

**THE ATLANTA INTERNATIONAL CENTER  
FOR CONTINUING STUDY OF  
THE SHROUD OF TURIN, INC.  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA**

**THE SHROUD AND HEALING**

**1999 (Revised) ©**

**Albert R. Dreisbach, Jr.**

*All rights reserved. No part of this manuscript may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without notarized permission in writing from the author.*

## ABSTRACT

Though students of the Shroud are most familiar with its Power to heal via the role of St. Jude (*i.e.* Addai) in the Abgar Legend, there are "spy-clues" in both the canonical texts (e.g. **Acts 19:12**) and various works from the New Testament Apocrypha (e.g. *The Lament of the Virgin*, *The Martyrdom of Pilate*, the *Cura Sanitatis Tiberii* and the *Mors Pilati*) which support such power. In the course of examining these materials, one discovers that the "woman with the issue of blood" (**Mk. 5:21-43; Mt. 9:20-22; Lk. 8:40-56**), known as **Bernike/Bernice** in the East becomes **Veronica** in the West. According to the fifth century Makarios of Magnesia, **Bernice** is even described as "**a princess of Edessa.**"

In a veritable literary "persistence of memory", Arthur Edward Waite notes not only does Veronica's Cloth become an alternative to the Shroud in the West, but he goes on to conclude that:

**The story of the Veronica Cloth**, of the *Sudarium*, and of the healing of the a Roman Emperor **is the root matter of the earliest historical account of the Holy Grail**; and this fact has led certain scholars to infer that **the entire literature [*i.e.* the Holy Grail] has been developed out of the Veronica Legend**, as part of a Conversion Legend of Gaul, according to which the holy women, took ship to Marseilles and preached the Gospel therein. They carried the *Volto Santo* and other Hallows [**Emphasis added.**] (1961, pp. 341-42). [**Note:** supplement with reference(s) to the Grail's healing properties.]

Returning to the sixth century, further study reveals that the Persian King Khusraw - involved in the siege of Edessa in A.D. 544 - is alleged to have used a copy of the Edessa Image to heal his daughter of a demon. Four centuries later the *Epistola Abgari* (ca. A.D. 900) records a story where, after a thief had stolen the mandylion and thrown it in a well, "the sick, especially non-Christians, bathed in the waters of the well and were healed of elephantiasis, leprosy and 'Abgar's disease,' gout."

Those who tend to dismiss such apocryphal sources would do well to heed C. Milo Connick's caveat that such material "tends to exhibit - one of two characteristics: amplification of a tradition found in the canon or heavy indebtedness to some special interest group in the Christian community. From the cure of Abgar's "leprosy" to the restoration of Longinus' sight and on to the "resurrection" of the Good Thief, sources in the New Testament Apocrypha give witness to both the continuing presence and the healing power of the linen burial cloth believed by many to have survived and today known as the Turin Shroud.

## THE SHROUD AND HEALING

St. Jude Thaddeus [**Slides 1 & 2**] owes his title as "The Patron Saint of Lost Causes" or "The Helper of the Helpless" to the ancient legend wherein he is dispatched to King Abgar of Edessa with a "portrait" of Jesus on a linen cloth which miraculously cures that ruler of his "leprosy." In gratitude, Abgar [**Slide 3**] converts to Christianity, Edessa becomes one of the earliest centers of that faith and the healing power of the long Shroud is thus established.

Though this legend long has been known to students of the Shroud, what has not been so readily acknowledged by them is the possibility that it may well have its root origins in the more familiar healing by Jesus Himself of "**a woman who had a flow of blood for twelve years (Mk. 5:21-43; Mt. 9:20-22; Lk. 8:40-56)**" [**Slide 4**].

This *haemorroissa* is first named in Chapter 7 of the second or fourth century work called the *Acts of Pilate*<sup>1</sup>. In the Greek manuscript of the same she is called **Bernike/Bernice**, while in the Latin version she is named **Veronica** [**Slide 5**]. Makarios of Magnesia (ca. A.D. 400) identifies her as a *princess of Edessa*<sup>2</sup> while Moses of Khrone (ca. 5th to 8th c.) even goes so far as to name her as *Abgar's queen*. [*Italic added*].<sup>3</sup>

In examining the biblical account of the *haemorroissa*, Davies and Allison provide us with a seminal clue about this seemingly unnamed woman:

“Unlike the normal Jewish aversion to women with a discharge of blood {See Lev. 15:19-25. *m. Zabim* 5.1,6 and *m. Zabim* 4.1}, Mt 9:18-26 seems to offer a contrast. The woman with an issue [of blood] is offered in a wholly positive light. The subject of her uncleanness is not mentioned or alluded to. Onlookers do not whisper that Jesus has come into contact with an unclean woman. All this is surprising..”<sup>4</sup>

Other scholars have been quick to point out that the healing of Jairus' daughter and that of the *haemorroissa* have been combined and purposefully weighted with deep theological significance. Most modern biblical scholars conclude that these seemingly independent “healings” were later purposely woven together. Linguistic analysis of the two stories reveals different styles of composition: Mark's account of the raising of Jairus' daughter uses the historical present, short sentences and few participles, whereas his version of the healing of the *haemorroissa* has the more usual aorist and imperfect tenses, participles and longer sentences

In what follows, I am deeply indebted for the insights set forth by a variety of scholars, especially C.S. Mann and Lamar Williamson.

### **Analysis of Key Words:**

1. **Daughter** - an affectionate term used with both the child and the **woman with the issue of blood** - with the latter to reassure her that she is now part of Israel. Remember that such a woman would be "**unclean**" and had to be separated from Israel.
2. **Twelve** - In the Lucan version of these events the **twelve years** links the two stories and what happens to the **woman sick for twelve years** becomes a **sign** of what will be done for **the twelve-year-old girl**.
3. **Mk. 5:42** "The Greek of *got up (anesté)*, despite its New Testament associations with the resurrection of Jesus, should be treated in Mark's text with caution. Luke's Greek admits of no such caution, and he regarded the narrative as one of resurrection."<sup>5</sup>
4. **Mk. 5:23,28 & 34** "The Greek verb (s\_z\_) translated "make well" in this passage...is usually translated "save" in the New Testament. In the present passage it retains a nuance of more than physical wholeness, for it stands over against a more common word for physical healing with its cognate term for a healer."<sup>6</sup>

What we may really be dealing with here in the combining of these two stories is a post-resurrection midrashic retelling or construction of "events". The story of Magdalene's healing is told without naming her. It may even be a description of the initial event responsible for her becoming a devoted follower of Jesus. Later she becomes the initial discoverer of the empty Shroud marked with the body's image and the bloody marks of the Passion/Resurrection. "If" as will be argued later in this paper the secret of the Shroud's survival is to be maintained to avoid its confiscation and destruction by its enemies, then the combining of these two stories avoids the overt proclamation of the burial linen's survival while simultaneously proclaiming the "gospel" of its ultimate healing. Like Elijah and Elisha who preceded him, Jesus also has restored a child to life. Like Elijah's mantle, Jesus' *himation* (i.e. *shroud*) has "healed" one which it has touched just as it was with Mary Magdalene the *haemorroissa* and will be later in the case with King Abgar of Edessa.

We discover yet another potential clue in this connection of the *haemorroissa*/Magdalene/Veronica in a work known at least from the third or fourth century. In the (Copt.) *Book of the Resurrection of Christ by Bartholomew the Apostle*, we find the following description of the discovery of the Empty Tomb:

Early in the morning of the Lord's day the women went to the tomb. They were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James whom Jesus had delivered out of the hand of Satan, Salome, who tempted him, Mary who ministered to him and Martha her sister, Joanna (aka Susanna) the wife of Chuza who had renounced the marriage bed, [and?] **Bernice who was healed of an issue of blood in Capernaum.** [Emphases added.]<sup>7</sup>

Knowing how historical “facts” become confused and/or distorted with the passage of time, this author wonders if the gospels’ lack of specific identification of the *haemorhoissa* is once again responsible for the confusion which lists both her and Bernice as being present at the Empty Tomb? And is it merely by chance that Bernice who becomes the “Veronica” of the West is described as the one “**who was healed of an issue of blood**”? I don’t think so.

Finally, according to Arthur Edward Waite:

there is an Eastern tradition that a leaky boat carried Lazarus, his sisters and some friends to Cyprus where he was made a bishop at Kition. His alleged relics were then transferred to Constantinople in A.D. 890. By the 11th century a legend spread in the West that he had been the Bishop of Marseilles and even martyred under Domitian. While Joseph of Arimathea is supposedly consecrated by Saint Philip and dispatched to England where he founds a church at Glastonbury, Lazarus with the Magdalene continues to remain in Gaul. What is so striking here is that in this tradition we also find a connection with the Legend of the Holy Grail. **Lazarus and his party, including Mary Magdalene, land in the south of France carrying the Face-Cloth [*i.e.* the Veronica in the West] with them.. [Emphasis added.]**<sup>8</sup>

To continue with this potential connection of the *haemorhoissa*/Magdalene in the East with “Veronica” and her cloth in the West, we now turn Fr. Maurus Green, O.S.B. According to Fr. Green:

The Veronica story is almost certainly the Roman version of the exchange of letters between the sick King Abgar of Edessa and Jesus...In the earliest Roman version, the *Cura Sanitatis Tiberii* (600 A.D.), the Emperor **Tiberius** (emperor A.D. 14-37) [**Slide 6**] is afflicted with leprosy [*i.e.* the identical malady suffered by his eastern counterpart, King Abgar)...In a later work of uncertain date called the *Mors Pilati*, Veronica ...decides /to have His portrait painted...Jesus asks for the canvass, presses it to his face, and returns it to her with His image miraculously imprinted upon it. He had done exactly the same for Hannan, King Abgar's envoy.<sup>9</sup>

Susan Haskins may have uncovered yet another potential “spy clue” in noting that:

According to “In the Russian Orthodox church of Mary Magdalene at Gesemane, **Mary Magdalene [Slide 7]** appears in a large nineteenth century wall painting presenting the Emperor Tiberius with a red egg and greeting him with the words, ‘Christ is Risen’. The iconography derives from a well known legend in Orthodoxy which tells of her journey to Rome.”<sup>10</sup>

Thus we have a potential hint that in its original Orthodox version, “Veronica” of the West may originally have been Mary Magdalene and/or the *hemorrhissa* of the East.

When we do search the past for the origins of this legend, students of the Shroud will be quick to note that it is Eusebius (ca. A.D. 260-340) who informs us in his *Ecclesiastical History*, Book VII, Chapter XVIII that Paneas is the home of the *hemorrhissa* and owner of the "statue" of Jesus in that city. According to this account:

At the gates of her house, on an elevated stone, stands a brazen image of a woman on her bended knee, with her hands stretched out before her like one entreating. Opposite to this is another statue of a man, erect, of the same materials, clad in a mantle (diplois) and stretching out his hand to the woman...This statue, they say, is a statue of Jesus Christ, and it has remained even until our times; so that we ourselves saw it whilst raving in that city. <sup>11</sup>

Now it is this **woman with the issue of blood** who is first given the name **Bernike/Bernice /Veronica** in Chapter 7 of the *Acts of Pilate* (ca. 2nd to 4th century A.D.). At this point Judah Segal provides us with the following and highly significant insight:

Significantly, there is confusion between the sacred handkerchief of Edessa in the East and the Veil of Veronica or Bernice of Paneas in Palestine in the West. **The legends of Paneas and Edessa are curiously interwoven.** The evangelist **Addai** is said to have been **born in Paneas - or at Edessa.** ...[and it was] Bernice of Paneas [who] dedicated a statue of Jesus as a thanksgiving offering on being healed from sickness [**Emphasis added**]. <sup>12</sup>

Could it be that the Magdalene was the original woman with "the issue of blood" who went on to stand by the cross at the Crucifixion [**Mk. 15:40**] and was the first to discover the Empty Tomb and the Resurrection [**Jn. 20:1; 11-20**]?

*If* such a reconstruction is possible, then it would encompass the following:

1. Acknowledge the prominent role of the Magdalene as faithful disciple and initial discoverer of the Resurrection.
2. Hint at the *healing power* of Christ's garment (*i.e.* robe/Shroud) for those who touched or were touched by it (Cf. Longinus, Pilate, Abgar, *etc.*)
3. Include the role of *blood* - a substance clearly visible from the wounds on the Shroud and symbolic of Christ as the Lamb of Sacrifice.
4. Via the Magdalene's presence at the Empty Tomb, proclaim Christ's post-Resurrection "appearances" in both Jerusalem and the Galilee.

Returning to the Shroud and its association with healing, we discover in Robert de Boron's *Roman* (*i.e.* written after 1191 and before 1202, according to good evidence in the Arthurian Encyclopedia), states that:

...after the Resurrection, the emperor Titus (sic. Boron mistakenly identifies Vespasian who is the actually the father of Titus who ruled from A.D. 79-81 ) sends to Jerusalem for the Holy Prophet to come and heal his son, **Vespasian** (emperor A.D. 69-79) [Slide 8] of his leprosy. The envoys find that Christ has already been put to death, but Pilate, anxious to please the emperor, puts them in touch with a woman of the Jews who has a <<semblance>> of the dead Saviour. She is called Verrine and tells the envoys the following story: <<I had had a **shroud** made (*sydoine*) and was carrying it in my arms and met the prophet on the road I was travelling. He had his hands bound behind him attached to a long rope. When **the Jews** met me they **begged me** by the great God **to lend them my shroud** that they might wipe the prophet's face. At once I took the **shroud** and wiped his face very carefully for he was sweating so freely that it ran all down his body. I went away and they led him off beating and striking him frequently and treating him very badly; nonetheless he made no complaint. And when I went into my house and looked at my **shroud** I found this likeness (*semblance*) there, just as it is formed >> (1593-1614).<sup>13</sup>

Now “*if*” we are safe in assuming that the primary source for Robert’s development of this legend in his *Roman* is both Byzantine and prior to the sack of Constantinople in 1204, then we again may have uncovered a significant “spy clue” defining the Veronica cloth as a **shroud**.

If one continues to pursue Veronica as revealed by history, one discovers that by the fifteenth century she has become the patron of the French cloth-workers’ guild. Lynette Muir goes on to inform us that:

Several nondramatic texts add to the complexity of the Veronica/shroud tradition. The fourteenth century *Livre de la Passion*,<sup>20</sup> ... **introduc...[es her as] a shroud seller who is hoping to sell the shroud to buy medical help for her mother**. When she knows it is for Christ, she gives it freely and **her mother is miraculously healed**. An even more mixed miracle is that found in the late French adaptation of the *Meditationes* attributed to S. Bonaventure.<sup>21</sup> **In this version Veronica [herself] is a leper who at the crucifixion laments she has found Christ too late for him to heal her. The Virgin Mary asks for the *touaille* which is on her head, wipes her son's face with it and gives her the *Veronice*. She is immediately healed. [Emphasis added.]**<sup>14</sup>

Writing in *The Interpreter's Bible*, S. MacClean Gilmour observes:

According to Mark, the sick woman touched Jesus' "garment." Matthew and Luke are more explicit, it was the *fringe* that she touched. ...the loose end of the cloak would have hung over Jesus' left shoulder, and the çiqith attached to it could have been touched by one **who came up behind him**. [Emphasis added.]<sup>15</sup>

Following up on this motif, R.A. Veenker comments that in the ancient Near East, the *hem* of the garment was closely identified with the person of the wearer. It was regarded as an extension of the owner's personality and authority.<sup>16</sup> [Veenker goes on to suggest that in the case

of the *haemorrhoid*...her action may be based on the belief that the power of a person is transferred to the clothing (**Matt. 14:36** m **Mk. 6:56**; **Acts 19-12**). These New Testament citations are particularly significant as revelatory of the belief by the early church that contact with Jesus' garment had and did result in healing. Beyond the more celebrated incident of this **woman with the issue of blood**, **Mark 6:56** reminds us that "The sick...besought him that they might touch even the fringe of his garment and as many as touched it were made well." <sup>17</sup>

Remembering that the *Gospel of the Hebrews* records that Jesus gave the Shroud to **James the Just [Slide 9]** on Easter morn, St. Jerome (ca. 342-420) informs us that the Lord's "brother":

was so deeply venerated by the people that they contended for the honour of touching the hem of his garment. <sup>18</sup>

### THE WORD *SUDARION*

Before proceeding any further, I would like to focus on the use of the word **soudarion** in in connection with *burial*, *resurrection* and *healing*. The point to be made here is not to limit one's approach to a narrow, literalistic definition of that word, but rather to consider the author's intended - or covert meaning - in the literary context in which it is employed.

In making a study of the word **sudarion** (συνδαριον), one is struck by the infrequency of its use. The fact that it is employed in the canonical texts solely by John (**11:44**; **20:7**) and Luke (**19:20**; **Acts 19:12**) *may* point to the Shroud's significance in this area. In other words, the very lack of specificity and detail surrounding its use in these canonical texts may well reflect a conscious effort by these earliest writers to insure the Shroud's physical survival rather than to be taken as "proof" that the Shroud was unknown and of little import to the early church.

Note that in the four instances where John and Luke do employ the word **soudarion**, it is associated with the following phenomena:

- 1. BURIAL** - of (**Jn. 11:44**); of Jesus (**Jn. 20:7**), of the servant's pound (**Lk. 19:20**; Cf, **Matt. 25.-24-25**). Could it be that *one* of the components of the Lazarus story is the use of *sudarion* (συνδαριον) as a "spy clue" to assure the new believers that they too, like their Master, will one day join Him - leaving behind, so to speak, an empty cloth in their empty tombs as "proof" of their own newly achieved resurrected state? John is known to communicate on more than one level with a single word or phrase; and the very "creation" of the incident with Lazarus would greatly facilitate the use of such a symbolic promise of everlasting life.
- 2. RESURRECTION** - of (**Jn-11:44**); of Jesus (**Jn. 20-7**).
- 3. HEALING** - of the sick by Paul (**Acts 19:12**).



It should not be surprising that it is Luke the physician who may well supply us with the best "spy-clue" of all for the influence of the Shroud's healing properties in both the memory and practice of the early church. Though **soudarion** (συδαριον) is used only four times in **all** of the New Testament (**Lk. 19:20; Jn. 11:44; 20:7; Acts 19:11-12**), Luke employs it specifically in the passage from Acts to depict Paul's being empowered by God to continue Jesus' ministry of healing:

And God did extraordinary miracles by the hands of Paul, so that **handkerchiefs** [*i.e.* soudaria; **συδαρια**] or aprons were **carried away from his body to the sick**, and diseases left them and the evil spirits came out. [**Emphasis added.**]

Not only does Luke specifically opt for the plural of the word *soudarion* in this context, but his very phrasing in **vs. 12** that such handkerchiefs were "**carried away from his body to the sick**" might suggest that Luke himself was aware of the Shroud's healing powers. Lest one think that such an interpretation is forced and/or too fanciful, note that Luke also employs the word *soudarion* in **19:20** to describe the "napkin" used by the servant to lay away (*i.e.* "bury") money in the ground.

While debate continues among scholars as to whether John's use of *soudarion* in **20:7** is to be translated as referring to the entire burial shroud or is limited solely to a *chinband* or a *face cloth* like that of Oviedo, in either case such a cloth would have been **buried** (*i.e.* hidden or **laid away in** the ground) at the time of entombment. If one is open to the hypothesis proposed as early as 1939 by the late Theodora Bates Cogswell that John specifically employs *soudarion* as a "code word" signifying the Shroud <sup>19</sup> and if one is also willing to acknowledge Luke's familiarity with some of the Johanine source material, then it may well be that Luke is here making "hidden" reference to the Shroud - a secret known to certain members of the fledgling church. At the same time, those who had no knowledge that the *soudarion's* ordinary meaning of **sweatcloth** or **handkerchief** was a "spy clue" indicating the true source of the shroud's image (*i.e.* possibly the **bloody sweat** from the Garden of Gethsemane; See also the Court of Constantine Porphyrogenitus "*Story of the Image of Edessa*" cited in Wilson's *Shroud of Turin* <sup>20</sup>) would pay little or no attention to such a reference. According to Cogswell, the use of such a "code word" would obscure knowledge of both the Shroud's survival and significance for its opponents. Had the latter been aware of its true meaning, they well might have made a concerted effort to seize and destroy it thus denying the community of believers a veritable linen "proof text" of the Resurrection.

One more hint of the possible use of such cryptic communication when referring to the Shroud *may* be found in G.H.C. Macgregor's observation regarding "the **healing power** of Peter's **shadow...compared with the faith in Paul's 'handkerchiefs'**" (**Acts 19:12**)" <sup>21</sup> [**Emphasis added.**] . It would seem logical to conclude that a **shadow**, like the **hem of** the garment described earlier by Veenker, might also be acknowledged as an extension of its owner's authority and personality. Once again a potential "spy-clue" hinting at just such a connection can be found in Chapter 5 of the Court of Constantine Porphyrogenitus' "*Story of the Image of Edessa*" where we discover that Ananias [aka Hannan] who acts as a courier for his toparch in delivering a letter to Jesus is also

instructed by Abgar to:

bring back to him a **portrait** accurately drawn **of Jesus' appearance so that he [Abgar] might be informed**, as it were **by a shadow**, not only through word of mouth but **also through sight** as well **what he was like who had done these fantastic miracles. [Emphasis added.]**<sup>22</sup>

What makes the above potentially so significant is that the fantastic miracles cited above all have to do with healing.

This author has yet to discover any Jewish precedent for the taking of a cloth to the sick and thereby effecting a cure as witnessed to in the case of St. Paul. Nevertheless, one might consider exploring a possible connection between the use of a **handkerchief** by Paul and the Shroud which Jude Thaddeus brought to King Abgar - a cloth which not only effected Abgar's cure, but also bore on it the '**shadow**' or faint image(s) of the resurrected Jesus.

Is it merely a coincidence that Peter and Paul, both described as valid inheritors of the Lord's commission and power to serve as vehicles for healing in His Name, should have such potentially Shroud-related aspects as **handkerchief** and **shadow** connected with their respective healing ministries. And if it is more than mere coincidence, then what is the primary motivation behind Luke's reference to these two elements and their connection by Jesus' followers with the ministry of healing?

### NON-CANONICAL "SPY-CLUES"

In addition to the canonical scriptures, the New Testament Apocrypha contain a wealth of "spy-clues" for the discerning investigator which affirm the Shroud's healing powers. C. Milo Connick reminds us that just such material:

Tends to exhibit one of two characteristics: amplification of a tradition found in the canon or heavy indebtedness to some special interest group in the Christian community.<sup>23</sup>

Both *The Lament of the Virgin* and *The Martyrdom of Pilate* are potential treasure troves of information pointing to the Shroud and the healing powers attributed to it by members of the early church. Thus, it would seem that these apocryphal accounts bear out both criteria associated with such works noted by Connick. In other words, they reveal both **the amplification of tradition** surrounding the Shroud's role in healing and they also exhibit their **heavy indebtedness to some special interest group** (e.g. Christians aware of the Shroud's survival and its connection with healing).

Just such a clue to the shroud and its significance is quite apparent in *The Lament of the Virgin*. M.A. van den Oudenrijn notes that the Ethiopic mss. of this text which is the most complete version now known:

appears to be no older than the 5th or 6th century, but **older elements may have been worked up in the narrative.** [Emphasis added.] <sup>24</sup>

The sheer frequency of the word for **wrappings** (16 times) and/or **linen** (2 times) for a total of eighteen occasions would seem to testify to the import of the Shroud in that writer's mind.<sup>25</sup>

Of particular interest for the purposes of this paper are two spectacular healings described as having resulted from direct contact with the Shroud:

**1. The restoration of the centurion's (i.e. Longinus) sight [Slide 10]:**

And the centurion...seizing the wrappings... embraced them, and when they, touched his face he immediately saw with his blind eye as before, as if Jesus had laid his hand on it as he had done with the blind man.<sup>26</sup>

**2. The "resurrection" of the Good Thief [Slide 10]:**

Then they took the wrappings that belonged to the Lord Jesus and shrouded the body of that dead man [*i.e.* the Good Thief who earlier had been found by the Jews in a deep well] and shrouded the body of the dead man with them. And Pilate and his soldiers lifted it and placed it in the tomb in which Jesus lay. Then Pilate stretched his hands; and prayed at the door of the sepulchre... When Pilate recited his prayer..., a voice came from the dead man saying: "O my lord Pilate, open to me the door of the tomb in order that I may come out, I was the first to open the door of Paradise. Lift the stone, O my lord Pilate, so that I may come out by the power of my Lord Jesus Christ who rose from the dead"...And Pilate said to him: "From where are you, and who threw you in this well?" And the robber replied saying: "I am the robber who was crucified on His right. I have been deemed worthy of all favours and gifts before My Lord Jesus Christ because of the few comforting words that I uttered while He was on the wood of the cross."<sup>27</sup>

When we move on to examine *The Martyrdom of Pilate*, considered by many to be a second Gamaliel apocryphon like *The Lament of the Virgin*, here too we discover a clue to Pilate's hope for total "healing" (*i.e.* "resurrection") for himself by having his corpse wrapped in a shroud and placed in proximity to Jesus' tomb. According to the text, **Pilate [Slide 11]** instructs his wife as follows:

O my sister Procula, arise and hide in a place on account of what Herod is going to do to me...Watch, however, over my body, if they are bent in taking off my head. Give silver to the soldiers and redeem my body from them, **shroud it, and place it near the tomb of my Lord Jesus** in order that his grace may overtake me. **Do this even if you have to give all my possessions for the purpose.**[Emphasis added.] <sup>28</sup>

Pilate's adamant desire to be enshrouded with his own corpse placed near the Empty Tomb may be the result of an earlier ploy whereby, according to the *Mors Pilati*, the Procurator had successfully protected "himself from Caesar's anger for a long time by wearing the seamless robe of Jesus".<sup>29</sup>

The central point in all three of the examples cited above is not that the healing of the Centurion's eye and/or the "resurrections" of the Good Thief and Pilate are real historical events. Rather, the intended conclusion is that even at the time of the writing of both *The Lament of the Virgin* and *The Martyrdom of Pilate*, **healing** and "**resurrection**" are **associated with the actual** - or, in Pilate's case, replica - **burial wrappings of Jesus**.

Consider that both logically and chronologically, Pilate's instructions to his wife had to have been issued some time after the original Easter morning. Thus, it is not surprising that the creator(s) of these legends - knowing that the actual Shroud had long since been hidden away to avoid seizure and probable destruction - simply had the Procurator giving orders for his own body to be shrouded in the same manner as He who was proclaimed as risen from the dead.

The crucial element in analyzing these non-canonical texts is the persistence of certainty by the early church that **healing** and **Resurrection** itself are somehow intimately associated with an earlier tradition which connects them both with the Holy Shroud. Like **Dali's "Persistence Of Memory"**[Slide 12], the version we encounter here is quite distorted. Nevertheless it is based on a prior and undistorted reality.

Suspiciously like the Image of Edessa/Shroud - both as *acheiropoietos* and healing agent - is the Image of Camuliana (also Kamoulianai or Camulia). According to this legend, a *portrait of Christ* which

fell from heaven to make God's existence credible to a pagan woman, Hypatia, who claimed **she could not believe what she could not see**...The oldest version of the Camuliana picture story was written in Syriac after 560 but before 574 [the year in which it was transferred to the imperial collection in Byzantium. According to a latter version of this legend]...In the days of the Emperor Tiberius II (578-82) **Mary**, a sick widow, who **hoped to be cured by means of the Holy Face**, asked that the "true" **image be lent to her for forty days**. Because of Mary's patrician origin and piety, her wish was granted...her condition deteriorated...**Mary touched it** [the holy picture], and **was immediately healed**. [**Emphasis and double underlining added.**]<sup>30</sup>

**Note:** A legend known from Zacharias of Mytilene and a sermon of pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa (probably ca. 600-750) describes the appearance of an *achieropoietos* image of Christ in Kamoulianai. Zacharias says that it was found (at an unspecified date) floating in a fountain by a pagan woman named Hypatia;

Pseudo-Gregory reports that **Christ himself**, accompanied by all the heavenly powers, appeared to Bassa-Acquilina, wife of the *toparches* of Kamoulianai, washed and dried his face, and **disappeared leaving behind his image on a towel**. Zacharias refers to two *achieropoietoi* copies of the image --one in Caesarea of Cappodocia; another in the village of Dioboulion near Amaseia; in contrast, pseudo-Gregory relates that the image was transferred from Kamoulianai to Caesarea under Theodosios I [**Emphasis and italic added.**] .<sup>31</sup>

The **emphasized** portions of the above quote from Kuryluk give every indication that this legend is an amalgam of different components of the original version connecting Jesus' burial shroud with the cure of King Abgar of Edessa. **Hypatia** becomes a later female version of **Thomas** who, unless she *sees*, will not *believe* (**Jn. 20:25**). **Mary**, the "sick widow", even bears the name of the Magdalene who - according to a Russian Orthodox legend came to be identified as the "woman with the issue of blood" who was healed by touching the fringe of Jesus' garment (**Matt. 9:21-23; Mk. 5:28-29; Lk. 8:43**). And, as a final touch, the **forty days** just happens to be the period chosen by Luke to represent the time between the Resurrection and "ascension" during which Jesus "presented himself alive after his passion by many proofs, appearing to them during **forty** ...(Acts 1:3).

Together with the propensity to combine various aspects of the Shroud's history into a much-redacted version is the penchant for "discovering" the healing powers of cloths associated with Jesus at ever earlier stages in his life. A good example of this practice can be found in the eighth or ninth century Latin text of *The Liber de Infantia* or *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*. In a synopsis of Chapter XIII, M.R. James informs us that upon Mary's arrival at Bethlehem:

An angel made her dismount and enter a dark cave which began to shine. There Christ was born. Joseph was gone to find midwives and brought Zelomi and Salome. Zelomi believed, Salome was incredulous, and her *hand* withered and was *healed by touching the swaddling cloth*. [Italic added.]<sup>32</sup>

Here the incredulity of Salome combined with her *hand touching* the cloth points to her emergence as a female Thomas who virtually says: "Unless I see...and place my hand in his side, I will not believe" (**Jn. 20:25**). However, for those not familiar with the terminology of Orthodox liturgy, Prof. Daniel Scavone reminds use that the Greek word for *swaddling cloths* - *spargana* (plural of *spargon*; **spargan\_w**) - in certain contexts (esp. with "entaphia") "definitely means burial cloths."<sup>33</sup> Ian Wilson not only agrees, but goes on to note: "In my view the normal meaning of the word does not preclude its use symbolically in a funerary context, bearing in mind that Jesus's death was/is also regarded as a rebirth."<sup>34</sup>

One final example of the seeming connection between a "shroud" and resurrection can be found in the thirteenth century's *The Golden Legend* by Jacobus de Voragine. In Voragine's description of the legend of the Magdalen's voyage to Marseilles "in a ship without a rudder," he

describes the ruler of that province seeking "proof" of the faith which she preached. The ruler decides to travel by ship with his pregnant wife to Rome to seek confirmation of what Mary had said from Peter himself. Before they depart, the "Magdalen placed the *sign of the cross* upon their *mantles* to protect them from the snares of the Devil".<sup>35</sup> The ruler's wife dies at sea during a violent storm giving birth prematurely to a son who survives. Grief-stricken, the ruler bribes the crew to put into shore. However, when he attempts to bury them: being unable to dig a grave because the earth was too hard, he spread out his *cloak*, and laid the corpse therein, and placed the infant on his mother's breast...<sup>36</sup>

To make a long story short, after a "visit" with St. Peter to Jerusalem - including "the place of the Passion and the scene of His Ascension" - the ruler sets sail for home and stops at the island where he had deposited the bodies of his dead wife and son. Dumbfounded, he discovers to his great joy that both the child and his spouse are alive.

Shortly thereafter they sailed into the port of Marseilles...found Mary Magdalen...[and] falling at her feet, they told her all that had befallen them: and \*Saint Maximus *baptized* them with all solemnity." [*Italic added.*]<sup>37</sup>

As de Voragine himself would obviously antedate either knowledge of the Genoa Icon in that city and/or the arrival of the Shroud in Turin in 1578, one wonders if just possibly such potential "coincidences" (*i.e.* Turin and Genoa) are simply by chance or possibly the work of a later redactor? As Jacobus did not die until July 13, 1298, he certainly would seem to have had *general knowledge* about the Shroud and, conceivably, *might* have been in possession of more *specific knowledge* of its significance and locale following the fall of Constantinople in 1204.

In summary, the healing powers of the Shroud best known to students of sindonology in the Abgar and Veronica legends *may* also be discerned by careful reading and analysis of certain canonical and apocryphal New Testament texts. The influence of these legends continues to be evidenced as late as the thirteenth century in the writings of Jacobus de Voragine and his *The Golden Legend*. In the examples cited, "spy-clues" to both the Shroud's survival and significance may well have been purposely obscured by their authors to insure the Shroud's preservation during a time of persecution of the early church.

For those who cannot accept all or part of the above hypothesis, the author would be sincerely grateful for alternative analyses which seek to explain:

- A) The connection by the primitive church of the **haemorhoissa** with Bernike/Bernice/Veronica - a legend where, according to the **fifth** century Greek author Makarios of Magnesia, she is alleged to have been a **princess of Edessa**.<sup>38</sup>
- B) The underlying rationale for the original choice and infrequent use of the word **soudarion** in the canonical texts and then only by John and by Luke.
- C) The etiology of Paul's use of **handkerchiefs** (**Acts 19:12**) in the healing

of the sick.

## CONCLUSION

The author makes no case for having made a definitive analysis of these seemingly disparate "spy-clues" from canonical and apocryphal sources which attest to the Shroud's healing powers. Some historians interested in doing further research on the healing of prominent rulers with leprosy might wish to check on a fifth century Armenian text of the **legend of the healing of Constantine [Slide 13]**. According to Louise Ropes Loomis, Duchense believes that the Constantine legend originated early in the fifth century in the Syrian or Armenian communities of the Eastern Church. *Lib. Pont.*, vol. I, pp. cix- cxx....Cf. Coleman, *Constantine the Great and Christianity* for literature on this and related topics [*The Book of the Popes (Liber Pontificalis)*. 1916. New York: Columbia University Press.] See also *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* which informs us that in a later legend which asserts that Pope Sylvester "baptized Emp[eror] Constantine (cleansing him from physical leprosy)." (F.L. Cross (ed.), 1961, p. 1312). What makes this legend potentially significant for sindonology is that once again the Shroud is connected with a major secular ruler in the cure of the latter's "leprosy." Others will no doubt wish to explore accounts of the Persian King Khusraw's use of a copy of the Edessa Image to heal his daughter of a demon.<sup>39</sup>

Still others may choose to examine Basil Bar Shumana's report of a story in which a thief who had stolen the *mandylion* threw it in a well. "Thereafter, the sick, especially non-Christians, bathed in the waters of the well and were healed of elephantiasis, leprosy, and 'Abgar's disease,' gout."<sup>40</sup>

Beyond Edessa, we discover through its historical journeys, stories concerning the Shroud's healing powers continue to be associated with this linen cloth. Even during its translation from Edessa to Constantinople in A.D. 944 we learn that when it reached Samosata:

Countless miracles happened by the agency of the holy image...while on route. Blind men were unexpectedly made to see, the lame were made well again, those who had long been bedridden leapt up, and those with withered hands were made whole again. In short, all diseases and sicknesses were dispelled.<sup>41</sup>

Still later during its triumphal relocation to Byzantium at the monastery of the Holy Mother of God in Optimatan Province,

...the wonder-working image was deposited with due reverence and due ceremony, and many people who came there with a pure intention were cured of their diseases.<sup>42</sup>

It was here also that **a man troubled by an evil spirit [Slide 14]** was made whole - an event depicted in the surrounds of both the **Genoa Icon [Slide15]** and the **Buckingham Mandylion [Slide 16]**. After seeing the shroud's image(s), this newly-healed man is alleged to have

prophesied: "Constantinople take the glory and joy, and you Constantine Porphyrogenitus, your kingdom." <sup>43</sup>

Finally, the "Story of the Image of Edessa" tells us that as the Shroud was being paraded through Constantinople on the day after its arrival:

A man who had been paralyzed in his feet and weak for many years...stood up to see the divine image as it went past. In some marvelous way he was healed at the sight, and...ran up on his own two feet and kissed the container of the image and...glorified God. <sup>44</sup>

Legends concerning the Shroud's healing properties do not end with its disappearance from Byzantium in A.D. 1204 when that city was sacked by the Fourth Crusade. Historians with a more modern focus may wish to study Leo Dupont [**Slide 17**], the 19th century Holy Man of Tours. Here one will discover many cures of the sick. Though not attributed directly to the actual Shroud, these healings are associated with a true likeness of the "Veronica's veil" based on its Holy Face. <sup>45</sup>

In our own century, one might wish to undertake further research on the partial "cure" of the late Josie Woollam [**Slide 18**] of England. Thanks to the dedicated efforts of World War II ace Leonard Chesire, Josie was granted permission to touch the Shroud in its casket in 1953. She subsequently experienced a remission of her osteomyelitis to the extent that she married and became a mother. She did not actually see the Shroud until 1978 when she again journeyed to Turin for its public exposition in that year. <sup>46</sup>

Whatever future scholarship in this area may yield, I am loathe to abandon the apparent connection between the Shroud and the healing power associated with it until a simpler and more cogent case can be made for a theory which accounts for all the elements included in this paper. Granted, it is

ultimately God and not a linen burial shroud who is "The" Source of all healing. Nevertheless, the cloth today kept in Turin - like the hem of the garment touched by the *haemorhoissa* some two thousand years ago - may well prove to be one of the many vehicles by which God chooses to exercise His ministry of healing for those who still need an outward and visible sign on which to focus their petitions for healing based on their faith in the inward and spiritual grace supplied by God to achieve same.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Hennecke, E. & Schneemelcher, W. (eds.), 1965, *New Testament Apocrypha, Vol. 1*. Philadelphia: Westminster, p. 457.

<sup>2</sup> Crafer, T.W. 1919, *The Apocriticus of Macarius Magnes*. New York: Macmillan, p. 31.



- <sup>3</sup> von Dobschütz, E.1899. *Christusbilder*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, p. 114.
- <sup>4</sup> Davies, W.D. and Allison, Dale C. Jr.. 1991. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Gospel According to Saint Matthew, Vol. II*. 1991. Edinburgh: T & T Clark. p. 128..
- <sup>5</sup> Mann, C.S..1986, p.287.
- <sup>6</sup> Williamson, Lamar, Jr. 1983. *Mark: Interpretation, a Bible commentary for teaching and preaching*, p. 110.
- <sup>7</sup> Kuryluk, Ewa. 1991. *Veronica and Her Cloth* , p. 10.
- <sup>8</sup> Waite, Arthur Edward. 1961. *The Holy Grail*, p. 67.
- <sup>9</sup> Green, M. 1966. "Veronica and her veil; The Growth of a Christian Legend." *The Tablet*, Dec. 31, p. 1470.
- <sup>10</sup> Haskins, S. 1993. *Mary Magdalene*, p. 406 n.55.
- <sup>11</sup> Eusebius. 1979. *Ecclesiastical History*, p. 289.
- <sup>12</sup> Segal, J. 1970. *Edessa: The Blessed City*, p. 77.
- <sup>13</sup> Muir, L. 1982. "The Holy Shroud in Medieval Literature." *Sindon. No. 31, Anno XXIV*, pgs. 28-29.
- <sup>14</sup> Muir, *op cit.*, p. 32.
- <sup>15</sup> Gilmour, S.M. 1952. "Exegesis - The Acts of the Apostles." *The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 8*. New York: Abingdon, p. 161.
- <sup>16</sup> Veenker, 1976. "Hem". *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (Supplementary Volume)*. Nashville: Abingdon, p.401.
- <sup>17</sup> Veenker, *ibid.*, p.402.
- <sup>18</sup> Ryan, G., tr. and Ripperger, H.L. 1941. *The Golden Legend of Jacobus de Voragine*. London: Longmans, Green & Co., p. 262.
- <sup>19</sup> Cogswell, T.B. 1935. "Reconciliation of the Shroud with the Gospels." Unpublished manuscript, p. 3.
1939. "The Known History of the Shroud of Turin." Unpublished manuscript, pp. 2-5.
- <sup>20</sup> Wilson, 1979, p. 278. Here in the "*Story of the Image of Edessa*" we find: "And so receiving the likeness from the apostle [*i.e.* the "Portrait"/Image of Edessa/Mandyllion /Turin Shroud from Jude Thaddeus] and placing it reverently on his head [*i.e.* King Abgar's], and applying it to his lips, and not depriving the rest of the parts of his body such a touch, immediately he felt all parts being marvelously strengthened and taking a turn for the better; his leprosy cleansed and gone."
- <sup>21</sup> Macgregor, 1952. "Exegesis - The Acts of the Apostle." *The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 9*. New York: Abingdon., p. 80.
- <sup>22</sup> Wilson, 1979. *The Shroud of Turin (rev. ed.)*. Garden City, NY: Image, p. 275.
- <sup>23</sup> Connick, C.M. 1978. *The New Testament: An Introduction to its history, literature and thought (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. Encino:CA, Dickinson, p.114.
- <sup>24</sup> Hennecke, *op. cit.*, p. 510.
- <sup>25</sup> Mingana, 1928. *Christian documents in Syriac, Arabic, and Garshuni with two introductions by Rendel Harris. Woodbrooke Studies, Vol. 2*. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons (Reprinted from the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 5 Vol. 12, 1928*), pp. 179-210.
- <sup>26</sup> Mingana, *op cit.*, p. 206. **Note:** An alternative version cited by Malcom Godwin (*The Holy*

*Grail: Its Origins, Secrets and Meaning Revealed*. 1994. New York: Viking Penguin, p. 51)  
“has it that Longinus was a blind Roman centurion who thrust the spear into Christ’s side at the crucifixion. Some of the blood fell upon his eyes and he was healed...The prototype for this story is to be found in the Norse of Hod, the blind God who slew the hero Balder. The feast day of the Blessed Longinus falls on the Ides of March, the same day devoted to Hod.”

<sup>27</sup> Mingana, *op cit.*, pp, 208-209.

<sup>28</sup> Mingana, *op cit.*, p. 253. Cf. p. 274.

<sup>29</sup> Hennecke, *op. cit.*, p. 484.

<sup>30</sup> Kuryluk, E. 1991. *Veronica and Her Cloth*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell, pp. 30-32.

<sup>31</sup> Kazhdan, A. *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, Vol. 2.*, 1991, New York: Oxford University Press, p. 1099.

<sup>32</sup> James, M.R.(Trans.).1989. *The Apocryphal New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, p. 74).

<sup>33</sup> Personal e-mail dated 12 Nov 1997.

<sup>34</sup> Personal e-mail dated 12 Nov 1997.

<sup>35</sup> Ryan, G., tr. and Ripperger, H.L., *op. cit.*, p. 358.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. v.

<sup>37</sup> Ryan, G., tr. and Ripperger, H.L., *op. cit.*, 359-60. **Note:** It is hardly likely that \* **St.**

**Maximus** could have been involved in any way given the fact that neither St. Maximus the "Confessor" (c.580-662), Gk. theologian and ascetic writer nor St. Maximus, Bishop of Turin (c.380-c.470) would have been alive in the first century. Note that Jacobus was elected Archbishop of Genoa in 1288 a position which he did not accept until four years later in 1292. There may be some confusion here regarding the Shroud and the Image of Genoa, kept since the late 14th c. at the Church of St. Bartholomew of the Armenians in that city. The latter is generally thought to have been given to the Genoese doge Leonardo Montaldo by the Byzantine Emperor John V Paleologus, and Montaldo, when he died in 1384, bequeathed it to the church in his will. (See Wilson, 1991. *Holy Faces: Secret Places*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, p. 86.)

<sup>38</sup> Crafer, *op cit.*, p. 31

<sup>39</sup> Segal, *op. cit.*, p. 73, f.n. 3..

<sup>40</sup> Segal, *op cit.*, p. 250.

<sup>41</sup> Wilson, 1979, *op. cit.*, p. 287.

<sup>42</sup> Wilson, *ibid.*

<sup>43</sup> Wilson, *ibid.*

<sup>44</sup> Wilson, *op cit.*, p. 289.

<sup>45</sup> Scallan, D. 1990. *The Holy Man of Tours: The life of Leo Dupont (Rev. Ed.)*. Rockford, IL: Tan. Cf. Wilson, 1991, *Holy Faces; Secret Places*.

<sup>46</sup> Chesire, G.L. 1956. *Pilgrimage to the Shroud.*. New York: McGraw Hill.

### SLIDES

1. **St. Jude Thaddeus (Addai)** - contemporary statue depicting portrait of Christ in rondo
2. **St. Jude** - Presentation of portrait by Addai to King Abgar of Edessa (Icon, ca. A.D. 950. Monastery of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai.

3. **Destruction of Pagan Idols by Abgar following his conversion** - Genoa Icon surround. Chapel of St. Bartholomew, Church of the Armenians, Genoa.
4. **Healing of the Woman with the Issue of Blood** - Late 3<sup>rd</sup> c. Cemetery of S.S. Peter and Marcellinus, Rome.
5. **Veronica** - 15<sup>th</sup> c.. The National Gallery, London.
6. **Tiberius** - Emperor A.D. 14-17. Gold coin struck A.D. 15. Museo Nazionale, Rome.
7. **Mary Magdalene** - 13<sup>th</sup> c.. Galleria Dell Academia, Florence.
8. **Vespasian** - Official Portrait. Museo, Nazionale, Rome.
9. **St. James the Just/Pious** - First bishop of Jerusalem. "Brother" of Jesus. Late 15<sup>th</sup> c.. Russian Museum, Leningrad.
10. **Longinus & the "Good Thief"** - Rabula Gospels. Mss. Illustration of A.D. 586. Florence, Italy.
11. **Pontius Pilate** - "Judgment of Pilate", 4<sup>th</sup> c. sarcophagus. Latin Museum, Rome.
12. **Salvador Dali** - "Persistence of Memory", 1931.
13. **Constantine the Great** - Ten times life size. Forum Romanum, Rome.
14. **A man troubled by an evil spirit** - Genoa Icon surround. Chapel of St. Bartholomew, Church of the Armenians, Genoa.
15. **Genoa Icon & Byzantine silver-gilt Frame** - Frame from the Palaeologuan-period (ca. A.D. 1261-1453). Genoa Icon, Chapel of St. Bartholomew, Church of the Armenians, Genoa.
16. **Buckingham Mandylion** - Collection of the Queen's Pictures, 17<sup>th</sup> c.. Buckingham Palace.
17. **Leo Dupont** - Holy Man of Tours, 19<sup>th</sup> c..
18. **Josie Woolam & Group Captain Leonard Chesire** - 1953.

### REFERENCES

- Chesire, G.L. (1956). *Pilgrimage to the Shroud*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cogswell, T.B. (1935). Reconciliation of the Shroud with the Gospels. Unpublished manuscript.
- (1939). The Known History of the Holy Shroud of Turin. Unpublished manuscript.
- Connick, C.M. (1978). *The New Testament: An Introduction to its history, literature and thought (2nd. ed.)*. Encino, CA: Dickinson.
- Crafer, T.W. (1919). *The Apocriticus of Macarius Magnes*. New York: Macmillan.
- Cross, F.L. (Editor) (1958) *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Davies, W.D. and Allison, Dale C. Jr.. `991. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Gospel According to Saint Matthew, Vol II*. 1991. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Eusebius Pamphilus. 1979. *Ecclesiastical History, Popular Edition*. (Trans. Christian F. Cruse). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Gilmour, S.M. (1952). "Exegesis: The Gospel according to St. Luke." *The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 8*. New York: Abingdon.
- Godwin, M. (1994). *The Holy Grail: Its Origins, Secrets and Meaning Revealed*. New York: Viking Penguin
- Green, M. (1966). "Veronica and her veil: The growth of a Christian legend." *The Tablet, Dec. 31, 1470-1471*.

- Haskins, Susan. 1993. *Mary Magdalene*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Hennecke, E. & Schneemelcher, W. (Eds.). (1965). *New Testament Apocrypha, Vols. 1 & 2*. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Kuryluk, Ewa. 1991. *Veronica and Her Cloth*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell, Inc.
- Macgregor, G.H.C. (1952). "Exegesis- The Acts of the Apostle., *The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 9*. New York: Abingdon.
- Mann, C.S. 1991. *The Gospel According to Mark, The Anchor Bible, Vols. 26 & 27*. New York: Doubleday.
- Mingana, A. (1928). *Christian documents in Syriac, Arabic, and Garshuni with two introductions by Rendel Harris. Woodbrooke Studies, Vol. 2*. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons (Reprinted from the "Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 5 Vol. 12, 1928).
- Muir, Lynette R. (1982). "The Holy Shroud in Medieval Literature." *Sindon* 24:24-36.
- Ryan, Granger and Ripperger, Helmut. 1941. *The Golden Legend of Jacobus de Voragine, translated and adapted from the Latin..* London: Longmans, Green & Co., p. 262.
- Scallan , D. (1990). *The Holy Man of Tours: The life of Leo Dupont (rev. ed.)*. Rockford, IL: Tan.
- Segal, J. (1970). Edessa: The Blessed City. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Veenker, R.A. (1976). "Hem." *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (Supplementary Volume )*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Waite, E. (1961). *The Holy Grail*. New Hyde Park, NY: University Books.
- Williamson, Lamar, Jr. 1983. *Mark: Interpretation, a Bible commentary for teaching and preaching*. Louisville: John Knox Press.
- Wilson, I. (1979) *The Shroud of Turin*.(rev. ed.). Garden City, NY: Image.  
(1991) *Holy Faces: Secret Places*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.