

**Geoffroy I de Charny Did Not Obtain the Present Turin Shroud on the Smyrna Campaign of 1346.  
The Issue Revisited, With a New Assessment of Primary Documents.**

© 2005 Daniel Scavone All Rights Reserved

No scholar of the Turin Shroud knows with certainty where its first known owner, Geoffroy I de Charny, acquired it. We know only that by about 1355 the Shroud had been deposited in the small church he had built at Lirey, France, in honor of the Virgin. A recent carefully researched essay by Gian Maria Zaccone (2000) discusses the Shroud's history from 1204 to 1355. He generally follows in the path taken by Daniel Raffard de Brienne (1997; 2000), Fr. Giovanni Pisanu (1990), Noel Currer-Briggs (1987), Fr. Paul de Gail (1973), and Joseph du Teil (1902) in hypothesizing that Geoffroy I de Charny's acquisition of the Shroud had something to do with his presence on the Smyrna campaign of the French dauphin Humbert II de Viennois in 1345-1346.<sup>1</sup> Zaccone notes with others that in 1316 Geoffroy's older brother Dreux de Charny had wed Agnes de Charpigny, dame of the fief of Vostitza in the Morea (medieval name for the Peloponnesus). Several of the above Shroud researchers have intimated that her family might somehow have come into control of the relic. Unfortunately, no document supports this belief. In common, therefore, these writers believe the Smyrna campaign and some Greek connection should be a prime consideration in any attempt to determine how, when, and whence Geoffroy entered into possession of the Shroud. Having mentioned the unpublished letters of du Teil and suggested the "further information" in possession of the Duc de Bauffremont--descended from the Charnys--in support of his Vostitza hypothesis, Zaccone regrets that the latter are no longer available.<sup>2</sup> *It must be clear to all that if these documents had anything decisive to say about the Shroud, they would long since have been placed in evidence.* Still, Zaccone writes that Dreux went to Greece with his father Jean and adds parenthetically—and gratuitously--"*perhaps with his brother Geoffroy*" (italics added). Zaccone concludes (2000, 393), "It is therefore possible that Geoffroy had had direct contacts with the branch of his family that was well established there." We must applaud the balanced moderation of his remarks but, as indicated above, the Shroud is nowhere mentioned.

Daniel Raffard de Brienne's short paper (2000) follows the theme of his contribution at Nice (1997). Both papers accept that the shroud from Constantinople went to Athens in 1205 with Othon de la Roche. It is the thesis presented in depth by me in 1989 and acknowledged by Bro. Bruno Bonnet-Eymard (1989 and 1991) and others informally. De Brienne then argues that Geoffroy's purpose in going East was precisely to obtain the Shroud, and he hints subtly that his own de Brienne ancestors possessed the Shroud as lords of Athens until driven out by the Catalans in 1311. He writes (1997, 171), "What became then of the Shroud which, by our hypothesis, remained in Athens? We do not know."

(Que devient alors le Linceul qui, suivant notre hypothèse, est toujours à Athènes? Nous ne le savons pas.) He then quietly supposes--constrained by the immensity of the suggestion--that Othon must have relinquished his ownership of the Shroud and left it in Athens upon his own departure or death. It is an unlikely event. Brienne continues: the Shroud was still in Athens or elsewhere in the East, still property of the de Briennes, and since the last de Brienne Lord of Athens, Gautier (Walter) VI, was likely a friend of Geoffroy as a comrade in arms in France during the Hundred Years' War, he may even have given over the Shroud later in Florence. Brienne concludes, "Is there a link between [Geoffroy's] early return [from the Smyrna campaign of 1346] and the transfer of the Shroud to France? That is the question." Unfortunately, his words do not provide an answer acceptable to historians. First, we do not know that Geoffroy went East in advance of the big battle of Smyrna (24 June 1346), as de Brienne guesses without a document, but we do know that Geoffroy fought at Smyrna, which was the only major battle of the campaign—and the last—the Crusade having concluded in August 1346 (Chevalier 27; Jorga 56). So, having acquitted himself among "the flower of Christian chivalry" in the battle, Geoffroy's early departure--he was present again in France at Aiguillon on August 2, 1346--is thus not necessarily "early," nor is it indicative of some secret personal agenda. Also, and crucially, the fact of the matter is that no Brienne held power in Athens after Gautier V in 1311. Gautier VI, had failed in his effort to regain his family's fief against the incumbent Catalans in 1331 (Brienne 1997, 172).<sup>3</sup> Geoffroy would have no generous friend in Athens to endow him with the treasured relic. Still seeking to establish Geoffroy's quest for the Holy Shroud as his reason for going East, De Brienne also wondered why Geoffroy would leave France at all, given the bitter need for his services during the Hundred Years War, unless it was for a highly personal reason. It is the "shotgun" approach to history. The latter question may be turned around: why, indeed, did Humbert, recruit an entire army of Frenchman and organize a coalition of Christian allies to sail to Turkey when the British were running free in most parts of France? The answer must, of course, be their fervent hope that one of the intermittent truces between 1340 and 1345 might actually be permanent. Moreover, Humbert seems to have been the driving force--and bankroller--behind a new chivalric Order of St. Catherine, founded in the 1330s and soon directed against the Moors of Spain and in the East (Atiya 305f.).

Let us pause here to outline what little we really know about the presence of Geoffroy I on the Smyrna Crusade. Humbert was moved by a genuine religious zeal, and after long preparations to obtain papal sanctions and to recruit men and ships in a large Christian coalition, he set sail from Marseilles sometime towards the end of August 1345. Still in Venice on Oct. 24, 1345, his fleet reached the waters of Negroponte (Euboea, or often, its main city, Chalcis) in the spring of 1346. The battle for Smyrna actually was recorded by Philippe de Mézières, who personally saw Geoffroy I among the combatants at

Smyrna (Chevalier 32, n.1, citing M. N. Jorga's text of Mézières 56). This information argues that Geoffroy did actually go to the East for the purpose of joining a crusade against the Turks, though possibly not traveling with Humbert's main fleet. Perhaps the reason Geoffroy was not named in the original roster of knights under the dauphin at Venice (Jorga 56 and n. 1) was that he was only a "bachelor," i.e., a son of a noble family, not a squire, but not yet a knight. Scholars generally agree that for his prowess at Aiguillon he was knighted. What is now known is that Geoffroy received a great honor, perhaps as soon afterwards as March of 1347. At that time he was first named as the royal *porte d'oriflamme* by Philip VI Valois. As this banner was carried in battle only on special occasions, Geoffroy was appointed a second time to this highly honorable post in June 1355 by Philip's son King John the Good (Kaeuper and Kennedy 15 and nn. 49-50; Contamine 1973). From 1346 to his death in 1356 Geoffroy became one of the principal personages of the realm, serving as the king's man on several important missions and posts and receiving commensurate but uncommon rewards.<sup>4</sup> From this record of Geoffroy's career, one must begin to believe that a gift of the Shroud from the king was not beyond the realm of probability.

If, therefore, Mézières is the only witness for Geoffroy at the battle of Smyrna, we must admit that we know nothing about when he left home--whether before Humbert's armada or afterwards, as so many others did. We do not even know whether Mézières himself joined the crusade late, perhaps at Cephalonia (off the west coast of the Peloponnese), arriving from a sojourn on Cyprus as Jorga thinks (56 and n. 1), or was already with Humbert at Marseilles. He was not named among the knights in the pay of Humbert's army from the start, probably because he was only a squire. He himself says he was knighted during the Crusade for valor (Jorga 69-70). However, other squires *were* named. Therefore, he may well have arrived on the scene later. My point in discussing the unknowns about Mézières at some length and from his own account is to emphasize strongly that we cannot say with certainty any more about Geoffroy than that he fought at Smyrna in June and was at Aiguillon in August. The evidence does not support Geoffroy's presence in Greece or Turkey already in 1345 for the purpose of laying his hands on the Shroud, as Raffard de Brienne has proposed. By the time he departed for home, we are told that the entire crusade had been *virtuellement terminée* (Chevalier 27; Jorga 56). Moreover, fighting in France was again heating up--the huge French defeat at Crecy took place also at that time, on August 26, 1346. If Geoffroy departed early, it was not seriously premature, and the reason is not mysterious. Perret (55) has anticipated me in this opinion. Humbert's last year in the East was not remarkable, the impact of this last Crusade virtually negligible.

## PINGONIUS ON THE SHROUD

Geoffroy's acquisition of the Shroud while in the East in 1346 is by no means a preposterous notion. Nevertheless, a closer attention to the origins of the Smyrna hypothesis in its several variations reveals its contrived underpinnings. No shroud of Jesus is mentioned in any of the above hypotheses related to the Smyrna Crusade. This simple omission is just the tip of a series of wishful suppositions that set out from the ignorance or silence about the Shroud's Lirey period on the part of Philibertus Pingonius (or Pingon), court historian to the Savoys and the Shroud's first historian, in 1581.

We may look together at Pingonius' history of the Shroud, which was then, historically, the property of the Savoys. His entire account runs from his pages 8 to 20. It is thus not at all lengthy. Initially (8-11), he indulges in the expected survey of the Gospel narratives of Good Friday. Page 11 is filled by Pingonius quoting Nicephorus Callistus (ca. 1300) and pseudo-Lentulus for what they say of Christ's physical appearance. Pingonius next quotes from the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus dealing with the Passion and from Juvenius' translation of the New Testament into Vergilian hexameters (ca. 330). He adds (13) a discussion of shrouds claimed by Besançon, Lusitania, and Germany: indeed, these do not violate the Gospels, he casually asserts, which, after all, mention several linens. To the objection leveled by some that the burial linens would by now no longer survive, Pingonius cites some Psalms and Thomas Aquinas. They are hardly relevant. To this point his narrative has wavered between naive and studious. It continues on a similar level.

Now (13-14) he comes, rather surprisingly, to Abgar, and he gives the story, already familiar from ancient texts such as the Doctrine of Addai and the Acts of Thaddaeus and easily available in recent Latin versions. The inability of Abgar's outstanding painter to capture the shimmering divinity of Christ and Abgar's fervent piety prompted Jesus to send him His miraculous portrait. But the marginal notes to Pingonius' book cite for this passage Eusebius I.13, who, we know, never mentioned the portrait but only the letters that passed between Abgar and Jesus, and the same notes also refer to the bland version found in Nicephorus II.7. Pingonius' sole purpose in alluding to Abgar was to help establish the genuineness of the Savoys' Sindon.

In some way the entire form of the body of Christ was expressed on this Sindon which has come to the Savoy Princes. . . . And since Peter . . . did not fear to go into the empty tomb where he saw the Sindon and linens as well as the sudarium, who can doubt that great care was taken of these objects.<sup>5</sup>

Still on page 14, Pingonius adds that the Savoys' Shroud was always protected by legitimate

Christian ruling families:

I do not doubt that [preserved by other rulers, the Savoys' Sindon] came from them [other rulers] to the kings of Jerusalem . . . in 1098 . . . [who] sent it with the crown of Cyprus to the Lusignans. . . . The last king of that line was John. His sister Anna was wed to Duke Louis of Savoy in 1432.<sup>6</sup>

Shall we believe Pingonius' questionable "certainties" about this lofty pedigree of ownership? In the first place, it is well known that the Shroud of Jesus was still in Constantinople until 1204. Further, Pingonius will almost immediately contradict his remark about Lusignan possession of the Shroud by describing Geoffroy's granddaughter Marguerite de Charny as the donor of the relic. For his Savoy patrons, the issues raised in 1389-90 by Bishop d'Arcis's condemnation of the authenticity of the Lirey Shroud must not be permitted to attach to their incredibly valuable acquisition. Comes next the passage upon which the above writers depend to prop up the evidence for Geoffroy's acquisition of the Shroud in the East. Pingonius wrote, in contradiction of his previous statement about Lusignan ownership:

Then in the year 1458 [read 1453], the capital of the Eastern Empire [Constantinople] was overcome by military force of Mahumet, King of the Turks, and everything was torn asunder and laid waste. Constantine Palaeologus, decapitated, lost his kingdom and his life at the same time. Nothing in Greece, Asia, or Syria remained safe. Everyone fled the cruelty of that most atrocious tyrant. A certain notable matron, Marguerite de Charny, having packed her bags, packed also this precious Sindon and decided to leave Greece and head for the safer climate of France.<sup>7</sup>

The deception of making Marguerite de Charny come from Greece was begun by Pingonius but manipulated into "fact" by Joseph du Teil, as we shall see.

Pingonius discussed the marriage liaison between the Savoys and the Lusignans, but said nothing of the marriage of Dreux de Charny and Agnes de Charpigny, inserted by Zaccone. He concerned himself only with the Savoys' acquisition of the Shroud from Marguerite de Charny in 1453 (1458 in Pingonius) and with the Shroud's history during their ownership from then to his own time. Though the aforementioned modern writers may take their lead from Pingonius, the fact is that, incredibly, the Savoys' historian seems or affects--not to know with certainty who Marguerite de Charny was. On page 15 Pingonius writes, and it is instructive of his Savoy-dictated motives:

It is certain that she issued from the kings of Jerusalem because a woman of Jerusalem is named in the history of Cyprus wed to Hector Lusignan, son of Philip: and the time is about right for all these [factors]. I think Charny is named because they ruled in the city Carina of Ionia in Asia Minor or in Aeolian Carna or in the citadel of Phoenician Carna, which is near Mt. Libanus. Others say Burgundy, because an illustrious family of that name was there. Either she migrated to Asia or from Asia into France. [Pingonius continued:] When she reached Italy and overcame the Alps, at Chamb?ry (in the region of the Savoy dukes) she was received most splendidly as a princely matron and relation, as was seemly, by the rulers Louis and Cyprian Anna. Upon them, though they objected, she bestowed the sacred gift of the Sindon. [He concludes:] The precise reasons cannot properly be discussed here for lack of space.<sup>8</sup>

Of course, our Marguerite de Charny did not issue from the kings of Jerusalem. Pingonius' commission was to legitimize the Savoys' ownership. To this end he must bring the Shroud from the East, where everyone knew it had been, and avoid all doubt about his patrons' rightful possession. In the absence of any certain account of the acquisition of the Shroud by the Charnys, Pingonius must, at any cost, circumvent the scandal intimated by the Memorandum of Bishop d'Arcis and the alleged inquest by Bishop Henri di Poitiers; and he must avoid the chance of a suit by the Besançon authorities. Therefore, ignorant of--or proactively forgetting--a hundred troubled years of the Shroud in Lirey, he waffled: might Marguerite have brought the Shroud from Greece or the Holy Land. He will have used Savoy records; but it must be doubted that the Savoys in 1452-53 could have been ignorant of the fairly recent "Lirey controversy" of ca. 1389-90 and Marguerite's even more recent touring the neighborhood with the disputed "figure or representation" of the Shroud of Jesus.

Zaccone (2000, *passim*) is properly suspicious of the work of Pingonius. Fr. Edward Wuenschel noted in the margins of his copy of Pingonius that the historian of the Savoys knew absolutely nothing about the Lirey history of the Shroud of Jesus. It is certainly true that he *seems* to know nothing. He was silent about the Charnys in France except for what he could not omit: that one Marguerite de Charny had been the owner of the cloth prior to the Savoys. Wuenschel's judgment about Pingonius is quite understandable, even as one reviews the extant documents. And there may be more to tell. We may be sure that Pingonius' agenda was to establish the familial right of the Savoys (already joined by marriage to the Lusignans of Cyprus) to legitimate ownership of the much-disputed and notorious Shroud of Jesus. What is true is that no scholar has yet turned up a Lusignan text that ever

mentioned the Shroud. Pingonius' contradictory "slip" (above) about Lusignan ownership was intended somehow to reconfirm, essentially to "redouble," the possible avenues in support of the Savoys' right of ownership, and it paid a sort of homage to their new relations, the powerful Lusignans.

### **PINGONIUS MANIPULATED BY DU TEIL**

Not the least of the aforementioned manipulations of du Teil in 1902 was his espousal of the importance of Dreux in the Charnys' acquisition of the Shroud. In this he followed the testimony of the Duc de Bauffremont and not Pingonius. The above discussion of the Lusignans has no intrinsic relationship to the marriage of Dreux and Agnes or to Dreux's acquisition of Vostitza, and it cannot override the fact that nothing ties the family of Charpigny or the venue of Vostitza to any shroud (page 1 above). The silence is deafening. Dreux's daughter Guillemette sold the rights to Vostitza sometime after her father's death about 1325.<sup>9</sup> The pathway of the Shroud from its presumed twenty-one years' silence in Vostitza (1325-1346) to Geoffroy de Charny, "defector" from the Smyrna campaign, is little more than a fiction. I hope here to reveal its origin.

From his own words we may read what Pingonius knew or wished us to know, and good historical method--as also logic--dictates that we not enhance or alter his knowledge or his project or his historiographical skills half a millennium after his death without his imprimatur. On a single page (14), Pingonius leapt from the year 1098 to 1432 to 1458. He demonstrates no knowledge of the Shroud's career during that stretch of time. Unless one reads into his account something that is not there, one might, as Wuenschel, conclude that his "scholarly" knowledge of the Shroud virtually began when it became a property of the Savoys in 1452-53. Wuenschel (unpublished notes) expressed the opinion that the entire Lirey-d'Arcis controversy was unknown in Chambéry. I have found it impossible to accept this and, instead, proffer Pingonius as carrying out a historical account that reflects the Savoys' agenda unbesmirched by the heritage of Lirey and the charges of d'Arcis.

Pages 15-20 are devoted to the Savoys' possession of the Shroud from 1452-53 to 1562, the last date mentioned. Describing five miracles associated with the Shroud, Pingonius concludes with its marvelous retrieval from the 1532 fire in Chambéry Cathedral by the duke's confidant Philibert Lambertus, the smithy Gullielmo Pussodo, and two Franciscans: *Illud equidem palam omnes vidimus (tunc enim aderam)*, "which we all clearly saw (for I was then present)." This passage alone asks our indulgence and gratitude for this writer. Then an utter surprise: Pingonius retells the traditional Abgar story and, for the first time ever, to my knowledge, openly associates the Edessa cloth with the shroud of Jesus. Except for these two isolated contributions to the Shroud's history, Pingonius is no historian

to rely upon for information on the early history of the Shroud before 1452.

Du Teil thought otherwise, and his followers, de Gail, Curren-Briggs, and now Zaccone and Raffard de Brienne, have been led wrongly. Look again at Pingonius' passage on the events of 1458. Convinced that Geoffroy I de Charny obtained the Shroud in Greece in 1345-46, du Teil must omit the very specific details in the passage cited above and in full. Here again are Pingonius' words followed by the reduced version of du Teil. Pingonius wrote:

Then in the year 1458 [read 1453], the capital of the Eastern Empire [Constantinople] was overcome by military force of Mahumet, King of the Turks, and everything was torn asunder and laid waste. Constantine Palaeologus, decapitated, lost his kingdom and his life at the same time.

Nothing in Greece, Asia, or Syria remained safe. Everyone fled the cruelty of that most atrocious tyrant. A certain notable matron, Marguerite de Charny, having packed her bags, packed also this precious Sindon and decided to leave Greece and head for the safer climate of France.

Here begins du Teil's translation (25f.) of Pingonius. He omits the first lines of the above quotation and alters the rest.

Nothing in Greece, Asia, or Syria remained safe, *because the lands were filled with squadrons of barbarians*. . . . A certain notable matron, Marguerite de Charny, having packed her bags, packed also this precious Sindon and decided to leave Greece and head for the better climate of France. (My italics.)

In the abridged version by du Teil, we read simply that Marguerite brought the Shroud from Greece to France. The year and the event--the capture of Constantinople by Mohammed the Conqueror in 1453--are omitted, and this opens many doors. Only forty years after Pingonius' account, Chifflet (1624, 90f.), the early historian of Besançon, had already quoted Pingonius accurately, even correcting his date of 1458 to 1453 and clearing up the ambiguity about Marguerite's Burgundian origin.<sup>10</sup> In taking and abridging Pingonius' words from Chifflet's full quotation, du Teil set in motion the unlikely scenarios which gave the Shroud to one or other family in the East without their apparent awareness of it and substituted Agnes de Charpigny for Marguerite de Charny (below).

Here I repeat the first lines of my above quote of Pingonius' lack of certainty (15 and Endnote 8 above) so as to highlight du Teil's seizure of misinformation. Pingonius:

It is certain that she issued from the kings of Jerusalem because a woman of Jerusalem is named in the history of Cyprus wed to Hector Lusignan, son of Philip: and the time is about right for all these [factors]. I think Charny is named because they ruled in the city Carina of Ionia in Asia Minor or in Aeolian Carna or in the citadel of Phoenician Carna, which is near Mt. Libanus. Others say Burgundy, because an illustrious family of that name was there. Either she migrated to Asia or from Asia into France.

The question must cross one's mind: Is there anything here upon which one may hang a viable historical scenario?

Because of Pingonius' seeming uncertainty about the person and activities of Marguerite de Charny, du Teil could assert confidently (15) that the Lusignans once possessed the Shroud and could imply that Marguerite had obtained it as the wife of Hector Lusignan. Du Teil (19-23) then launched an interpretation which, like a good historical novel, combines some facts with a series of undocumented inferences. He occasionally provides good sources (Chevalier and Mézières), which I have used.

Du Teil (23) must have known he still needed something more. He had already linked the Charnys to a great Franco-Greek family (Charpigny) as also the Savoys had been linked to the Lusignans. Now he reveals that the Charpignys had . . . "settled in the region for over a century and [their] forefathers had *perhaps* assisted in sacking Constantinople, whence the Blachernes Shroud disappeared."<sup>11</sup> (My italics.) It is a desperate hope, as the flashing lights of "*peut-être*" ("perhaps") teach us.

Knowing full well that Marguerite de Charny, granddaughter of Geoffroy I de Charny, lived in the 15th c., du Teil made it seem that Pingonius had confused her with Agnes de Charpigny (the 14th c. widow of Dreux de Charny) as the carrier of the Shroud out of Greece. This would have the merit of immediately placing the Shroud in de Charny possession and explain the mystery of its acquisition by Geoffroy I. This suggestion was only made possible by his out-of-context and partial quotation drawn from Pingonius' apparent, but probably feigned, uncertainty about Marguerite. Du Teil, then, must wax creative. He next points out (26, n.1) that in an Italian monograph of 1641, Marguerite is mistakenly called Anne. Moreover, he goes on, "as everyone knows (*I'on sait*), in the past the names Anne and Agnes were used indifferently one for the other." And therefore? What is important is that--as seen above--Pingonius knew her name was Marguerite and he knew she was not a Charpigny. The rest is du Teil's creature.

Even without studying the entire work of Pingonius in detail for its fidelity to truth and accuracy, one

might suspect that, as historian for the house of Savoy, he would be likely to “spin” events in their favor. It should be clear that in this instance, though Pingonius must have had access to Savoy files, his imprecise and wandering remarks cannot be made the basis for supporting a theory regarding the journey of the Shroud from Constantinople to France. It should be noted that these mistakes about events whose truth is known, this pushing of the evidence beyond its limits and with patent tendentiousness, are occurring in 1581, only 130 years after the transfer of the Shroud to the Savoys in 1452-53. Zaccone informs us that, surprisingly, the document of the transfer of the Shroud from Marguerite to the Savoys does not exist. More significantly, he adds that even the existing documents involving dealings between Marguerite de Charny and the Savoys in 1452-53 “do not contain any reference to the Shroud.”<sup>12</sup> One must really wonder why. Perhaps the answer lies in the premise of the present study.

Du Teil’s omission of the crucial date of 1453 opened a different door for Noel Currer-Briggs, who wrote, in an unpublished paper of 1987, that the Shroud remained in Athens until after the battle of Pelagonia in 1259. Currer-Briggs, who used du Teil and did not see Pingonius, thinks the time of trouble to which the passage alludes must be the last years of Latin rule in Constantinople, which indeed must have been filled with turmoil. But then, in 1259-61, who might be the “barbarians” mentioned in du Teil’s French version of Pingonius and thus in Currer-Briggs’ English translation? After all, the event of 1259 chosen by Currer-Briggs is the defeat of the Franks by the Byzantines at Pelagonia, neither properly considered as barbarians. This 200-year differential was directly caused by du Teil’s abridged version of the passage rendered above. Pingonius has not made an error of 200 years: he fully intended to describe the events following the fall of Constantinople to Mohammed the Conqueror in 1453 and not those surrounding its recapture by the Greeks in 1261. He fully intended to name Marguerite de Charny, who in the mid-15th c. did transfer the Shroud to the Savoys, and not Agnes de Charpigny, a lady of the early 14th c. The Dreux connection becomes hereby a flimsy--i.e., not any--solution to the question of the Charnys’ acquisition of the Shroud. The present negative assessment of the “Dreux connection” is shared by Pere Dubarle (1998, 66-67).

Dorothy Crispino has actually provided us with a strong argument that militates against the possession of the Shroud by Geoffroy already in the 1340s. She drew attention to a text found in Chevalier to the effect that Geoffroy I apparently changed his mind in 1354 about where he wished to be buried, requesting permission to create a graveyard near his Lirey church.<sup>13</sup> This suggests that he only obtained the Shroud nearer in time to that decision, viz. after 1351, the year of his release from an English imprisonment by means of a large ransom paid by King John himself. It was a time when Geoffroy was among the French king’s most valued knights. At this very time, though the precise year is not known, Geoffroy was wed to Jeanne de Vergy of Besançon. It was a period when Geoffroy was reaping the

rewards of a life led with honor and loyalty to church and country. Aware of all this, Crispino would yet deny him the king's gift to his personally chosen *Porte d'Oriflamme*.<sup>14</sup>

It is perhaps fitting that Jean Jacob Chifflet (94-95)--the dean of Besançon's historians--should have the last word in our discussion of the Smyrna hypothesis. He already thought Pingonius must have known Marguerite was Burgundian and that Humbert de la Roche, Lord of Villersexel in Burgundy (d. 1438), was wed to her, the granddaughter of Geoffroy, the royal standard-bearer for Philip VI Valois (1347) and also for his son John the Good (appointed on 25 June 1355--my Endnote 4). Chifflet knew that Humbert and Marguerite had taken the Shroud, "already at least sixty years at Lirey," to Burgundy (in 1418, to Marguerite's Montfort castle, for safekeeping during the British invasion in the Hundred Years War). It was in her possession until 1452-53, when it was transferred to the Savoys. Chifflet also knew that Pingonius had contradicted himself: Marguerite could not have given over the Shroud in Chambéry in 1452 (fact) if she had left Constantinople in 1458 or 1453 (Savoy fiction).

The subject is not resolved. Some historically unacceptable scenarios about the Shroud's history between 1204 and 1355 have been denied because of misinformation at their sources. There are others, for another day.

## NOTES

1. Zaccone (1998 and 2000), is director of the Archival Museum of ItalGas, which provided the latest protective container for the Shroud. In pointing up the weaknesses of the other main hypotheses for the Shroud's whereabouts during the notorious 150-year gap in its documented history, I do so partly in order to make manifest the comparatively, if surprisingly, strong case for the Shroud's presence in Besançon during that period. The major point to be made about those other hypotheses has to do only with their historiographical methodology. Put most simply, while their hypotheses are plausible, the flaw they all share is that they are supported by no document that names the Shroud of Jesus. Only the Ste. Chapelle hypothesis of Pere Dubarle and Mme. Leynen depend on references to the Mandylion. However, these references are found by careful analysis and research to be mistaken with relation to the Shroud. I have researched this in another chapter (not yet published). As for the Smyrna-Greece hypotheses, any bona fide historian searching for the Shroud's history must turn away from such a total absence of even a single reference--especially when there exist documents which do point elsewhere to the Shroud's equally plausible venue in Besançon. So it is with great respect for the otherwise careful studies of these Shroud researchers that I must nevertheless disagree with their historical constructs. Of course, where their researches have produced cogent information, one would be remiss not to notice that.

But most importantly, besides the lack of any references to the Shroud of Jesus, the overriding historiographical problem which has hindered the conclusions reached by the advocates of the Smyrna-Greece hypothesis is no fault of theirs. They have followed a thread begun by du Teil who, for his part, allowed himself to be misled by the Savoys' historian Pingonius and then pushed his own imagined scenario beyond acceptable limits. This last is the chief argument and main discovery of the present paper.

2. Zaccone 2000, 392. However, in the *Pièces justificatives* in du Teil (1902), letter F is, in fact, a communication from the Duc de Bauffremont referencing the marriage of Dreux and Agnes. Du Teil gives a rationale for his conclusions—but not for his misuse of his sources. Marguerite's first husband was Jean de Bauffremont who died at Agincourt in 1415. He was a great-grandson of Agnes de Charpigny, dame of Vostitza. Du Teil then imputes the blame for the confusion of Marguerite and Agnes to Pingonius (27, n. 2). But the major damage must be laid at his own feet, as we shall see.

3. Some background to these important facts in the present discussion: Byzantine Emperor Andronicus II had allowed the army and navy to deteriorate. Then, in 1302, after being defeated by the first arrival of Ottoman forces at Nicomedia, he hired a mercenary company of some 6000 Catalan troops led by Roger De Flor. After a successful campaign against the Turks, Roger was slain by Alans at Adrianople in 1305. The Catalan vengeance resulted in the devastation of Thrace and much of northern Greece. Gautier (Walter) V, duke of Athens, employed the company in 1310. However, he failed to pay them and they rebelled. The armies clashed at Kephissos in 1311, where Walter's knights charged into a quagmire, which looked quite like a grassy field, and were slaughtered by the light infantry of Almogavars who formed the bulk of the Catalan company. Gautier was beheaded. The Catalans went on to capture Athens, establishing themselves there until 1388. See Wolfe and Hazard in Setton, II, 271f.

4. I have collected these in an unpublished chapter on the subject of "Pour Scavoir," whose spirit some researchers of the Shroud have entirely failed to appreciate. Contamine (1973, 179-186) discusses the possible ancient origins of the *oriflamme* as the special banner of the kings of France, and he fastens upon 1124 as the point when documents seem more firmly to notice it and to remove it from the realms of legend. It was, in fact, the Valois kings who identified it most closely with their regime (*Ibid.* 200ff.). Not coincidentally, it was also the time of the Hundred Years War, when palladia, mundane or supernatural, would have been invoked—and were. Contamine (223f.) can list only thirteen knights as *les gardes de l'oriflamme* between 1297 and 1418—Geoffroy being the only one to die in battle (at Poitiers in 1356) still

holding the banner. The much maligned Lirey document of ca. 1525, *Pour Scavoir la Verité*, has directly or indirectly litanized the nobility of the families from which Geoffroy descended (analysis in Scavone, unpublished). See, too, Perret 55ff.; Kaeuper and Kennedy 15-18; Crispino (1987), and especially Viard, *passim*, on the numerous honors freely given and the missions entrusted to Geoffroy. All of this, now enhanced by Contamine's list and discussion of the *portes d'oriflamme*, should give new cogency to the claim of *Pour Scavoir* that Geoffroy received the Shroud as a precious gift coming from the king of France:

Geoffroy de Charny, chevalier, comte dudict Charny et seigneur de ce present lieu de Lirey, descendu des anciens ducz de Bourgoigne et des seneschaulx de Champagne, barone de Joinville, gouverneur et lieutenant générale pour le roy de France Philippes dice de Valoys en ses pays de Picardie. . . reçut du roi Philippe de Valois, en récompense de sa vaillance, le saint Suaire de Nostre Seigneur. . . .

Geoffroy de Charny, knight, count of said Charny and lord of this place, Lirey, descended from the ancient dukes of Burgundy and from the seneschals of Champagne, baron of Joinville, governor and Lieutenant-general for the king of France Philip de Valois in his lands in Picardy . . . received from King Philip de Valois, as reward for his courage, the holy Shroud of Our Lord.

5. Pingonius, 13-14:

*Quemadmodum vero integra effigies hac in Sindone de Christi corpora expressa, ad Sabaudos Principes non immerito tandem pervenerit. . . . Cum igitur Petrus . . . monumentum vacuum introire non extimuit, viditque Sindonem & linteamina, necnon sudarium, quis dubitet haec non neglexisse.*

The version of the Abgar legend retold by Pingonius is very nearly that to be found in the twelfth- and thirteenth-century versions of Ordericus Vitalis (*HE*, Bk. II, ch. 8-9, in Dobschütz 224\*) and Gervase of Tilbury (*Otia imperialia* 3.23 in Dobschütz 131\*\*ff.).

6. Pingonius, 14:

*Hinc ad Hierosolymitanos reges pervenisse non ambigam . . . anno MXCVIII [1098]. . . & ad Lusinianos . . . cum Cyprio diademate transmisit. Cujus stirpis rex ultimus Johannes, Jani filius, sororem habebat Annam Ludovico Sabaudiae Duci collocatam, anno MCCCCXXXII [1432], a qua Sabaudiae Duces sunt editi.*

7. Pingonius 14f.

*dum anno MCCCCLVIII [1458] orientis Imperii sedes vi, & armis, a Mahumete Turcarum rege expugnaretur, caede omnia diriperent & vastarentur, Constantinus Palaeologus ipse truncatus capite, regni simul, & vitae finem fecisset. Nihil in Graecia, nihil in Asia, aut Syria tutum restaret, aufugerent omnes atrocissimi tyranni crudelitatem; illustris quaedam matrona Margarita a Carninomine, sarcinis collectis, inter quas hanc raram Sindon reposuerat, Graecia movere, coelumque mutare constituit, atque in Galliam proficisci.*

8. Pingonius, 15:

*Hanc [Marguerite] a regibus Hierosolymitanis prodiisse ex eo constat, quod Ierosolymitana in historia Cypria vocetur, nupta Hectori Lusignano Philippi filio: quibus omnibus tempora conveniunt. Carnim autem denominatam puto, quod Carinae urbi Ioniae in Asia minori, dominaretur; aut Carnae Aolidis, sive a Carnae oppido Phaeniciae, quod ad montem Libanum reponitur. Burgundam alii ferunt, quod eius nominis illustris ibi fit familia, in Asiam illa migravit, sive ab Asia in Gallias deducta fuerit. Ubi ergo in Italiam Carna appulit, & magnis itineribus Alpes superavit, Camberii (quae Sabaudiae Ducum regia est) a Ludovico, & Anna Cypria, ducibus, splendidissime, ut tantam principem matronem, & affinem decebat, excepta est. Quibus tandem hoc sacrosanctum Sindonis munus, discedens non sine magnis obsecrationibus contulit. . . . Quid donationi causam dederit, non hoc loco absonum sit paucis enarrare.*

9. Petit (1888, Vol. 2, "Genéalogie des Sires de Mont-St.-Jean . . . et Charny") ambiguously gives three dates: 1335-1346-1355.

10. Du Teil (26, n. 2). In fairness, du Teil did not cite Pingonius directly. Chifflet (1624) had done so. In 1631, A. Duchesne had translated Chifflet's Latin into French. It was this last from which du Teil drew his quotation of Pingonius. Therefore, could Duchesne have been the one who elided the above lines? Duchesne's 1631 French translation of Chifflet's book is entitled *Hiérothonie de Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ*. I have not controlled this version beyond what I have seen in Du Teil. It remains true that those modern scholars who depended on du Teil have been misled.

11. . . . *fixée dans la région depuis plus d'un siècle et dont les ascendants avaient peut-être assisté au sac de Constantinople où disparut le Suaire des Blachernes.*

12. Zaccone (2000, 408f.). See also Wilson (1998, 285 under date 1453).

I add here that the loss of such 15<sup>th</sup> c. documents that must have once existed concerning the present Turin Shroud is instructive. It teaches clearly that the loss of medieval documents is a commonplace. Most importantly, for the question of the location of the Shroud after its disappearance from Constantinople, we know that the medieval documents which might have chronicled the arrival in Besançon of the Shroud from Othon de la Roche in Athens should no longer be counted against the hypothesis of that city's possession of the Shroud of Constantinople in the 13<sup>th</sup> c. Urban strife in Besançon (the looting of the residence of the Bishop in the 13<sup>th</sup> c.) and the fire in St. Etienne Cathedral (ca. 1350) resulted in the loss of all ecclesiastical records before 1412. The years 1234-1355 fall in this area and are precisely the years in question. It is worth repeating that if records relating to the Shroud are not optimal in Besançon, the reader should note again that the Shroud of Christ is not attested or claimed in any documents anywhere else from 1208-1355. On the loss of Besançon records which once existed, J. Gauthier, authoritative archivist of Besançon, wrote about 1901:

. . . destroying as useless rubbish thousands of accounts and charters, the delegates of the departmental directory of Doubs threw to the fire or shredded all the registers of the archepiscopal office, that is, all the administrative records of the diocese over four centuries. . . . This destruction, infinitely regrettable, *reduced by about nine-tenths* the sources of the Archbishopric and of the Chapter of Besançon . . . to the point where all together they form only 534 articles--having fortunately allowed to survive some precious inventories and cartulaires, and the registers of deliberations of the Chapter from 1412 to 1790. (Italics mine.)

Finally we know that many church records as well as Besançon's painted replacement-shroud itself were also lost in the anti-clerical vandalism of the Revolutionaries in 1794. In 1624, however, Chifflet attested to subsequent sources including the "rediscovery" of Besançon's Shroud about 1378 and the miraculous "proof" that it was the same that had been lost in the turmoil of 1350. He had access to records no longer available today, lost since 1794.

13. Chevalier, *Autour*, 27, Item C, dated 1354: *Eisdem* [the deacons] *conceditur, ut cimiterium juxta ecclesiam ipsam habere possint*. See Crispino (1981) and Kaeuper and Kennedy 38. Crispino (1986) has elsewhere argued that the Shroud of Jesus was retained in Constantinople until 1247. The “Golden Bull” of Latin Byzantine Emperor Baldwin II of that year records his cession of a *partem Sudarii*, in which Jesus’ body was wrapped to King-St. Louis IX of France. In the following year Louis bequeathed a small bit of Baldwin’s cloth to Archbishop Juan of Toledo, Spain. Mark Guscini has examined it and sent me a photo; it is distinctly brown in color—and not from the Shroud of Jesus (personal communication). See also Barta (2002). For this and other reasons, Baldwin’s assumed retention of the Constantinople Shroud must, it seems, be abandoned.

14. In another paper, yet unpublished, I have shown the plausibility of the statement in the 1525 document *Pour Scavoir la Verité* that King Philip VI gave the Shroud to Geoffroy I at Amiens (*damyens*) about 1351.

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Atiya, Aziz S. *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*. New York: Krause Reprints, 1965; rp. of 1938.

Banks, S. E., and J. W. Binns, eds. and trs. *Gervase of Tilbury: Otia Imperialia, Recreation for an Emperor*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2002.

Barta, Cesar. “The Shroud Sent to Louis IX of France by Baldwin II, the Latin Emperor at Constantinople.” (British Society for the Turin Shroud) *Shroud Newsletter*, No. 56, December 2002, pp. 57-65.

Bonnet-Eymard, Bro. Bruno. *The Catholic Counter-Reformation in the XXth Century*, No. 217, March 1989, pp. 7f. Also No. 237 (English), March 1991, p. 25, n. 3.

Chevalier, Ulysse. *Autour des Origines du Suaire de Lirey, avec documents inédits*. Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1903.

\_\_\_\_\_. *La Croisade du Dauphin Humbert II - 1345-1347*. Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1920.

Contamine, Philippe. "Geoffroy de Charny (debut du XIVe siècle-1356) 'Le plus prudhomme et le plus vaillant de tous les autres.'" In J. J. N. Palmer, *Histoire et Société: Melanges Georges Duby, II, Le tenancier, le fidele et le citoyen*, Aix-en-Provence, 1992, pp. 107-121.

\_\_\_\_\_. "L'oriflamme de Saint-Denis aux XIVe et XVe siècles." *Annales de l'Est*, Vol. 7, 1973, pp. 179-244.

Crispino, Dorothy. "The Emperor's Scissors." *Shroud Spectrum International (SSI)*, No. 19, June 1986, pp. 26-31. [SSI is her own periodical, wholly edited by Crispino.]

\_\_\_\_\_. "Geoffroy de Charny in Paris." *SSI*, No. 24, Sept. 1987, pp. 13-18.

\_\_\_\_\_. "To Know the Truth." *SSI*, No. 28-29, Sept.-Dec. 1988, pp. 24-40. [On the text *Pour Scavoir*.]

\_\_\_\_\_. "Why Did Geoffroy Change His Mind?" *SSI*, No. 1, Dec. 1981, pp. 28-34.

Csocsan Varallja, Eugene. "The Turin Shroud and Hungary." *Ungarn-Jahrbuch*, Vol. 15, 1987, pp. 1-49.

Currer-Briggs, Noel. "The Shroud in Greece." Unpublished typescript, March 1987.

De Gail, Paul. *Histoire religieuse du linceul du Christ*. Paris: Editions France-Empire, 1973.

Dubarle, A.-M., and Hilda Leynen. *Histoire ancienne du linceul de Turin*, Tome 2, 944-1356. Paris: François-Xavier de Guibert, 1998.

Du Teil, Joseph. *Autour du Saint-Suaire de Lirey*. Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1902.

Gauthier, Jules. *Collection des Inventaires sommaires des Archives Departmentales anterieures a 1790*. Departement du Doubs, Archives Ecclesiastiques; no date, but c. 1901.

Gervase of Tilbury. See Banks and Binns.

Jorga, M. N. *Philippe de Mézières, la Croisade au XIVe Siècle*. Paris: Émile Bouillon, 1896.

Kaeuper, Richard W., and Elspeth Kennedy. *The Book of Chivalry of Geoffroi de Charny: Text, Context, and Translation*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Pr., 1996.

Ordericus Vitalis. See Von Dobschütz.

Perret, Andre. "Essai sur l'histoire du Saint Suaire du XIV<sup>e</sup> au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle." *Mémoires de l'Académie des Sciences Belles-lettres et Arts de Savoie*, Vol. IV, 1960, pp. 49-120.

Petit, Ernst. *Histoire des Ducs de Bourgogne*, 4 vols. Nendeln/ Liechtenstein: Kraus, 1976; rp. of Dijon: 1889.

Pingonius, Emanuel Philibert. *Philiberti Pingonii Sabaudi Cusiacen. Baronis Sindon Evangelica*. Turin: Sons of Nicolas Bevilaqua, 1581; rp. 1777.

Pisanu, Giovanni, o.f.m. "La Storia e la Sindone di Torino." In A. Ladu, ed., *La Datazione della Sindone: Atti del V. Congresso Nazionale di Sindonologia*, Cagliari: Edicar Service, 1990, pp. 199-238.

Raffard de Brienne, Daniel. "Les ducs d'Athènes et le Linceul." In *non dait de main d'homme: Actes du IIIeme Symposium Scientifique International du CIELT- Nice 1997*, pp. 171-172.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Geoffroy de Charny's Journey to the East." In Scannerini and Savarino, 2000, pp. 427-430.

Rinaldi, Pasquale. "Un documento probante sulla localizzazione in Atene della Santa Sindone dopo il saccheggio di Costantinopoli." In L. Coppini and F. Cavazzuti, eds., *La Sindone, scienza e fede*, Bologna: Editrice CLUEB, 1983, pp. 109-113.

Scannerini, Silvano and Piero Savarino, eds. *The Turin Shroud: Past, Present and Future*. (Acta of meeting held in Turin, Italy, 2-5 March 2000). Turin: Effata Editrice, 2000.

Scavone, Daniel. "The Shroud in Constantinople: The Documentary Evidence." *Sindon*, Vol. I (N.S.), 1989, pp. 113-128.

Von Dobschütz, Ernst. *Christusbilder*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1899.

Wilson, Ian. *The Blood and the Shroud*. New York: The Free Press, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Turin Shroud*. London: Gollancz, 1978.

Wolfe, Robert Lee, and Harry W. Hazard, eds. *The Later Crusades, 1189-1311*. Vol. II of Setton, Kenneth M., ed., *A History of the Crusades*, Madison, Wisconsin and London: Univ. of Wisconsin Pr., 1969.

Zaccone, Gian Maria. "The Shroud from the Charnys to the Savoys." In Scannerini and Savarino, 2000, pp. 379-412.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Sindone di Torino e sindone di Besançon, appunti per una ricerca parallela." *Sindon*, Vol. 9-10 (N. S.), 1996, pp. 107-116.