Further consideration and consultation about the Greek text of the sermon attributed to Gregory Referendarius has led to me reconsider my original position about the supposed reference to the side wound.

Originally agreeing with Dubarle’s translation, I had understood that paragraph 22 meant that it was the Image itself that was embellished with blood from Christ’s side, although I now think this interpretation cannot be defended either from the Greek text or from the internal logic of the text. If the Image had indeed been embellished with blood from Christ’s side, this could only have taken place after his death on the cross, whereas Gregory’s text clearly states that the Image was formed before the crucifixion and the resulting contradictions are excessive even for a Byzantine mentality.

Dubarle understands ἀφ’ οὖν in the original in a temporal sense, meaning that after the cloth received the impress of Christ, it was embellished by drops from his side. This could only be so in modern Greek, and even then with the word αφού. The structure τὸ ἀφ’ οὖν κατεσταλάχθησαν refers back to the body of Christ, not to the Image. The thrust of the text is that the sweat of agony (like drops of blood) adorned the Image, just like blood from its side adorned the body from which the sweat had dripped, i.e. two different events at two different times.

This in no way affects the interpretation of the other (numerous) texts that do indeed suggest that the Image of Edessa and the Shroud of Turin are one and the same object.