

The First Captivity of Geoffroy de Charny and the Acquisition of the Shroud

by Père André-Marie Dubarle

Collegamento pro Sindone Internet – June 2004

© All rights reserved

This article was published in *Montre-Nous Ton Visage*, No. 8, 1993, pages 6-18. Translated from the French by Daniel C. Scavone, Nov. 1993, as amended with Pere Dubarle's instructions.

.....

The present article on "The First Captivity of Geoffroy de Charny" (referred to henceforth as GC or G) in 1342 aims to complete and fortify the brief notice on "The Vow of Geoffroy and the Church at Lirey" published by D.C. Scavone in SINDON.¹ A writing by the Lirey canons dating about 1525 and still unedited in its original language, attributes the construction of the church to a vow made by GC during the captivity that followed his failed attempt to recapture the town of Calais from the British, who had seized it in 1347.²

G had bought the cooperation of a member of the garrison, who had promised to open the gates of the citadel to a small French unit led by G. The ruse failed, the traitor having revealed the plot to the English King, Edward III, who organized a sortie against the attackers. In the violent battle that followed, G was taken prisoner along with other French knights.

According to the account of the Lirey canons, G was detained in a high tower and treated inhumanely by the English king, who refused to free him for a ransom. This was the occasion of his vow to build a church in honor of The Virgin Mary if he should ever escape his captivity. An angel then appeared to him in the form of a young man, servant of the tower guard, who promised him his help. Night came and he opened the prison gates, supplied him with English accoutrements and placed him within an English unit just leaving to fight the French. G followed these orders and was captured by his compatriots, to whom he revealed himself and thus escaped his enemies.

Historians have not accepted this romantic escape.³ They know from other sources that G and the other knights were brought to England, where they enjoyed a large amount of freedom. Finally G, after several refusals on Edward III's part, was freed after 18 months, thanks to a ransom of 12,000 écus, given by French King Jean le Bon in July 1351. The account of the Lirey canons would appear thus as the fruit of an unbridled imagination.

Meanwhile, J. DuTeil in 1902 had drawn attention to the fact of an earlier captivity, placing it in 1342. Thus the vow to build a church following a deliverance would appear as prior to an act of King Philip de Valois in June 1343, granting G the right to collect rents on a domain so he could endow a church with canons to serve it. These rents amount to a first step for the execution of the vow made during a first captivity which the Lirey canons did not know of.

For this first captivity DuTeil cited some *Histoires de Bretagne*, works of 18th c. Benedictines, Lobineau and Morice. The impressive folios were furnished from a not less impressive series of official documents.⁴ In his article in SINDON Scavone reproduced the names of Lobineau and Morice while noting that he had not seen their work. I have wanted to control these references. But the task has not been easy.

The *Histories of Brittany* of Lobineau & Morice are evidently in the Bibliotheque Nationale

of Paris. They have been reprinted in 1973. The *History of Brittany* by P. Lebaud⁵ can be consulted in microfiche. Lobineau and Morice give a detailed account of a battle near Morlaix in 1342. It is a minor episode in a war of succession in Brittany, in which one of the pretenders was supported by the king of France, the other by the king of England, all in the background of the early part of the Hundred Years War. The account mentions the participation of G and his capture, along with the deaths of a good many other knights. In the margin can be read in small characters: "Lebaud, chr(onicles) manus(cript) ecc(lesiae) nannet(ensis) (=Nantes) 284, *Actes de Bretagne*, II, 311."

If we go back to Lebaud p.284, we find, in the course of a long series of battles in different locales in Brittany, the remark that Froissart was describing the events on a larger scale, to which William de St. André in his chronicle added that in the same year there was a battle at Morlaix, in which the party of Charles de Blois (of which G was a member, but is not named) was defeated. It is properly in a history of Brittany, but disappointing for those who wish to fully know the life of G.

It is then that I discovered in a bibliography the mention of A. Le Moyne de la Borderie, *Histoire de Bretagne*, in six volumes, 1896-1914.⁶ The trail was good. A note at the beginning of tome 3 signals the researches in British archives made by Jean Lemoine, which greatly aided Le Moyne. On page 468, after an account of the battle of Morlaix, quite similar to that of Lobinaud and Morice stating G's participation and capture, Lemoine adds a note: "All the incidents of the battle of Morlaix are textual extracts from the chronicles of Merimuth (pp 136-7) and from that of Knighton (in Twisden, cols. 2581 and 2582)." In fact, Merimuth⁷ has helped to fix the date (30 September 1342) and Knighton⁸, has detailed the occasion and the vicissitudes of the encounter. Foreseeing an attack, the English party entrenched itself behind a well-camouflaged ditch, into which the charging enemy cavalry tumbled. There was a great massacre and GC was made prisoner.

These English chroniclers are interested in the war of succession of Brittany since it offered the English king, Edward III, the means of troubling Philip de Valois, with whom Edward contested the title of King of France. They are contemporaries of the events who had concrete details, thanks to returning English soldiers. Before Morlaix, Knighton has related another engagement in which Henri (Herve) de Leon and six other knights named individually were taken prisoner, without counting other combatants. The seven nobles were taken to England and incarcerated in the Tower of London. Their escape was impossible in this situation. This new fact explains the anguish of G, himself a prisoner and fearing never to escape nor to be able to pay a ransom, being a knight of feeble fortune. Thus the fervor of his prayer and the vow that accompanied it.

The wondrous escape followed soon after, since G is mentioned as head of the rear guard of an army led by the Duke of Normandy, the future king John the Good, who went to seek combat with the king of England, near Vannes.⁹ Philip de Valois came himself to Ploermel (N.E. of Vannes). He was able then to meet G., recently escaped. A little later a truce was accepted by both sides in the war, at the request of the legates sent by Pope Clement VI, the treaty of Malestroit, 19 January 1343. About June 1343, a royal decree accorded to G the right to an income of 140 lires in order to build a church at Lirey and endow the canons to administer it.

The deliverance of the prisoner thanks to an angel who, in the form of a servant of the tower guard, opens the prison gates and furnishes an English military outfit, can appear to be little believable. It is helpful to note an analogous escape found in Froissart. The sire (lord) Raymond de Mareuil, vassal of Edward III for a fief in Périgord, had rallied to the cause of the king of France, Charles V, in 1369. Returning from Paris to his lands, he was taken prisoner by an English party. Guarded in a tower, and about to be sent to King Edward III, who wanted to punish his defection, he

was in such a desperate state that he excited the pity of even his English guard. The latter tried to console him, and finally opened the gate of the prison and escaped with him for a promise of a reward. Thus the captive was freed. A second version (MS of Amiens) omits the compassionate initiative of the jailer. The rest of the story is substantially the same; it is a parallel reinforcing the credibility of the document *Pour Scavoir la Verité* ("To Know the Truth"). The piety of either G or of the canons has made an angel intervene, perhaps as an allusion to the deliverance of St. Peter found in Acts of the Apostles (12:7-11).¹²

Another fact provides additional reinforcement to the information in "To Know the Truth." The Lirey church possessed some *ex voto* gifts from G, also recalling his captivity and escape. They are mentioned in a receipt signed by Humbert de la Roche, husband of Marguerite de Charny, granddaughter of G. The land of Champagne being considered unsafe on account of the war between France and England, it was judged wiser to transfer the most precious objects from the church to a safer venue. Humbert thus took charge of the Shroud and other objects, named in the receipt: "Item: a silver cross . . . ; item: a gilded silver angel holding in both hands a vase which held a hair of Our Lady. This angel is seated on a tower mounted on three pillars and in this tower is an expital* on which there is a knight bearing the arms of Charny. Item . . ." *[The sense of expital is uncertain.] Chifflet has interpreted this passage but has added a detail: The knight is on horseback. "A gilded silver angel sits on a tower held up by three columns and holding in both hands a small vase in which is inserted a hair of the holy Mother of God, and in this tower is the figure of a horseman resting on a pedestal which bears the arms of Charny." Though not all the details of the description are perfectly clear, it is enough to note the relic of the hair of Our Lady, to which we will return later, and the explicit mention of the horse. This last is not mentioned in the known copies of "To Know the Truth." It is, however, found in a parallel account composed by Camusat, canon of the diocese of Troyes, who says he consulted documents of the ancient church at Lirey, fully recognizing that this miraculous escape is not related elsewhere. In this version, to help in his escape, G was given a gift of a thoroughbred--*equoque generoso donatus*."¹³

The notice "To Know the Truth" reports that G, locked in a tower, was inhumanely treated by King Edward of England for nine months. Some historians mention this detail in order to contest the historical value of that document. In fact, the prisoner had been transferred to England, and the conditions of his detention were honorable. He was freed by means of a large ransom about a year and a half after his capture. This "inhumane treatment" could be the enhanced memory of a fact reported by the chronicler of Jean le Bel and copied by Froissart. The night of the battle of Calais, after which the French survivors were made prisoners, Edward III wanted to treat them with a grandiose and chivalric courtesy on New Year's Day. He gave them new outfits and at supper he conversed amiably with them. He commended particularly the valor of Eustache de Ribaumont, with whom he had duelled hand to hand during the engagement. He made him a gift of a "chapelet," not properly a hat, but a head ornament decorated with pearls, and announced that by the next day he would be free. But he addressed G very harshly: "Messire Geoffroy, I have little reason to love you, since you have tried in one night to take from me what has cost me much. Fortunately, I have caught you in the act. You tried to have it cheaper than myself, for a ransom of 20,000 écus, but God has, in reality, helped *me*, so that you have not succeeded in your project. He will help me again, if it please Him, since He truly knows that my cause is just." Geoffroy made no response, and the king pursued his conversations with the others in a more cordial tone.¹⁴

ENTERING IN POSSESSION OF THE SHROUD

The texts reviewed above make entirely certain a captivity of Geoffroy prior to that occasioned by the unfortunate attempt on Calais. They show on the other hand that the tradition of Lirey has preserved a certain memory of this first captivity, which was later adapted, though badly, to the second captivity in Calais and England: the vow to build a church, the particulars of the escape, the meeting with Philip VI. We even can understand certain details that the historians have left in doubt: the inhumane treatment of Geoffroy by Edward III consists in the harsh remarks which he addressed to him during the dinner party after the battle of Calais and the long-term refusal to accept a ransom. It is possible to organize in a coherent manner the different data belonging to two distinct captivities.

Now a question of importance: can we accept the statement of the notice that King Philip de Valois gave the Shroud to Geoffroy? Ian Wilson and Dorothy Crispino think it impossible.¹⁵ In their opinion, nothing establishes that Philip VI had been in possession of the Shroud and, if he had been, it is improbable that he would have been able to dispose of it in the secret manner supposed by the affirmative hypothesis. No other known document mentions this donation, though a good number have treated the gifts of rents or houses.

It can be useful nevertheless to mention here some hypotheses very unequally valuable, all of which admit the gift of the Shroud by Philip VI to Geoffroy.

According to E. Faure,¹⁶ the Shroud was sent to Besançon after the capture of Constantinople by the crusaders in 1204. There it was placed in the cathedral. At the time of the fire in this church in 1349, it was collected or robbed by a member of the family of Vergy (to which belonged Jeanne de Vergy, second wife of Geoffroy de Charny). That individual handed his or her booty to King Philip VI, who planned to conquer Franche-Comté and regarded the Shroud as a palladium. The king in his turn gave the relic to Geoffroy, and a secret of state became a family secret. All this is affirmed with caution by a "historian" whose work is not found in the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris.¹⁷ As P. Vignon recognized, no document permits us to think that the cathedral of Besançon possessed a Shroud of Christ before 1523. To which he added the sensible remark: if Besançon had possessed it before 1349, while the Shroud was exposed at Lirey about 1353 or a little after, there would have been a reclamation of the stolen relic; a thing that did not occur.¹⁸

A second hypothesis, a little less improbable, presented by G. Pisanu, makes the occasion of G's acquisition of the Shroud the crusade directed by the Dauphin Humbert II in 1345-46, in which G participated, at least at the start. The spoils of this crusade were sent to the king of France, who divided them among the participants. The value of this relic could not be noticed for want of a regular voucher of authenticity.¹⁹ This reconstruction is based only on the word of the Lirey canons relating to the royal gift. No other document confirms it. The suggestion of the 1346 crusade is the work of Pisanu. G is named among the crusaders by a testimony that must be taken seriously.²⁰ Some strophes of his poem on chivalry seem much inspired by a personal experience. G addresses himself to a knight who plans to go "beyond the sea to harass the enemies of God." He encourages him and warns him of the dangers coming from bad weather or pirates, and then exhorts him to accomplish without delay the promises made to God in adversity.²¹ In any case it is quite probable that Geoffroy returned to France before the end of this crusade. On August 2, 1346, he signed a receipt for his pay at Aiguillon. It is unlikely that he could have been present at the important battle of Smyrna on the preceding June 24, or merited a part of the spoils.

Finally, a third hypothesis, little likely on first view: the Shroud was taken by Philip VI from the treasure of the Sainte Chapelle, where it had been placed among other relics ceded by Baldwin II, Latin Emperor of Constantinople, to St. Louis, King of France.²² Our curiosity is now concentrated on the Shroud. But this causes one to neglect a part of the information contained in the old documents. Perhaps a more attentive consideration may lead us to a more solid conclusion. In the article cited above, D. C. Scavone has led us to this point.²³

The narrative of the canons, *Pour Scavoir*, says King Philip gave to G the Shroud, a part of the true cross, and several other relics. A little later it notes that G gave to the church at Lirey the Shroud, part of the true cross, and some other relics with a beautiful silver tower, a memorial of the place of his captivity.²⁴ The receipt given by Humbert de La Roche, when he took on deposit the precious objects from the church, adds some details. Besides the Shroud and the piece of the true cross there was a tower where was seated an angel of gilded silver, holding a vase enclosing a hair of the Mother of God; on this tower was also found the figure of a man on horseback (Camusat alone mentions the horse assisting in Geoffroy's escape).

Three documents therefore, two narratives and a legal receipt, describe with precision an object that was at once a reliquary and a commemorative of a vow. Each contains an element absent in the others: the fact of a gift of relics by Philip VI, the horse aiding the escape, the hair of the Mother of God in the reliquary. Therefore the three documents are not copies one from another.

Three documents and three different relics. The provenance of the Lirey Shroud, considered by itself, is perhaps an insoluble question. But the question of the provenance of the three relics, considered together, is a different matter.²⁵ The hair of the Virgin is a paradoxical relic. Faith in the Assumption excludes a priori the possession of any part of her body. Hair is somewhere between the body itself and the exterior. The usual relics of the Virgin are her robe, her cincture, her funeral linens, her pitcher, or her basket or throne. The index of Riant's *Exuviae*²⁶ mentions only two cases of relics of her hair, at Corbie and at Halberstadt. A more general account, not limited to the relics coming from the crusader spoils after the capture of Constantinople in 1204, lists twenty relics of her hair.²⁷

The treasure of the Sainte Chapelle possessed one of these. It was not in the collection ceded by Baldwin II to St. Louis. This relic is neither mentioned in the Bull of cession, nor in the liturgical hymn exactly recapitulating every detail.²⁸ It could have come from the church of St. Etienne, near Notre Dame and previously demolished.²⁹ But it, or rather its tiny container, is represented in an engraving in *Histoire de la Sainte Chapelle Royale de Paris* and it figures in No. 14.³⁰ A clearly documented collection, personal property of the king of France, thus includes at one time the three relics identified at Lirey, of which the third (Virgin's hair) has itself not been named with precision by the canons, who estimated it perhaps as too insignificant in comparison with the Shroud. The presumption is very strong that these three relics are mutual guarantees that they were given by the same royal donor from his own personal treasure. It would be indeed strange to find a secondary relic (the hair) not coming from the royal treasure chosen to be housed in a jeweled case of great value, one that the king of France could give, but not a knight of modest wealth as was Geoffroy. The medieval practice of subdividing relics as gifts to different persons or churches is well known. Nothing prevented Philip VI giving a piece of the cross or one of several hairs of the Virgin, just as St. Louis had dispersed individual thorns from the Crown of Thorns. This gift of precisely named relics is in itself very plausible, and another origin for these two relics is difficult to conjecture.

This removes the initial surprise at the concealed gift of a relic as important as the Shroud.

Has Philip VI misunderstood the value of this linen that he had not unfolded? Were the Lirey canons the first to have discovered it? One might thus explain the reticence of the heirs of G to document clearly the precise provenance of this property. "Liberaliter oblatam" (freely given), declared Geoffroy II, son of the founder of the church; "conquis par feu messire G. de C., my grandfather" attested Marguerite, his grand-daughter.³¹

A very different document supports the above considerations. Miss Hilda Leynen has examined the successive inventories of the treasure of the Sainte Chapelle. An inventory drafted in 1534 is evidence that the Sainte Toile could not be identified in the box which ought to have contained it.³² From this came an embarrassed formula that marks the incertitude of the observers: "With regard to the eighth article containing the trellis inserted in the frame, after several difficulties it was finally found in a large reliquary and frame decorated with gilded silver, where there appears an effigy, the said trellis flat against its frame, completely surrounding the said effigy." It seems then that there was found only a trellis which was the classic decoration framing the face of Christ in the images inspired by the Mandylion of Edessa: recall the image of Laon and those of Nereditsa, Gradac, and Alexandria.

The collection of the Sainte Chapelle comprised then, among other things, a cloth bearing the image of Christ, two distinct parts of the true cross, and a relic of a very rare kind, and which did not come from the cession made by Baldwin II, of some hairs of the Mother of God. The image of Christ seems to have disappeared at an undetermined date. This collection has the desired characteristics to be the origin of the relics attested at Lirey, and the donor will be, according to the notice of the canons, King Philip VI de Valois. Perhaps one can suggest, on a point not as important as the question of the origin of the Shroud of Lirey, that the donor was John the Good, who succeeded his father who had died in August 1350.³³

In a request addressed to Pope Clement VI on 16 April 1349, Geoffroy asked 100 days of indulgence for the pilgrims visiting the church that he should build. He requested that his body be divided after his death and interred in different places. On 30 January 1354 he requested larger indulgences, more canons, and permission to be buried with his family in the cemetery to be established near the church now completed. These more important favors are well explained if in the interval there had occurred an event enhancing the dignity of the church. It is obvious to think of a relic such as the Shroud. But after the request of 16 April 1349, Geoffroy was taken prisoner of the English from 1 January 1350 to June 1351. He was then freed by means of a large ransom paid for him by the new king, John the Good. He could have received at that time the gift of the Shroud. Secondary question, I repeat. The Lirey canons may be excused some inexactitude at a distance of more than 150 years.

CONCLUSION:

The origin of the Shroud of Lirey by a gift of the king of France is the thesis that best harmonizes an ensemble of facts of which each taken alone are insufficient to form a proof.

NOTES

¹ D. C. Scavone, "Geoffroy's Vow and the Church at Lirey," in *Sindon*, new series, June 1989, pp. 129-132.

² This notice entitled "*Pour scavoit la voirs*" (*vérité*) was affixed in the little church at Lirey, which was reconstructed in 1525 or a bit later. Four copies are preserved (one incomplete) in the Bibl. Nat. de Paris. Fr. E. A. Wuenschel (+)

studied them and left us a transcription of one of them (B), from which an English translation was published in *Shroud Spectrum International*, no. 28/29 (Sept./Dec. 1988, pp. 25-40, "To Know the Truth: A Sixteenth-Century Document with Excursus" by D. Crispino. It is the only complete publication to my knowledge. But different authors have cited or alluded to it.

³ See the critiques of D. Crispino, art. cit., p. 25: "Not a word of truth"; and similarly the reservations of I. Wilson, *The Turin Shroud*, 1978 (p. 269, n. 7 of ch. XX). For a detailed biography of Geoffroy de Charny, see A. Perret, "Essai sur l'histoire du Saint-Suaire du XIVE au XVIe siècle. De Lirey (Aube) à Chambéry," in *Mémoires de l'Académie des Sciences, Belles-Lettres et Arts de Savoie*, 6th series, T. IV, 1960, pp. 49-121. This essay, highly documented by chronicles and archival documents, makes no mention of the first captivity of Geoffroy in 1342. This latter was, however, signaled by J. DuTeil, *Autour du Saint-Suaire de Lirey*, 1902, p. 1. B. Bonnet-Eymard has personally controlled archival documents relative to Geoffroy and the church at Lirey (*La Contre-Réforme Catholique du XXe siècle*, n. 271, Feb.-Mar. 1991, p. 14b). For the fact of a first captivity of Geoffroy (p. 16, n. 13), he cites DuTeil who "demonstrated it by supporting references."

⁴ G. A. Lobineau, *Histoire de Bretagne, composée sur les titres et les auteurs originaux*, Paris, F. Muguet, 1707; year 1342, p. 326. P. H. Morice, *Histoire ecclésiastique et civile de Bretagne*, Paris 1750-1756, t. 1, p.260. This work was preceded in 1743 by *Mémoires pour servir de preuves à l'Histoire de Bretagne*, Paris, Osmont, 1743, 3 vols. This dossier of documents is cited in the *Histoire* under the designation "Actes de Bretagne."

⁵ P. Le Baud, *Histoire de Bretagne avec les chroniques des maisons de Vitré. . .*, Paris, G. Alliet, 1638. The author, a priest, composed his work at the request of the Duchess Anne (+1514), who ordered the archives to be opened for him.

⁶ A. Le Moyne de La Borderie, *Histoire de Bretagne*, 6 vols., 1896-1914. An offset in 1972.

⁷ Adam de Murimuth, *Chronica sui temporis*. Edidit et recensuit Thomas Hog, London 1846. *Continuatio Chronicarum R. de Avesbury: de gestis mirabilibus*, London, 1889. He was a canon of St. Paul after 1325, with access to the official documents and private information.

⁸ H. Knighton, *Chronica de eventibus Angliae a tempore Regis Edgari usque ad mortem Regis Ricardi secundi*. London 1652. Chronica H. Knighton or Cnitton, Leicester monk. (*Rerum britannicarum mediæ aevi scriptores*, n. 92-92 bis, 1889.) The author was a canon of Leicester. He speaks later of the capture of Calais by the English, but not of the attempt to take the city by Geoffroy. He mentions his death at the battle of Poitiers. The name of Knighton appears sometimes in the margins in the *Histoire* of Lobineau, but not for the battle of Morlaix, though the account closely follows the English source.

⁹ J. Froissart, *Chroniques*, edition Buchon, vol. 1, Ch. ccx; edition S. Luce, T. III, #200, where he was at the front.

¹⁰ According to the notice *Pour Scavoir* of the Lirey canons, G escaped from Calais and came to Amiens, called by Philip VI who wished to be informed fully about his deliverance. The king was pleased with his devotion and gave him for his projected church some relics and revenues. The meeting can easily be placed after the captivity at Morlaix and subsequent escape. It is not necessary to move the first concession of revenues from 1343 to 1353, as A. Perret (op. cit., p. 61, n. 1) and U. Chevalier (*Etude critique*, p. 22, n. 3) have conjectured.

¹¹ J. Froissart, *Chroniques*, Edition Buchon, ch. cccxi; Edition S. Luce, T. VIII, #261.

¹² Perhaps another explanation is possible. The reliquaries sometimes bore the figure of an angel, either holding the relic or simply ornamental. The canons could have thought that a decorative element of their reliquary was an allusion to an actual event of the escape.

¹³ J. J. Chifflet, *Hiérothonie de Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ*, 1631, p. 105. In the original Latin form of the book, *De linteis sepulchralibus Christi Servatoris crisis historica*, 1624, p. 99, we read the Latin equivalent "statuam equestrem." It must be noted that the account of the Lirey canons mentions only the English uniform given to the captive to assure his

escape. N. Camusat, *Promptuarium sacrarum antiquitatum Tricassinae dioecesis* . . . 1610, p. 411, adds the horse: equoque generoso donatus. Do the sources speak of the horse? Or is this a deduction drawn from the statue of a man on a horse? For the detail of the archival basis containing the receipt of Humbert de la Roche, see U. Chevalier, *Etude Critique...*, 1902, p. xxi, document Q. In the enumeration of the relics and jewels, the mention of the Shroud alone is there reproduced.

¹⁴ Jean Le Bel, *Chronique*, ed. J. Viard, 1904-05, T. 2, p. 181; J. Froissart, Book 1, Part 1, ch. cccxxix. Another example of this chivalric courtesy with regard to prisoners has been reported by Jean Le Bel, p. 171: On returning to London after the capture of Calais in 1347, Edward III went to greet his prisoners and offer them to dine with him. The much shorter account has not been reproduced by Froissart.

¹⁵ See above, n. 3.

¹⁶ E. Faure, *Le portrait authentique du Christ révélé par la photographie du Saint-Suaire de Turin*, Paris 1918, pp. 65-66.

¹⁷ Abbé Loye, *La ville de Saint-Hippolyte*, Jacquin 1909, Besançon. My thanks to the librarian of the seminary at Besançon who brought this work to my knowledge. It contains nothing which E. Faure attributed to it. In his memory he confused the Abbé Loye and the Abbé A. Blanchet, author of a chapter on "Le Saint Suaire de Besançon," inserted in the general study of P. A. Pidoux, *Vie des saints de Franche-Comté, 1908-1090, in vol. 4, pp. 21-46*. This work is found in the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris. E. Faure has reproduced literally (p. 66) several passages of A. Blanchet (pp. 29-30), unfortunately lacking all justification by historical documents for the political motivations of giving the Shroud to King Philip VI.

¹⁸ P. Vignon, *Le Saint-Suaire de Turin devant la science* . . . 1939, pp. 105-108. Again B. Bonnet-Eymard *Contre-Réforme Catholique au XXe siècle* No. 271, Feb.-Mar. 1991, p. 24b.

¹⁹ G. Pisanu o.f.m., "La storia e la Sindone de Torino," pp. 199-238 in *La Datazione della Sindone (Atti del V. Congresso Nazionale di Sindonologia: Cagliari 29-30 Aprile 1990)*, ed. A. Ladu, Edicar Service.

²⁰ N. Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières, 1327-1405, et la croisade au XIVe siècle* 1896, p. 56. Philippe de Mézières names as a combatant at the battle of Smyrna 24 June 1346, several noble knights, among whom was Geoffroy de Charny. Perhaps this testimony is only fully valid for his participation at the start of the expedition.

²¹ A. Piaget, "Le livre Messire Geoffroy de Charny," in *Romania* 26 (1897), pp. 394-411, has given a selection of the most interesting passages. P. Savio, *Ricerche sopra la Santa Sindone* 1957, has devoted attention to Geoffroy (pp. 95-112). At the end he cites from Piaget some strophes of the poem.

²² W. Bulst, *Das Turiner Grabtuch und das Christusbild*, B. 1, *Das Grabtuch*. Frankfurt am Main: Knecht 1987, thinks that this is, in the actual state of the research, perhaps the most probable, pp. 142-143. In a manner much more firm and documented, this is the thesis sustained by Hilda Leynen in a study published by the revue *Soudarion* (in Flemish), Bruges. The article has been later offered to a larger public in French translation ("A propos du Mandilion," pp. 24, 1991). The English, Spanish, and Italian translations are in preparation. On the cover is a reproduction of an engraving showing the contents of the large case of relics at the Saint Chapelle de Paris.

²³ D. C. Scavone, art. cit, p. 129.

²⁴ For the sources of this paragraph, see above n. 13 and corresponding text.

²⁵ It goes without saying that we are here setting aside the question of the authenticity (real or supposed) of these relics.

²⁶ P. Riant, *Exuviae sacrae...* 2 vols. 1877-1878.

²⁷ Colin de Plancy, *Dictionnaire critique des reliques*, Paris, 1821, T. II, p. 159. The last on the list is that of the Sainte

Chapelle, followed by etc., etc., etc.

²⁸ P. Riant, op. cit., vol II, p. 48 and 134.

²⁹ Private communication from Mlle H. Leynen.

³⁰ Unsigned engraving, illustrating *Histoire de la Sainte Chapelle Royale du Palais*, by S. J. Morand, 1790. Reproduced in the cover of the brochure "A propos du Mandilion," cf. above, n. 22.

³¹ I am helped here by recalling with D. Crispino (*Shroud Spectrum*, No. 28-29, 1988, p. 30) that this attestation has sometimes been truncated: "conquis par feu" rendered as "butin de guerre." In reality "feu" is followed by "messire" and means not "fire," but "the dead messire." Without mistranslating "feu," Camusat and Chifflet have understood the word "conquis" as "bello partum," that is, "taken in war." But as J. DuTeil has recognized (*Autour de Saint-Suaire de Lirey*, 1902, p. 27, n. 1), the word "conquérir" possessed already in the Middle Ages the possible meaning of "acquire without violence," as well as "gotten by war." Marguerite wished only to affirm that the Shroud was a personal property of her grandfather; she did not intend to detail the means of acquisition.

³² Text reproduced in H. Leynen, "A propos du Mandilion," p. 12; after M. Félibien, *Histoire de la ville de Paris*, 1725, T. III, p. 150 and A. Vidier, *Le trésor de la Sainte Chapelle*, Paris 1911. H. Leynen next comments on the text and concludes with the high probability of a gift made by the king to Geoffroy.

³³ D. Crispino, "Why Did Geoffroy de Charny Change His Mind?" in *Shroud Spectrum*, No. 1, 1982, pp. 28-34, has put in evidence this increase from request to request and has explained it by his entering in possession of the Shroud.