxims dealing with the fullness of royal power, but I do not believe the English and French kings began to absent themselves for such deep symbolical reasons. In 1327, the new king Edward III fulfilled custom by participating in his father's funeral, but after that the new monarchs in England did not do so. In France, as I have long argued, abstention of the new king was the result of unusual circumstances going back before the introduction of the effigy-plague in Paris, English army in Paris, a petulant successor, a king who chose not to have the traditional funeral ending at Saint-Denis—until, in 1498, Louis XII could well have attended Charles VIII's funeral but chose not to do so. By that time the effigy of the dead king was beginning to receive honors as if it were still alive, as noted officially by the Parlement de Paris in an arret cited earlier. Wherefore, had Louis XII come before Charles VIII's effigy, he would have created the paradoxical situation of a live king who was uncrowned confronting a crowned king who was unalive.

From 1498 onwards it was firmly established that the new king must not attend the royal funeral. Had he done so in 1515, we might ask ourselves, would he have chosen to follow the body or the effigy, which now went separately in the convoy? This is a false question, I believe: had the new king been accustomed to attend the funeral, the body and effigy of the deceased would not have been separated in the first place. And if that had not happened, there would have been foreclosed completely from the ceremonial the possibility of its evolution into a dramatic portrayal of the doctrine of the "king's two bodies".

I have shown unusual restraint by not having referred, before now, to the doctrine of "the king's two bodies". The magisterial work with that title, composed by Ernst H. Kantorowicz—to appear in French next year—provided the key for my interpretation of the Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France, as well as the motive force for my recent efforts, including the

present one, to discover political meaning in royal ceremonial. In order to become a dramatization of the juristical doctrine of the king's two bodies—the natural body vs the mystical body, the latter personifying the perpetuity of royal power and thus of the kingdom—the royal funeral had to focus upon the conjunction of mortality and immortality that occurred in a given king, whence the contrast between the deceased body natural in the coffin and the apparently still-alive body mystical of the same king, contrived in an effigy. The presence of the new king would have made a joke of the effigy.

Concentrating as we are on comparisons and contrasts between effigy usages, one question asks itself almost naturally: why did the English not develop some ceremonial bicorporalism in their royal funeral? For, after all, it was English jurists who made by far the clearest statement of the doctrine of the king's two bodies. From among many that could be adduced, here is one from the year 1560:

The King has two Capacities, for he has two Bodies, the one whereof is a Body natural ... and in this he is subject to Passions and Death as other Men are; the other, is a Body politic, and the Members thereof are his Subjects, ... and this Body is not subject to Passions as the other is, nor to Death, for as to this Body the King never dies.

All that fits beautifully with the French representing the same person in two guises at the royal funeral. But let us continue quotation from the Tudor jurist:

and his natural Death is not called in our Law the Death of the King, but the Demise of the King, not signifying by the Word (Demise) that the Body politic of the King is dead, but that there is a Separation of the two Bodies, and that the Body politic is transferred and conveyed over from the Body natural now dead ... to another Body natural ... a Removal of the Body politic of the King of this Realm from one Body natural to another.

To wit: in England, the body politic was always conjoined with a living body natural. However readily the body politic can be comprehended in one's mind as an abstract entity, a legal fiction, it does not lend itself meaningfully to material representation as an effigy of a king who is dead. because it exists only in the person of a living king. The English funeral effigy was therefore only a "picture"—a word they often used—of the body natural, lying dead in the coffin below it; the new living king possessed the "body politic".

In France, the effigy of the deceased king portrayed the undying "corps mystique". I have found it very useful, and quite true to the contemporary usage, to speak of the "Body politic" of the English king, as in the quotation just made, and "Body mystical" when speaking of the

French. In the parlance of the late medieval jurists one often finds the expression "corps mystique et politique du roi". "Corps politique" is down-to-earth; as the most famous of Tudor jurists, Sir Edward Coke, put it: God alone can make a corps naturel; man has conceived the corps politique as a useful legal fiction. "Corps mystique", the usual French juristic term, tended to see things the other way around: the corps naturel was a corruptible material object, the "corps mystique du roi" a transcendental mystery, a gift from God.

A similar difference exists between the English and French ways of expressing the notion "le roi ne meurt jamais". The Tudor jurists regularly expressed the idea in the fashion we have just seen: "The king, as King, never dies" making it clear by putting emphasis upon the second "King" when speaking, or by capitalizing it when writing, that only kingship itself escaped the mortal coil. In French, however, the distinction between the king's two bodies is not made clear, but confounded, in the cryptic form: "Le roi ne meurt jamais". By treating an effigy of the deceased as if it were alive, separated from the body of the king, associates "king" and "Kingship" with the same deceased king, leaving it to the spectator's imagination to comprehend the effigy's deeper "constitutional" significance as the very embodiment of the sovereign state.

When the French funeral effigy took on its truly thaumaturgical aspect, in 1547, by serving meals in its presence in the *salle d'honneur*, one contemporary evoked the analogy of the *ritus consecrationis* of the ancient Roman Empire (Fig.14), where an effigy of the deceased emperor was treated as if it were alive for several days before being cremated, along with the body, in a giant funeral pyre, as an eagle was released to signify the soaring of the soul to join the gods—a theme that fascinated antiquarian scholars during the renaissance, as can be seen from this engraving: the effigy on one level, the coffin on another, the eagle at the top. I have, at least to my own satisfaction, argued that this played no role in ritual innovations introduced in 1547; nevertheless, from that time onwards I find hints now and then that some contemporaries were uneasy about serving meals to an effigy. Only recently, however, did I find the most convincing proof of it: Leonard Perin, the learned Jesuit priest who delivered the oration at the funeral service of Grand Duke Charles III, in 1608, in the *salle d'honneur* on the day of the final *service à la royalle*, argued at great length to persuade the spectators that the effigy's presence was irrelevant to the serving of the meal.

This brings us to the question of whether, and to what degree, the French king's personification of the "king's two bodies" could be transferred to the Dukes of Lorraine when they copied the custom of the royal funeral to treat the body and the effigy separately. What would it mean to say—which to my knowledge it never was—"Le duc ne meurt jamais"? The

duchy itself might expire if the dynasty dies out. Every transmission of the ducal power is, in principle at least, subject to the approval of the sovereign lord to which it owes homage. In short, only true sovereigns—those who, according to the medieval way of defining sovereignty, know no superior—can claim verbally, or dramatize visually, the notion that in some way they "never die."

René II claimed the effigy as a royal privilege, which his grandfather had enjoyed, and the *livret* describing the funeral in 1508 has the word sovereign sprinkled throughout. René II's successor, Antoine, did not assume the title of *Roi de Sicile et Jerusalem*, but he did work to acquire sovereignty in other ways, the principal one being the acquisition, from Emperor Charles V, of sovereign privileges to an area that the Dukes of Lorraine had held from the Empire.

Antoine died in 1544 in circumstances that forced the postponement of his funeral; within a year his successor, François, also died; only after another year, in 1546, were their funerals held, in close succession—but only François was represented in effigy, carried in the convoy in the traditional fashion atop the coffin. The funeral *livret* makes it clear that François was the descendant of a sovereign king, René II, and also cites the sovereignty the dukes had come to enjoy in its formerly imperial parts. But the claim to sovereign status within the House of Lorraine achieved its most extravagant expression only three years later, in 1550, at the funerals of two of René's younger sons, princes of Guise. Three years earlier, the French royal funeral had witnessed the introduction of the effigy meal in the *salle d'honneur*. Claude de Guise's effigy was accorded that privilege, as was that of his brother Jean, Cardinal de Guise, on the basis of their genetic descent from René II, King of Sicily. In small respects of costume and other protocol, however, Claude's effigy was denied certain honors that had been accorded to the effigy of his nephew François in 1546, for François, as Duke of Lorraine, had exercised sovereignty in specific territories, which Claude, although *Pair de France*, had not; fittingly enough, Claude's brother Jean's effigy could not have a meal service *à la royalle* because, as a Cardinal, he enjoyed no secular office whatever.

The three funeral *livrets* of Duke François and his two Guise uncles—composed by a zealous and ambitious herald, Emond du Boullay—contain fascinating distinctions between genetical and territorial modes of transmitting sovereignty. They deserve the attention of political scientists, whether or not they deign to consider the ceremonial enactment of those distinctions.

During his very long reign, from 1546 to 1608, Charles III of Lorraine assumed the title of Grand Duke. As we have seen, he adopted the French king's regalia, crown, sceptre, and *main*

de justice; other emblems displayed at his funeral, such as the ducal sword, were "dites de souverainete." His funeral was a consummation of the century-long striving conducted by the Dukes of Lorraine, by means of ceremonial pomp, to buttress their political aspirations to be regarded as sovereigns. That striving continued long after the effigy-funeral had been dropped; it is a famous "lost cause" in the history of early modern France. Looking only at the ceremonial aspects of the matter in the age of the Renaissance, I find that the program of "sovereign" power invested in the funeral of the grand duke of Lorraine was always flawed by the fact that Grand Dukes could never claim that the dignity they enjoyed would never die.

In Tuscany, the funeral of the grand duke involved no ritual treatment of the effigy as if it were alive. Here is the closeup (Fig.15), promised earlier, of Cosimo I's funeral effigy within the catafalque, still not too clear but I assure you it is there. That he was thought of as dead and not alive is revealed in various artistic devices used to embellish the catafalque, and if there is any doubt whatever about the matter, let me quote the author of the *livret* describing Cosimo I's funeral in 1574. The most important people, he tells us, marched close to "i due corpi del morte & del vivo Principe". The "two bodies of the dead and living prince" that spectators actually saw, one immediately after the other in the convoy, were somewhat confounded in their appearance: a royally attired effigy of the father, with an extremely realistic visage modeled in wax from a death mask, followed by the son in full mourning attire, his face almost hidden by a heavy cowl. This visual inversion of the dead and the living may convey a hint of the deceased king's dignity, but *i due corpi del Principe* in this case resonates only by verbal accident with the true doctrine of the "deux corps du roi", which concerns only one person.

One important public-law dimension of the Tuscan funeral, as we have seen, involved decorative devices and theatrical tricks to announce the inauguration of the new duke. This did not require an effigy, however, so we still have to ask, why Medici Grand-Ducal effigies? The most summary investigation of the life of Cosimo I gives the answer. His greatest ambition was to acquire sovereign status, and he succeeded. He dreamt early of a royal title, but settled finally for an arch-ducal one. A papal decree, followed by a papal crowning in Rome, was the keystone, accepted later by the Habsburg rulers in Germany and Spain. The Medici funeral-effigy ritual, then, was adopted in the same spirit of sovereign comportment that had motivated the Dukes of Lorraine.

To summarize most briefly the complex of ideas in our "Renaissance quartet": the doctrine of the "king's two bodies", used in public law in both England and France to articulate the mystery of the perpetuity of *puissance souveraine—le roi ne meurt jamais*—could not penetrate

the funeral ceremonial of the kings of England as it did the French because of their different ways of conceiving the "corps mystique et politique du roi". In our two grand-ducal cases, the sovereignty of the prince lacked the theoretical quality of perpetuity: *puissance souveraine* was possessed discreetly by each successive grand-duc. Accordingly, the funeral was used as an inaugural ceremony: the previous sovereign was represented in effigy, the new sovereign represented himself in person. There is in all cases a conjunction—albeit in the case of England a negative one—between ceremonial symbolism and the concept of sovereign power in an emergent form.

The funeral effigies of the Doges of Venice and the Kings of Prussia appear at first sight to have enjoyed a more privileged status than anything one finds in the Renaissance quartet: the effigy was the object of an entirely separate funeral, performed separately from, and some days or weeks after, the funeral of the body. In Venice, an official distinction was made between the "private funeral" of the body and the "public funeral" involving the effigy. Here we would seem to have the veritable stuff of which "two-bodies" ceremonial is made—the main stimulus for me to have engaged in this comparative study. But, alas, it does not hold up.

I must pass over the isolated case of Doge Giovanni Mocenigo in 1485: if there was indeed a funeral effigy—although I have not encountered any primary source evidence of it—surely did not set a precedent for Doges' funerals in the later fifteenth and entire sixteenth centuries, for which I have made a reasonably thorough study of primary sources.

On the chart (Fig.5, above, following p.2) I have accepted the opinion of Antonio Da Mosto, the author of the most recent full history of the Doges of Venice, that Antonio Priuli had a funeral effigy in 1623. After him there were twenty-six doges before the fall of the republic in 1797, but I did not undertake an investigation of them, doge for doge; I have simply guessed that half of them had effigies. My research endeavor focused instead upon an ordonnance for doges' funerals, obviously an official manual, from which a nineteenth-century historian had transcribed excerpts. I admit to failure to lay my hands upon that manuscript in the Archivio di Stato di Venezia (although I do believe it is still there), but I learned enough from the wording and references included in the printed excerpts to feel certain that the elusive manuscript itself belongs to the eighteenth century, while the procedures it prescribes go back to the mid-seventeenth century.

Taken at face value, my anonymous ordo presents a startling picture of a Doge's funeral. The private funeral was conducted very quickly by the deceased's family. The day after the

Doge's demise his body, either exposed or encoffined, was put on display in the ducal palace. That same night, after midnight, it was transported with minimal ceremony to the church of burial where final services were performed. Meanwhile, the Signoria—the small group of ducal councillors who, along with the Doge when he was alive, represented the state in ceremonial matters—quickly installed the Vice-Doge as interim head of state, who then made the official announcement of the Doge's death in this fashion: "With much displeasure we have heard of the death of the Most Serene Prince, a man of such goodness and piety; however, we shall make another." (*Con molto dispiacer avemo sentito la morte del Serenissimo Principe di tanta bonta e pieta; pero ne faremo un altro.*) The complicated process of electing a new doge began at once, absorbing by far more official and general public attention than the preparations for the public funeral, which went on at the same time. An often-quoted, almost formulaic, phrase by Marino Sanute captures the spirit of the republic at the time of a doge's death: "E morto il Doge, non e morta la Signoria".

The public funeral, began a few days later with the display of an effigy of the deceased doge in the ducal palace. When the French king's effigy was put on display in comparable circumstances, it was endowed with attributes and treated ritually as if it were alive. Not the doge's effigy: the golden spurs on the boots were reversed, the short ducal sword pointed downwards, and the ducal escutcheon of the Doge's arms turned upside down. This was surely a dead Doge—or, if the eyes of his visage were doctored so as to be open, a lifelike Doge being deposited posthumously.

Again to compare the French and the Venetian sovereigns' funeral: in France, during the funeral convoy, the Presidents of Parlement wore their normal red robes of office (because "la justice ne cesse jamais") and marched next to the effigy which represented the mystical body of the king, which never died; in Venice, those officials who wore normal non-funereal cloaks represented the live signorial government, and stood in opposition to the doge's effigy, which was carried in the convoy as it had been displayed in the palace beforehand, with its emblems of power symbolically reversed.

Thus it was that in the eighteenth century, a ceremonial device, a funeral effigy, which had been devised centuries earlier for kings to dramatize the perpetuity of their sovereign power, was used in Venice to celebrate the fact that Venice was a republic where the head of state, powerful as he may have been in life, lost every trait of authority when he died. The fact is, however, that this fundamental law of the Venetian state was incorporated in the funeral of doges long before funeral effigies were used. The trick of reversing the emblems of authority of the

deceased doge belongs to the age when his corpse was exposed during his funeral and is attested as early as the fourteenth century. Originally, one assumes, such denouncement of the dead doge's authority was imposed upon the funeral ceremony as a warning to the deceased's family that it had lost the special place it had recently held in society—and above all, to counteract the tendency, to which those who exercise great power have always been all too prone, to make the office hereditary.

What was actually new in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was the quick burial of the body by the family, the so-called private funeral; the public funeral, for its part, preserved the age-old ceremonial custom and public-law symbolism, transferring it, simply, from the body to the effigy. Finally, as proof that funeral effigies in Venice, in and of themselves, carried no connotation of sovereign (or ex-sovereign) privilege, we may note that soon after being used for doges they were adopted for the funerals of the Grand Chancellor, the Patriarch, and foreign ambassadors.

Turning now to the last of our six cases of funeral effigies of European sovereigns, those found in eighteenth-century Prussia, we should note first that the two Hohenzollern kings involved had the same kind of double funerals, private and public, that the Doges of Venice practiced at that time. The bodies of Frederick William I in 1740 and Frederick the Great in 1786 were interred within a few days of their demise, and elaborate state funerals were performed for them several weeks later. There was an effigy of the king in 1740, two of them perhaps, but used in a very strange way; in 1786, the funeral effigy of Frederick the Great—at least in the terms I have been dealing with it here—turns out to be a phantom.

First, let us look at the artifacts. In 1740, Frederick William I's body was interred very quickly after his death, and the public funeral performed some three weeks later. In the royal palace in Potsdam, a life-sized, life-like effigy of Frederick William, in his favorite military costume, seated in an armchair, was to be seen in what was called a *Trauerzimmer*. I must apologize for a blunder on my part that resulted in not getting a slide of this: but just think of how wax figures appear today in the Musée Crevin, and you will be close to the truth. Visitors to the palace during the days just preceding the final services had to pass through this room, observing the extremely lifelike wax figure of the king before entering the great chamber, shown in this engraving (Fig. 16), where his coffin was on display. This room, designated by the Latin term *castrum doloris*, was decked in mourning as a *salle de deuil* should be, but there several reasons (besides the obvious fact that the deceased's body was not present) to regard it less as a *salle de deuil* than as a *salle d'honneur*: As we look more closely at the display we see:

- (1) at the head of the coffin, the king's casque was propped up to give somewhat the illusion of an image. (I show you here [\[Fig.17\]](#) an engraving of the convoy with crown placed on cushions above the coffined head of the deceased.);
- (2) behind and above that, on the tapestry, was hung a "State Portrait" of Frederick William in his lifetime; and
- (3) inside the coffin, it has been said, there was to be found, though not seen, a wax effigy of the dead king.

Considering that one effigy of the deceased was in another room, and the other (if it existed at all) was invisible inside the "parade coffin", the arrangement of the *castrum doloris*—i.e., the catafalque—in 1740 was perfectly within a century-old tradition of the house of Hohenzollern; this engraving shows the arrangement at such an earlier funeral: the casque on the coffin, with the emblems of royalty beside it or on tabourets alongside it, and the portrait hung behind. The seated effigy of the deceased in the *Trauerzimmer* is nothing other than what I asked you to imagine it to be: a museum piece, made during the deceased's lifetime, decorative and commemorative when utilized, in a supplementary fashion, at the public funeral, but simply not a funeral effigy.

Frederick the Great's "effigy" in 1786 is a product of art-historical imagination about the use of death masks: they had been used since the fifteenth century to make funeral effigies; one was made of Frederick the Great immediately after his death; ergo, Frederick's must have been used for a funeral effigy. The facts, however, are as follows: in his last will and testament, which was opened immediately after his death, Frederick ordered that his body be buried in the garden of Sans Souci, ceremony,—confirming what he had joked about, that he wanted to be buried alongside his dogs. But his nephew who succeeded him, Frederick William II, felt bound to keep up the tradition of grand state funerals. The royal funeral of 1740 was taken as the model. Frederick's body was buried the second day in the church crypt alongside his father. A death mask had been made immediately after Frederick's death ([Fig.18](#)), however, upon the order of his nephew. It survives, as you see on the screen. From it ([Fig.19](#)), moreover, there was also made a lifelike visage, which is still on display at Potsdam. This would have made a fine funeral effigy—and that, I feel certain, is the king pin of the funeral effigy story. But I had the good fortune, when checking the newspaper accounts of the funeral of Frederick, to discover what other *chercheurs* had not. The reporter tells us that after the "public funeral" was over, and the funeral party had had the great repast in the palace, he had seen the artist who had made the death mask bring to the new king, for his appreciation, the life mask which he had confectioned from it.

The death mask and the life mask of Frederick the Great were his nephew's whim, stimulated by the then-current vogue for lifelike effigies, which his uncle had scorned.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in Venice and Prussia, the funeral effigy had its last, rather inconsequential, manifestations. At the same time, however, the funeral ceremonies of sovereigns in Europe achieved an overall magnificence unequalled in any age. This is as true of the countries that had once used funeral effigies as of those that never had. The focal point of the pomp was the catafalque, or mausoleum, or baldachin, or theatre, as it was variously termed, which was a genuine—albeit temporary—architectural construction, several stories high, erected specifically to house the coffin of the deceased in a palatial and/or ecclesiastical setting for long periods of time before the funeral took place. In some measure the monstrous offspring of the *chappelle ardente*, the catafalque as a whole and in its decorative parts—allegorical statuary, tableaux, inscriptions, escutcheons—"represented" the deeds and the dignity of the deceased. In olden days, when reposing on the lit d'honneur or atop the coffin in a *chappelle ardente*, the effigy had been a commanding figure; in the age of the Baroque, when a life-sized was effigy enshrined within a catafalque—as for example (Fig.11, Fig.15) that of the Grand Duke of Tuscany we saw earlier—the scale to which that structure was made would make the effigy appear to be that of a dwarf. In short, the effigy found itself not well suited, in artifactual terms, to changes in the mise en scene of funerals.

Another development in the domain of art rendered the function of funeral effigies ambiguous. Wax effigies for commemorative purposes go back to the fifteenth century, but early in the seventeenth their manufacture became a business, in Germany first, and by the eighteenth century there existed prototypes of modern wax museums. The effigy of Kaiser Frederick William I displayed in the *Trauerzimmer* at his funeral in 1740 was of this ilk. Once lifelike effigies became a commonplace for show purposes, they had to lose much of the aura of mystery they had possessed when used in the funerals of sovereign princes.

These two artistic innovations, the construction of catafalques for use in the funeral ceremony itself and the common manufacture of wax effigies for display in secular settings, both worked to lessen the potential of an effigy to be the show-piece at the funeral of sovereigns. Not only does this make it quite reasonable, in purely ceremonial terms, that the funeral-effigy practice did not spread in post-Renaissance times, but also, it can be argued, it helps account for the abandonment of the sovereign's funeral effigy in at least one of the countries where it had long been used—indeed, in the country where the funeral effigy was invented and had lasted for the longest time: England.

The English abandonment of the funeral effigy did not, in any event, entail breaking an ideational bond between royal ceremonial and constitutional principles: for, as we have seen, the funeral effigies of the kings of England were not treated as anything more than a substitute for the body. Quite otherwise, however, with the remaining three members of our Renaissance quartet, France, Lorraine, and Tuscany. In those states, the funeral effigy had come to be used as a symbol of the continuity of the ruling house and/or the grandeur of sovereign power as such; accordingly, the abandonment of the custom touched, to some degree, upon considerations of fundamental law.

I maintained earlier that the funeral effigy custom was introduced into Lorraine and Tuscany as a ceremonial demonstration of Grand-ducal aspiration to sovereignty. Allowing that it was an imaginative venture, it was in the final analysis only an imported and not a domestic product. In addition, it was somewhat idiosyncratic and certainly pretentious: idiosyncratic in that, of all the sovereigns in Europe at that time, only two used funeral effigies; pretentious in that other Grand Dukes and princes who claimed sovereign status—just think of the number of them in Germany alone—did not mimic this particular royal custom. Simply put, the Grand Dukes could have decided that their use of the funeral effigy, besides being unnecessary, was overly pompous. Or at least, in the case of Lorraine, recalling the dark suggestions of the preacher at the funeral in Nancy in 1608, that serving meals in the presence of the effigy and treating it in other ways as if it were alive smacked too much of pagan rites.

In France, and France alone of all our six examples, did the full-blown effigy ritual evolve as an indigenous adaptation of royal ceremonial to public law; the extinction of that ritual after 1610, I would now like to argue, as my conclusion, was linked to changes in the fundamental law that had nourished its existence.

In 1610, as we noted earlier, the Presidents of the Parlement of Paris saw clearly the notion of the king's two bodies when they spoke of "l'image du Roi en cire, qui representoit le Roi dans toute sa majesté, comme s'il étoit vivant". However, the magical quality of the effigy had been gravely subverted before the funeral ever began. The cardinal premise of the royal funeral ceremony in Renaissance France was that the new king should not be present, so that the make-believe world of the old king in effigy, treated as if alive when resting on the *lit d'honneur* in the *salle de parade* and later carried in triumph in the funeral convoy, could be sustained. Thus, in 1547, although Henri II was prohibited by custom from attending the funeral of his father, François I^{er}, he contrived anyway to view the convoy secretly from a house on the rue St. Jacques, but warned his companions not to show him reverence but to treat him as a private

person so as not to betray his identity, since his very presence was a "travesti". In my mind's eye, though, the vision of Henri II, hiding the fact that he was de facto perfect king, looking down upon the encoffined body of the deceased king of France, drawn on a black-draped chariot, followed at some distance by the same king's lifelike effigy, carried in triumph, conveys lucently the fact and the fiction embodied in the maxim, *Le roi ne meurt jamais*.

In 1610, however, the traditionally discrete behavior of the new king was rudely shattered within hours of the death of his predecessor. Early in the morning after the assassination of Henri IV, the eight-year-old Louis XIII was enthroned, crowned and in full regalia, at a *lit de justice* before the Parlement of Paris, while the edict establishing a regency council was read in his name. It must be said that, in the grand scope of royal ceremonials, this preemptive coronation—one contemporary called it just—created a considerable problem for the organizers of Louis XIII's coronation and *sacre*, which took place just five months later at Reims. In the interim, the funeral of Henri IV was conducted in the usual grand fashion, but *contretemps* abounded. The fine two-bodies pronouncement by Parlement was in fact uttered in opposition to the effort of two bishops to march closer to the effigy than the Presidents; and when those bishops got a rescript from the regency council upholding their claim, Parlement "fut indigne de voir qu'on osat se servir du nom du Roi meme, pour donner atteinte a la Majeste du Roi." That, too, has a nice bicorporal ring, but in so far as it pits the authority of the new king against the glorification of the majesty of the old one, the mystery of the funeral ceremony is disparaged.

For some years before the occurrence of this succession of events, which I call "Le crise du ceremonial en 1610", French jurisconsults had fixed upon the theory of instantaneous succession of the new king, utilizing such maxims as "Le roi ne meurt jamais" and "Le mort saisit le vif" to conclude that "qu'au mesme instant que le Roy defunct a la bouche close, son successeur est Roy parfait par une continuation immediate." Louis XIII's overnight *lit de justice*, as much as it owes political exigency, constituted a ceremonial fulfillment of that new definition of royal succession. Louis XIV and Louis XV also acceded as minors and performed quick "inaugural lits de justice", but even if they had achieved their majority when they came to the throne, I cannot see their predecessors' being accorded funeral rites centered upon a lifelike effigy. In fine, the funeral effigy expired in France when the theory of the king's two bodies exemplified in it—or, more cautiously, the singular fashion in which the effigy had come to exemplify the theory of the king's two bodies—became defunct.

My long journey of visitations at the funerals of European sovereigns has shown the funeral effigy ritual of the kings of France could readily be imitated in the ceremonial of other

lands, and even affixed to differing notions of *puissance souveraine*; but viewed in the broad comparative perspective, the French effigy ritual alone possesses the qualities of an original creation (using here the metaphor of couturier) blending royal ceremonial and public law.

SOURCES

- [Anon.] "Ausführliche Beschreibung des feyerlichen Leichenbegängnisses, welches für Se. Hochselige Majestät König Friedrich der Zweyten, am 9ten September 1786 zu Potsdam veranstaltet worden ist." Supplement to *Berlinsche Nachrichten von Staats- und gelehrten Sachen*,. No. 109 (12 Sept.1786.) Also Nos. 99 (19 Aug. 1786) and 104 (31 Aug. 1786).
- Borsook, Eve. "Art and Politics at the Medici Court. I: The Funeral of Cosimo I de' Medici," *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Instituts in Florenz*, 12 (1965), pp. 31-54.
- Bruckner, Wolfgang. *Bildnis und Brauch. Studien zur Bildfunktion der Effigies*. Berlin, 1966.
- Cecchetti, Bartolomeo. *Il Doge di Venezia*. Venice, 1864. Esp. pp. 275-93 on "Cerimoniale del doge." [(N.B.: see the note following this list of sources.)]
- Da Mosto, Andrea. *I dogi di Venezia*. Milan, 1960.
- [Anon.] *Descrizione della Pompa Funerale fatta nella essequie del Ser^{mo} Sig. Cosimo de' Medici Gran Duca di Toscana nell' Alma Città de Fiorenza il giorno Xvii di Maggio dell'Anno MDLXXVIII*. Florence, 1574. [Bib. nat. Fr.: côte K. 5421] Cf. below at "L'Ordre..."
- Giesey, Ralph E. *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France*. Geneva, 1960; reprint, 1983. French translation: *Le roi ne meurt jamais* (Paris, 1987).
- , *Cérémonial et puissance souveraine. France, XVe-XVIIe siècles*. Paris, 1987.
- Keller, Harald. *Reallexicon zur deutschen Kunst-Geschichte*, ed. Otto Schmitt *et. al.* (Stuttgart, 1958), IV, 743-49. Article on "Effigie".
- Kletschke, Johann Gottfried. *Der Tod Friedrichs des Grossen : letzte Stunden und Leichensbegängnis Friedrichs des Zweiten, Königs von Preussen*. Potsdam, 1786. (Repr. Berlin, 2006.)
- La Ruelle, Claude de. *Discours des Ceremonies, honneurs et pompe funebre faits à l'enterrement du Tres-Hault, Tres-Puissant et Serenissime Prince Charles 3 du Nom, par la grace de Dieu Duc de Calabre, Lorraine, Bar, Gueldres, Marchis,..* Nancy, 1609.
- Laske, Friedrich. *Die Trauerfeierlichkeiten für Friedrich der Grossen. Mit Rekonstruktionen des Castrum doloris im Stadtschloss und der Auszierung der Hof- und Garnisonkirche zu Potsdam am 9 September 1786*. Berlin, 1912.

[Anon.] "L'ordre tenu aux obsèques et funérailles du serenissime Grand Duc de Toscana en la ville de Florence le 17e jour du moi de May 1574"; Bib. nat. Fr. ms. fr. 18,535, fols. 434^r-440^r. Cf. above at *Descriptione*..."

Marot, Pierre. *Recherches sur les Pompes funèbres des ducs de Lorraine*. Nancy, 1935.

Périn, Leonard. *Oraisons funèbres sur les trespas de feu Mgr. très illustre et serenissime prince Charles III [de Lorraine]* Pont-à-Musson, 1608.

Roy, Hippolyte. "Sur la célèbre pompe funèbre de Charles III Duc de Lorraine," *Memoires de l'Academie de Stanislas*, 6e ser., t. 28 (1930-31), pp. 55-116.

Sanuto, Marino. *I Diarii di Marino Sanuto*.

Strozzi, Giovanbatista. *Essequie del Serenissimo Don Francesco Medici, Gran Duca di Toscana II*. Florence, 1587.

Volz, Gustav Berthold. *Friedrich der Grosse im Spiegel seiner Zeit*. Berlin, 1901. 3 vols. (Vol. III, 243-49, on the demise of Frederick II.)

NOTA BENE: The catalogue of state archives in Venice now frequently uses different descriptive titles for manuscripts than they did in the 19th century, so that many manuscripts which once bore the word *Cerimoniale* in their titles no longer do so. To get the original titles, go first to Bartolomeo Cecchetti, *Il. R. Archivio Generale di Venezia* (Venice, 1875), and draw up a list of manuscripts that have *Cerimoniale* in their title, along with their call numbers (which are unchanged from old practice) and go to the current numerical catalogue in the archive to find the title by which to order the manuscript. It will often be noticed that the change of descriptive titles of manuscripts has concealed the fact that they deal with ceremonial practices. This archival oddity was discovered only when it was too late to do further research before giving the lecture, wherefore the list of sources given above may be deficient in respect to use of funeral effigies of the doges of Venice.