

## **(1) BESANÇON AND OTHER HYPOTHESES FOR THE MISSING YEARS: THE SHROUD FROM 1200 TO 1400**

### **FORWARD**

I continue to regard Ian Wilson's 1978 book<sup>1</sup> as my Shroud "Bible." I have built a "Shroud career" upon his research. Without his insights about Edessa, Shroud history would begin with Robert de Clari in 1203 (Fourth Crusade). Ian is the first to applaud the scholar who makes a good case for some theory, even though it may depart from his own position. I am counting on this as I speak. I consider that we have been partners in the search for the true history of the Shroud since (2) we had espresso together with eminent Archbishop John A. T. Robinson on an October evening in Turin in 1978. I wish my friend, Ian Wilson, could be here with us in Ohio today.

I will begin with a strong statement and try to back it up in the rest of my talk. *If the Shroud was not at Besançon where it is named--and claimed to have been--during the famous gap in its record (about 1200 to 1400), it was somewhere else, unnamed, unclaimed, unattested, and undocumented.*

At least three popular hypotheses may be briefly discussed.

### **THE KNIGHTS TEMPLAR**

First, the Knights Templar hypothesis. The above statement means that the words "Shroud of Jesus" are not found in all the documents of the trials of the Templars. The hypothesis that they possessed the Shroud during the missing years hinges on their worship of an idol in the form of a head. In 1911, before the Shroud was ever a Templar issue, Salomon Reinach noted, from the records of the trial, that no two members gave the same description of their

supposed idol. More recently, other scholars<sup>2</sup> have echoed this, noting that no Templar described it as a *cloth* image and that some said it was a skull or had (3) three heads. They noted, too, that some interrogated Templars were menials who were never present at the secret meetings when the idol was supposedly exposed. Yet they also proffered a description. Today the real issue is not a Templar possession of the Shroud but the very existence of an idol. The inquisitors used the same questions in the trial of the Cathars. It now seems proven that the inquisitors themselves intruded the idol into the interrogations, and the members of the Order described one in hopes of receiving leniency.<sup>3</sup>

#### THE SMYRNA HYPOTHESIS

Regarding the Smyrna theory, I can say unequivocally that Geoffroy de Charny did NOT go on the “Smyrna Crusade” in 1346 for the purpose of obtaining the Shroud. Again, the Shroud was not mentioned by any of its supposed owners in the Greek East. Further, in 1902 the evidence was manipulated by the Baron du Teil, and modern advocates of the Smyrna hypothesis have not noticed it.<sup>4</sup>

#### THE SAINTE CHAPELLE HYPOTHESIS

(4) Finally, no Shroud was ever inventoried among the relics placed by King St. Louis IX in his new Sainte Chapelle, where the (5) *Grande Chasse* (“Great Reliquary Chest”) housed the Crown of Thorns and other relics which had come from Constantinople in 1248. There we read two contradictory items, neither of which is the Shroud: *Du saint Suaire* (a piece of the Shroud) and *une sainte face* (a holy face).<sup>5</sup> Periodic inventories of Sainte Chapelle relics refer to the latter as the *sancta toella in tabula inserta*: the “holy towel (of

Jesus' face) in a frame.” This had been a term for the Mandylion from Edessa. However, the “towel” had already been unfolded in Constantinople in 958. From then on we must agree with Ian Wilson that the legend of the (6) Mandylion (face only) had to be preserved (after its “ticker-tape” arrival parade in 944) and *something* called the *tuaile* was kept separately in the Pharos Chapel relic treasury, where, in 1203, Robert de Clari (par. 83) saw only the container hanging from the ceiling, while (7) the Shroud (the mandylion unfolded) was later moved to the Blachernes Palace, where Clari (par. 92) saw it raised up every Friday and identified it as the *sydoines*, i.e. the Shroud. In the meantime, in Europe, Ordericus Vitalis (1130) and Gervase of Tilbury (1211)<sup>6</sup>, using the Abgar legend, already described a full-length Shroud long before 1248. Yet the towel in a frame continued to be named in Sainte Chapelle inventories until at least 1575, when we know the actual Shroud was already on its way from the Savoys in Chambery to Torino.<sup>7</sup>

These three scenarios, plausible in their own way, and laid out by sincere scholars, are built on foundations of silence. Historiography, however, proceeds by documents.

#### THE BESANÇON HYPOTHESIS

(8) The hypothesis which identifies the Turin Shroud with the cloth said to have been previously used in the Easter liturgy at the cathedral of St. Stephen at Besançon has been scrutinized by scholars, but it has never been refuted.<sup>8</sup>

(9) In fact, the Besançon hypothesis has been revived often in the past 20 years, by me in 1989, others, and most recently by Alessandro Piana in 2007.<sup>9</sup> The case for Besançon continues to acquire more supporting evidence.

.....

**Here let us all be reminded: The Shroud remains--overall--relatively free of historical documentation. Even Geoffroy de Charny, owner of the Lirey-Chambery-Turin Shroud about 1349-54, never gave any sign that he ever heard of it. Long after his death his descendents say, vaguely, that he acquired the Shroud as a “reward freely given.” This is true enough, though one gets the feeling that something is being held back.**

**The official papers of the foundation of Geoffroy's church at Lirey from 1343 to 1353 mention other relics but not the Shroud. Still, the Shroud at Lirey has been vindicated by Bishop d’Arcis’s Memorandum in 1389, the Shroud’s first firm document 34 years after its arrival in Lirey.<sup>10</sup> The Besançon hypothesis is defined by a series of documents and runs as follows.**

#### **OTHON DE LA ROCHE**

**First we must ask: Who was Othon de la Roche that he, of all the illustrious French knights of the Fourth Crusade, should acquire the most striking relic in Christendom. Othon was a Burgundian nobleman who emerged as a leading figure of the Fourth Crusade, was awarded the fief of Athens, and somehow acquired the Shroud of Jesus along with other relics in Constantinople in 1204.**

**So our first task is to get the Shroud from Constantinople to Othon in Athens. In 1983<sup>11</sup> Pasquale Rinaldi discovered in Naples a 13<sup>th</sup> c. copy of a (10) letter asserting that the Shroud of Jesus from the relic collection in Constantinople was in Athens. Othon had been the Seigneur of Athens since late in 1204.**

**The letter is dated August 1, 1205. Theodore Angelos, brother of Michael, Despot of Epirus, wrote to Pope Innocent III, complaining that the Shroud of Jesus had been taken to Athens. Michael was one of only a few**

remaining Greek rulers after the capture of Constantinople by the 4<sup>th</sup> Crusade.

Is the letter to the pope authentic? Some scholars have denied it. The main issue raised is their claim that Theodore would have signed his name as Doukas and not Angelos. However, Robert Lee Wolfe, who has authored a massive history of the Crusades, has preferred to identify Theodore as Angelos Comnenus. Importantly, the timing of the letter rather favors the choice of Angelos for the following reasons. In 1205 Pope Innocent III was still threatening to excommunicate the leaders of the western crusading forces for the looting of *Christian* Constantinople. It was a time when a leading spokesman of the Greeks might yet hope that a pope's intervention might result in the return of the Greeks to power in their own land and of the Shroud and other relics into Greek hands. Would Theodore have presented himself as Angelos in the letter? Despite the short tenure of the Angelos rulers on the Byzantine throne (1185-1204), the name might have been received more favorably in Rome than Doukas because, as emperor, Alexius IV Angelos had shown a friendly hand towards the Latins.<sup>12</sup> It is also true that Theodore, who succeeded Michael in Epirus from 1214 to 1230, was already ambitious for power in 1205 and might have felt himself in a position to deal with the papacy.<sup>13</sup>

In 1989 I uncovered a second support of the Shroud's presence in Athens. In the years immediately after the Latin takeover of Constantinople in 1204, Nicholas of Otranto, Abbot of Casole monastery in southern Italy, was the personal translator for the newly seated Latin Patriarch, Benedict of Santa Susana. Together they held discussions with Greek clergy, hoping to reconcile disagreements over dogma and papal primacy. These differences included the Greek use of leavened bread as contrasted with the Latin church's use of unleavened (*ázymos*) host in the Eucharist.<sup>14</sup>

.....

**(11) Nicholas' reports were written in both Greek and Latin. His reference to the Shroud comes in the midst of a discussion of the Communion bread in 1207. The Byzantines had asserted that a portion of the original (leavened) bread used by Jesus had been present in the imperial relic collection but had been stolen. Here is the crucial passage: "When the city was captured by the French knights, they entered as thieves, even in the treasury of the Great Palace where the holy objects had been kept, and they found among other things the precious wood, the crown of thorns, the sandals of the Savior, the nail [sic], and the burial linens, *which we [later] and saw with our own eyes.*" Among the lost relics of the Passion, which Nicholas now enumerated, were that bread and Jesus' burial linens. In this passage, the key words are "with our own eyes."<sup>15</sup> The question must be asked as to just *where* it was that Nicholas actually saw the linens. To answer this, we must add what he says in another context: that, in 1206, Benedict and he had traveled to Athens and to Thessalonika debating the same questions of Church unification with the Greek theologians. It may, therefore, be in Athens that Nicholas saw the burial linens--so emphatically "with our own eyes"--which is such a peculiar part of the passage just cited. Most significantly, he says he saw them *after* the rush of pillaging of Constantinople's precious relics by the crusaders. For the linguists among us, it is crucial to notice that the Latin pluperfect *ubi sancta posita erant* ("where the holy things *had been kept*") and the Greek imperfect *en tois ta hagia ekeinto* ("in which places the holy objects *used to be kept*") argue strongly that the linens were no longer in the Great Palace and that Nicholas did not see them *there*. Theodore of Epirus and Nicholas of Otranto thus provide mutual supports for the Shroud in Athens.<sup>16</sup>**

**How did Othon get the Shroud? During the second siege of Constantinople, which effectively placed the crusaders in control of the**

Byzantine government on 14 April 1204, Othon was among the Burgundians following Henry of Flanders and garrisoned in the (12) Blachernes Palace, according to Chamard.<sup>17</sup> If so, and since the Shroud of Jesus was in this precinct--and accessible--as Robert of Clari attested, then Othon could have gained possession of it that very day.<sup>18</sup> Official ownership would be earned and granted later. Unfortunately, I could not confirm Chamard's assertion of Othon in Blachernes by any document, but Theodore's letter (Note 11 above) about the Shroud in Athens already in 1205 does indicate Othon's possession prior to that year.

By summer of 1204, Othon emerged as a personal representative of the Marquis Boniface de Montferrat, who nearly became the first Latin Byzantine Emperor. Baldwin of Flanders was elected, and Boniface was compensated by possession of Thessalonika. This, in effect, made him the overlord of a kingdom comprising most of mainland Greece, for which he paid feudal homage to Baldwin.<sup>19</sup> In November of 1204, he appointed Othon Lord of Athens.

In 1205, Baldwin was killed, and his younger brother Henry was crowned emperor in August 1206. Soon afterward Othon was personally entrusted with a special mission to the new emperor bearing the offer of Boniface's daughter Agnes in marriage.<sup>20</sup> It is an attractive possibility that in the joyous generosity of this event (ceremony in Hagia Sophia, reception in the Imperial Palace), Henry awarded (or confirmed) the Shroud to Othon's protection. The question is not so much *whether* Othon received the Shroud but only about when and how he received it.

In April 1209, after helping to reduce Greek resistance led by (the same) Theodore of Epirus in the Peloponnese, Othon arrived as a conqueror at Henry's important council at Ravenika. In May, Henry visited Othon for two

days in Athens. He was accompanied by Pons de Chaponay de Lyon, his fiscal agent and “shuttle diplomat,” who had already accomplished missions in the West to profitably dispose of relics, precious fabrics, and imperial jewels in France. The bonding of the three men continued when Othon escorted Henry on his journey to Euboea.

Logic demands that Othon would have shipped the Shroud or carried it home to Burgundy. Sometime, either in 1206 or in 1219, it arrived at his (13) Burgundian Chateau de Ray-sur-Saône near Besançon. Michele Bergeret and now Alessandro Piana have provided evidence that (14) this was the permanent home of Othon’s Shroud. They have introduced photos of a wooden chest labeled in recent times as that in which the Shroud was “brought back by Othon de Ray in 1206.” The great Byzantine scholar, Eduard Riant<sup>21</sup> noted that this Pons de Chaponay was sent to Burgundy in 1219 on an undefined but important mission. Given Pons’s other special assignments and the friendly relationship that existed between Emperor Henry and Othon, it is not too brash to suppose that in 1219 Pons might have delivered Othon’s precious relic to his Chateau de Ray.

I have preferred this latter option for several reasons. The first is that document of 1207, the year when Nicholas of Otranto was in Athens and asserted that he saw it personally. I have shown above that he did not see it among the relics in Constantinople, and that the context of the reference to the Shroud was his enumeration of relics lost or stolen in the Fourth Crusade. A second reason is the fact that Othon’s military and administrative activities, not least of which were the negotiations for the wedding of the daughter of Othon’s lord Boniface of Montferrat to Emperor Henry, would have required his presence in Thessalonika and Constantinople during 1206 and 1207. There

seems little or no time for the long voyage to Castle de Ray and back to Athens during these years.

Othon died in 1224. (15) Though no written document attests to Othon's return home,<sup>22</sup> (16) Alessandro Piana has presented a replica in the chateau of an actual tomb-memorial, whose epitaph reads: "Under this stone is buried Othon de Ray. Pray God that the enemy no longer can surprise him."<sup>23</sup>

A short historical digression may serve to indicate what major events could become factors in the itinerary of the Shroud in France. From 1309 to 1377 the papacy resided at Avignon; French popes pursued a French foreign policy. By 1377 there must have been few alive who had ever known a papacy that was truly the spiritual leader of *all* Europe's Christians. After 1377 rival popes in Rome and in Avignon claimed the allegiances of Catholics in what is called the "Great Western Schism."

The location of Besançon rendered it a hotbed of all the political and religious dichotomies of the times. Sometime capital of Burgundy, the city straddled France and the German Holy Roman Empire in its geography and politics. A French party constantly worked for the city's annexation by France and for the legitimacy of the French anti-popes. A German party strove for Besançon's continued attachment to the Empire and, not surprisingly, supported the popes in Rome. The Vergy family was among the pro-French faction in Burgundy.

#### **THE YEARS 1351 TO 1354 MARK THE WINDOW WHEN GEOFFROY OBTAINED THE SHROUD FROM JEANNE DE VERGY**

Besançon's historians wrote that on March 6, 1349, a fire in St. Stephen Cathedral resulted in the apparent destruction--certainly, the disappearance--of their Shroud and the loss of all church documents attesting to the

circumstances of its arrival in that city. Safe in the chateau, the Shroud survived the fire and would have been accessible to (17) Jeanne de Vergy (c.1320-1388?), descended from Othon and with her family's proper claim to ownership. In 1349 she could deal with the Shroud in the same way that the Savoys exercised their family's ownership of the Shroud well into the 20<sup>th</sup> c. The powerful Vergy family had a virtual lock on the post of seneschal in Besançon from 1191 to 1310.<sup>24</sup> Bro. Hilary de Cremiers,<sup>25</sup> especially, has supported my own research in the Wuenschel Shroud Archives (with thanks to Fr. Adam Otterbein) giving virtual certainty that soon after the fire, Jeanne carried the Shroud out of Burgundy and subsequently to her marriage to Geoffroy I de Charny between 1351 and 1354. All the evidence for the ever-silent Geoffroy's acquisition of the Shroud leads neatly to his second wife, Jeanne de Vergy. This is what was not said in the Charnys' vague "reward freely given." It would have been unwise to announce that Lirey now possessed Besançon's lost precious relic.

In 1929, Noguier Malijay suggested a variation on this theme, namely that Jeanne de Vergy brought the Shroud out of Burgundy, thereby saving it for France. Malijay argued further that she presented it first to the French king, Philip VI de Valois (d. 1351), who in turn awarded it to Geoffroy de Charny, his trusted *porte-d'oriflamme* (banner bearer) as a major relic to be placed in the as yet unfinished new church at Lirey and as a wedding present that was--again--"freely given." In any case, the question of the Shroud of Jesus in Besançon and its transfer to Lirey has a decidedly political dimension.<sup>26</sup>

## **COULD GEOFFROY HAVE ACQUIRED THE SHROUD IN THE 1340S?**

**In the interest of thoroughness, let us consider if Geoffroy could have obtained the Shroud in the 1340s. During most of that decade Geoffroy was pursuing his career as a fighting knight in western France. He suffered his first British imprisonment in the battle of Morlaix in 1342. During this time, as a man (*bachelor*) of modest means--not yet advantaged by Vergy wealth and not yet the king's *porte-d'Oriflamme*--he considered praying for a miracle. The tradition is well-known that he vowed to build a church to the Virgin if he should ever be freed. He *was* released from that imprisonment--whether by ransom or escape--in 1343, when, with financial aid from the same King Philip, work began on his Lirey church.**

**In 1345-46 he was present on the Smyrna (Turkey) Crusade. Back in France, he again saw battle as the banner-bearer for King Philip from 1347 to 1349. The end of the decade found him again imprisoned from December 31, 1349, until mid-1351. This time his ransom was paid by Philip's son King John the Good, and Geoffroy needed no miracle. All this leaves little time for a wedding.<sup>27</sup>**

**Dorothy Crispino, who has vigorously denied the validity of the Besançon thesis, has found a request by Geoffroy I to Pope Innocent VI on August 3, 1354, for permission to have a cemetery by his (18) new Lirey church. I have found his letter in the writings of Ulysse Chevalier.<sup>28</sup> As Dorothy has put it, Geoffroy “changed his mind” about where he wished to be buried--and his new choice was in this new graveyard. She is sure, and I can agree fully, that the reason was his obtaining possession of the Shroud about that time. Dorothy's valuable evidence places any acquisition of the Shroud by Geoffroy in the 1340s in serious doubt.**

.....

Ian Wilson<sup>29</sup> noted that in 1355 Geoffroy gave a receipt “as lord of Savoisy and Montfort,” titles and properties acquired via his marriage to Jeanne, for the removal of the Shroud from Lirey on account of the dangerous presence of the British in the Hundred Years War (1337-1453). In 1356, after Geoffroy’s death, ownership of the relic was exercised by Jeanne, since Wilson also notes that Geoffroy II was still a minor in 1356. It remained safe in their castle of Montfort from 1356 to 1389. Jeanne’s death must have occurred during this period, for Bishop d’Arcis’s *Memorandum* of 1389-90 named Geoffroy II as displaying the Shroud in Lirey falsely as the true Shroud of Jesus.

The absence of any mention of the Shroud in the earliest documents (1343-1353) of the Lirey church and the (19) presence of the Vergy arms on the famous Seine medallion point to Vergy ownership and Jeanne’s delivery of the Shroud from Besançon. No other theory of the missing 150 years has ever explained so efficiently--or at all--how Geoffroy wound up with the Shroud.

## SHROUD CONFUSIONS

(20) In 1624 J. J. Chifflet, Besançon’s first historian, convinced that the original Shroud was consumed in the St. Stephen fire, wrote that in 1377 it was miraculously discovered in a niche in the new cathedral. In 1902, based on the (21) illustrations of the Lirey and Besançon shrouds from Chifflet’s book, Vignon wrote that the Shroud of Besançon was clearly a replica of that of Lirey, made between the years 1349 (the fire) and 1375. Besançon’s own historian Dom François Chamard (1902)<sup>30</sup> agreed--though he was not forthcoming about how Lirey had obtained the original.

Remember how Bishop d’Arcis complained in 1389 that in Lirey an artist had “painted” an imaged shroud? Now we can demonstrate that there

really was a copy of the shroud painted by an artist. It was most likely commissioned by Jeanne, now the Lady of Lirey, and sent in 1377 as a replacement for the one she had taken out of Besançon in 1349. I will have more on this in the exciting conclusion of my paper.

## **BASIS OF OPPOSITION TO THE BESANÇON HYPOTHESIS**

Opposition to Besançon is largely the result of the loss of records. What shall we make of the fact that local scholar Chifflet in 1624 knew nothing of Othon? (It is time to play the “lost documents card,” and we will understand the reasons.) Recall the loss of virtually all church records from the fire in 1349. This means that in Chifflet’s time there were no documents attesting to the role of Othon in the Shroud’s arrival in Burgundy. Then comes the strongly anti-clerical French Revolution. J. Gauthier, authoritative archivist of Besançon, was *not* a defender of his town’s ever possessing the true Shroud of Jesus. Ca. 1901 (56) he wrote the following about the French Revolutionaries.

And when . . . the delegates of the departmental directory of Doubs threw to the fire or shredded . . . all the administrative records of the diocese over four centuries . . . this destruction . . . *reduced by about nine-tenths the sources* of the Archbishopric . . . [Now] all together they form only 534 articles . . . from 1412 to 1790.<sup>31</sup>

This destruction of all ecclesiastical records before 1412 immediately announces the obstacles in the path of Chifflet as he attempted to reconstruct the history of the Shroud in his city from a few isolated documents. Jeanne’s role in removing the Shroud about 1350 is also lost. Chifflet knew only that it had “disappeared” after the fire. A few of his isolated documents referred to the Shroud’s rediscovery in a niche in the church in 1378. Chifflet could see it

**in his day: a cloth with a clumsy frontal only image of the body of Jesus looking so much like the true Shroud still in Lirey that Vignon said Besançon's was surely a copy of Lirey's. This frontal-only "replacement" shroud of 1377 was singled out in the official account of those events in 1794 as having been torn into bandages.**

**My next point is supremely important: it needs to be understood that writers who casually reject the Besançon hypothesis have focused *only* on the replacement copy of 1377 with its frontal-only image. (It was the Lirey "painted" copy mentioned by Bishop d'Arcis in 1389. Those detractors have wasted many pages proving what nobody denies--that the later shroud in Besançon was not the Shroud of Turin. In short, these "refutations" have not disproved the original Shroud sent to Burgundy from Athens.<sup>32</sup>**

**This present fresh approach to the Besançon hypothesis provides answers to some major issues in Shroud history. Besançon's possession of the replacement shroud explains why the city did not more strenuously claim prior ownership of the Lirey Shroud. They had the copy and believed it to be the rediscovered original. In 1624 poor Chifflet, well aware of Lirey's Shroud, opined that there had been two real Shrouds, one for carrying the body and one for wrapping it.**

**A frequently used argument against Besançon's one-time possession of the present Shroud of Turin is that the earliest extant record of it in the city dates from 1523. However, to be accurate, this was a reference to (22) the city's Easter ritual, in which the city's shroud played a role. Nobody says Besançon *first received* a shroud in 1523. Chifflet thought that the ritual already was used in Besançon "before the union of St. John and St. Stephen in 1253," and that it was "renewed" in 1523.<sup>33</sup> Consider that the question has never been asked as to why, given the Shroud's adverse notoriety in Lirey in**

the 14th c. and its possession in 1523 by the powerful Savoy family in Chambery, Besançon should seriously enter the “shroud business” in that year. Besançon’s claim on the Shroud of Jesus makes sense only if the city previously had possession of the original.

Chifflet did not mention Othon. But he was clear when he wrote: “The fire burned up the [Shroud and] the details of the Shroud’s arrival: i.e., the means, the time, and the carrier.”

The next episode seems to be a patent and deliberate conspiratorial contrivance. However, instead of destroying the Besançon thesis, it rather strengthens it. Chifflet wrote that in 1377 the cloth in its chest was rediscovered by means of a strange light coming from a hidden part of the cathedral. Judging from the lapse of 28 years (1349-1377) between the fire and “rediscovery,” there could not have been many in Besançon who knew precisely what the original had looked like. *Here comes my exciting conclusion.*

Archbishop Guillaume III de Vergy (1371-91), was the fifth in line since the fire. That is to say, four archbishops, who might have been able to compare the replacement cloth with the original, had died. In order to determine if it was the same true burial Shroud of Christ previously lost, Chifflet relates that the cloth newly found in 1377 was placed upon a corpse, which miraculously sat up and began giving Shroud lectures. (☺) It was thus a Vergy who “verified” by a “miracle” that the new Besançon replacement shroud was indeed the original Besançon *Shroud*. Is anyone thinking “family cover-up”? Nobody doubts that the *new* cloth residing in Besançon until its destruction in 1794 was only the painted copy, and Vignon has so described it. There supervenes the history of the Shroud at Lirey, the Shroud whose continuity extends to the present day, the Shroud which is beyond a doubt

**identifiable as the Shroud of Turin. Besançon's claims to possession of the true burial wrapping of Christ thus gradually evaporated.**

## **SUMMARY**

**All of the mysteries surrounding the initial appearance of the Turin Shroud are by no means solved by these historical revelations, but new insights may have been gained into the mind that produced the d’Arcis Memorandum and about its weakness as a document always adduced by sindonoclasts in attempts to refute the authenticity of the Shroud.**

**You may judge if the case for the Shroud in Besançon during the lost years remains merely a hypothesis. It offers documents that actually name the Shroud, which other hypotheses do not. It has a reasonable provenance from Constantinople via Othon. It affords us the moment and circumstance for Geoffroy de Charny’s acquisition of the cloth, which no other hypothesis could do. I hope to have shown that the Besançon hypothesis is the only one that truly fills the chronological void commonly called “the missing years” of the history of the Shroud of Turin.**

**Daniel Scavone, University of Southern Indiana, Evansville**

.....

## NOTES

1 Wilson (1978).

2 Reinach (1911); M. Barber (1983); Frale (2001); Partner (1982).

3 Barbara Frale, *op.cit.* (118-132 and Chapter 3) has revealed the accusatory protocol initiated by King Philip the Fair as “fluid,” a work always in process, the charges capable of increasing as the poor knights and lowly brothers uttered statements that permitted new avenues of interrogation. So, an initial basic list of seven charges had grown to 87 in Cyprus and to 127 in some places. Frale has called this the “terrible mechanism of power.”

4 See Pingonius. Du Teil, (25f.). See the full argument at <[www.shroud.com](http://www.shroud.com)>.

5 Dubarle (1998); Hilda Leynen, (1991). Her paper, which discusses the *Grande Chasse*, is an extract from *Soudarion* (Bruges, 1991) trimestral revue published in Flemish. Here it is translated into French, and in fall of 1993, from French to English by Dan Scavone.

6 See Mazzucchi for the first clear reference to the Shroud in Constantinople in 958. Yet there exists no record--no celebration--of the arrival of the Shroud. This led Ian Wilson to hypothesize, correctly, I think, that the Mandylion had been unfolded and revealed as the Shroud. In order to conserve the 900-year-old Abgar legend, another cloth (*tuaile*) was sealed inside one of two *vaissiaus* seen hanging by chains from the ceiling of the Pharos Chapel by Clari in 1203. See Ordericus in Von Dobschütz; Gervase in Banks and J. W. Binns.

7 Vidier gives the first inventory of the Ste-Chapelle as 1279. It says: “*Item: A painted wooden box in which is a great sanctuarium without a label.*” The next three are dated 1341, 1349, 1363. In none of them is a towel in a *tabula* mentioned, nor is the above quote mentioned, nor “*la sainte trelle in tabula.*”

Mme. Leynen herself noticed the inconsistent descriptions of this crucial object, and she described a supreme confusion, that in an inventory dated 1534, *toella* has become *La sainte trelle inserte a la table (ou est la face de Nostre Seigneur)*. *Trelle* is either a copyist's error for *toella* or signals the discovery of only a trellis, which was the classic decoration framing the face of Christ in the artists' copies inspired by the Mandylion of Edessa.

8 See Chifflet (1624); Vignon (1902, 64-76); Fr. Paul de Gai (1973); and Dorothy Crispino (1985).

9 M. Buttigieg (1990); Bro. Hilary de Crémiers (1991); Michel Bergeret in *CIELT* (1993); and now Alessandro Piana in *BSTS Newsletter* (2007). See also Piana, *Sindone: gli anni perduti* (2007).

10 See the translation of the *Memorandum* in Wilson (1978, 230-235) from the original in Fossati (1961, 213- 219).

11 Pasquale Rinaldi (1983); Scavone "Documents" (1989). The letter was rediscovered in the archive of the Abbey of St. Caterina a Formiello, Naples; it is folio CXXVI of the *Chartularium Culisanense*, originating in 1290, a copy of which came to Naples presumably as a result of close political ties with the imperial Angelus-Comnenus family from 1481 on. See also Longnon (1949, 118).

12 Karlheinz Dietz (personal letter), citing Polemis (89f.), is essentially correct about the nomenclature of Theodore of Epirus. But other scholars are not so insistent. Theodore himself could use Doukas, Angelos, and Comnenus sometimes together and sometimes interchangeably. Polemis concedes, with Stiernon, only that after Theodore's fall from power did his contemporaries call him by Angelos. See Wolfe (240). The use of the name Angelos and the credibility of Theodore's letter in 1205 are supported by the following. In 1202, when the Western princes launched the **Fourth Crusade** from **Venice**, **Alexius IV**, the son of the deposed Isaac II, appealed to the crusaders, promising to end the **schism** of **East and West**, to pay for their transport, and to provide military support to the crusaders against their original target,

Egypt, if they helped him to depose his uncle and to sit on his father's throne. Moreover, Alexius V Doukas Mourtzouphlus, had initially led the resistance to the crusading forces. The name Angelos was decidedly more popular in the West than Doukas.

13 Wolfe (214 and *passim*).

14 Nicholas of Otranto, Abbot of Casole (c.1155-1235), should be distinguished from a younger contemporary poet of the same name. Our Nicholas was also known as Nectarius and as Nicholaus Hydruntinus. See Longo and Jacob; also Hoeck and Loenertz; Gerland (133-37, n. 40); Norden (183-87, n. 40); and Heisenberg (1923, 8-12, n. 42). Cardinal Benedict was then Bishop of Porto, on the Tiber opposite Ostia, and of S. Rufina, two hamlets united by Pope Callixtus II (1119-1124).

15 Riant, *Exuviae* II (233f., n. 2), gives both the Greek and Latin versions:

*quum capta esset a Francingenis regalis civitas . . . et in scevophylachium Magni Palacii tamquam latrones, ubi sancta posita erant, scilicet: preciosa ligna, spinea corona, Salvatoris sandalia, clavis, et fascia (que et nos postea oculis nostris vidimus) aliaque multa invenerunt . . .* (Riant's parentheses—no reason given).

Nicholas' own Greek translation of the above text has no parentheses. The Moscow MS published by Bishop Arsenij, Greek only, with Russian translation (Novgorod, 1896, 41), does not have the word [h]ύστερον, "later," which is in Riant's Greek text, from Leo Allatius, *Examen de libris ecclesiasticis Graecorum* in Fabricius (Vol. V, 151f.). The present interpretation takes his neuter plural relative pronoun *que* (*quae*) in Latin, [h]atina in Greek, to refer only to *fascia* /σπάργανα, "burial linens." See also Fabricius (Vol. XI, 288f.). See also Heisenberg (1923, especially 10, n. 1) from the first treatise of Nicholas of Otranto on the procession of the Holy Spirit.

16 For the linguistic evidence placing the Shroud in Athens, see Scavone "Documents" (1989), now accepted by Bonnet-Eymard (1989), Zaccone

(2000), and Raffard de Brienne (2000, 427), but doubted by Dubarle (1998). These last, however, have other destinations in mind for Othon's Shroud.

17 Chamard (40f.).

18 Robert de Clari (par. 92). These passages prove that Clari knew a painting when he saw one. His words are evidence that he did not "see" the *sydoines* as a painting.

19 Villhardouin (ch. 12-13); W. Miller (28f.).

20 Villehardouin (ch. 19, par. 450), in Shaw (146-148). See Henri de Valenciennes, in Longnon (1948, 108 and n. 2).

21 See Bergeret and Piana. Riant (1875, 87). Also Riant (1878, Vol. I, clxiii), in which latter place he suggests the delivery in Burgundy of the "Saint Suaire de Besançon" by Ponce de Chaponay de Lyon in 1219. Chamard (43f.) thought this was the natural explanation of the presence of Othon's *Suaire* in Burgundy "as a moral certitude." Alas, though I agree with Chamard, he spoke here with an inordinate confidence. See the case for the arrival of the Shroud from Athens in 1206 in Piana (2007, 59 and 71).

22 Longnon (1949, 118).

23 Piana, *BSTS* (18). The text reads MOLA SUB ISTA CI PREMITUR OM(ni)S RAIANI OTHO ROGATE DEUM NE PREMAT HOSTIS EUM.

24 See Chamard (49) and Legrand (1985, 9). By the present interpretation, Jeanne de Vergy could establish her family's ownership of the Shroud in 1354. It is not clear that Geoffroy I could assume any right of ownership by virtue of his marriage to Jeanne, though Zaccone (2000, 407), has suggested a certain *jus patronatus* conferred on

**Geoffroy I “and his successors” by Pope Innocent VI in 1354 by virtue of his founding of the collegiate church at Lirey. Wilson (1978, 173) also thought Jeanne may have originated the Shroud’s expositions at Lirey in 1357, after Geoffroy’s death. This is certainly possible, judging from the absence of the Shroud in the founding documents.**

**25 Cremiers, *op. cit.* (note 9 above).**

**26 Noguier Malijay (1929).**

**27 Crispino, (Sept.-Dec. 1988); Leynen (1998); Contamine (1992); Contamine (1973).**

**28 Crispino, *SSI* (Vol. 1, 1982). Chevalier (1903, 28).**

**29 Wilson (1998, 278f.). Vignon (1902, 57) places the venue of the safekeeping of the Shroud at St. Hippolyte-sur-Doubs. He cites Chevalier (1900, 24), who in turn cited Chifflet (1624, 107), that Marguerite, granddaughter of Geoffroy, showed it each year in Burgundy, in a meadow outside the town of St. Hippolytus on the banks of the Doubs (. . . *traditione fertur, Sindonem illam quotannis publicae ostendi solitam extra S. Hippolyti sanum in aperto quodam prato, ad ripam Dubis, quod vocant Domini pratum*). See also Bergeret.**

**30 Vignon (1902, 62-76). Chamard’s summary has been drawn from his excellent concluding chapter, 95-101. Essentially, his recitation of the adventures of the Constantinople-Athens- Besançon-Lirey Shroud agrees with that of the present survey, with only minimal points of contention.**

**31 J. Gauthier, *Collection* (ca. 1901, iv), authoritative archivist of Besançon. (Translation and italics mine).**

*Et quand, suivant l'exemple malheureusement donne par les feudistes ou les faiseurs d'inventaires (detruisant comme fatras inutiles des milliers de comptes et de chartes) les delegates du*

*directoire departemental du Doubs jettent au feu ou au chiffonnier tous les registres de la chambre archevêpiscopale, c'est-à-dire l'administration du diocèse pendant quatre siècles. Les destructions infiniment regrettables qui réduisirent des neuf dixièmes environ les fonds de l'Archevêché et du Chapitre de Besançon en 1793--au point que réunis, ils forment seulement 534 articles--ont heureusement laissé survivre et des inventaires et des cartulaires précieux, et les registres de délibérations du Chapitre de 1412 à 1790.*

32 Most recently Zaccone (1996, 108-112) has also written pages to prove that which is already accepted by all: that the new shroud in Besançon from 1378 (Chifflet) and cited again in 1523 was a copy. Raffard de Brienne (1994) has done the same in his brief and cursory review of Chamard. The Bibliothèque Municipale de Besançon was kind enough to send me the microfilm of MS 826 for research. It has two parts: “In favor of the authenticity of Besançon’s shroud” and *Dissertation qui Prouve que le S. Suaire de Besançon n’est pas Authentique*, which focused almost entirely on the “replacement” shroud and therefore did not prove that the original Shroud (from Othon in Athens) was a fake.

33 Chifflet (55) and Chamard (44, n. 1).

## REFERENCES

- Arsenij, Episkopos. *Nikolaya Gidruntskayo (Otrantskayo), Igumena Grecheskayo Monastyrya V(y) Kazulakh(y)* (Novgorod, 1896). [This is the Moscow MS of Nicholas of Otranto, in Greek only, with Russian translation.]
- Babinet, Robert. “La Profession de Foi en Jésus-Christ des Derniers Templiers.” *La Pensée Catholique*, vol. 281 (Mar.-Apr. 1996): 49-74.
- Banks, S. E., and J. W. Binns. *Gervase of Tilbury, Otia Imperialia: Recreation for an Emperor* (Oxford: Clarendon Pr., 2002).
- Barber, Malcolm. “James of Molay, the Last Grand Master of the Order of the Temple.” *Studia Monastica*, vol. 14 (1972): 91-124.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The New Knighthood*. (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 1994).

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Templars and the Turin Shroud." *Shroud Spectrum International (SSI)*, 6 (March, 1983): 16-34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Trial of the Templars*. (Cambridge: University Pr., 1978).
- Baroche, Charles (Association des Amis de Vergy). "Jeanne de Vergy et le Saint-Suaire." *Gazette de Vergy*, 7 (Dec., 1972): 11-13.
- Belting, Hans. "An Image and Its Function in the Liturgy: the Man of Sorrows in Byzantium." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 34-35 (1980-81): 1-16.
- Berard, Adam, ed. *History, Science, Theology and the Shroud* (Proceedings of the St. Louis, Missouri, Symposium, 22-23 June 1991) (Amarillo: Man in the Shroud Committee of Amarillo, 1991).
- Bergeret, Michel. "Le Trou Historique: 1204-1357," paper presented at the C.I.E.L.T. Symposium in Paris in 1993.
- Bloomfield, B. C., ed. *Middle East Studies and Libraries: A Felicitous Volume for Professor J. D. Pearson* (London: Manse, 1980).
- Bongert, Yvonne. "The Hungarian Pray Manuscript." *CIELT Revue*, 55-56 (July-August 1994): 3-4.
- Bonnet-Eymard, Bro. Bruno. *The Catholic Counter-Reformation in the XXth Century*, No. 217 (March, 1989): 8ff; also especially, no. 237-238 (April, 1991).
- Brereton, Geoffrey, ed. & trans. *Froissart Chronicles* (London & New York: Penguin, 1981).
- Bulst, Werner, and Heinrich Pfeiffer. *Das Turiner Grabtuch und das Christusbild* (Frankfurt am Main: Knecht, 1987).
- Buttigieg, M. "La Lettera del Vescovo Pierre d'Arcis." *Collegamento Pro Sindone* (Sept.-Oct. 1990): 33f.
- Camuzat, Nicolaus. *Promptuarium Sacrarum Antiquitatum Tricassinae dioecesis* (Troyes: 1610). [On Henri de Poitiers, 207-212; on Pierre d'Arcis, 217-228, where each page covers a *verso* and a *recto* and thus should be counted for two pages.]
- Carles, R. P. Alcide. *Histoire du Saint Suaire de Notre-Seigneur, Jesus-Christ, conservé dans l'ancienne église abbatiale de Cadouin, en Périgord, et des tous les autres linges funèbres du Sauveur* (Paris: 1875).

- Cary, Earnest, trans. *Dio's Roman History*, 9 vols. (London: Heinemann, 1927).
- Castan, d'Auguste. *Notes sur l'Histoire Municipale de Besançon (1290-1789)* (Besançon: Dodivers, 1898).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "La Première Éntrée des Archevêques de Besançon sous l'Ancien Régime." *Memoires de la Societe d'emulation du Doubs* (1875): 207-232.
- Chamard, François. *Le Linceul du Christ* (Paris: Oudin, 1902).
- Chevalier, Ulysse. *Autour des Origines du Suaire de Lirey, avec documents inedits* (Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1903).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *La Croisade du Dauphin Humbert II--1345-1347* (Paris: Auguste Picard, 1920).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Étude Critique sur l'Origin du St Suaire de Lirey-Chambéry-Turin* (Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1900).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Le Saint Suaire de Turin: Est-il l'Original ou un Copie?* (Chambery: 1899).
- Chifflet, Iohannes Iacobus. *De Linteis Sepulchralibus Christi Servatoris: Crisis Historica* (Antwerp: 1624).
- 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 (1992): 107-121.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "L'oriflamme de Saint-Denis aux XIVE et XVE siècles." *Annales de l'Est*, vol. 7 (1973): 179-244.
- Crispino, Dorothy. "Doubts Along the Doubs." *Shroud Spectrum International (SSI)*, 14 (March, 1985): 10-24. [SSI is her own periodical, edited by Crispino.]
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Emperor's Scissors." *SSI*, 19 (June 1986): 26-31.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Excerpts from 'The Palace Revolution of John Comnenus' by Nicholas Mesarites." *SSI*, 17 (Dec. 1985): 23-27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Geoffroy de Charny in Paris." *SSI*, 24 (Sept. 1987): 13-18.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "To Know the Truth." *SSI*, 28-29 (Sept.-Dec. 1988): 24-40. [On the text *Pour Scavoir*.]
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Why Did Geoffroy Change His Mind?" *SSI*, I (Dec. 1981): 28-34.
- Csocsan Varallja, Eugene. "The Turin Shroud and Hungary." *Ungarn-*

- Jahrbuch*, 15 (1987): 1-49.
- Currer-Briggs, Noel. *The Shroud and the Grail* (NY: St. Martin's Press, 1987). [Postscript dated May 1987.]
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Shroud in Greece," unpublished typescript (March 1987).
- de Crémiers, Hilary. "The Holy Shroud Refound--From Constantinople to Lirey (1204-1354)." *Catholic Counter-Reformation*, 238 (April 1991): 42-47.
- De Gail, Paul. *Histoire religieuse du linceul du Christ* (Paris: Editions France-Empire, 1973).
- de Malijay, Noguier. *Le Saint-Suaire de Turin* (Paris: Spes, 1929).
- Dembrowski, Peter F. *La Chronique de Robert de Clari: Étude de la Langue et du Style* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Pr., 1963).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sindon in the Old French Chronicle of Robert of Clari," *Shroud Spectrum International*, 2 (March 1982): 13-18.
- Des-Guerrois de Jesus, M. N. *La Saincteté Chrestienne* (Troyes: Jean Jacquard, 1637). [Bishop Henri de Poitiers is discussed on pages 372-379; Pierre d'Arcis on pages 381-385, where each page covers a *verso* and a *recto* and thus should be counted for two pages.]
- Despois, Eugene. *Le Vandalsime Révolutionnaire* (Paris: 1888).
- Diehl, Charles. *Manuel d'Art Byzantin* (Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1910).
- Dietz, Karlheinz. "Einige Hypothesen zur Frühgeschichte des Turiner Grabtuchs," in Scannerini and Savarino, eds. (2000): 325-378.
- Dio Cassius. See Cary, Earnest.
- d'Orival, François. *Le Saint Suaire de Besançon, Antiquité, Miracles, et Veneration d'iceluy* (Besançon manuscript, 1610).
- Dubarle, A.-M. *Histoire ancienne du linceul de Turin Jusqu'au XIIIe siècle* (Paris: O.E.I.L., 1985).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "L'Homélie de Grégoire le Référendaire pour la Réception de l'Image d'Édesse." *Revue des Études Byzantines*, 55 (1997): 5-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "La Première captivité de Geoffroy de Charny et l'acquisition du Linceul." *Montre-nous ton Visage*, 8 (1992): 6-27 (rp. In Dubarle-Leynen, ch. V).
- Dubarle, A.-M., and Hilda Leynen. *Histoire ancienne du Linceul de Turin 944-1356*, tome 2 (Paris: F.-X. De Guibert, O.E.I.L., 1998).

- Du Cange, Charles. *Historia Byzantina, Part II, Descriptio Urbis Constantinopolitanae* (Paris: Ludovicus Billaine, 1680).
- Dunod de Charnage, F. I. *Histoire de l'Église, Ville et Diocese de Besançon* (Besançon: Marchands Libraires, 1750): 401-425.
- Du Teil, Joseph. *Autour du Saint-Suaire de Lirey* (Paris: Picard, 1902).
- Ebersolt, Jean. *Monuments d'Architecture Byzantine* (Paris: Leroux, 1934).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sanctuaires de Byzance* (Paris: Leroux, 1951).
- Étaix, R., and De Vregille, B., S.J. “Les Manuscrits de Besançon, Pierre-François Chifflet et la Bibliothèque Bouhier.” (After 1964): 27-39. [Journal in Wuenschel Archives but not identified.]
- Fabricius, Johannes Albertus. *Bibliotheca Graeca* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, vol. XI (1967); rp. of 1712).
- Félibien, Michel, and Guy Alexis Lobineau. *Histoire de la Ville de Paris*, 5 vols. (Paris: Desprez et Desessarts (1725).
- Fine, John Van Antwerp. *The Late Medieval Balkans: A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century* (Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Pr., 1994).
- Fohlen, Claude. *Histoire de Besançon des origines à la fin du XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris: Nouvelle Librairie de France, 1964).
- Foley, Charles. “The Besançon Cloth.” *Sindon*, vol. I, (n.s.) (1989): 63-70.
- Fossati, Luigi. “Copies of the Shroud,” *Shroud Spectrum International*, 12 (Sept. 1984): 7-23 and 13 (Dec. 1984): 23-39.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Lirey Controversy.” *SSI*, 8 (1983): 24-35. [Translation by Daniel Scavone; additional text inserted by Dorothy Crispino.]
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Lirey Controversy.” *SSI*, 8 (1983): 24-35. [Translation by Daniel Scavone; additional text inserted by Dorothy Crispino.]
- \_\_\_\_\_. *La Santa Sindone: Nuova Luce su Antichi Documenti* (Torino: Borla, 1961).
- Frale, Barbara. *L'Ultima Battaglia dei Templari* (Rome: Viella, 2001).
- Froissart. *Chronicles*. See Johnes, 1901; also Brereton, 1981.
- Gauthier, Jules. *Archives Départementales et Archives Communales du Doubs, for 1882-1883* (Besançon: 1883).

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Archives Departmentales et Archives Communales du Doubs, for 1895-1896* (Besançon: 1896).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Collection des Inventaires sommaires des Archives Departmentales anterieures a 1790* (Departement du Doubs: Archives Ecclesiastiques, no date, but ca. 1901).
- \_\_\_\_\_. “L’Eglise et les Monuments de l’Abbaye Cistercienne d’Acey.” [I obtained this article incomplete from the Wuenschel Archive; the name of the journal was not available.]
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Étude Archeologique sur la Cathedrale St.-Etienne de Besançon.” (1901): double pagination 6-14 and 452-460. [I obtained this article incomplete from the Wuenschel Archive; the name of the journal was not available.]
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Notes Iconographiques sur le Saint-Suaire de Besançon.” *Acad. des Sciences, Belles-Lettres et Arts de Besançon* (1884): 288-327, esp. 290-293 for d’Orival citation.
- Gerland, Ernst. *Geschichte des Lateinischen Kaiserreiches von Konstantinopel* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966).
- Germanos. See Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 98.
- Gervase of Tilbury. See Banks and J. W. Binns.
- Gould, Karen. “The Sequences *de Sanctis Reliquiis* as Sainte-Chapelle Inventories.” *Medieval Studies*, XLIII (1981): 315-341.
- Grabar, Andre. “Les peintures murales dans le choeur de Sainte-Sophie d’Ochrid.” *Cahiers Archéologiques*, 15 (1965): 257-265.
- Green, Maurus. “Enshrouded in Silence.” *The Ampleforth Journal*, XXIV (Autumn 1969): 321-343.
- Guillaume, J. “La Saint-Suaire de Besançon.” *La Révolution française*, vol. 1, no. 1 (14 July 1902): 5-16. [Contains a transcript of the *Procès-Verbal* and other documents on the destruction of the Besançon shroud in late 18th c.]
- Gwatkin, Henry M., gen. ed. *Cambridge Medieval History* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1924-36).
- Halkin, François. *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca* (Bruxelles: Soc. Bollandistes, 1957).
- Harnack, Adolf. “Der Brief des britischen Königs Lucius an den Papst

- Eleutherus." *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 26 (1904): 909-16.
- Heisenberg, August, ed. *Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Kaisertums und der Kirchenunion. Tome I. Der Epitaphios des Nikolaos Mesarites auf seinem Bruder Johannes* (Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1923).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Nikolaos Mesarites, die Palastrevolution des Johannes Komnenos* (Würzburg: Koenigl. Universitätsdruckerei von H. Stürtz, 1907).
- Hoeck, Johannes W., and Raimond J. Loenertz. *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto, Abt von Casole. Beiträge zur Geschichte der ost-westlichen Beziehungen unter Innocenz III und Friedrich II* (Ettal: Buch-Kunstverlag, 1965).
- Hopf, Carolus (=Charles). *De Historiae Ducatus Atheniensis Fontibus* (Bonn: Eduard Weber, 1852).
- Hopf, Charles. *Chroniques greco-romaines inedites ou peu connues* (Paris: 1873; rp. Brussels: Impression Anastaltique Culture et Civilisation, 1966).
- Howarth, Stephen. *The Knights Templar* (New York: Dorset Pr., 1982).
- Iliopoulou-Rogan, Dora. "Sur une Fresque de la Période des Paléologues." *Byzantion*, vol. 41 (1971): 109-121.
- Imbs, Paul. "Enygeus." *Bulletin bibliographique de la Société [Arthurienne] internationale*, 6 (1954): 59-71.
- Janin, Raymond. *La Géographie Ecclesiastique de l'Empire Byzantine*, vol. 3, *Les Eglises et les Monasteres* (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1953).
- Johnes, Thomas. *Froissart: Chronicles of England, France, Spain, etc.*, 2 vols. (London and New York: The Colonial Press, 1901).
- 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).
- Kessler, Herbert L., and Gerhard Wolf, eds. *The Holy Face and the Paradox of Representation*. (Bologna: Nuova Alfa, 1998). [Papers from a Colloquium Held at the Bibliotheca Hertziana, Rome, and the Villa Spelman, Florence, 1996.]

- King, J. E., trans. *Baedae, Opera Historica*, 2 vols. (London: Heinemann, 1930).
- Ladu, A., ed. *La Datazione della Sindone: Atti del V. Congresso Nazionale di Sindonologia*. (Cagliari: Edicar Service, 1990).
- La Favia, Louis. *The Man of Sorrows: Its Origin and Development in Trecento Florentine Painting* (Rome: Sanguis, 1980).
- Legrand, Antoine. *Le Linceul de Turin* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1980).
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Le Linceul de Turin: Quinze Siècles de Voyages.” *Notre Histoire*, 17 (Nov. 1985): 6-11.
- Lespinasse, Renè. *Cartulaire de la Charité-sur-Loire* (Paris: H. Champion, 1887).
- Le Tournier, René. *La Cathédrale de Besançon* (Paris: Henri Laurens, 1967).
- Leynen, Hilda. “Á propos du Mandilion.” *Soudarion* (1991).  
[Soudarion is a Flemish journal published in Bruges. Pere Dubarle kindly sent me a French translation.]
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Pour Scavoir la Vérité.” In Dubarle-Leynen (1998): 113-138.
- Longnon, Jean. *Les Compagnons de Villehardouin* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1978).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *L'Empire Latin de Constantinople et la Principauté de Morée* (Paris: Payot, 1949).
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Henri de Valenciennes: Histoire de l'Empereur Henri de Constantinople* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1948).
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Les Premiers Ducs d'Athènes et Leur Famille.” *Journal des Savants* (Mar.-June 1973): 61-80.
- Longo, Augusta Acconcia, and André Jacob. “Poesie di Nicola d'Otranto nel Laur. Gr. 58.2.” *Byzantion*, 54 (1984): 371-379.
- Mazzucchi, Carlo Maria. “La testimonianza piú antica dell'esistenza di una Sindone a Costantinopoli.” *Aevum*, 57 (1983): 227-231.
- McNeal, E. H., trans. *Robert de Clari, The Conquest of Constantinople* (New York: Columbia Univ. Pr., 1936; rp.1966).
- Michelet, J., ed. *Le Procès des Templiers*, 2 vols. in the *Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France* (Paris: 1841-51).

- Miller, E. "Reliques de Constantinople: Part I." *Journal des Savants* (May 1978): 292-309.
- Miller, William. *The Latins in the Levant* (London: 1980).
- Miranda, Salvador. *Les Palais des Empereurs Byzantins* (Mexico: 1965).
- Morgan, Rex. "Did the Templars Take the Shroud to England? New Evidence from Templecombe." In Berard (1991): 205-232.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Was the Holy Shroud in England?" *Shroud News*, 42 (August, 1987): 3-17.
- Murray, Stephen. *Building Troyes Cathedral* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Pr., 1987).
- Nicol, Donald M. *The Despotate of Epiros* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957).
- Norden, Walter. *Das Papsttum und Byzanz* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1958; rp. of 1903).
- Ordericus Vitalis. See Von Dobschütz.
- Oursel, Charles. *Petite Histoire de Bourgogne* (Paris: Arthaud, 1945).
- Partner, Peter. *The Murdered Magicians* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1982).
- 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): 49-120.
- Petit, Ernst. *Histoire des Ducs de Bourgogne*, 4 vols. (Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus, 1976; rp. of Dijon, 1889).
- Piana, Alessandro. "The 'Missing Years' of the Shroud." *BSTS Newsletter* (2007): 9-31.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sindone: gli anni perduti* (Milano: Sugarco Edizioni, 2007).
- Pingonius, Emanuel Philibert. *Philiberti Pingonii Sabaudi Cusiacen. Baronis Sindon Evangelica* (Turin: Sons of Nicolas Bevilaqua, 1581; rp. 1777).
- Piquard, Maurice. "Les archevêques de Besançon et le Saint-Empire romain germanique (1052-1674)." *Mémoires d'Académie de Besançon* (1934): 58-78.
- Pisanu, Giovanni, o.f.m. "La Storia e la Sindone di Torino." In A. Ladu (1990): 199-238.

- Polemis, Demetrios. *The Doukai* (London: Univ. of London Athlone Pr., 1968).
- Raffard de Brienne, Daniel. "Les ducs d'Athènes et le Linceul." In *Non fait de main d'homme: Actes du IIIeme Symposium Scientifique International du CIELT at Nice* (1997): 171-172.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Geoffroy de Charny's Journey to the East." In Scannerini and Savarino (2000): 427-430.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "L'Histoire et le Linceul." *La Lettre Mensuelle du C.I.E.L.T.*, 57-58 (Sept.-Oct. 1994).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Review of Dom François Chamard, *Le Linceul du Christ, étude critique et historique*" (Paris-Poitiers: Oudin, 1902). In *Revue Internationale du Linceul de Turin*, Sommaire no. 15-16 (year not available): 53.
- Reinach, Salomon. "La Tête Magique des Templiers." *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 63 (1911): 25-39.
- Riant, Eduard. *Depouilles Religieuses Enlevées a Constantinople au XIIIe Siècle par les Latins et des Documents Historiques Nés de leur Transport en Occident* (Paris: 1875).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Exuviae Sacrae Constantinopolitanae*, 3 vols. (Geneva: 1878).
- Richard, M. *Histoire des Dioceses de Besançon et de Saint-Claude*, 2 vols. (Besançon: Cornu, 1847-51).
- Robert de Clary. *La conquête de Constantinople*. See Hopf (1873; rp.1966). Engl. trans. E. H. McNeal (1936; rp,1966).
- Rolland, Jacques. *L'Assassinat Programmé des Templiers* (Paris: Éditions La Table d'Émeraude, 1999).
- Savio, Mons. Pietro. *Ricerche Storiche sulla Santa Sindone* (Torino et al.: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1957).
- Scannerini, Silvano, and Piero Savarino, eds. *The Turin Shroud: Past, Present and Future* (Turin: Effata Editrice, 2000). [Acta of meeting held in Turin, Italy, 2-5 March 2000.]
- Scavone, Daniel C. "Geoffroy's Vow and the Church at Lirey," *Australian Shroud News*, 40 (1987): 4-7. Also in *Sindon*, 1 (n.s.) (1989): 129-132.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Greek Epitaphioi and other Evidence for the Shroud in Constantinople up to 1204." In Bryan Walsh, ed., *Proceedings of*

- the 1999 Shroud of Turin International Research Conference* (Richmond, VA: Magisterium Press, 2000): 196-211.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Hundred Years of Historical Studies on the Turin Shroud." In Alan Adler, Isabel Piczek, and Michael Minor, eds. *The Shroud of Turin: Unraveling the Mystery*. Proceedings of the 1998 Dallas Symposium. (Alexander, NC: Alexander Books, 2002): 58-70.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Note on the Name of the Pharos Chapel in Constantinople." *Australian Shroud News*, 61 (October 1990): 10-12.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review in *BSTS Newsletter*, 46 (Nov.-Dec. 1997): 35-42 of Robert Babinet, "La Profession de Foi en Jesus-Christ des Derniers Templiers," in *La Pensée Catholique*, 281 (Mar.-Apr. 1996): 49-74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Review of Recent Scholarly Literature on the Historical Documents Pertaining to the Turin Shroud and the Edessa Icon." CD-ROM. Emanuela Marinelli and Angelo Russi, eds., *Proceedings of the Sindone 2000 International Shroud Congress in Orvieto, Italy* (San Severo: Gerni Editori, 2001).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Shroud in Constantinople: The Documentary Evidence." *Sindon*, vol. I (n.s.) (1989): 113-128. Also in Sutton (1989): 311-329. [Cited as "Documents."]
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Shroud of Turin: Opposing Viewpoints* (San Diego: Greenhaven Press, 1989).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "La Sindone di Torino, Othon de la Roche, Besançon, and the D'Arcis Memorandum." *Collegamento Pro Sindone*, part 1 (Jan.-Feb. 1993): 28-45 and part 2 (Mar.-Apr. 1993): 28-48.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Turin Shroud from 1200 to 1400." W.J. Cherf, ed. *Alpha to Omega: Studies in Honor of George John Szemler on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Chicago: Ares Publishers, Inc., 1993): 187-226. [Earlier version of the present paper.]
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ugo di San Ghislain, le Nove Porte di Rame e la Santa Sindone." *Collegamento Pro Sindone*, part 1 (Sept.-Oct. 1989): 13-28 and part 2 (Nov.-Dec. 1989): 25-40.
- Setton, Kenneth M., ed. *A History of the Crusades*, 6 vols. (London and Madison, Wisconsin: Univ. of Wisconsin Pr., 1969).
- Shaw, M. R. B., trans. *Joinville and Villehardouin: Chronicles of the*

- Crusades* (New York: Penguin, 1963).
- Ștefănescu, J. D. *L'Illustration des Liturgies dans l'art de Byzance et de l'Orient* (Brussels: Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales, 1936).
- Stiernon, Lucien. "Les Origines du Despotat d'Épire." *Revue des Études Byzantines*, 17 (1959): 90-126.
- Sutton, Robert F. Jr., ed. *Daidalikon: studies in memory of Raymond V. Schoder, S.J.* (Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Pubs., 1989).
- Viard, Jules. *Les Journaux du Trésor de Philippe VI de Valois suivi de l'ordinarium Thesauri de 1338-1339* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1899).
- Vidier, A. "Le Trésor de la Sainte-Chapelle." *Mémoires de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris et de l'Ile-de-France*, vols. 34, 35, 36, 37 (Paris: H. Champion, 1907-1910).
- Von Dobschütz, Ernst. *Christusbilder: Untersuchungen zur christlichen Legende* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche, 1899).
- Walter, Christopher. *Art and Ritual of the Byzantine Church* (London: Variorum, 1982).
- Whanger, Mary, and Alan. *The Shroud of Turin: An Adventure of Discovery* (Franklin, TN: Providence House Pubs., 1998).
- Wilson, Ian. *The Blood and the Shroud* (New York: The Free Press, 1998).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Cavalieri Templari e la Sindone: da Costantinopoli alla Francia." *Collegamento pro Sindone* (Nov.-Dec., 1999): 10-25.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Turin Shroud* (London: Gollancz, 1978).
- Wolfe, Robert Lee, and Harry W. Hazard, eds. *The Later Crusades, 1189- 1311*, vol. II of Setton (1969).
- Wuenschel, Fr. Edward, C.Ss.R. Unpublished papers. The Wuenschel Archive at Mt. St. Alphonsus Center, Esopus, NY.
- Zaccone, Gian Maria. "The Shroud from the Charnys to the Savoys." In Scannerini and Savarino (2000): 379-412.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sindone di Torino e sindone di Besançon, appunti per una ricerca parallela." *Sindon*, n.s., 9-10 (1996): 107-116.