

I CONGRESO INTERNACIONAL SOBRE LA SABANA SANTA EN ESPAÑA

Discovering more of the Shroud's Early History

A promising new approach...

Ian Wilson, M.A. (Oxon).

Talk for the International Congress on the Holy Shroud in Spain, Aula Magna of the Faculty of
Medicine, University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain 28-30 April, 2012

[slide 1]

It is now almost four decades since I first put forward the hypothesis that the miraculously Christ-imprinted cloth of the Byzantine era known by historians as the Image of Edessa was one and the same as the miraculously Christ-imprinted cloth that today we know as the Turin Shroud.¹

To express the theory in its simplest form, the Image of Edessa cloth is broadly traceable from as early as AD.30, albeit that this phase of its history has to be gleaned from later sources. From the Jerusalem of Jesus' time it was taken to Edessa [slide 2] (today Şanlıurfa in eastern Turkey) to help convert Edessa's king Abgar V² to Christianity [slide 3]. It seems to have been almost immediately to be hidden away, apparently due to persecution when one of Abgar's successors reverted to paganism. Rediscovered in a hiding place above the city's gate in the early sixth century [slide 4], it then became a reasonably well recorded historical object for a further three centuries in Edessa. A Byzantine army then took it to Constantinople [slide 5], where it remained for another two and a half centuries, only to disappear during the Crusader sack of the city in 1204 [slide 6]. Thereafter its fate is essentially unknown.³

In the case of the cloth that we today call the Turin Shroud, it very mysteriously appeared in the 1350s in Lirey [slide 7], France in the possession of a comparatively minor though extremely heroic and honourable French knight Geoffrey de Charny, who died in 1356. In 1453, notably the year of Constantinople's final fall to the Turks, Geoffrey de Charny's childless granddaughter Margaret bequeathed it to the then upwardly mobile House of Savoy who initially kept it in Chambéry [slide 8]. In 1578 it was transferred to Turin [slide 9], where it remains to this day.

So obviously there remains an unexplained gap between 1204 and the 1350s (and my suggestion of Templar ownership during this period has never been more than tentative and provisional - please note that I no longer support the claims for this put forward by Dr Barbara Frale back in 2009⁴). Nonetheless, if we can identify the Image of Edessa of the Byzantine era as one and the same as our present day Shroud, the Shroud is provided with a plausible and reasonably full history across nearly two thousand years.

Now one very big problem to such an identification, as any Byzantine scholar will tell you, is the fact that no-one in the Byzantine world - openly at least - recognized the Image of Edessa as any kind of burial shroud. The prevailing idea amongst the Byzantine populace and its priesthood, continuing amongst the Eastern Orthodox to this day, was that the image comprised Jesus' face only [slide 10], and was created by Jesus while he was alive.⁵

Yet as I have long argued, if the Image of Edessa really was our Turin Shroud this seemingly insuperable obstacle is relatively easy to overcome. With regard to the size of the Edessa cloth, some early manuscripts refer to it as a *sindon*, the very same word used in the three synoptic gospels for Jesus' burial cloth [slide 11]. Others use the word *himation*, which likewise denotes a cloth of full garment-size proportions. Yet others use the term *tetradiplon*, a very rare Greek word which simply means doubled in four. [slide 12] And when we try doubling the Shroud in four it appears as a disembodied looking face on a landscape aspect background, strikingly reminiscent of what most Byzantine artists understood of the Image of Edessa's appearance. If we imagine the Shroud folded in this way, then mounted on a wooden board and covered with gold - exactly as tenth century Byzantine texts tell us was done of the Image of Edessa - it is easy to understand how there could have been a lack of awareness of the full body imprint. - particularly given that, when the body image areas are viewed on the Shroud itself, making any sense of them can be extremely difficult..

Moreover, if indeed only the Shroud's face area was visible and accessible - and the face area is obviously the most meaningful and manageable section of the Shroud's imprint - anyone before the age of photography might easily have supposed that such a watery-looking imprint [slide 13] had been created by an alive Jesus, not a dead one. By way of demonstration of this, if we look at how sixteenth and seventeenth century artists depicted the Shroud [slide 14], in full knowledge that it was Jesus' burial wrapping, we can see that they made Jesus' eyes appear open and staring just as if he was alive. This is because that is exactly how the actual 'natural' imprint on the cloth appeared to them, before the now so famous negative image became revealed by photography in 1898.

But there is also a second, closely related reason for how and why such a profound misunderstanding of the Edessa cloth's origin could have come into being - the entirely different cultural attitudes that prevailed in the Middle Eastern and Byzantine world of the Edessa cloth's first twelve centuries.

Unlike in the mediaeval west, where public showings of the Shroud became commonplace, in the Byzantine East, with one lone exception,⁶ the Image of Edessa was never ever shown publicly. As expressed in the words of a Byzantine hymn, it was regarded as far too holy,⁷ any viewings of it - always rare - being strictly reserved for royalty, for occasional visiting potentates, and for the highest clergy.⁸ Even in church decorations, depictions of it were often in high locations awkward for viewing by the ordinary congregation [slide 15], and icons of it covered by a veil.

And this is why, whenever we see artists' depictions of the Image of Edessa it is important to realise that not one of these should be assumed to be a reliable, direct copy of the original. Besides all the reserve because of the object's holiness, accurate copying was simply not in the Byzantine mindset, and if we try putting together a representative selection of depictions of the Image [slide 16] their wide differences even one from the other become all too obvious, immediately negating their authoritativeness.

In such circumstances, attempting to make a typology of all such early depictions might seem to be a rather futile task, which may well be the reason why no-one before me has ever tried it with any comprehensiveness. Yet despite such apparent handicaps it is a project that I have actually quite enthusiastically taken upon myself for my twilight years because I believe that the way the depictions fall into certain quite distinctive groups may still have some important things to teach us concerning the Image of Edessa's identity as the Shroud.

In which context let us have a look at the first group, which I have called the 'Round Shield' type [slide 17]. For obvious reasons (not least the round shape and the absence of any apparent cloth background), such a type has not previously been widely recognised as depicting the Image of Edessa. Yet thanks to the inscriptions on two of them, an eighth century wall-painting at Telovani, Georgia,⁹ and a slightly later, but even more badly damaged one in the monastery of Deir al-Surian in Egypt (both of these only recently discovered), there can be little doubt that all four do (at least in their very Byzantine way), depict the Image of Edessa. A notable third example of this same type, likewise discovered only relatively recently, is this mosaic of the sixth century which was found at Şanlıurfa, Turkey - none other than the original Edessa itself.

By way of a brief explanation of the round shield, in the Byzantine era such a *clipeus* device, as it is often called, symbolised in a specially powerful way the person represented, on a par with the emperor's portrait on a battle standard. It was therefore a very reverential way of depicting the Image of Edessa. More puzzling may seem the way that the face has been depicted, the splayed out hair, lack of any fork to the beard and crudely indicated neck all seeming far removed from anything that might have been inspired by the Shroud. Even so, there is a simple enough explanation. As can be gleaned from the tenth century official history of the Image of Edessa cloth,¹⁰ back in the first century King Abgar of Edessa, Edessa being a city the art of which was heavily influenced by neighbouring Parthia, ordered a portrait of Jesus on tile to be set up on his city gate as a sign of his Christianity [slide 18]. This portrait, along with the Edessa cloth, was then removed and hidden away when a later monarch restored paganism. When both the tile and the cloth were rediscovered in the sixth century, the Parthian-style likeness on the tile may well have been the more accessible image for artists to copy from.

Whatever the validity of this explanation, all thankfully becomes at least a little more straightforward following the Image of Edessa cloth's physical transfer from Edessa to Constantinople in 944. Thereafter there quickly appear, in no particular chronological order, a variety of further types.

This is type 2 [slide 19] of my numeration, which I call the 'Predominantly Plain Rectangular Type'. With many variations in shape, also often with vertical stripes decorating the cloth proper, it was in common usage between the tenth and thirteenth centuries, and can be found widely spread across the Byzantine world - Egypt, Greece, Cyprus, Anatolia, etc., etc.

This is type 3 [slide 20], which I call 'Rectangular with Decorative Roundels'. Again with some marked variations, it is a lot more rare than type 2, and is found principally in the eleventh century, and principally in the Cappadocia region, apart from an example found in a Georgian manuscript, the Alaverdi Tetraevangelion.

This is type 4 [slide 21] which I call 'Rectangular with Decorative Lattice'. Like type 2, it is relatively common, particularly between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries. It is also similarly widespread, there being examples to be found in Egypt, Greece, Serbia and even as far as Russia. Probably the best-known

example is the so-called 'Holy Face of Laon'. which on the basis of its inscription seems to have been of thirteenth century Serbian origin.

Although the splayed out hair way of depicting Jesus' face continued in places for many centuries, particularly in countries like Russia , quite obvious is that in many of these newer depictions Jesus' face is depicted with straight down hair, a forked beard and no neck [slide 22]. These changes are certainly much more compatible with what we see on the Shroud, thereby suggesting that by now at least a few more people had achieved some closer access to the so sacred cloth than had been possible before

Likewise with regard to the way the cloth background is depicted, although some artists made this square, some rectangular, some gave it a fringe at the sides, some at the top and bottom, at least what is represented is now quite unmistakably a piece of cloth, although any common ground quickly ends thereafter. As earlier mentioned, but worth repeating, on some copies we see a plain background. On some we see vertical stripes. Some examples feature large roundels [slide 23] which at least one scholar has suggested might denote the seven seals with which the Image is associated in the *Epistula Abgari*.¹¹ On some we see a lattice decoration [slide 24], a feature that is also to be found on Byzantine artists' depictions of the veil of the Temple of Jerusalem,¹² that was reportedly rent at the time of Jesus' death on the cross.¹³ Inevitably for anyone wanting some truly accurate facsimile of Image of Edessa to compare with the Shroud such widely varying depictions can only be very disappointing. They tell us only that whatever the true, original was, very few Byzantine artists ever gained a firsthand viewing of it - even of just the face area.

Yet if the Image of Edessa really was one and the same as the Shroud, could there be at least one amongst the various types of depiction that I have identified suggesting that someone had a more direct viewing of it than any of the others? As it happens, I believe there is. My working label for this particular type is 'large billowing suspended' [slide 25], and it has several distinctive features that are worth enumerating:

1. instead of the Image of Edessa appearing as if fastened flat (as on all previous types), it hangs as if free and loose, sometimes suspended from hooks.
2. the visible amount of cloth is landscape aspect relative to the face, exactly as the Shroud appears when 'doubled in four'

3. An unusually large size cloth seems indicated in several examples.
4. Below and above the face further, unseen areas of the cloth are indicated by loose, apparently unterminated folds sufficiently extensive that they could easily bear (unseen) imprints of Jesus' full body

Now there are quite a number of examples of this particular type. Intriguingly, they mostly seem to date from the period after the Image of Edessa's disappearance from Constantinople before the Shroud's emergence in Lirey, thereby opening up the possibility of an eventual explanation for that one hundred and fifty year gap in the Shroud's history. Several examples are linked to scenes of the Annunciation [slide 26], Jesus having become imprinted at that moment in Mary's womb seemingly being directly associated with his much-later-in-life imprinting on the Image of Edessa. At the monastery of St Catherine, Sinai there is [slide 27] a particularly beautiful Annunciation icon of the 12th century which illustrates this exactly, its so shadowy image of the 'embryo' Jesus being stylistically closest in character to the Shroud image of anything to be found in the entirety of Byzantine art. The copies of the 'billowing' Image of Edessa type are mostly to be found in the northern Greece/Macedonia/Serbia region where other copies of the Image of Edessa dating from this period are also surprisingly accurate [slide 28]. It is also the kind of area where refugee Byzantine groups had reformed during the decades following Constantinople's fall to the Crusaders and the city's recapture by the Palaeologue dynasty from 1261 - thereby allowing for the possibility that someone in such group may have secretly possessed the Image of Edessa alias our Shroud.

Particularly notable in this same context is that it is also from Serbia that we find the so Shroud-like *epitaphios* [slide 29] of the Serbian King Milutin Uros II (reigned 1282-1321). Hitherto this so superbly embroidered liturgical cloth - one directly symbolising the Shroud - has attracted rather less attention than it deserves partly because it was created around 1320, thereby so late in the Byzantine era that it was actually within the lifetime of the Geoffrey de Charny of Lirey, France, in whose family's ownership the Shroud is recorded from the 1350s on. Yet it now raises the question, could such close proximity to Geoffrey's lifetime, rather than its being any drawback, actually have something to tell us? Might the fact that this and other near-contemporary Serbian artworks exhibit such striking resemblances to the Shroud hold a

crucial key to how, when and why the relatively obscure French knight Geoffrey de Charny may have acquired the Shroud from the eastern world ?

Of possible considerable relevance here is our very latest understanding of Geoffrey's single known visit to the eastern Mediterranean world. As I have recently shown elsewhere,¹⁴ his one certain visit to the east, cryptically yet unmistakably alluded to in his poem the *Livre Charny* [slide 30],¹⁵ did not take place, as has previously been supposed, as part of the later rather limp Humbert de Vienne 'Crusade' of 1346. The expedition of Humbert set sail from Marseille in September 1345. It disembarked at Genoa, crossed the Italian peninsula, set sail a second time from Venice, and arrived at Smyrna [slide 31], today the spectacular port of Izmir on Turkey's western coast, in June 1346. The key battle against the Turks took place on 24 June. If Geoffrey really had been part of that 'Crusade' he would have had to rush back at near the speed of light in order to be present, as historically certain, on a battlefield at Aiguillon, near Agen south-western France on August 2 of that same year.

Instead we now know that Geoffrey's true foray into the east was actually nearly two years earlier, late in 1344, when he and companion in arms Edward de Beaujeu played key parts in the very successful surprise capture from the Turks of Smyrna's harbour fortress, only the fortress, it should be emphasised, but a highly strategic victory nonetheless. Although very few details of their escapade have come down to us, the fact that in its aftermath the pair both received some of France's most coveted military honours - Edward de Beaujeu was created Constable of France, and Geoffrey de Charny was created Porte-Oriflamme, bearer of the sacred battle-standard of St Denis - suggests that both had displayed some exemplary courage in the course of the action.

Now Edward de Beaujeu, an individual of rather more illustrious birth than Geoffrey de Charny, has never previously been a person of any special interest amongst Shroud historians. Yet with regard to any connection to the Knights Templar, for instance, Edward's link to the fallen Order is actually far stronger than Geoffrey's. He was of the same family as Guillaume de Beaujeu [slide 32], the renowned Templar Grand Master who died, true to his oath never to flee in battle, when the Crusaders' last Holy Land stronghold of Acre fell to overwhelming numbers of Turks back in 1290. Accordingly, when in 1343 Edward told Avignon Pope Clement VI of his great keenness to take his personal troop of fighting men eastwards on a campaign to fight the Turks, Clement lost no time putting him in touch with the Templars' surviving

counterparts the Knights of St John on Rhodes and their allies in Cyprus, thereby setting in train both Edward's and companion in arms Geoffrey's participation in the capture of the Smyrna harbour fortress.¹⁶

At this point our interest especially concerns the route that Geoffrey and Edward, together with their respective companies of troops, would have taken from the east back to France [slide 33], to which both are recorded as having returned by mid 1346. As already noted, Edward was of a significantly higher social standing than Geoffrey, his domains being broadly what is today France's Beaujolais region. With all eastern Christendom in the greatest fear of being overrun by the Turks, and the Smyrna garrison urgently needed reinforcements, the two knights would almost inevitably have called in at various friendly locations along the way to report on the situation. Although Rhodes and Cyprus are more definitely linked historically,¹⁷ Serbia, whose monarchs had almost routinely married high-born French wives was very possibly also one such a stopover. Whatever, it seems far from inconceivable that somewhere along their route Edward and Geoffrey came across someone who had quietly become the Edessa Image/ Shroud's owner subsequent to 1204,¹⁸ and that that person asked them to take the so sacred cloth back with them to France to hold *in trust* until (as all would have fervently hoped) the Turkish menace could be decisively defeated and rolled back.

Accordingly I believe it to be a possibility worthy of at least some serious consideration that the original first Frenchman to whom the Shroud was entrusted may have been, not Geoffrey de Charny, but instead the higher-born Edward de Beaujeu. How the Shroud then may have so quickly passed from Edward to Geoffrey is also easy enough to explain. During their years in France immediately subsequent to their Smyrna campaign Geoffrey and Edward are repeatedly recorded side by side in the fight against the English, which is certainly how they were when [slide 34] on June 8, 1351, riding near Ardres in northern France, they happened to surprise a troop of seven hundred English soldiers leaving Calais. The skirmish that quickly occurred was one of the relatively few of the time in which a French force decisively routed the English, but for Geoffrey the extremely sad aspect was that his friend Edward de Beaujeu was killed in the action. Raising the question, did Edward, as he was dying on the battlefield, pass on Geoffrey his special secret trusteeship of the Shroud? [slide 35] And only of course for Geoffrey, after founding a church

notably dedicated to the Annunciation in which to house the Shroud, himself to die so very prematurely on the field of Poitiers a mere five years later...

Although such a scenario must of necessity remain highly conjectural at the present time, nevertheless it does have the virtue of explaining quite a number of elements to Geoffrey's ownership of the Shroud that have long puzzled historians. It potentially explains, for instance, why there is no official record from Geoffrey's lifetime of his ever owning the Shroud; why the Shroud was not included in the official lists for the relics of the Lirey church that Geoffrey founded; why when Geoffrey's son Geoffrey II de Charny was so forcefully challenged by bishop d'Arcis in 1389 he could produce no document to support the Shroud's authenticity; and why both Geoffrey II and his daughter Margaret de Charny so patently regarded the Shroud as something very personal to them (to the extent, in Margaret's case, of being taken around by her), rather than bestowing it permanently to their Lirey church, as might otherwise have been expected.

Any such possible prior association with Edward de Beaujeu notwithstanding, that the de Charny family were very definitely well aware that they possessed the eastern world's Image of Edessa is now very well supported by what for me has been one of the most exciting findings of recent years - one that remains surprisingly all too little known. By this I am referring to the wall-paintings dating from the early 15th century [slide 36] that were discovered in 1997 (after their having long being covered over with plaster), in the church at Les Terres de Chaux [slide 37], most significantly located just a few kilometres from St.Hippolyte-sur-Doubs where Margaret de Charny and local lord, Margaret's second husband Humbert de Villersexel, count de la Roche, kept the Shroud between 1418 and 1453.¹⁹

For what we see at Terres de Chaux is an Annunciation scene [slide 38] painted on the side of the screen facing the congregation, then on the other side of this, at the top of the arch a now very familiar-looking landscape-aspect cloth bearing the imprint of Christ's face [slide 39]. Such linking to an Annunciation scene,²⁰ such a landscape aspect to the cloth, such locating the cloth at the top of an arch, such making the cloth viewable only from within the altar area, such holding of the cloth by two angels - all these are classic for the way that the Image of Edessa cloth was depicted in churches in the Byzantine east. Although in most other respects they were painted in contemporary western

style, the Terres de Chaux paintings seem to have been ordered by someone with the keenest awareness of their earlier, classically eastern antecedents.

But the further element of interest is what we see lower down on the left hand side of the arch bearing the depiction of the 'Edessa' cloth. [slide 40] It is the bearded figure of Margaret de Charny's second husband Humbert de Villersexel/de la Roche holding a casket in his hand, a casket of just the right size to hold a folded-up Shroud, and which in all logic has indeed to have contained the Shroud back at that time. Although there is a great deal yet to be learned concerning how the Terres de Chaux paintings came in to being, already they seem to be an absolutely priceless 'missing link', indicating that the de Charnys, amongst whom we should include Margaret's husband Humbert (de la Roche being another name with some illustrious Templar antecedents), knew very well that the Shroud was one and the same as the Image of Edessa that had been lost from Constantinople in 1204.

Which may well make rather more than mere coincidence [slide 41] why the childless and now second-time-widowed Margaret de Charny chose the year 1453 - the very year when there died any last hope for Byzantine Constantinople's survival against the Turks - to bequeath the Shroud on to Duke Louis of Savoy and his Cyprus-born wife Anne de Lusignan.

Likewise it may explain why immediately upon acquiring the Shroud Duke Louis of Savoy commissioned the celebrated musical composer Guillaume Du Fay [slide 42] to write a special musical mass in honour of the Shroud.²¹ Entitled 'Missa Se la face ay pale' this lays special stress on the face of Christ on the Shroud, a theme hauntingly reminiscent of Byzantine understanding of the Image of Edessa.

Also arguably relevant in this same context is this lost medallion which Louis of Savoy also commissioned in 1453 [slide 43]. Note how it depicts a quite unique 'over the head' mode of displaying the cloth, strikingly reminiscent of how the Edessa cloth was thought to have been brought to king Abgar back in the first century AD, - also, incidentally, how the later Eastern Orthodox church carried their *epitaphios* liturgical cloth symbolising the shroud...

Also too often overlooked is the fact that just as the Image of Edessa was regarded as the palladium or protection device for the ancient city of Edessa, so was the Shroud for the dynasty of Savoy [slide 44]. And maybe the last word

ought to go to a reminiscence of the late ex-king Umberto of Savoy [slide 45] , the last of his line to own the Shroud, by his daughter Princess Gabriella:

'My father enjoyed setting the dynasty of the Christian King Abgar of Edessa...alongside ours, in that both had for centuries been jealous guardians of Christ's winding-sheet....'

Did king Umberto actually know rather more about the Shroud's origins than he ever disclosed? Given that even his dynasty's motto, the letters FERT [slide 46], remain cryptic to this day, this seems hardly beyond the bounds of possibility. Notable also in this same context is that Aymon of Geneva, who married Geoffrey de Charnys widow Anne de Vergy following Geoffrey de Charny's death, and in whose Alpine realms the Shroud most likely reposed between 1356 and 1388 was a member of the very exclusive Order of the Collar of Savoy - an order, just like Geoffrey's Lirey church, dedicated to the Annunciation. Likewise belonging to the same order were Geoffrey's son Geoffrey II de Charny, who personally exhibited the Shroud in Lirey in 1389; and Geoffrey II's daughter Margaret's second husband the already mentioned Humbert de Villersexel.

What I have shared with you in this presentation, I would stress, remains very much a 'work still in progress' rather than anything I would wish to claim as a fully-fledged hypothesis ready to be broadcast to the world at large. Nevertheless - and here I should acknowledge the sterling support that has been coming from Mark Guscini's ongoing textual researches - I feel more positive than for a long while that we are currently on the brink of making some real advances in our understanding of the Shroud's early history, particularly with regard to the period between 1204 and 1453. And even with regard to the pre-1204 period [slide 47], I am encouraged that some proper archaeology is at last beginning to happen in Muslim Şanlıurfa - the now very Turkish town to which, when it was pagan Edessa, I am convinced that our Shroud was first brought from Jerusalem nearly two thousand years ago.

¹ The article was first publicly advanced by me in November 1973 in an article for the British Catholic weekly newspaper *Catholic Herald*. Five years later this was followed up in my first book *The Shroud of Turin*, published by Doubleday of New York in the USA, then (as *The Turin Shroud*), by Gollancz in the UK, followed by translations in nine other languages.

² Reigned AD13-50

³ Some scholars have suggested the Image was one and the same as a '*sanctam toellam*' acquired for the Sainte Chapelle, Paris by Louis I of France in 1247, then later destroyed during the French Revolution. See for instance, Steven Runciman, 'Some Remarks on the Image of Edessa', *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 3, 1931, pp.251-2. But the total obscurity surrounding this '*toellam*', particularly throughout a time of wildly popular expositions of the Veronica of Rome, hardly inspires confidence that it could have been the fabled Image of Edessa.

⁴ As made clear in a recent article for the Newsletter of the British Society for the Turin Shroud, I now firmly reject as evidence of Templar ownership the Sabbatier document so highly publicised by Dr Barbara Frale in April 2009. See Ian Wilson 'The Shroud, The Knights Templar and Barbara Frale', *Shroud Newsletter* no.73, June 2011, pp.39-43. But as I also stress in the same article, I do not totally reject the possibility of some Templar involvement in the Shroud's history between 1204 and the early fourteenth century.

⁵ As made clear in the tenth century *Narratio de Imagine Edessena*, there was, however, considerable uncertainty concerning the exact point in Jesus' life in which he created the imprint. See Mark Guscini *The Image of Edessa*, Brill, Leiden and Boston, 2009, pp.24-25, section 10 of the *Narratio* manuscript

⁶ By this I am referring to Robert de Clari's viewing of a *sydoine* bearing an imprint of Jesus' 'figure' at the church of St Mary of Blachernae in Constantinople in 1203. This seems to have been a one-off exposition of the Image of Edessa as a way of rallying the spirits of a Constantinopolitan populace highly alarmed at the presence of an army of western Crusaders being allowed to roam in their city.

⁷ In Edward Gibbon's translation 'How can we with mortal eyes contemplate this image, whose celestial splendour the host of heaven presumes not to behold? He who dwells in heaven condescends this day to visit us by his venerable image; He who is seated on the cherubim visits us this day by a picture, which the Father has delineated with his immaculate hand, which he has formed in an ineffable manner, and which we sanctify by adoring it with fear and love.' The original Greek of this, from a text of the Eastern Orthodox *Menaion*, can be found in Mark Guscini op.cit, p.136. Guscini also offers some most interesting variations on this text, e.g. on p.135 'He who was bodiless at first did not refuse to take on a body among us through the Father's will. He granted us the divine figure of his form'.

⁸ This 'royal exclusive' traces right back to the first century when, as recorded by Eusebius of Caesarea around 325 AD, king Abgar V of Edessa alone was granted the otherwise unexplained 'vision' brought to him by Jesus' apostle Thaddaeus/Addai. As quite evident from the *De Imagine Edessena* and other texts, later Byzantine writers unhesitatingly interpreted Abgar's 'vision' as an exclusive viewing of the Image of Edessa

⁹ Zaza Skhirtladze, 'Canonizing the Apocrypha: the Abgar Cycle in the Alaverdi and Gelati Gospels,' in Herbert Kessler and Gerhard Wolf (eds.), *The Holy Face and the Paradox of Representation: Papers from a Colloquium held at the Bibliotheca Hertziana, Rome and the Villa Spelman, Florence, 1996*, Bologna, Nuova Alfa Editoriale, 1998.

¹⁰ See Guscini, op cit p.37

¹¹ Dr Irma Karaulashvili, private correspondence with the author

¹² See Herbert Kessler, *Spiritual Seeing - Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia 2000, pp.57-8

¹³ Matthew 27: 51

¹⁴ Ian Wilson, 'Geoffrey de Charny, Edward de Beaujeu and the first battle for Smyrna in 1344-5. That little known campaign's possible relevance to Geoffrey's acquisition of the Shroud', *Shroud Newsletter*, British Society for the Turin Shroud, issue no.74, December 2011, pp.29-42

¹⁵ The French text of this poem was published in Michael Anthony Taylor, 'A Critical Edition of Geoffrey de Charny's 'Livre Charny' and the 'Demandes pour la Joute, les Tournois et la Guerre', Ph.D. thesis submitted to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1977.

¹⁶ For details of this little-known campaign, see Kenneth M. Setton, *The Papacy and the Levant, 1204-1571*, Philadelphia, American Philosophical Society 1976, pp.188-194.

¹⁷ Solely because forces from Cyprus and Rhodes had been Edward and Geoffrey's allies in the attack on Smyrna. Historically, Geoffrey and Edward's entire return route remains unknown.

¹⁸ An interesting hypothesis for how the Shroud may have got to what is today Serbia by the mid 13th century was put forward back in the 1980s by the Hungarian-born Oxford scholar Dr Eugène Csocsán de Várallja. See Eugène Csocsán de Várallja, 'The Turin Shroud and Hungary' in *Ungarn-Jahrbuch, Zeitschrift für die Kunde Ungarns und verwandte Gebiete*, Munich, Dr Rudolf Trofenik, vol 15, 1987, pp.1-49

¹⁹ For excellent photos of the wall-paintings, see the website http://chaux2.plateautv.net/dossier_eglise/DossierIconographique.pdf

²⁰ For the association of the Image of the Edessa with the Annunciation, see for instance the depiction of the Image of Edessa directly between the Archangel Gabriel announcing Jesus' birth to the Virgin Mary in the St. Euthymios chapel, the basilica of Hagios Demetrios, Thessaloniki, Greece, dating from 1303.

²¹ See Anne Walters Robertson 'The Man with the Pale Face, the Shroud and Du Fay's 'Missa Se la face ay pale'', *Journal of Musicology*, vol 27, no.4, fall 2010, pp.377-434.