

RECENTLY PUBLISHED

D. RAFFARD DE BRIENNE: *Le Secret du Saint Suaire*, Chire 1993, pp. 125.

While this is only his second book about the Shroud, Raffard de Brienne is an established and accomplished author. *Le Saint Suaire dit vrai!* was published in small format in 1992. The present volume has a very attractive cover showing the Burial of Christ by Giovanni Battista della Rovere and a Preface by André van Cauwenberghe.

In his Introduction, Raffard de Brienne states that the object of these pages is to find out if this sheet is the true Shroud of the Savior. Part I, The Shroud in the West, and Part II, the Shroud in the East, sketch historical aspects. Part III touches upon scientific studies; the linen, traces of the Passion, image formation, etc. The unsavory affair of the 1988 carbon dating is explained.

Reading this book is like taking a stroll down a garden path of sindonic history, pausing to admire the marble busts of sindonology's Great Men: Barbet, Pia, Vignon, Delage ; and to marvel at the colorful tableaux of numinous places: Lirey, Chambéry, Turin....

Deeper into the past, a herm of Robert de Clari preludes Constantinople, where the full figure on the cloth was displayed, the Image identified: and so into the umbrous arbor of King Abgar and his Mandylion.

All so familiar to us.

Familiar too the author's conclusions: the man whose Image we see is Jesus-Christ; the passion of Christ is graphically represented; the Shroud is an illustration of the Gospels; the Image is the eloquent witness of the Resurrection. This is the overwhelming "secret" of the Shroud. But there are new generations to be served and Daniel Raffard de Brienne, affable host of ancient lineage, graciously welcomes them.

The narrative flows smoothly, for the author states he chose not to encumber the text with notes and references. Beginners desirous of widening their knowledge will find basic works indicated in a brief critical bibliography. Illustrations, black and white, sans credits, are from vintage files, proper to a primer. The first, a full-length positive of the Shroud, is flopped.

A.-M. DUBARLE, O.P.: "La Première Captivité de Geoffroy de Charny et l'Acquisition du Linceul", *Montre-Nous Ton Visage*, #8, 1992.

Charles de Blois marched with a superior army to force Robert d'Artois to raise the siege of Morlaix. D'Artois marched toward

Charles all night and set up an ambush near a little woods. He dug trenches all around his camp and covered them with forage. At daybreak, he feigned readiness for battle. Charles de Blois divided his army into three corps. Geoffroy de Charni, who led the first, was defeated by the English, who attacked him to attract the others into the trap. In fact, Charles de Blois, seeing the small number of the enemy, and angered by this first disadvantage, sent forward the two other battalions, that did not fail to fall into the trenches, where the English inflicted a horrible massacre. Charni was taken; and there were fifty knights of the nobility killed, besides a considerable number of other soldiers who also lost their lives there.

(Geoffroi de Charni qui conduisait le premier fut défait par les anglais, qui l'attaquerent pour attirer les autres dans le piège. En effet, Charles de Blois, voyant le petit nombre des ennemis, et irrité de ce premier désavantage, fit avancer les deux autres batailles, qui ne manquèrent pas de tomber dans les fosses, où les anglais enfermèrent un horrible carnage. Charni fut pris; et y eut cinquante chevaliers de marque tués, outre un nombre considérable d'autres soldats qui y perdèrent aussi la vie.)¹

Père Dubarle pulled forward one of the heavy volumes that lay on his work table. With slender fingers, he tapped against this passage in the *Histoire* of Dom Lobineau. "Here it is," he said, "and it is also in Morice, another Benedictine of St. Maur, in 1750 ..."²

That was early in 1992; Father Dubarle was just finishing his article, promised to the Paris journal, *Montre-Nous Ton Visage*, with permission for *Spectrum* to publish in English. Rather than wait indefinitely, this issue of *Spectrum*, devoted to the Rome Symposium, presents a review of Dubarle's important study.

Gathering background material for the review, I remembered seeing a scribbled note by Father Edward Wuenschel, C.S.S.R.: "Was Geoffrey taken captive twice?" The search turned up another note at the bottom of a Vatican document: "N.B. De Charny's first imprisonment in 1343." The next day, I unearthed Wuenschel's photocopies of the passage from Morice and Lobineau. In the margins he had written, large and underlined, "1342".

In his article in *Sindon* (June 1989, pp. 129-131), "Geoffroy's Vow and the Church at Lirey", Dr. Daniel Scavone cites the two Benedictines in a note, saying that he had not seen these sources.

It was, however, Scavone's article that prompted the Dominican scholar to pursue the question further. And right away, he announces that his aim is to complete and bolster Dr. Scavone's brief account.

About 1525, the canons of the Lirey church posted a notice, *Pour scavoire la voire* (published in *Spectrum* 28/29), that attributed the construction of the church to the fulfillment of a vow made by

Geoffroy de Charny during his captivity in England after he was taken at Calais in the night of 31 December 1349. The canons narrate that Geoffroy was held in a tower and treated inhumanely by Edward III, who even refused a ransom. Thus Geoffroy made a vow to the Virgin that if he were delivered from prison, he would build a church in her honor. An angel appeared; when night fell, he gave Geoffroy English equipment, opened the prison gates, and led him to join a troop of English soldiers leaving to fight the French. Disguised as an English soldier, Geoffroy accompanied them, let himself be captured by the French, and in this way gained his freedom.

To tell the truth, Geoffroy and other knights were honorably treated in England, and enjoyed considerable liberty. Geoffroy was released when King John II paid his ransom of 12,000 gold ecus³ (July 1351).

For his article, Scavone relied mainly on Joseph du Teil (*Autour du Saint-Suaire de Lirey*, 1902), who called attention to a captivity in 1342. Scavone and Dubarle relate Geoffroy's vow to this previous captivity, as his first amortization from Philip VI is dated June 1343. Du Teil referred to Lobineau and Morice; Père Dubarle wanted to see where the two Benedictines would lead him. "But the task was not easy."

Consulting the monks of St. Maur, Dubarle was led to Père Lebaud's chronicle (1638) of the church of Nantes; Lebaud quotes Guillaume de Saint-André who mentions the Battle of Morlaix but does not speak of Charny. But it was there that Dubarle found a reference to Le Moyne de Borderie who pointed the way to Jean Lemoine's research in English archives. Lemoine describes the Battle of Morlaix, the participation and capture of Geoffroy de Charny, and adds this note: "All these incidents about the Battle of Morlaix were taken textually from the chronicles of Merimuth and Knighton". Both of these English chroniclers were contemporaries of the events in Brittany. Merimuth even gave the date of the battle: 30 September 1342.

Geoffroy's imprisonment could not have lasted long, for he is next reported near Vannes as commander of the arrière-ban (general summons of all men between 18 and 60) in the army of the Duke of Normandy, soon to become King John II. Papal envoys arrived in December and on 19 January 1343 the combatants signed a truce to last for three years.⁴

Père Dubarle remarks that an escape such as Geoffroy's might seem the fruit of imagination, but credibility is strengthened by the similar evasion of Raymond de Mareuil in 1369, as related by Froissart. Other escape episodes come to mind; for instance, it was told of the formidable Breton in whose heart bloomed the fleur-de-lys, Bertrand du Guesclin, already a legend in his own time, that an angel in the night opened prison gates and led him to safety. On Charny affairs, one must not fail to consult André Perret; on this

question, Perret knows of the vow but explains at some length how such a legend could originate, especially after Geoffroy's heroic stand at Poitiers. The model for angelic deliverances is, of course, that of Saint Peter, as Père Dubarle remarks.

But he calls another witness to Geoffroy's miraculous escape; it is an ex-voto listed in the inventory drawn up by Humbert de la Roche in 1418: "Item, an angel of gilded silver holding between his hands a vase in which is a hair of Our Lady. And the angel is seated on a tower with three supporting columns and in this tower is a pedestal on which is a knight armed with the Charny arms."

It is curious that *Pour scavoir* speaks of relics in two different places. First, "King Philip of Valois ... gave Charny ... the Holy Shroud ... a large price of the True Cross and several other relics and holy things to be put in the church" Then, a few paragraphs farther on, one finds more detail: "And the count [sic] of Charny gave to this church the Holy Shroud, the True Cross with numerous other relics ... and even a beautiful tower all of silver, in likeness and resemblance to the one where he had been held prisoner in Calais, in which there were several holy relics."

Such documents, Dubarle affirms, make certain a first captivity of Geoffroy de Charny, but after 200 years the souvenir of 1342 was adapted to the more famous captivity, that of Calais. "The narrative becomes coherent when the elements are divided into two captivities."

This brings up an important question: Can one accept the affirmation, in *Pour scavoir*, that the Shroud was given to Geoffroy by Philip of Valois? Dubarle muses over some doubts: There is no indication that Philip ever possessed the Shroud; even if he had, it seems unlikely that he could have disposed of it secretly; no document mentions the donation, although several concern royal gifts of rents and houses to Geoffroy — quite ordinary bonuses from kings.

Nonetheless, Dubarle proposes to examine some hypotheses, admitting for the moment that it was indeed King Philip VI who gave the Shroud to Geoffroy.

1) Emile Faure (1918) believed that from Constantinople, 1204, the Shroud was sent to Besançon where it was "collected or stolen" in 1349 by a member of the Vergy family and given to Philip VI. This hypothesis is drawn from Loye (1888) whose work is not catalogued in the Bibliothèque Nationale.

2) The Franciscan, Giovanni Pisanu, (1990) places the acquisition of the Shroud in the Smyrna crusade (1345-46). While the suggestion is an old one, Pisanu has a new angle: The spoils were delivered to Philip VI, who divided them amongst the knights. No document confirms this. Furthermore, if Geoffroy joined the crusade it was only in the beginning, for the Battle of Smyrna took place on June 24, but Geoffroy was already at Aiguillon (southwest France)

by August 2. While this argument suffices, it seems to me that perhaps another weakness of this hypothesis lies in the fact that the Smyrna crusade was not sponsored by the king but by the pope.

3) The Holy Shroud was taken from the treasury of the Sainte-Chapelle, repository of the relics from Constantinople, ceded by Baudouin II to King Louis IX in 1247. At first sight, this hypothesis appears unlikely. However, it gains by an examination of the other relics that, according to the canons of Lirey, Philip VI gave to Geoffroy, who deposited them in the church: the Holy Shroud, a piece of the True Cross, and other relics along with a silver tower.

Père Dubarle notes that the Sainte-Chapelle did have a small piece of the Virgin's hair, but this unusual relic was not a part of Baudouin's cession to Louis IX in 1247. No document mentions it. Yet the flacon that contained it is shown on the engraving in the *Histoire de la Sainte Chapelle Royale de Paris* of Marand, 1790. Thus it is seen that the treasury of the kings of France contained three relics that were later listed at Lirey. The presumption is strong that these three "mutually guarantee each other", and that they were offered by the same royal donor, dipping into his personal treasury.

But a snip of the Virgin's hair and splinter of the True Cross, of secondary value, are accompanied by a very important item: the Holy Shroud. And Père Dubarle asks if Philip VI knew what he had. Were the canons of Lirey the first to unfold and discover the true nature of this relic? Would that not explain the reticence of Geoffroy II and Marguerite concerning the provenance of their family heirloom?

Here the research of Hilda Leynen comes with some answers. In her meticulously researched booklet, *A propos du Mandilion*, she reports that an inventory of the Sainte-Chapelle made in 1534 reveals some embarrassing uncertainty; where there had been a tableau in a large reliquary and a painting where appeared an effigy covered by a trellis, only the trellis had been found! The trellis being the decorative frame around the visage of Christ in images inspired by the Mandylion of Edessa.

The collection in the Sainte-Chapelle, then, once contained a cloth bearing the image of Christ, an item that at some indeterminate time, before 1534, disappeared....

In conclusion, Père Dubarle expresses his preference for the third hypothesis, that is, that the Shroud of Lirey was given to Geoffroy de Charny from a king of France. Each factor, taken by itself, would be insufficient to furnish proof, but taken all together they harmonize well with this hypothesis.

NOTES

1. DOM GUI ALEXIS LOBINEAU: *Histoire de Bretagne*, Paris 1707.
2. DOM PIERRE-HYACINTHE MORICE: *Histoire ecclesiastique et civile de Bretagne*, Paris 1750.
3. In general, chivalric practice established that a ransom should not exceed a knight's annual income. A knight of renown or of royal blood could command a higher price. Edward III demanded 60,000 écus for Raoul de Brienne. Du Guesclin, taken prisoner in 1367, was ransomed for 100,000 francs from the treasury of Charles V. Six gold francs were equal to one gold ecu. To ransom Charles de Blois, a prince of the blood, King John II paid 400,000 gold ecus.
4. Morlaix lies on Brittany's north-west coast, Vannes on the south-east coast.

* * *

An article by Emanuela Marinelli and Orazio Petrosillo appeared in the April 1993 issue of *The Catholic World Report*, under section "Inquiry". Not much originality is expended on the titles of Shroud articles (in general, they are thought up by editors); this one is dubbed "Shrouded in Mystery". At the outset, the authors state that from the scientific aspect the Shroud remains mysterious. Not so much because the C14 date is opposed by other evidence, but also because "the mystery of the origin of the human image retains its fascination." Aiming to allay every doubt, the two collaborators present the supporting evidence with authority. In short, crisp sentences, the acquired facts are counted out in favor of the authenticity of the Shroud and identification of the Person represented. There are a couple of errors, so surprising that I must attribute them to translator's misinterpretations.

It is good to find Marinelli and Petrosillo published in an American periodical. Their book *La Sindone: Un enigma alla prova della scienza* (1990; see *Spectrum* 35/36, p. 29), has been translated into several European languages and has sold well. Why there is no English version reflects not on the quality of the book, but on extrinsic considerations too profound for my comprehension.

In the May/June issue of *Collegamento Pro Sindone*, Professor Gino Zaninotto describes a Tau-shaped crucifix in a XIIth century Swiss codex. He discusses briefly the Tau schema and translates the hymn *Laudes Crucis Attollamus* that is written around the figure. We can add this example to our collection of "Thumbs-in-the Palms" crucifixes. Illustrated are also the crucifixes of Rambona (ca.900), Honnecourt (XIIth c.) and Gero (Xth c.), showing the thumbs dropped into the palm.

Ernesto Brunati reasons against further C14 testing, citing Jackson's theory (the Cloth falling through the "mechanically

transparent" Body) and Gilbert Lavoie's demonstration of off-image blood stains. In a second article, Brunati points to flaws in the carbon dating report in *Nature*. He bases his study on the Ward and Wilson "significance level" that stipulates a minimum limit of acceptability at 5%. Brunati (as well as Van Haelst) finds that one of the data published in *Nature* was given as 5 whereas in reality the significance level was 4.17. Brunati remarks that it is absolutely not admissible to round out 4.17 to 5, and adds that the persons responsible "knew that passing from 4 to 5 was decisive."

More than anywhere else in recent years, Rome has become the seething center of sindonic activity and original research. This is reflected in the scholarly contributions to *Collegamento Pro Sindone*. The July/August issue includes a piece by Father Heinrich Pfeiffer and one from the inexhaustible resources of Don Fossati. There is a study by Emanuela Marinelli on the crucifix of Lucca. Dated perhaps as early as the VIIIth century, the crucifix was once a reliquary. According to Gervasio of Tilbury, the corpus was sculpted by Nicodemus, Who deposited the Shroud in the hollow of the interior.

Gino Zaninotto reveals the discovery in Jerusalem, on the site of Golgotha, of the hole in which the cross of Jesus was set up. Excavations in Rome have brought to light similar holes for infixing crosses. The cavities are invariably round, consistent with the Roman technique: the stipes, then, were round; which indicates that the feet of the crucified were nailed one over the other, since placing them side by side would require a wider and flat surface. The patibulum would also have been round, which argues for a Tau cross.

Remi Van Haelst still stalks the British Museum with relentless argumentation. How long will the bastion hold out? When will corporate reticence be worn thin and the whole story be disclosed?

In this issue, the Rome symposium is reviewed by Ilona Farkas, who sat doggedly in the audience hall for hours on end; a feat of dedicated stamina in view of the ambient conditions, which she forthrightly reports. However, the presentations were, almost all, of the highest level. This was, indeed, the praise of all attendees, but we like to note in passing that her years as an editor have endowed Miss Farkas with a particularly solid knowledge of the Shroud and a keen understanding of Shroud affairs. What is more, behind the quiet, dignified demeanor of this noblewoman smolders a fierce adherence to what is, in the words of Georges Porche, the definition of a sindonologist: "It is not a personal work that we are doing; we seek only to serve the Truth".

The 23 pages of the June issue of *Shroud News* cover the first day of the Rome Symposium. Rex Morgan's report is perceptive and candid. The August issue reports on the proceedings of the second day, with a lurid description of the accommodations at the Domus Mariae. Sad, but mostly true.

With the serenity of a man of experience, Father Adam J. Otterbein, C.S.S.R., in the June *Holy Shroud Guild Newsletter*, through the perspective of the Rome Symposium, surveys the strength and stability of sindonology. Detailed reflections on the program are from the pen of a zealous newcomer, Father Frederick Brinkmann, C.S.S.R., member of the Holy Shroud Guild, who accompanied Fr. Otterbein to Rome.

In the June *Lettre Mensuelle*, the president, André van Cauwenberghe, comments briefly on the success of the Symposium. He mentions the preliminary Press Conference and the wide media coverage. Twenty-some members of CIELT attended the Wednesday papal audience, at the close of which Pope John Paul II exchanged a few words in private with Dr. van Cauwenberghe and two other members.

Copies of the Acts of Rome, soon to be published, will be available from: The Holy Shroud Guild, P.O. Box 155, Esopus NY 12429; The Turin Shroud Center of Colorado, 5875 Lehman Drive, Suite 201-D, Colorado Springs, CO 80918; and the Indiana Center for Shroud Studies, 1252 N. Jackson Branch Ridge Road, Nashville IN 47448.
--