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| THE HOLY SHROUD OF TURIN  SILENT WITNESS  IN PREPARATION FOR A CENTENARY (1898 - 1998)  Adapted for the internet from the Catholic Counter-Reformation in the XXth Century, no 295, April 1997, special edition   |  | | --- | | The Holy Shroud in its reliquary in the Basilica of Turin |  |  | | --- | | Figure 1: After the announcement of the results of the fraudulent carbon 14 dating by Cardinal Ballestrero (13 October 1988), the Church locked the Holy Shroud in its reliquary "as a dirty rag is thrown in the dustbin. And there it was left as the worthless souvenir of a man already dead and forgotten. But now He is risen." (Georges de Nantes, CRC no238, Eng. ed., April 1991, p.41) |   The same goes for the Holy Shroud as for the Gospel. "Anything new?" I am asked. Well! I’ll tell you. "Every scribe become a disciple of the Kingdom of Heaven is like a householder who brings out from his storeroom new things as well as old", Our Lord said (Mt 13.52). And that is what we shall do in preparation for the exposition to take place in Turin from the 18th April to the 31st May 1998, the fifth centenary of the consecration of the Cathedral of Saint John the Baptist, and the first centenary of the exposition of 1898, during which the first photograph of the Holy Shroud was taken (28 May 1898).  OUR TREASURE  The Relic at present rolled up in its silver reliquary and kept behind the high altar of the Duomo, is our treasure; all the more ours in that it is we, who for the last ten years, have prevented it from being thrown on the scrap heap. It is certain that had we not denounced the crime of the fraudulent "mediaeval dating" proclaimed by Cardinal Ballestrero on the 13th October 1988, no one would still be talking of this distinguished Relic today, except as some vile object, on display in the gallery of "famous hoaxes" in the British Museum.  But since it is the "mediaeval dating" that is a "hoax", the Holy Shroud is genuine. And at this good news, everything changes, everything is reborn. The Holy Shroud is truly, really, substantially the sheet in which Joseph of Arimathea, Nicodemus and Saint John shrouded the Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ on the evening of Good Friday. In his Gospel, Saint John relates how Saint Peter and he found this "Shroud" (soudarion), carefully rolled up, apart from the other funerary cloths, in the empty tomb, on Easter morning (Jn 20.6-7). They conserved it preciously and handed it down to us.  Since then, from age to age, down to our century, it has attracted crowds. The last time was in 1978, when three and a half million pilgrims filed past the Holy Relic unfolded full length and displayed above the high altar of Saint John the Baptist’s Cathedral, at Turin, during those blessed days of the pontificate of the holy Pope John-Paul I. That is what we shall see again next year, if God wills!  Why so much veneration? What attracts the crowds are the imprints left by the Body of Jesus on this linen cloth 4.36m long and 1.10m wide, imprints which are themselves marked with His precious Blood, shed for us during His sorrowful Passion.  The Church is like Saint Veronica: down the centuries for two thousand years, but more than ever now in our modern times "on the threshold of the third millennium", she lovingly keeps this cloth left to her by Jesus after having mysteriously imprinted it not only with the features of His Holy Face, but also with the image of His Body, naked, scourged, wounded all over with the sacred stigmata of His sorrowful Passion, so that in contemplating these images, this virginal Spouse, the Church, might be absorbed in the memory of her Saviour’s agony and might devote herself to loving and consoling Him for the many blasphemies and outrages that have reached their fill in these times of apostasy in which we are living, renewing the insults of His Passion.  In this spirit of reparation, soon after the Revolution and the Empire, the 19th century was the century par excellence of devotion to the Holy Face. And yet, before the exposition of 1898, it was not the Holy Shroud kept at Turin that was the object of this devotion, but the image honoured and then propagated by "the holy man of Tours", Monsieur Dupont, from 1851.  This image was a reproduction of the miraculous veil venerated in Rome under the name of "Veronica’s Veil" from time immemorial. This veil was the subject of miraculous manifestations in 1849, during the Pope’s exile at Gaeta. Monsieur Dupont had received two copies of this Veil from the Prioress of the Carmelites of Tours three years after the death of a sister of this community, Sister Marie de Saint-Pierre, from whom Our Lord Himself had asked for reparation in 1845, in these terms:  "The face of France has become hideous in the sight of My Father; it provokes Him to justice; offer Him, therefore, the Face of His Only Son in Whom He is well pleased, to draw His mercy down on France, without which she will be chastised. Here is France’s salvation, that is to say, in the Face of the Saviour."  After the death of Sister Marie de Saint-Pierre, "the holy man of Tours" became the messenger of this mystical message, by exhibiting the Roman Holy Face, the "Veil of Veronica" in his study, soon to be transformed into an oratory. Through anointings made with the oil from the lamp burning in its presence, the "Veil of Veronica" worked miracles; it attracted crowds of pilgrims, but above all, it raised up "Veronicas" in accordance with the desire expressed by Our Lord to Sister Marie de Saint-Pierre:  "I am looking for Veronicas to wipe and to honour my divine Face."  In the year 1885, we find recorded in the register of the confraternity set up by the Bishop of Tours, the names of the entire Guérin family of Lisieux, then of Monsieur Martin and of his daughters, the last of whom, Thérèse, was twelve years old. She entered Carmel at the age of fifteen, under the name of Sister Thérèse of the Child Jesus. She was, therefore, already a member of the Confraternity of the Holy Face. What a touching encounter!  VERONICA’S COMPASSION  On the 10th January 1889, the day of her clothing, Sister Thérèse of the Child Jesus ended a note to Sister Martha with a new signature: "Sister Thérèse de l’Enfant-Jésus et de la Sainte-Face". As our Father showed us in his retreat on "Thérèse of the Child Jesus, miniature of the Immaculate", there is a mystery here, a prophetic foretelling of the great trial which is to befall her a month later, on the 12th February: the mental illness of "our dear Father drinking of the bitterest and most humiliating chalice of all". Then, through her tears, Thérèse learns to "recognise", in the facial features of her humiliated father, those of the suffering Servant foretold by the Prophet Isaiah in chapter 53.  Monsignor Guy Gaucher, the penetrating commentator on Saint Thérèse, quite rightly remarks that to reduce her to "no more than a symbol of childhood" leads to a misunderstanding of her essential message, which is profoundly evangelical:  "To mutilate her name is to mutilate her message, not to say her life. She could rightly be called Saint Thérèse of the Holy Face, based on the testimony of Mother Agnes: ‘Devotion to the Holy Face was the Servant of God’s special attraction’."  Guy Gaucher rightly remarks that "the word ‘devotion’ to the Holy Face suggests some optional pious practice, left to the freedom of each individual". But it is an error, which Thérèse herself will correct, in order to clarify that for her it is not just a devotion, but the ground of all her piety:  "These words from Isaiah: ‘Who has believed our report ?... There is no beauty in him, nor comeliness... etc.’ form the basis of my devotion to the Holy Face, or rather, the foundation of all my piety. I too would desire to be without beauty, alone to tread the grape in the wine press, unknown to any creature..."  "We touch the heart of her life, as that of the Gospel", adds Guy Gaucher, who then goes on to show how Sister Thérèse of the Holy Face lived her "Passion" through closely espousing the Passion of Jesus: "On the 5th August 1897, the eve of the Transfiguration, the Holy Face from the choir of the Carmelites was installed in the infirmary to the great joy of Thérèse: ‘Oh! how that Holy Face has done me so much good in my life!’ All night long she looks at it."  This loving contemplation leads her to a constant configuration with her Beloved, right up to the hour of her agony, endured on the 30th September, in imitation of the agony of Jesus, "with no added consolation". At 3 o’clock in the afternoon, the monastery bell rang, as it rang every day, to recall the death of Christ. When "with her arms outstretched in the form of a cross, leaning on her two sisters, she is seen in her agony gasping for breath, it is the vision of the Crucified that makes its mark on the witnesses". At this point, Guy Gaucher notes: "Doctor Barbet’s work on crucifixion has shown that the crucified victim dies of suffocation, the lungs being congested", as she too died.  You will recall that the object of Doctor Barbet’s work was the Holy Shroud or, "more accurately", it was to make an experimental verification. It is not without importance to specify this point since it is a major fact governing all the historical events down to our day, to this present year 1997, the centenary year of the death from love of Saint Thérèse of the Child Jesus and of the Holy Face (30 September 1897).  Everything happens, in fact, as though from her dies natalis, from the day of her birth into Heaven, she were concerned to engrave this Holy Face in the hearts of all men, if possible. "In fact, it was in October 1897", Father Piat notes, "that the King of Italy, the owner of this precious treasure, was presented with a request for the Holy Shroud to be exhibited. The royal authorisation bears the date of the 10th November 1897. Is this manifestation of the portrait of Jesus so soon after the death of Thérèse no more than a coincidence?"  One is all the more inclined to see not a coincidence but the hand of Thérèse in these events, for the Holy Shroud and herself, "the greatest saint in modern times" according to the judgement of Saint Pius X, are going to travel together in the ascent towards glory. L’Histoire d’une âme was given the imprimatur on the 7th March 1898, and the first edition was dated the 30th September. Between the two: an exhibition of sacred art opens in Turin on the 1st May 1898...  THE CARMELITE AND THE POPE  Pilgrims crossed the city in serried ranks, beneath the pastoral staff of their bishops, often come from very far away to contemplate and venerate the Holy Shroud exhibited on the altar of the Cathedral of Saint John the Baptist. Indifferent to the sarcasm of the anticlerical, positivist and scientist press, who denigrated this crude "painting" of no aesthetic value, their zeal received its reward, in the form of a "divine surprise" comparable to the miracle worked in answer to Veronica’s tender compassion, according to the sixth station of our Way of the Cross: the photographic negative of the venerable Relic clearly and unequivocally revealed a perfect positive image. The portrait of a man stood out clearly (lumineux) against the background of the now dark cloth. Wonderful fulfilment of the words of Thérèse to Céline: "Yes, the face of Jesus is luminous." And not only His Face, but His whole Body covered with blood and wounds: "Was it not before the wounds of Jesus, on seeing His divine Blood flowing, that the thirst for souls entered my heart?"  The repercussions were immense. Thérèse’s uncle, Isidore Guérin, brought to the Carmel of Lisieux a copy of Paul Vignon’s first work, Le Linceul du Christ, as soon as it appeared in 1902. His niece Céline, in religion Sister Geneviève, the artist of the Martin family, had entered Carmel in September 1894, after the death of her father, taking her camera and easel with her. Three years later, in the autumn of 1905, Father Prévost, the postulator of Thérèse’s cause, received in Rome, from the Lisieux Cannel, a monochrome image of the Holy Face, which Sister Geneviève had executed in grisaille from photographic plates of the Holy Shroud, lovingly scrutinised and understood down to the least detail.  Father Prévost had it sent to Pius X, and the holy Pope returned this precious image with these words written below:  "To all those who meditate on the Passion before this image, we grant each time, in addition to the apostolic blessing, all the indulgences formerly conceded by the Sovereign Pontiffs to the chaplet of the Five Wounds."  Why the "Five Wounds"? Because they are the source of the Precious Blood which stains this Shroud, and is therefore the object of our veneration. In anticipation of Barbet’s first scientific work, Les Cinq Plaies du Christ, which will appear thirty years later (1933), the favour granted by Saint Pius X saw the Holy Face enthroned in every Christian family throughout the world, at the same time as the image of Thérèse herself, whom he desired to see rapidly canonised: "Bisogna far presto questo Processo (this cause is a matter of urgency)", he said to Mgr de Teil. He attached a three hundred day indulgence to a prayer to the Holy Face composed by the holy Carmelite, now inseparable from the image painted by her sister (13 February 1906).  In order to respond to the holy Pope’s desire, we are going to meditate on the Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ by examining the Holy Shroud through some admirable unpublished photographs, the reproduction rights of which are strictly reserved to ourselves. This special number is offered as an exposition of the Holy Shroud in preparation for that of next year.  In no case should it be used to contest the authenticity of the Holy Shroud. The Blood stains alone are sufficient to make us see and understand what He suffered in His Body, and to guess the rest: what He endured in His Soul, in His pierced Heart, during this sorrowful Passion. "Our only thought is to pay the homage due to this Shroud touched by Jesus and which we touch, sprinkled with His Blood and left imprinted with His bodily form and His Holy Face, so that we might believe in Him, and so seeing Him, touching Him and venerating Him we might adore Him. This Shroud is a continuous link, a direct bond between Him, in His sacred humanity, and us 20th century faithful and multitudes of men of good will who are awaiting just such a sign in order to believe in Him, adore Him and love Him."  As Doctor Lavoie said: "If we had no more than these blood stains, we would have to conclude that they result from a body wrapped in this Cloth after enduring the torture of Roman crucifixion." Everyone is in agreement with that, even those who hold to the "mediaeval dating". They are obliged to, since the Cloth is stained with blood, real human blood! Even though they may then maintain that the victim was a man from the Middle Ages! Or that it is "pig’s blood", as Professor Hall declared, in his odious language...  This is why we must again go over the proof of this fraud perpetrated under the patronage of the British Museum in 1988, by taking our inquiry to the very end this time. As director of the Oxford laboratory, this same Professor Hall was one of the principal perpetrators of this fraud. Everything has been said since 1991, and we have received not the slightest refutation. For anyone who requests it, we hold available our special number, which has not aged, as well as the video recording where you can hear the contradictory statements of the scientists responsible for this gigantic machination. It has to be heard to be believed! But once you have heard it with your own ears, there can be no further doubts about the crime committed.  We can then, by way of conclusion, return to our contemplation of this Body, which left, in addition to traces of His precious Blood, an imprint, which the scientists, with common accord, admit themselves incapable of explaining. This scientific enigma will bring us back to the mystery of the extraordinary circumstances of the glorious Resurrection of this Body, an historical event which can be truly dated to the 9th April of the year 30 of our era. | | |
| I.  THE PRECIOUS BLOOD OF JESUS. HIS BODY, EVEN HIS SACRED HEART, WOUNDED  "The blood stains are composed of haemoglobin and also give a positive result to the albumin test."  Pierre Barbet had intuited this on the steps of the Cathedral of Saint John the Baptist at Turin on Sunday the 15th October 1933, when twenty five prelates presented the sacred Relic "for the veneration of the immense crowd that had congregated in the square behind a double cordon of foot soldiers", as he relates. "I was in front of them, on the cathedral steps, and His Eminence, Cardinal Fossati, Archbishop of Turin, very kindly placed the frame on the edge of the steps for a few minutes, so that we could have a good look at it. The sun had just gone down behind the houses on the other side of the square; the bright but diffused light was ideal for observation. I, therefore, saw the Shroud in broad daylight, uninterrupted by glass, at a distance of less than a metre, and suddenly I experienced one of the strongest emotions of my life. For I saw, without expecting it, that all the wound images were of a clearly different colour from the body as a whole; and this colour was of that of dried blood having impregnated the cloth."  Its colour was "more marked on the sides, on the head, on the hands and on the feet; paler, but still very perceptible, on the countless wounds left by the scourging... But the surgeon understood, beyond any possibility of doubt, that it was blood with which this cloth had been impregnated, and that this blood was the Blood of Christ!"  Barbet relates that he was reproached for having written: "The surgeon understood, beyond any possibility of doubt, that it was blood with which this cloth had been impregnated." He protested: "I may have erred through being excessively concise. But I am not so naive as I appear." And he added: "Of course, a rigorous scientific proof that these stains are of blood would require (if allowed) physical or chemical tests."  Today, those tests have been done. It remains for us to imitate the attitude of this holy and learned man that was Pierre Barbet, a Catholic surgeon. Relating how, in 1933, to his great surprise, "the crowd broke into applause", he added: "As for me, a Catholic and a surgeon, my soul was overwhelmed by this sudden revelation, and enthralled by this real presence which was inescapably self evident to me, I went down on my knees and adored in silence."  Less than fifty years later, men who had come from quite another world had the same experience! Ernie Brooks and Vernon Miller travelled to Turin on a reconnaissance mission in September 1978. They were the forerunners of the STURP team who were to come in October with a complete laboratory, and had come to note the optical characteristics of the Shroud in order to help their colleagues to calibrate their instruments.  The exposition was in full swing. We are in those beautiful days of the radiant reign of Pope John Paul I, who drew the same crowds to Rome. Miller is a Mormon, Brooks a Presbyterian. Both men entered the cathedral of Saint John the Baptist amid the ceremonial of High Mass being celebrated in the presence of the Holy Shroud exposed beneath inert gas in its bulletproof glass cage. Neither had ever been in a Catholic cathedral before. It was an overwhelming experience: "I had never witnessed such pageantry", relates Brooks. "The acoustics were powerful in this ancient cathedral. There was candlelight, ringing of bells and a choir. There must have been two thousand people packed in there."  At the end of the ceremony, the crowd poured out and the two men, helped by Father Rinaldi, took photographs of the Holy Shroud. In order to take close ups, scaffolding had to be constructed from bits and pieces, a ladder and various items of furniture. Finally, with one foot on the top of the ladder and the other on his companion’s shoulder, Miller found himself level with the Shroud. Suddenly, Brooks, who was balancing Miller on one shoulder, looked up and said:  "Jesus Christ! Vern, I think the blood on the face is crimson!"  His voice echoed through the cathedral.  "Ernie, watch your language!" Miller hissed, then added, "Well, at least you called Him by the right name."  CHRIST’S WOUNDS  Jesus is entirely naked. The dorsal silhouette shows quite clearly all the marks of the flagellation, from head to foot, and the facial silhouette shows the hands crossed over the pubis in a gesture of modesty. In all human memory, no artist had even been seen to take the liberty of representing Jesus in that manner; but as we have said, this is not the work of an artist. It is the Shroud that wrapped "the ineffable Dead (Jesus), naked and perfumed after the Passion", as was stated by Nicolas Mésaritès, the sacristan at the church of Saint Mary of the Pharos, when it still sheltered this Relic at Constantinople, in 1201.  Far from being indecent, this moving nakedness urgently invites us to count His wounds if we can. They are countless: flagellation wounds, wounds made by the crowning of thorns, all the blows, outrages and cruelty of the trial and of the carrying of the Cross; finally the wounds of the Crucifixion, in the hands and the feet, ending in that thrust of the spear which left a gaping wound through which the Body was emptied of its Blood.  "Pilate took Jesus and had Him scourged." (Jn 19.1)  No one had ever imagined the scourging of Our Lord in all its ignominy, as we see it represented here. If the Evangelists are laconic over this, perhaps it is because of the horror inspired in them by the memory of this torture inflicted on Jesus (Mk 15.5; Mt 27.26; Jn 19.1). According to literary testimony, the person condemned was entirely stripped of his clothing and attached to a pillar. That is why we speak traditionally of "the column of the flagellation". But if Jesus had had His arms raised in that way, tied to the top of a column, at least His chest would have been sheltered from the blows. But here we see the blows raining down on His shoulders, on His Back, on His loins, His thighs and on the calves of His legs; and we can also count the marks of the blows to His chest and to the front of His legs.  The flagrum, a whip of two or three thongs with small lead pellets attached, was wielded by a torturer who moved round his victim, or by two torturers, one of whom struck from behind. Jesus lost a great deal of Blood, for a reason only mentioned by Saint Luke, "with the unsurpassable precision of a medical doctor", writes Barbet; perhaps because he had questioned Saint John, the beloved disciple who did not fall asleep on the Mount of Olives:  "And being in an agony, He prayed all the more earnestly. And His sweat became as drops of blood trickling down upon the ground." (Lk 22.44)  Barbet recognised the symptoms of haematidrosis, a rare clinical phenomenon, but well known to the medical profession, caused by a profound moral upheaval, precisely that in which we see Our Lord plunged during the agony of Gethsemane, when He foresaw in advance, and in detail, the sufferings awaiting Him; and above all when He recalled the appalling mass of OUR sins, and which He dons in the presence of His Father, taking them upon Himself to expiate them. This physiological symptom of a subcutaneous haemorrhage is brought about by a moral agony, a mortal combat: the blood mixes with the sweat, and with it, forms droplets oozing from the pores of the skin and literally trickling down all over the body, "trickling down upon the ground", Saint Luke writes.  Thus prepared by these millions of small intradermic haemorrhages, the skin becomes much more fragile and sensitive to the blows that are going to come. Infiltrated with blood, tender, the skin splits beneath the blows from the lead pellets and begins to peel off and hang down in shreds. Whilst the thongs themselves leave long livid traces, blue with subcutaneous bruises, which, seen beneath ultraviolet rays, are a moving sight. It is impossible to count them; they cover the whole body.  The flagellation produced the most serious haemorrhage suffered by Jesus, and was itself the cause of all the others; when the soldiers pulled off the cloak of derision which they had thrown over His shoulders after the scourging, to put His own clothing back on, and when they stripped Him again at the foot of the Cross: each time the blood streamed!  "Behold your king." (Jn 19.14)  It is clear that He was crowned with a sort of cap of thorns. This treatment, which is unique in all the accounts we have of crucifixion in Roman times, results directly from the dialogue Pilate had with Jesus, during which He openly claimed His Messianic Royalty. The soldiers charged with scourging Him had heard Him answer: "It is as you say. I am a King." (Jn 18.37) It was in this cruel manner that they testified to what they had heard.   |  | | --- | | The back of Our Lord's Head on the Shroud |  |  | | --- | | Figure 2: "The nape of the neck is seen to be pierced with long thick thorns, and so frequent as to be evident that the crown was made in the form of a "hat", and not as a circle like that of princes or as depicted by artists; on close inspection, the nape of the neck is seen to have been more tormented than the rest and the thorns more deeply embedded, with thick clots of blood mattered with the hair." (Testimony of the "Poor Clares" of Chambéry, 1534) |   They had no difficulty in procuring "a bundle of thorns from those shrubs that abound among the bushes in the area" of Jerusalem, writes Barbet: "the shrub is supple and bears long thorns, much longer, much sharper and much harder than the acacia". They wove them into "a sort of basket bottom", which they then battened onto His Head, pulling it down and binding the whole thing with a band of twisted cane. The whole Head was encaged, squeezed into this helmet from the nape of the neck to the forehead, and the thorns penetrated the scalp, causing it to bleed profusely. Long streams of blood flowed over the forehead, and the traces they have left on the Shroud show that they met the obstacle posed by the cane band (as can be seen in the two images shown here).  One of these blood flows "is particularly striking", writes Barbet, "and so true to life that I have seen nothing like it imagined or reproduced by any painter. It begins with a thorn-wound, very high up, just where the hair begins. The flow then moves down to the medial part of the left superciliary arch, following a meandering course obliquely downwards and outwards. It broadens progressively, just as a flow of blood does on a wounded man when it meets with obstacles.  "One must, in fact, never forget that we only see here a part of the blood which gradually coagulated on the skin. The flow is slow and continuous; several minutes are necessary for coagulation to take place. Only a small part, then, coagulates in the region of the wound. The further down one goes on the image, the greater is the quantity of blood which has reached that level, which arrives there when it is time for it to coagulate. The more also do the successive sheets of blood accumulate their clots in successive layers. The total mass of clots is thus broader and thicker the lower one looks; and this is because the blood has met with obstacles.   |  | | --- | | The Face of Our Lord on the Shroud |  |  | | --- | | Figure 3: "And the soldiers, platting a crown of thorns, put it upon His head; and they put on him a purple garment. And they came to Him and said: ‘Hail, King of the Jews!’ And they gave him blows." (Jn 19.2-3) Beneath the blows, the head oscillates pitifully from right to left, as is witnessed by the blood flows on the temples, in the form of an upside down "V": the blood took two directions alternatively, as the head leaned to one side or the other. Whereas on the brow a trickle "undulates serpent-like", as the Poor Clares of Chambéry would say: it follows the lines formed on the brow by the spasmodic puckering caused by the pain. |   "One should also point out that the blood has not moved downwards in a straight line. This error has scarcely ever been avoided by artists; when the course is irregular in their paintings, this is owing to caprice on their part, and cannot be accounted for by any obstacle or natural reason. But here the flow undulates a little both to left and right, and that is natural; the blood may be following for the moment a crease in the forehead, or rather some little thorny branch which is lying obliquely against the forehead, and forces the blood to flow in an oblique direction.  "Towards the base of the forehead, the same flow, which really deserves this minute surevey, stops just above the superciliary arch and spreads out horizontally towards the mesial line, increasing in height, while the thickness of the clot is visibly increased, which makes the colouring of the counter-drawing more intense. There are all the traces of the downward flow being stopped, like water piling up behind a dam. The blood has been forced to accumulate slowly, and has been able to coagulate at leisure, which accounts for the way it has spread out in breadth and increased in height, and for the way the clot has thickened.  "There is an obstacle here, and it is evidently the place where the head-band of rushes was bound round the base of the forehead above the eyebrows. One of the sprigs must have been tied closely over the forehead, for there is a horizontal band without clots stretching right across. To right and the left, near the sides, there are two clots which have stopped at exactly the same level, and one can follow the whole course of the band. Beneath it, the blood appears once more, in the vertical frontal flow we have just analysed, below the point where it had begun to spread out horizontally and to thicken out in the direction of the mesial line. As the obstacle is always there, close against the skin, it must be that the blood managed eventually to filter through the sprigs of the head-band, and got past the dam. The clot which has been formed underneath is thin and narrow in the supra-orbital region, but it spreads out and progressively thickens out on the inner side of the left eyebrow as far as the eye-socket. There is always the same process of flowing and coagulation.  "I would defy any modern painter, unless he is a surgeon, with a thorough knowledge of the physiology of coagulation, and has meditated for a long time on all the possible avatars of that thin thread of blood slowly coagulating in the midst of the obstacles, to imagine and to portray this image of the frontal clot. Even with such conditions, it is more than likely that here or there some blunder would betray the forger and the work of his imagination."  "As for the hypothetical painter whom people have dared to claim was capable, having painted or stained these negative images in the Middle Ages, of imagining (whatever his genius may have been) all the minutiae of this clot which is as pregnant with truth as if it was on a living man – it is enough to disgust a physiologist and a surgeon. Please do not talk of it! This image, and it alone, should be enough to prove that nobody has touched the Shroud except the Crucified Himself. And it is one image among a hundred others."  The "head-band of rushes" is actually kept at Notre Dame in Paris under the name of "Crown of thorns". This study is proof of its certain authenticity. In fact, it is remarkable that this relic has no thorns on it; if it were a hoax fabricated in the Middle Ages, the forger would most certainly have had added thorns.  "Bearing His Cross" (Jn 19.17)  Over and above the flagellation wounds, there are traces to be seen of the abrasions caused by a burden which weighed on the shoulder blades: a trace of the carrying of the Cross which no one had imagined in this way. Jesus did not carry the whole Cross, as is generally represented by artists. Places of execution were planted in advance with the upright stake, called crux, and the horizontal beam, called patibulum, was laid on the shoulders of the condemned man. It was a crushing burden. In His love for us and His will to save us, Jesus finds the energy to carry it on His shoulders, already wounded by a flagellation that should have killed Him (see figures [10](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud4.htm#figure 10) and [11](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud4.htm#figure 11)).  From the Antonia fortress to the top of Mount Calvary, the distance to cover is about six hundred metres. Jesus covered it barefooted. The ground was rough, scattered with stones, very uneven even inside the ramparts. In 1978, the Americans of the STURP team suddenly came face to face with the evidence of this painful procession to Calvary. They were absorbed in their scientific task, each one according to his own speciality. The one was establishing the reflection curve, the other was examining the Cloth and taking infrared photographs, the third was examining it under X-ray, etc. Suddenly, those who were establishing the reflection curves noticed different spectra about the heel. Jumper, who was directing operations, called Pellicori to ask him to install the macroscope: "See what it is on the heel that is making the spectra vary." After careful examination, Pellicori turned round and said: "It’s DIRT." Surprise all round! Everybody wanted to see this "dirt" encrusted in the fibres, which plunged them all into an abyss of thought. What could be more "logical"? A man has never been crucified wearing shoes or sandals! He walked barefoot. To find themselves thus suddenly in contact with the event, led them to ask seriously: "Could it be a genuine grave Cloth?"  But as good Anglo-Saxon empiricists, they thought they had gone beyond the data, and quickly came back to their measuring instruments. However, they found this "dirt" encrusted between the fibres at the level of the knee as could be expected. In putting one foot painfully before the other, Jesus collapsed several times, falling on his knees, which are but one big wound (see [figures 18 and 19](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud6.htm#figure 18)). Finally, Jesus falls full length, absolutely exhausted, and is unable to protect his Face from the brutal contact with the ground. Through his macroscope, Pellicori found this same dirt at the tip of the nose!  "They crucified Him." (Jn 19.18)  Having arrived at the height of Mount Calvary, Jesus is placed on the cross. How can we imagine such a scene? Through a careful study of the "Five Wounds" "dug", as Psalm 22 says, according to the Greek Septuagint version, in the hands and feet of Jesus, and in His Heart too. On His Shroud we can only see four, because that of the right wrist is hidden beneath the left wrist (see [figure 20](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud6.htm#figure 20)).  They are the wounds of one crucified by the hands and the feet as were the countless number of those so condemned in Antiquity, at least up to the time of Constantine exclusively. The truth obliges us to say that we know nothing about this torture, which had been abolished since the IVth century – nothing other than what the work of Barbet has discovered on the Holy Shroud. To be convinced of this, we need only read the study written by Catherine Salles on Crucifixion among the Romans.  The introduction to the article states: "In ancient Roman times, crucifixion was the ignominious penalty par excellence. It was a death reserved for those condemned persons who were not even judged worthy of the name of man. How these capital executions were carried out has been described in detail by historians and archaeologists." This last assertion is without foundation.  The truth is that the Gospel and the Holy Shroud are the only source of such detailed information. To be convinced of this, it is sufficient to read the author’s explanations on the placing of the nails in the hands and feet of the condemned man and on the cause of his death. On each one of these points she summarises the results obtained by Pierre Barbet from his surgical experiments conducted over a period of two years in the dissecting room of the Saint Joseph hospital in Paris. She then adds: "After these different operations, the titulus, a board indicating his identity and the reason for his condemnation, was fixed above the head of the condemned man or hung around his neck. In the provinces, the text was in three languages so as to be understood by all: Latin, Greek and the local dialect (Aramaic in the case of Jesus)." This time, the only reference, though still implicit, is the fourth Gospel (John 19.19-20). But why not acknowledge it?  The Passion according to the surgeon, Barbet, and the Passion according to Saint John, however remain absent from the author’s bibliography, where her own works on "The Old Testament" and on ancient Rome nevertheless find a place. But death by crucifixion is a form of execution unknown in the Old Testament. And it would remain unknown to us today were it not for the four Gospel accounts of Christ’s Passion, illustrated with such striking realism by the only silent witness: the Holy Shroud. Why hide her own sources?  The fact is that this appalling form of execution was abolished by Constantine in honour of Our Lord – an execution reserved to common law criminals, to slaves, to political prisoners, such as this Yehohanan ben Hagqôl, whose nail-transfixed heel was discovered by Israeli archaeologists outside Jerusalem. The man had been crucified in the year 70 AD, during the Jewish war, forty years after Christ therefore. He was doubtless among the hundreds of those unfortunate Jews who were "subject to every kind of torture before dying and then crucified facing the ramparts", which even moved Titus to pity according to Flavius Josephus (Jewish War 5.449-451).  Jesus did not leave us His skeleton, but His Shroud stained with His Precious Blood. This magnificent piece of linen certifies that after having been executed as a brigand, He was buried as a prince!  But why should a latinist of the University of Paris X (Nanterre) be unable to quote the Gospels in her bibliography, or the works of Doctor Pierre Barbet on the Holy Shroud? Why? Because the intellectual terrorism now reigning over "historians and archaeologists" forbids them to regard the Gospels as historical documents. As for the Holy Shroud, the same terrorism "situates its origins between 1260 and 1390", as is explained by the following article written by Odile Celier.  Thereafter, it is a question of knowing how a XIVth century "forger" could have represented "how this form of capital execution was carried out", with such faultless anatomical, physiological and neurological exactitude, when the memory of it had been lost since Constantine. In answer to this question, here is "the opinion of a research scientist": "The famous Holy Shroud of Turin very probably wrapped the body of one crucified", perhaps during one "of those Mysteries of the Passion when the cleric who played the part of Jesus could really be scourged, crowned, and crucified for the length of these long monologues, and then buried in a shroud".  So was "role playing" in vogue during the Middle Ages? Let us leave these absurd suppositions. The Holy Shroud truly dates from the first century, as we are going to demonstrate yet again. The definitive proof of this is in fact the 1988 dating, only provided there is no mistaking the identity of the samples! But before that, let us come back to the unique object of our study, our contemplation and our adoration.  "They pierced my hands and my feet." (Ps 22.17)  Jesus was first stripped of his garments. An atrocious torture: "Have you ever removed the first dressing which has been on a large bruised wound? Or have you yourself ever been through this ordeal, which sometimes requires a general anaesthetic? If so, you know what it is like. Each thread has stuck to the raw surface, and when it is removed it tears away one of the innumerable nervous ends which have been laid bare by the wound. These thousands of painful shocks add up and multiply, each one increasing the sensitivity of the nervous system. Now in this case it is not just a question of a local lesion, but of almost the whole surface of the body, and especially of that dreadful back! The executioners are in a hurry and set about their work roughly. Perhaps it is better thus, but how does this sharp, dreadful pain not bring on a blackout? How clear it is that from beginning to end He dominates, He directs His Passion."  Covered in blood and wounds, Jesus is stretched out on the ground and His shoulders laid on the patibulum. The wounds on His back, on His thighs and on the calves of His legs become caked with dust and with tiny pieces of gravel.  "Put your finger here, and see my hands." (Jn 20.27)  "The executioners take the measurements. A stroke with an auger, to prepare the holes for the nails (they know that the hands will be easy to pierce but the nails enter less easily into the wood), and the horrible deed begins. An assistant holds out one of the arms, with the palm uppermost. The executioner takes hold of the nail", a long nail, pointed and square, a "Passion nail", eight millimetres thick near its large head. "He gives Him a prick on the wrist, in that forward fold which he knows by experience." This precise place was something Barbet sought on fleshly amputated limbs, guided by the image of the Holy Shroud, where the left wrist wound can be seen (see [figure 20](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud6.htm#figure 20)). In the article quoted above, Catherine Salles unhesitatingly writes: "In the technique most commonly used, the nails do not pierce the palm of the hand (the skin would tear beneath the weight of the body) but the wrists in the middle of the carpus bones." She did not read that in Seneca nor in Cicero, that is for sure, but in Barbet: "There is no shadow of doubt that the wound on the back of the left hand, while it is not on the metacarpus, nevertheless is still on the hand; it must therefore be in the wrist."  "One single blow with the great hammer, and the nail is already fixed in the wood, in which a few vigorous taps fix it firmly. Jesus has not cried out," but His Face has contracted and His thumb, with a violent and unstoppable movement, has suddenly closed against the palm of His hand, as Barbet saw on arms freshly amputated, and therefore still alive, in the dissecting room of the Saint Joseph Hospital. In fact, each of the two hands, so fine and so slender, appears to have only four fingers, and are admirably transferred as such on to the Linen. The thumbs by contrast are hidden within the palms. Barbet understood this during his dissections: "His median nerve has been touched. I realise then what He had been through: an inexpressible pain darts like lightning through His fingers and then like a trail of fire right up to His shoulder, and bursts in His brain. The most unbearable pain that a man can experience is that caused by wounding the great nervous centres. It nearly always causes a blackout, and it is fortunate that it does. Jesus has not willed that He should lose consciousness. Now, it is not as if the nerve were cut right across. But no, I know how it is, it is only partially destroyed; the raw place on the nervous centre remains in contact with this nail; and later on, when the body sags, it will be stretched against this like a violin-string against the bridge, and it will vibrate with each shaking or movement, reviving the horrible pain."  "The other arm is pulled by the assistant; the same actions are repeated and the same pains. But this time, remember, He knows what to expect. He is now fixed on thepatibulum, to which His shoulders and two arms conform exactly. He already has the form of a cross: how tall He is!  "Now they must get Him on His feet. The executioner and his assistant take hold of the ends of the beam and then hold up the condemned man who is first sitting, then standing, and then, moving Him backwards, they place Him with his back against the stake", the vertical post, stipes crucis (the gibbet of the cross), planted in advance at the place of execution. "But this is done, alas, by constantly pulling against those two nailed hands, and one thinks of those median nerves. With a great effort, and with arms extended (though the stipes is not very high), quickly, for it is very heavy, and with a skilful gesture, they fix the patibulum to the top of the stipes. On the top with a few nails they fix thetitulus written in three languages […]  "The body, hanging, is held up by nothing more than the nails fixed into the two wrists – once more those median nerves! It could be held fast with nothing else. The body is not slipping forwards, but the rule is that the feet should be fixed."  On the piercing of the feet, Barbet could write with less anguish: "The left foot is flat on the cross. With one blow of the hammer, the nail is driven into the middle of it (between the second and third metatarsal bones). The assistant then bends the other knee, and the executioner, bringing the left foot round in front of the right which the assistant is holding flat, pierces this foot with a single blow in the same place. This is easy enough, and with a few vigorous blows with the hammer the nail is well embedded in the wood. This time, thank God, it is a more ordinary pain, but the agony has scarcely begun. The whole work has not taken the two men much more than two minutes and the wounds have not bled much."  But we shall see that in order to struggle against asphyxia and to breathe, in order to pronounce the seven words, a whole Gospel in themselves, Jesus raised Himself up by pushing on His feet, which must, therefore, have provided a solid support. That is why we suggested to Doctor Pierre Mérat, our friend, that he search in the tarsus, as Pierre Barbet had sought, not so long ago, for the space through which the nail pierced the hands in the carpus, and had discovered it in the anatomical space known as the de Destot space. We were simply taking up an intuition of Father Noguier de Malijay, which Barbet had discarded as "untenable", declaring that "the bones and the joints of the tarsus would resist penetration, especially if the two feet were crossed, thus greatly increasing the resistance". He added that "no image is to be seen in the tarsus corresponding with the piercing of the nail. I have also tried to nail the front tarsus of a freshly amputated foot, which is the least thick part of the tarsal group: For one foot alone, I had to strike firmly twenty times with the hammer before I had made my way through the bony group, by going deep into it."  In 1978, the photographs of the blood stain left by the imprint of the sole of the foot show a probable point of emergence for the nail corresponding to the tarsus rather than to the metatarsal spaces (see [figure 21](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud6.htm#figure 21)). Pierre Mérat, therefore, agreed to undertake the research, and he was rewarded for his efforts by a moving and overwhelming discovery:  "Using an eight millimetre square twenty centimetre long nail, we tried to find this passage by hand in the prominent part of the back of the foot. We used no hammer so as to break no bones, in conformity with Scripture (Jn 19.36). To no avail.  "Then we thought of the forced position which the executioners probably inflicted on those feet to be solidly fixed to the wood, and we bent the foot of our dissection subject until it was pointed like a ballet dancer’s. With the foot in that position, the nail went in quite easily so that only two knocks with the hammer blows were needed for it to appear through the sole. We placed the point of the foot onto the same place as the other foot, which was pierced in the same way. The dissection showed the passage of the nail to be between the second and the third cuneiform bone of the tarsus, above the scaphoid, at the place visible on the X-ray photo. The bones were not broken; at the most, they were slightly marked by the nail passing over the cartilage. I repeated the experiment eighteen times, and always with the same result.  "If a transparency of the skeleton is placed over the contour of the foot and these two transparencies are placed over the bloodstain of the cloth, the point where the nail emerges through the sole is evident. It is the little dark stain, surrounded by a clear halo, from which the blood ran down towards the ball of the foot. This trickle is accompanied by a clear flow, where again the characteristic reaction of albumin is brought out. There is a non-bloody lymphatic flow around the clots of blood. What forger could ever have imagined that!"  With our friend’s permission, we immediately gave the name "Mérat’s space" to the anatomical space discovered by him in the school of the Holy Shroud. Barbet’s conclusion receives striking and unanswerable confirmation from this further experimental proof:  "All the blood images coincide, without exception, and in an amazingly precise way, with anatomical reality. All these facts taken together, or rather this unanimity of veracity, constitute a presumption in favour of truth equivalent to certitude. If there were one single exception, I could hesitate and not give the Shroud that confidence, which has only increased as my experiments have progressed. And this confidence is still further strengthened when I see the blood clot at the wrist, which does not show a single vertical flow, but two clearly distinct flows separated by an angular distance. This manifestly coincides with what we know experimentally, alas! about death from asphyxia and the efforts made by the Crucified victim to hoist Himself up. One would need to be blind not to see in all these blood images the pure effect of reality."  "**I thirst!**" (Jn 19.28)  Hoisted up on His gibbet, Jesus sagged, pulling on His arms that are stretched, His shoulders scraping painfully against the wood, the nape of His neck hitting against thepatibulum. This movement caused the sharp points of His crown of thorns to tear the scalp a little more. This "crown" prevents Him from resting His poor Head against the wood; it, therefore leans forward, and each time He straightens it, He again feels the pricks.  After so many tortures, for a worn-out body this immobility is almost a rest. His features are drawn; His pale face is streaked with blood which is congealing everywhere. He thirsts! He will say so in a little while, not to complain but "so that the Scripture might be fulfilled", as Saint John notes (Jn 19.28).  "My mouth it dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue cleaves to my jaw." (Ps 22.16)  His mouth is half open and His lower lip has already begun to droop! A little saliva has flowed down to His beard, mingled with the blood from His nose. His throat is dry and on fire; He cannot even swallow the little saliva He has left! He has eaten and drunk nothing since… how long? And He has lost so much Blood...  Suddenly, He is seized with cramp! Gradually, all the muscles of His Body contract as a result of general tetanus, diagnosed by the doctor’s practised eye. His head leans forward, as we see on the facial silhouette, because the inspiratory muscles are contracted by this tetanus in which Jesus finally died. The streaks of blood along the arms follow the contours of the muscle contractions in the arms and forearms. The thighs too are distorted by the same monstrous, rigid projections. The stomach muscles stiffen in fixed waves; then the intercostal muscles, the neck muscles and the respiratory muscles.  The two main pectorals, which are the most powerful respiratory muscles are forcefully contracted, enlarged and pushed up towards the collar bones and the arms. The whole rib cage is itself pushed up and strongly distended through forced breathing in; the pit of the stomach is sunk in, depressed through the rib cage being raised and distended upwards and outwards. The whole abdominal mass is pushed downwards by the diaphragm: see, above His crossed hands, the protuberance of the lower stomach.  Such are the unquestionable symptoms of tetanus and asphyxia: "The air enters with a whistling sound but scarcely comes out any longer. He is breathing in the upper regions only; He breathes in a little, but cannot breathe out. He thirsts for air. He is like an asthmatic at the height of an attack. A flush has gradually spread over His pale face; it has turned a violet purple and then blue. He is asphyxiating. His lungs which are loaded with air can no longer empty themselves. His forehead is covered with sweat; His eyes are prominent and rolling. What an appalling pain must be hammering in His Head! He is going to die."  But no. Neither thirst, nor haemorrhage, nor asphyxia, nor pain will get the better of this athletic Body of a Saviour God! And if He dies with these symptoms, He will only die in truth because He freely wills it, having the power, as He had stated, of "laying down His life and taking it up again". It is precisely this voluntary death that will shortly make the centurion proclaim, as he observes at a little distance with an already respectful attention: "Truly this Man was the Son of God." (Mt 27.54)  Indeed, what did he and his squad witness, together with Mary, the Mother of Jesus, who stood there, and Saint John and the holy women? We can see the scene as though we were there: slowly, and with a superhuman effort, He pressed on the nail in His feet; the ankles and the knees stretch a little, and the body is pushed up bit by bit, relieving the pressure on the arms, but at the price of appalling pains, for the median nerves rub against the nail. With that, the tetanisation recedes, the muscles become relaxed, at least those of the chest. The lungs expel the vitiated air that filled them and soon the poor swollen face, all bleeding and distorted, recovers its ordinary pallor. Above all, He has recovered His breath! To do what? To speak. To articulate a few words with His dying voice: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!" (Lk 23.34)  And then, no sooner have these words been pronounced with a superhuman effort, than the Body sinks down again and the tetanisation comes on again. On seven occasions, He straightens up and speaks, between two bouts of asphyxia, at the cost of unspeakable pains, for every movement reverberates in His hands, irritating the median nerves. These successive movements of sagging and straightening up have left a visible trace on the Shroud: they are the two strands of blood making an acute angle of a few degrees on the left wrist (see [figure 20](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud6.htm#figure 20)). One side corresponds to the flow of blood in the sagging position, the arm then making an angle of 65 degrees with the vertical; the other corresponds to the flow of blood in the standing position, the arm then making an angle of 70 degrees with the vertical. The successive movements of pressing up and then of letting go "is the periodical asphyxiation of the poor unfortunate who is being strangled and then allowed to come back to life, to be choked once more several times over."  In addition to the thirst, to the cramp, to the asphyxia, to the unbearable vibrations of these two median nerves, we must mention the infection of the wounds and those horrible big blue and green flies buzzing all round His Body and suddenly settling on one or other wound to suck its blood and lay its eggs. They go for His Face, but it is impossible to whisk them away!  And not a complaint, other than gently to His Father: "Eli, Eli, lamma sabacthani. My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" (Mk 15.34)  And suddenly, knowing that "all is consummated" (Jn 19.30), again He utters a great cry: "Father, into Thy hands, I commend my spirit!" (Lk 23.46)  "He died when He willed to do so", wrote Barbet, "I wish to hear of no more physiological theories!" Jesus died by a miracle, and that is what made the centurion exclaim his profession of faith: "Truly this Man was the Son of God!" (Mt 27.54)  Ask any asthmatic in the most extreme throes of an attack to utter a cry. It is quite impossible! Where would he find the necessary air?  Finally, "bowing His head, He gave up the Ghost" (Jn 19.30).  His head fell straight forward, His chin resting on the breastbone, as we see on the facial silhouette: the head clearly fixed in a forward inclination, "the face now relaxed and calm, and in spite of its dreadful stigmata, illumined by the very gentle majesty of God, Who is still present there."  "Blood and water." (Jn 19.34)  The final revelation of a suffering of which we had no idea, and which must be added retrospectively to all the others. The soldiers use an iron bar to break the legs of the thieves. They now hang pitifully and, as they can no longer raise themselves on their feet, tetanus and asphyxia will soon finish them off. "But having come to Jesus", writes Saint John, the only eye witness of the scene, "when they saw that He was already dead, they did not break His legs. But one of the soldiers with a spear opened His side, and immediately there came out blood and water." (Jn 19.33-34)  Barbet looks on this "tragic and precise gesture" as a practising surgeon. "He raised the shaft of the spear, and with a single slanting blow to the right side, he pierced it deeply." He himself repeated the experiment on several corpses for autopsy, before dissecting them: "John truly saw it, and I also, and we would not lie: a broad stream of dark liquid blood, which gushed out onto the soldier, and slowly flowed in dribbles over the chest, coagulating in successive layers. But at the same time, and specially noticeable at the edges, there flows a clear liquid like water. Let us see, the wound is below and to the outside of the nipple (the fifth space), and the blow from below. It is therefore the blood from the right auricle, and the water issued from the pericardium. But then, O poor Jesus, Your Heart was compressed by this liquid, and apart from everything else You had the agonising cruel pain of Your Heart being held as in a vice." (see [figure 4](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud2.htm#figure 4), below)   |  | | --- | | *"****As it was the Preparation, the Jews, to avoid the bodies remaining on the cross on the Sabbath day – for that Sabbath was a solemn day – asked Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away. The soldiers, therefore, came and they broke the legs of the first, and then of the other that was crucified with Him. But having come to Jesus, when they saw that He was already dead, they did not break His legs. But one of the soldiers with a spear opened His side, and immediately there came out blood and water. And he that saw this has given testimony – and his testimony is true, and he knows that he is saying the truth – that you may also believe****.****For these things were done that the scripture might be fulfilled:*Not a bone of His shall be broken. *And again another scripture says:*They****shall look on Him Whom they have pierced." (Jn 19.31-37)** |  |  | | --- | | The side wound on the Shroud |  |  | | --- | | *Figure 4: On the facial silhouette, it is possible to see the clots of a massive flow of blood, partly hidden, on its outer edge, by a piece of cloth sewn on by the Poor Clares of Chambéry after the fire of 1532. It is possible to distinguish the imprint of the Wound, oval in shape and slightly oblique, from which the blood poured. This Wound, 4.4cms in its main axis and 1.5cms in height, is the passage opened by the spear. The upper part of the blood clot, the nearest to the wound, is the thickest and widest, unlike the wounds made by the Crown of Thorns where the blood, clotting more slowly, stopped in its descent and accumulated before an obstacle (see*[*figure 3*](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud2.htm#face)*, above). The inside edge of the clot is cut off by the rounded indentations, which are inexplicable on an immobile and upright body. These indentations correspond to the projections of the serrated main muscle (Barbet).* |   By way of spiritual bouquet, a sublime word from Saint Thérèse of the Holy Face will inspire our prayer: "O Jesus, allow me to tell You that You have done follies for Your little spouse." Thinking of all these sufferings, these dreadful pains which Jesus foresaw and premeditated throughout His life and wanted out of love for her, to save her, the predestined soul is filled with that charity which inflamed the heart of Saint Thérèse of the Child Jesus at the age of thirteen, ad which in a few years will entirely consume her.  "One Sunday, looking at a photograph (sic!) of Our Lord on the Cross, I was struck by the Blood which fell from one of His divine hands, and I felt great sorrow at the thought that this Blood fell to the ground with nobody eager to collect It, and I resolved that I would stay in spirit at the foot of the Cross to receive the divine dew flowing therefrom, with the understanding that I would then have to pour it over other souls... The cry of Jesus on the Cross constantly resounded in my heart: "I thirst." Those words enkindled within me an unknown and very vivid ardour. I wanted to slake the thirst of my Beloved, and I felt myself to be consumed with the thirst for souls."  THE LORD’S BURIAL  Attention is first of all concentrated on the study of the linen cloths which enveloped the Body of Jesus after His torture, and their arrangement in the tomb on Easter morning. On this point, as on so many others, John appears to be in serious disagreement with the Synoptics. In fact, the Synoptics relate the burial of Jesus by Joseph of Arimathea in asindôn, a sheet which wrapped the whole Body of Jesus (Mk 15.46; Lk 23.53; Mt 27.59). Whereas John, who writes as an eyewitness, does not mention this sindôn. According to him, Joseph and Nicodemus "took the Body of Jesus ad bound it with othonia." (Jn 19.40) The verb dein, "to bind", and the plural othonia, generally translated as "bandages", seem to exclude any identification between these bandages and the sindôn of the Synoptics and, a fortiori, with the venerable cloth of Turin.  At the Congress of Bologna (27-28 Nov. 1981), I made a contribution which figured in the Acts of the Congress, but which seems to have remained a dead letter through the authority of Father Feuillet, the learned professor of exegesis from my seminary years at the Institut Catholique de Paris. Certainly, it will seem very bold to object to his interpretation of the Johannine account of the empty tomb on Easter morning (Jn 20.3-10). Especially as his exegesis is regarded as definitive by a conglomeration of associations more or less devoted to the "scientific" study of the Holy Shroud and the defence of its authenticity.  For my part, I followed the path opened by the Abbé de Nantes, my Master, which begins by setting aside all "concordism" tending to interpret the accounts of the Resurrection according to the Holy Shroud, and by resolutely distinguishing the two disciplines: exegetical science and sindonology, not to oppose the one to the other as Father Braun did in 1939-1940, but so that, through comparing the one with the other, further light might be shed.  "**The Shroud that had been about His head**" (Jn 20.7)  I began therefore by dealing with this piece of cloth which Saint John calls soudarion in his account of finding the empty tomb, which he did with Peter on Easter morning, telling us that it had remained in place, and that he, John, had thus seen the othonia; the sight of this alone determined his faith (20.5-7). I proposed recognising in the Johannine soudarion, the sindôn of the Synoptics, as opposed to the exegetes who all agree in seeing this as a chin band surrounding the head of the deceased in order to keep the mouth closed, according to the prescription of the Mishna! "And so, distinct from the "sindôn" or shroud, they invent a short piece of cloth knotted under the head of Jesus, making it out to be a chin band, as people used to be depicted suffering from toothache! What a horror!"  The eminent Hellenist René Robert gave us the joy of agreeing with our exegesis. In order to show my gratitude to this illustrious scholar I would like to quote in full from the three articles he has devoted to this controversy. On every line, common sense, together with the resources of an immense erudition, sets aside the false arguments; this one, for example, "permanent since Bultmann", which contrasts "those who maintain that Saint John’s Gospel was composed by a single author with those who hold to many editorial levels". How can one not support this simple liberating observation: "As the solutions proposed by the latter are as divergent as they are numerous and conflict with the Fourth Gospel’s remarkable homogeneity of style, the question may be idle"?  In any case, the account of Our Lord’s burial according to Saint John "shows every appearance of being that of a live witness". It is for us to know how to read in order to understand what the Evangelist saw, remembering that "he does not relate all that he saw, but only what struck him or what seemed to serve his purpose".  Recalling how I proposed, "against the ordinary", to recognise the soudarion as a shroud, "the Italian relic, to be precise", René Robert notes that it is the exegesis of Father Feuillet, and not mine, that appeals to the text of Saint John to the point of distorting it to make it concord with the Holy Shroud of Turin and its imprints:  "As the manifestations of the risen [Lord] reported in the Gospels are described as that of a glorious body appearing and disappearing without displacing the surrounding objects, it was thought to be legitimate, at first, to explain the persistence and clarity of the imprints by an identical disappearance on Easter morning. This hypothesis seemed to be corroborated by an indication in verse 8 of our chapter 20, where it says that after Peter, "the other disciple" also went into the sepulchre, kai eiden kai épisteusen: "He saw and he believed." This faith, closely connected with sight, later prompted a re-examination of verse 7 and the reasons for believing which, logically he should have highlighted. Such is the thinking that guided the further research and it will not be surprising that the first in-depth inquiry conducted along these lines by C. Lavergne should have been published in the "Cahiers du Saint Suaire". The aim was therefore to find in verse 7 the idea that none of the linen cloths had been displaced: logically, the untied bands should rest on the shroud, itself laid out flat, having fallen back on the sepulchral stone; the oval chin band, also knotted, should be perceptible from its protuberance beneath the shroud, in the place where the head had lain. These are the facts which are supposed to explain "the other disciple’s" conviction that the tomb had not been profaned and that Jesus had risen."  All this "exegesis" is upset by a simple comment from the professor of Greek: "If the disciple saw that, the least one can admit is that he did not say so: there is no allusion to bandages still knotted nor, moreover, to any similarly tied chin band; there is no specific reference to a shroud, albeit so expected in this hypothesis as complementing the words entétuligménon (rolled up) or topon (place). The description of what the witness had beneath his eyes cannot, as we have seen, be made to justify the desired interpretation. Despite that, this interpretation has been persistently maintained for two decades, and as the text cannot satisfy all the requirements of the hypothesis, every effort has been made to guess, beyond the actual words, how it could be substantiated."  Writing in the Thomist Review, René Robert came back to the charge a few years later: "The exegetical problems posed by the mention in Jn XX.7 of Jesus’ "shroud" continue to rouse various and contradictory answers, and the confusion is now such that the object examined by Peter in the tomb has been assigned positions that are far from the obvious sense of the text and, based on these supposed appearances, a quite unexpected apologetic has been constructed." And he quotes "among others", the case of Antoine Legrand’s book with a preface by the Abbé Laurentin.  The following year, there is a new "response to a few questions" elicited by the learned professor’s acceptance of our exegesis of the Johannine "shroud". "The idea of the shroud-chin-band" and the "new representation of its placement", formulated by Father Feuillet, seems to him to be "governed by an apologetic intention":  "I have the greatest regard for the works of the Abbé Feuillet, but I must repeat that on this occasion he has accommodated the text to what he hoped to find in it, and that his translation is unacceptable."  The author then proposes "the most literal translation which, whilst being clear, does not make any special demands on the text of verse 7:  "He sees the linen cloths lying, and the shroud, which had been about His head, not lying with the linen cloths, but apart, rolled up in a separate place."  The learned professor then goes on to demonstrate that "writers of the Greek language never interpreted the text otherwise, at least as far as the arrangement of the linen cloths is concerned". He quotes Saint John Chrysostom arguing, on two occasions, from the displacement of the linen cloths in the tomb, in favour of the historical fact of Christ’s resurrection: "If the body had been stolen, the robbers would not have taken care to remove the shroud, roll it up and place it apart."  In the end, "what remains certain is the importance Saint John attaches to the linen cloth "rolled up separately in a place apart". An ordinary napkin or chin band would not merit such emphasis."  It is at this point that our hypothesis found its full force in the eyes of Robert. What particularly held his attention was the complement made to my proof in an appendix on the resurrection of Lazarus, where the "shroud-soudarion" also appears (Jn 11.44).  From the shroud of Lazarus to that of Jesus  At Bologna, I was opposed by Robinson and Fossati with this verse concerning the resurrection of Lazarus, the ordinary translation of which reads as follows:  "The dead man came out, his feet and hands bound with bandages, and his face was bound about with a shroud (soudarion). Jesus said to them: ‘Loose him and let him go’." (Jn 11.44)  In a very friendly letter, the illustrious exegete of Trinity College, Cambridge, insisted: "The only thing that can pass "around the face" (of Lazarus) and "over the head" (of Jesus) is a chin band."  My reply consisted in pointing out that, in that case, Lazarus emerged from the tomb clothed only in the bandages attached to his hands and feet, and a chin band around his head to keep his mouth closed. "I am not joking", I insisted. "Father Lavergne is embarrassed by this ‘absence of all precision concerning the garment (sheet, tunic)’ of the dead man. But he soon puts his mind at rest: ‘As soon as he was loosed, Lazarus resumed his place among the living in the round of everyday life. Which makes one think that he was then at least clothed in a tunic.’  "But then, a further question: So was Lazarus entombed in this tunic without any other ‘shroud’? Lavergne escapes the difficulty badly: ‘The shroud probably remained in the sepulchre. But this argument is admittedly quite weak, and I shall not insist on it.’  "As can be seen, the idea of the soudarion-chin-band leads the exegetes who hold it to the same incoherence with regard to Lazarus as to Christ in the tomb. On the other hand, the two burials can be simply and satisfactorily reconstituted, if, with us, you consider that the ‘soudarion’ of Lazarus, like that of Jesus, was the shroud itself: one large piece of cloth passing over the head, and thus enveloping the whole body, which was held by these ‘bands’ just mentioned by Saint John, attached to his feet and his hands. The Aramaic word itself (soudarâ), which according to us is implicit in soudarion, even appears to have exactly the same meaning as in 20.7. To understand it, however, each word must be translated in its obvious sense and according to its true function."  I then ventured to propose that "the almost universal translation, to my knowledge, of opsis by figure, face, no doubt through its false friend facies, as it is rendered in Latin, seems to convey the wrong meaning. This word, whose root is ops, to see, signifies either sight in the active sense: the action of seeing and even the organ of sight; or in the passive sense: what is seen, the spectacle, the outward appearance, the look, the aspect. It is this second sense that justifies the word being translated into the Latin facies:outward form, appearance, the look, and, derivatively, the physiognomy and features of the face. The two uses noted by Father Lavergne in the New Testament have exactly this meaning, and both are Johannine. After the example of classical literature, the New Testament reserves the designation of face to prosôpon, generally rendered in Latin byvultus (Lk 9.29), and sometimes by facies (Mt 17.2). With even greater reason hè opsis has nothing to do with hè képhalè, the head, which current exegesis treats as the equivalent from the fact that the soudarion is said to pass "over the head" of Jesus.  "In John 11.44, therefore, it is a question of Lazarus’ outward appearance, which "had been bound about with a shroud". It is "the sight" itself of this man that is thus found to be "encircled" by this linen cloth, and therefore hidden from the sight of the bystanders. The sense is exactly parallel to that which we determined for the burial of Jesus, where the soudarâ veils the majestic radiance in which this "appearance" normally clothed the Master. In the case of Lazarus, it is only a question of an ordinary man, except that this man was extraordinary in that he "had been dead" (ho tethnèkôs) and that he had been seen again on emerging from the tomb. In the eyes of the dumbfounded witnesses, it was a veritable "apparition", although "the sight" of the man himself (hè opsis autou) remained obscured "by a soudarion" which "encircled" him. The translation which results from this analysis is perfectly clear:  " ‘The dead man came out, attached by bandages at the feet and hands, and appeared wrapped in a shroud.’  "He ‘appears hidden’ in his shroud: it is through this paradox, much more palpable in the Greek turn of phrase, that Saint John reconstructs the full force of the bystanders’ stupefaction."  I then quoted Father Lagrange: "He does not say that Lazarus rose up in his sepulchre, but only what must have struck the bystanders with amazement, how the dead man emerged from the inner chamber and appeared still wrapped like one dead. If Lazarus had come out with his bands loosened, that would have been a second miracle; and it also seems to be a miracle that he was able to move forward thus bound. But there was a reason for this state of dress: to show in what state Lazarus was and to confirm the fact of the resurrection by this amazing walk."  My conclusion was: "At the same time as reconstituting the gripping film of the scene which he himself had witnessed, Saint John is able to pass on a full understanding of it: Jesus breaks the bonds which keep this ‘apparition’ veiled, and restores him to the light of day: ‘Loose him and let him go.’ "   |  | | --- | | The blood flow from the side wound |  |  | | --- | | *Figure 5: Joseph of Arimathea, Nicodemus and Saint John "succeeded in lowering the Body from the Cross and transporting it to the tomb with infinite delicacy, respect and tenderness. They hardly dared touch this adorable Body", Barbet stated. For proof: this transversal flow of blood coming from the lower cave vein (on the right for the reader), by the Wound of the right side (see*[*figure 4*](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud2.htm#side)*, above), after his being lowered from the Cross and placed in a horizontal position. After being carried, the Body was placed, naked, on the Shroud, which absorbed the imprint of the blood clots formed on the skin of the back during the flow of the capillarity. "It is certain that the Body was carried to the tomb with a minimum of movement, in such a way that the blood clots remained in place, unaltered. Had the movements been more numerous and less delicate, the blood clots would have been wiped out and effaced."* |   It is then that Robert gives me the great joy of verifying the validity of my hypothesis with the resources of his immense erudition. If we come back to the discovery of the empty tomb on Easter morning, what is the meaning of this detail: "which had been about His head" ? This detail, writes Robert "is not clear and is found in a context which is not clear either, if one refers to the contradictions in the criticism of this subject. Is it a question of information to do with the destination of the grave cloth and therefore of its size, as was thought by those who held it to be an accessory (a napkin)? Should we, on the other hand, suppose one of those symbolic intentions, so frequent in the fourth Gospel, especially in the account of the Passion? Bonnet-Eymard has kept to this last working hypothesis, and, in the path traced by Father Levesque, has had the good fortune and the merit to find the key to this particular, which had left the critics disorientated."  That was, in fact, the new information in what I communicated to the Congress of Bologna. We read in the Palestinian targums of the Exodus that at the moment when he came down from Mount Sinaï, holding "the two tablets of the Testimony", Moses failed to notice that his face radiated a brilliance, a brilliance which came to him from the brilliance of the Glory of the Presence of Yahweh, at the time when he had spoken with Him."  And so, after Moses had finished stating to Aaron and to the children of Israel, terrified by "the brilliance of the image of his face", all that Yahweh had said to him on the mountain, "he covered the image of his face with a veil (soudarâ) ". It is this word from the Aramaic targum, soudarâ, that Saint John has transposed into Greek by using the word soudarion, by reason of the parallel, established from his Prologue, between Moses and Jesus (Jn 1.17; cf. 1.45).  In the eyes of Saint John, it is not so much at the Transfiguration, which he also witnessed on Mount Tabor, that the glory of God shone on the face of Jesus, but rather at the moment of His supreme humiliation, at the "Hour" of His Passion. It is on the Cross, planted on Mount Calvary as on a new Sinaï, that the divine Glory shone on His face.  Coming down from Calvary, He hides His glory in order to be seen by men in His state of abasement. As Moses veiled his face, so Jesus is clothed in His Shroud.  At the moment of the Resurrection, His light, the light of His face is made manifest. Is this the burning that is recognised on the Holy Shroud of Turin? The conclusions of the symposium held at New London shortly after that of Bologna, on the 10th and 11th October 1981, seem to meet with this hypothesis. But the carbon 14 test intervened and seemed to put out the light that was already pouring forth from the Holy Shroud, negative of the divine glory, which had remained illegible for nineteen centuries, stifled again at the moment when it suddenly passed from negative to positive, from obscurity to illumination, allowing the features of our glorious Saviour to appear to our eyes. We reached the point where all the proofs of its authenticity seemed to have been extinguished and the very French mystical tradition of its reparatory devotion annihilated. | | |
| II.  THE CONCLUSION OF A NEW TRIAL: HIS CONDEMNATION TO DEATH AND HIS RESURRECTION During the life time of Therese of the Holy Face, the Holy Shroud had remained hidden like her, unknown, forgotten, relegated, buried in its "sepulchre", so aptly named, above Bertola's altar in the Guarini chapel.  It was an exhibition of sacred art which brought out the Holy Shroud in 1898, and photography revealed it to the world. Yet, it only emerged from its silence for a "public life"; its exposition in 1978, and the expertise which followed it, at the hands of the STURP team, were the Palm Sunday of its triumph. Putting a stop to the enormous imposture by McCrone, who made a great media fuss to have everyone believe that the image was an iron oxide painting, the thirty two scientists of the American team and their assistants published the results of their work at the New London symposium held on the 10th and 11th October 1981:  *"****We can conclude for now that the Shroud image is that of a real human form of a scourged, crucified man. It is not the product of an artist. The blood stains are composed of haemoglobin and also give a positive test for serum albumin.****"*  Shortly after this symposium, the Trustees of the British Museum authorised Doctor Tite to act as supervisor of a project for the Holy Shroud to be dated by the carbon 14 method. On whose initiative and with what aim? Mystery!   |  | | --- | | Face of Christ on the positive image of the Shroud |  |  | | --- | | Figure 6 |   Note that the Holy Shroud is already dated by the imprint of Christ with which it is marked, with a certitude strikingly corroborated by palaeography.  A procedure was first of all drawn up among the seven laboratories appointed for this project and the Pontifical Academy of sciences, which was commissioned with the task of co-ordinating the work with the help of the British Museum and the "G. Colonetti" meteorological institute in Turin, which would be responsible for the statistical analysis and interpretation of the results.  It is remarkable, however, that the Americans of the STURP team and the Italian sindonologists of the Centro, and we ourselves obviously, were kept out of these preliminary moves. Why "obviously"? Because we do not accept imposture in science any more than in doctrine, no matter from how high it claims to be imposed. Already, in the international campaign in support of McCrone's imposture, we had taken the place, despite ourselves, of judge and jury, which was vacant, opposing ourselves to the various Maffias.  STURP had enlisted for the multidisciplinary program of "Project no 2", the carbon 14 dating. But Henry Gove had sworn to keep them out. In the name of what and of whom did he get his way? The devil was already entering into the game.  The "Turin Protocol" numbered no less than eight hundred typewritten pages; everything, absolutely everything was provided for, from the taking of samples from the Holy Shroud, entrusted to Madame Mechtilde Flury-Lemberg, of the Abegg-Stiftung in Berne, the most qualified person in the world for this first delicate operation on which everything else depended, to carrying out the two dating methods (AMS and small gas counters).  Now, this protocol concluded under the aegis of Cardinal Ballestrero (29th Sept – 1st Oct 1986) ***was not respected****.* Nobody knows how or why Mechtilde Flury-Lemberg was set aside in favour of Signor Riggi, a person with no qualifications, why only three laboratories were kept in the end, using only one method, co-ordinated by the British Museum alone, in the person of Doctor Tite only, free to act as he liked. Nobody knows who evicted the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, not even Cardinal Ratzinger, contrary to all the promises he says he had been given. But it was from the hand of Cardinal Casaroli that the Pope's order reached Cardinal Ballestrero, in a letter dated May 1987 and transmitted to the laboratories on the 10th October 1987.  Thereafter, there was no more protocol. Tite is free to take whatever initiative he likes without being checked by anyone. And he is an ideological adversary of our Catholic faith, of its devotions, and of its "relics". Let us follow his actions carefully. SUBSTITUTION OF THE SAMPLES ***January 1988 :*** Tite holds a meeting in London with representatives of the three laboratories. Nothing has transpired from their discussions.  ***February :*** Tite starts the search for a linen sample absolutely similar to the Holy Shroud "in both weave and colour". But in secret. He writes to Jacques Évin. Évin addresses the Musée de Cluny but his request is refused. What is all that about? Mystery!  ***March :*** Tite writes a letter to the review ***Nature*** which will be published in April by way of "protocol", in which he makes no mention of this "double" of the Holy Shroud, which he was at that time actively searching in several directions. It all gives the idea of a substitution in preparation...  Jacques Évin went to Saint Maximin's, and without warning the Parish Priest, tore a few tufts of thread from the cope of Saint Louis d'Anjou (1274-1297), involving Gabriel Vial in the adventure to make sure that the texture of the cloth was similar in every point to that of the Holy Shroud. But he could not send them to Tite because of a postal strike. He, therefore, asked Vial to hand them over personally on the 21st April, the day fixed for removing the samples, to which the expert from Lyons had been invited.  In the meanwhile, hearing nothing from Évin, Tite turns to Ian Wilson of the British Society for the Turin Shroud, and makes the same request of him. It gets more and more curious!  There is no doubt that this secret quest for an unprovided sample is to prepare a substitute out of this sample for that of the Holy Shroud.  ***21 April 1988 :*** Madame Flury-Lemberg having been ousted, Signor Giovanni Riggi proceeds with the removal of samples from the Holy Shroud in the sacristy of the cathedral of Turin, in the presence of Cardinal Ballestrero, his scientific adviser Luigi Gonella, Professors Franco Testore and Gabriel Vial, textile experts, but knowing nothing of the Holy Shroud, Dr. Tite and representatives from the three laboratories.  After announcing in the "protocol letter" published by *Nature*, *"****that the laboratories will not be told which sample comes from the shroud****"*, Tite summons Professors Damon and Donahue from Tucson, Hall and Hedges from Oxford, and Wölfli from Zurich to be present at the sample taking... and to see what should have been hidden from them!  Furthermore, this sample taking session was a veritable *coup de force*, as is revealed by the grave incident that day when Cardinal Ballestrero was opposed by the *Beni Culturali* administration, the Italian State ministry of culture and proprietor of the Chapel of the Holy Shroud. Two officials came to remonstrate with the Cardinal for not having advised them about this sample taking, and stipulated that in future the Holy Shroud was not to be removed from its reliquary without the authorisation of the public authorities!  With remarkable clumsiness, Riggi cut out a large piece of 500 mg, and cut back 200 mg from the outer borders, ending in a strip of cloth 81 x 16 mm; in desperation, he divided it into two unequal parts; one part provided the three samples **that had to be equalised by adding a fragment from the other piece**, creating one sample of two pieces!  **This… detail of a sample in two pieces was guardedly held secret, both by Riggi** in his official report, dated the 26th April 1988, five days after the event, **and by Tite**in his, the official and definitive report, published in ***Nature*** ten months later, in February 1989, with the backing of the twenty co-authors of the dating. According to these reports, the sample taken from the Holy Shroud measured 7 x l = 7 cm2, and was divided into three equal samples, the first time, with no hitch, and all of the same shape, surface and weight.  They, therefore, passed in silence over the existence of a sample of two pieces, an indication of the crime they will no longer be able to wash their hands of right up to the time we finished by discovering it seventeen months later, as we shall remind all those who pretend to have forgotten.  Tite then intervened, but in the secrecy of a back room, in the presence of Cardinal Ballestrero and Gonella. In the ***three*** steel tubes for specimen ***n° 1*** he placed the ***four***fragments of the Shroud, destined for the three laboratories: Arizona (A1), Oxford (O1), Zurich (Z1). In the three tubes for specimen ***n° 2***, he placed a mediaeval cloth dated 11th- 12th century. In the three tubes for specimen ***n° 3***, under the false label "linen associated with the mummy of Cleopatra", he placed a sample of cloth from the Holy Shroud's "double" taken from the reserves of the *Victoria and Albert Museum*: three perfectly clean and equal rectangles cut from a strip of 7 x 1 cm belonging to a cloth from the 14th - 15th century.  In addition, each laboratory received a portion of the "fourth sample", brought by Vial who pressed it into Tite's hands, although he did not want it, since he had been unable to receive it in time and in secret. They were placed in small brown envelopes, since no steel tubes had been provided for this "fourth sample''.  ***23 April 1988 :*** On their return to Tucson and warned by Tite that their sample was in two pieces, which made the planned substitution easily detectable, and therefore dangerous, Douglas Donahue and Paul Damon decided to place the small 14 mg fragment in reserve and to make do with the remaining 40 mg for the analysis. Very quietly, they met as accomplices in the laboratory, that Sunday the 24th April; they opened tubes 1 and 3 and proceeded with the agreed substitution; they extracted the Holy Shroud,***in two pieces***, from tube 1; they took a souvenir photo (see below); they put the large piece into tube n° 3, and hid the small 14 mg piece away in a secret place. The cloth said to be from "the mummy of Cleopatra", but in reality a piece of medieval cloth from the 14th - 15th century, taken from the Bock collection of the *Victoria and Albert Museum*, was removed from tube 3 and placed in tube 1 where, as such, it took the place of the Holy Shroud. They did not bother about its weight or size...  They replaced the seals. From that moment, had everything gone smoothly, the fraud would have remained undetectable. But science is a wonderful thing, so exact, that the very numbers spoke! What am I saying? They cried out the truth!  ***Monday 25 April :*** Damon, Donahue, Jull and Toolin met for the solemn unsealing of the three numbered tubes; all four signed the laboratory notebook certifying that the seals were intact. A false testimony on the part of Damon and Donahue. Jull and Toolin are, as yet, kept out of the secret.   |  | | --- | | Photo of the Shroud in two pieces, Tucson Laboratory, Arizona, 14 April 1988 |  |  | | --- | | Figure 7: Detail of a "souvenir-photo" (!) taken at the Tucson laboratory, Arizona, on Sunday the 24thApril 1988, which Professor Donahue sent to us on the 3rdJanuary 1991. Our explanation:  –  the Archbishop of Turin’s red wax seal. It was not broken and will be replaced after the substitution, in such a way that on Monday morning, for the official opening of the tube, Damon and Donahue, Jull and Toolin will certify in the laboratory notebook that it was intact.  –  the steel tube marked "Al", the initial of the laboratory (Arizona), and the number of the sample which Tite placed therein on the 21stApril in Turin, in the presence of Cardinal Ballestrero.  –  the aluminium paper in which the sample was wrapped.  –  the Holy Shroud sample. It is in two pieces. The large piece weighs 40 mg; the small piece 14 mg.  Damon and Donahue are going to keep the small piece secret, and place the big piece in the tube marked "A3", after having previously taken from this tube no3 the sample officially labelled "Linen from the collection of the Egyptian antiquities of the British Museum, associated with a mummy of Cleopatra dating from the beginning of the 2ndcentury AD, originating from Thebes (EA 6707)." In reality: Linen from the Bock collection of the Victoria and Albert Museum (14th–15thcentury, weight: 53.7mg), which is going to take its place in the tube marked "Al".  Unfortunately for the hoaxers, this nocturnal transformation from 40 mg to50 and even 53 mg is inexplicable. It is proof of one of the greatest machinations invented by Christ’s enemies in the course of the first two millennia of the Christian era. To think that we reconstituted the whole of this crime six years ago, published it and everyone learned of it. Yet nowhere has there been heard an echo of this, in any book or article, journal or review. The moral: depending on whether you are a powerful liar or a wretched witness of the truth, the judgements of the court, of Rome or elsewhere, will make you out to be black or white. |  Dr TITE'S CONCERN ***From Friday 6 May to Wednesday 8 June :*** after preparing the samples – cutting them into sub-samples, cleaning, combustion into CO2 and conversion from CO2 into graphite targets – the Arizona laboratory made its analyses and immediately sent the results to Tite. For sample n° l, they came up with two calendar date ranges, one of which,***1359-1378***, with a 68% probability, was truly too modern for the "Holy Shroud". That alone was enough to alert the whole world that this sample n° 1, despite its label, was not the Holy Shroud exposed and venerated at Lirey ***from the year 1350!***  It was absolutely necessary, therefore, that the results from Zurich and Oxford correct this excess by providing results favouring the first date range (1285-1305). That is precisely what is seen at Zurich (see [figure 22](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud7.htm)). And still more at Oxford (see [figure 24](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud7.htm#figure 24)), which definitively reverses the trend by last minute measurements carried out ***over two days***, the 20th and 21st July, whereas the final report published by *Nature*, states that "each laboratory performed between three and five independent measurements for each textile sample, ***which were carried out over a time period of about one month***".  These three measurements made by Oxford did indeed end in the desired values. Of course! But one only has to examine the "figure 1" of the report published by ***Nature*** on the 16th February 1989 (our [figure 8](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud3.htm#figure 8), below) to see that they "fall" exactly – far too exactly, with no deviation to right or left – in line with the date range for sample 4, that of the cope of Saint Louis d'Anjou. Thus, Oxford's little plane, which is curiously in a band apart, is found to be exactly vertical with another Oxford plane, that of flight n° 4, sharing the same date range. We have underlined with two vertical red lines this first manifestation of the truth. While the other two little planes for n° 4, Zurich and Arizona, are here naturally in close flight formation with Oxford.  For flight n° 1 is the sample substituted for the Holy Shroud: the 1 x 7 cm strip. This one alone strangely presents a distinct variance among the three laboratories. It is a discordance which contrasts with the magnificent concordance of the other three results provided by the three other samples!   |  | | --- | | First figure in the report published by Nature (the lines having been added by the CRC) |  |  | | --- | | *Figure 8: First figure of the report published by the review*Nature*, 16th February 1989, summarising all the results obtained by the three laboratories (A, Arizona; O, Oxford; Z, Zurich) in radiocarbon age, that is to say, in the number of years before the present era (1950), the conventional age directly measured by carbon 14, before any calibration and conversion into calendar age. Each dash represents the range of results for a laboratory, identified by its initial. The shroud is sample 1, and the three controls are samples 2, 3 and 4. Sample 4 is the cope of Saint Louis d'Anjou.*  *The gap between Arizona and Oxford is too visible not to arouse the most legitimate of suspicions: enough to make one wonder whether these two laboratories worked on samples from the same cloth! The lengthy statistical development devoted to the interpretation of the results in the*Nature*report has no other reason than to attempt to answer that question... positively.*  *Our lines, added in red ink, underline that (all too) identical age of the supposed shroud and the cope of Saint Louis d'Anjou, both being the age demanded by Tite!* |   Oxford, therefore, proceeded, at Tite's request, with another substitution: a graphite target prepared from the threads of the cope of Saint Louis d'Anjou was used for "sample n° 1". The proof? The fact is written in black and white in the notebooks of the Oxford laboratory – secrets, secrets! – which we have to hand: this graphite target, codified 1166-l on the 13th July 1988, is missing from the table of measurements taken on the 20th and 21st July. Who stole it? Guess! THE MEDIA COUP DE FORCE According to scientific ethics, the result of the dating ought ***firstly*** to have been made the object of a report published in a specialist review and reviewed by peers, before being announced to the world. To reverse this order shows a manifest intention of abusing the public and of deceiving the entire world, as happened recently in the sphere of medical research.  ***25 June :*** "The delay is unusual", declares Kromer, Director of the Physics laboratory of Heidelberg. In fact, as we know, Arizona had completed its measurements by that time and had transmitted them to Dr Tite.  If the laboratories had acted simultaneously, at the same time as Tucson, in the weeks following the sample taking, and if they had transmitted their results to Tite together, everything would have been completed in June, but then there would have been no possibility of consulting together beforehand. But, there certainly was prior consultation and... all very secret! This is what took time. The laboratories acted one after the other: Tucson first, then Zurich, and finally Oxford, according to a well ordered timetable allowing for the results to be arranged at leisure so that they converged on the expected date.  It is only after Oxford's tests had been performed in July that the first "leaks" occurred.  ***From 27 July***, David Sox had filmed a programme for the BBC entitled *"Verdict on the Shroud"*. But he was not authorised to divulge what he already knew. He had, however, prepared a book with the provocative title, *"The Shroud unmasked"*, proclaiming in its sub-title the "discovery of the greatest forgery of all time". The book had been printed two weeks before the official publication of the results. The forgery was again at the forge!  ***Friday, 26 August***, the headlines in the London *Evening Standard* that day read, "The Shroud of Turin is a forgery". The news immediately spread like wild fire. Gonella, Cardinal Ballestrero's scientific adviser, attempted in vain to refute it.  After that, any delay imposed on the official publication of what was already generally known was denounced as an attempt on the part of the Church to obstruct the truth. A spokesman for Cardinal Hume, the Archbishop of Westminster, stated, however, that "the hierarchy would make no comment on the Shroud before receiving and studying the full report of the experiments". But would the Church be allowed this freedom under the pressure of such a formidable world orchestration? And would she want it?  ***28 September 1988 :*** Dr. Tite communicated the results to Cardinal Ballestrero, Pontifical Guardian of the Holy Shroud, who had neither the wisdom nor the courage to resist blackmail.  ***Thursday, 13 October 1988 :*** Even before the manuscript of the report to appear in ***Nature*** had been submitted for publication, and heedless of the incalculable consequences of his decision, the Cardinal gave a press conference on Thursday 13 October in the packed hall of the mother house of Don Bosco's Salesians at Valdocco. He, the Pontifical Custodian of the Holy Shroud, allowed himself to utter such insulting words with regard to the Holy Relic and its devotees, that Father Rinaldi, vice-president of the Holy Shroud Guild, demanded that he resign his office.  ***Friday, 14 October :*** press conference at the British Museum. Tite is enthroned, flanked by the physicists of the Oxford laboratory, Edward Hall and Robert Hedges. Behind them is a blackboard on which is chalked these simple dates: 1260-1390, punctuated with an exclamation mark, a shout of victory. On the evening of that Friday, the 14thOctober 1988, the "mediaeval" dating of the Holy Shroud was imposed on the Church – without any theological or pastoral attempt to justify its acceptance by the faithful so passionately attached to this dear Relic, and on the whole world without any control by "peers" of the scientific community – as the absolute and definitive result of the indisputable and undisputed carbon 14 method.   |  | | --- | | Press conference at the British Museum, 14 October 1988 |  |  | | --- | | *Figure 9: Press conference at the British Museum, on Friday the 14th October 1988. In the centre is Dr Michael Tite; to his right , Professor Edward Hall, director of the Oxford dating laboratory; on his left, the physicist Robert Hedges who carried out the test. Jacques Évin, the French specialist in low-level radioactivity, of the laboratory of Villeurbanne, recognised that it was necessary to "swindle" [in French, "truander"], to use his own expression, in order to obtain the arithmetical average published as the final result:*1260-1390!*the exclamation mark expressing all the jubilation concealed beneath the British coolness of Tite and Hall.*  *"They should not have averaged the figures", the French professor, Jacques Évin, conceded. Yet they did it all the same. Why? The last stage of our enquiry led us to question the statisticians of the British Museum.* |  TRACKING DOWN THE HOAXERS ***Sunday, 27 November***, at the main hall of the Mutualité in Paris, before an audience of two thousand five hundred, the Abbé de Nantes opened the inquiry, generously take the part of "devil's advocate", so as to gain a better hearing when he turned accuser. He resolutely dismissed all the imaginary "causes of error", which would allow the machines to be incriminated: neither contamination of the linen nor any supposed modification of the isotopic composition will ever explain how the results fall exactly in the all too expected 13th -14th century instead and in place of the 1st century of our era. Chance will have to shoulder the blame!  "And so, it is not the machines that laid down the law to men; it is men, their scientific and ecclesiastical "maffias", who manipulated and commanded the results in such a way that their "challenge" should end to their own glory and general satisfaction."  And already we have the first proof of this shady plot: the fraudulent intrusion of a fourth sample, removed from the cope of Saint Louis d'Anjou.  ***14 January 1989 :*** the English weekly *The Tablet* publishes an interview with Edward Hall, director of the Oxford laboratory, by John Cornwell, under the title: *Science and the Shroud*. "I would be willing to stake my entire reputation covering forty years on the reliability of our dating of the Turin Shroud." Well, today he has lost his bet!  ***16 February 1989 :*** The review ***Nature*** publishes *Radiocarbon dating of the Shroud of Turin* (volume n° 337, p. 611-615), signed by twenty-one co-authors, five months after the publication of the results *urbi et orbi*. This article had not been submitted for "peer" review. ***Nature***, moreover, is the only scientific review producing articles without such control. One only has to examine the "figure 1" of this report, an illustration of results accessible to all (our [figure 8](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud3.htm#figure 8), above), and study the statistical analysis devoted to the interpretation of these results, which itself occupies nearly one third of the whole article, to note that this development is of no real value. The review *Radiocarbon*, for example, would certainly have rejected this report. The simple fact of having substituted the Student test for the ***x***2 test, because of its negative result, is dishonest. The ***x***2 test posed a problem for the statistician, starting with the data with which he was provided. It was down to Dr Tite, therefore, the overall co-ordinator of the analysis, to submit the problem to the physicists and to ask them to make the complementary measurements.  Instead of that, what do we see? Not only did Dr. Tite fail to put the question, but he came to an agreement with statisticians of the British Museum, Madams Leese and Bowman, for another test to be applied that would raise no difficulty and would still allow an interval of dates, no matter how wide, to be defined. Provided they forget all about the ***x****2*!  For it is now established that this ***x****2* test cannot be circumvented, and, in the state of the present data, does not allow the results provided by the three samples A1, O1 and Z1 to be approved, for the three samples **do not obey one and the same normal law m1 ± 1.** In other words, in the present case, the Student test is of no significance, and the authors' statement in the *Nature* report, whereby *"the calendar age range of the Shroud, with at least a 95% degree of probability, is 1260-1390 AD"* is of no scientific value. This supposed degree of "probability" is false... Scientific honesty would have dictated the following declaration:  "***We have found for the Shroud an average calendar age of about 1320, but the results obtained do not allow us to place any degree of confidence in this average.***"  Imagine the effect on the journalists and on the organisers of the "Fake" exhibition. And then, it would have been necessary to explain why it was impossible to evaluate the precision of the result obtained, and to criticise the experiments and look for new data. But they were not paid for that...  ***Good Friday, 24 March 1989 :*** forty-five business men and "rich friends" *(sic)* give Professor Hall £1 million for services rendered, and notably for having *"established last year that the Shroud of Turin is a mediaeval fake"*.  *The Daily Telegraph* printed the news the next day, Holy Saturday, 25thMarch, explaining that this sum would provide for a successor to the "professor of Turin" *(sic)* who was coming up to retirement age. The professor declared his intention of investing the price of blood (Mt. 27.6) in the creation of a new chair of archaeological science at Oxford. With the evident agreement of all the generous donors. All disinterested, to a man! And what worthy scholar might there be to benefit from such aid? "The new chair will be occupied by Dr. Tite, director of the research laboratory of the British Museum, who also played a preponderant role in unmasking the fraud of the shroud of Turin." Any comment would be superfluous.  ***Easter Sunday, 26 March 1989***. The Italian daily *Il Messagero* echoed our denunciations and stirred up a scandal in Italy under the heading: *"The mysteries of the Shroud. A clandestine sample."*  However if "the affair of the fourth sample" seemed to reveal an attempted substitution, it appeared to have failed, since Gabriel Vial had taken this sample from his pocket and obliged Tite to accept it **after** the *mescolamento*. In any case, this textile was in the form of threads – not what Tite was expecting – and it would have been impossible to substitute it for the small pieces of the Shroud "mixed" with the pieces from the two other "control" textiles.  That is why, despite our *"****Summary of the carbon 14 affair****"* (June-July 1989) where we demonstrated that Tite had not even followed the "protocol" established by himself, he had continued to display an unshakeable composure.  ***4 June 1989 :*** **the death of Timothy W. Linick**, one of the twenty-one signatories of the ***Nature*** report. This young forty-two year old research scientist, from the laboratory of Arizona, was known for the scrupulous rigour that he brought to the statistical analysis of results obtained by the accelerator mass spectrometry method (AMS). Rumours circulated in the United States tending to pass this death off as suicide. Such an imputation is gravely damaging to the memory of this scientist. One may ask whether it was not meant to veil some shady crime. THE ARITHMETICAL PROOF OF A SUBSTITUTION OF SAMPLES The statistical analysis does not establish the proof of the fraud. It only indicates the diverse character of the results which are not explained by the hazards involved in counting the particles. It therefore calls for an inquiry into the origin of the samples distributed to the laboratories. Let us say in passing that, if there were any "cheating", it is idle to impute it to the Holy Shroud itself, as the bad defenders of the good cause persist in doing. According to them, something must have changed the radioactive content, and therefore the physical properties of the cloth. That does not explain the diverse character of the results. It will be necessary to look elsewhere and question the operators themselves.  ***7-8 September 1989. The Paris Symposium.*** Professor Hall had promised to attend in order to answer "doubts expressed as to the validity of the experiments". The explanations of one who, only last January, had declared that he was willing to stake his reputation as a scientist on the dating of the Holy Shroud carried out by his laboratory, was eagerly awaited. But it did not take place. We learned that the Professor sent his apologies, having been detained at the last minute by an important meeting of the administrative council. This news was interpreted in different ways. Unlike the other personalities prevented from attending, Hall sent no communication to the Symposium.  As for the laboratories of Zurich and Tucson, they also refused to take part. Only Dr. Tite was present, as guest of honour, full of quiet good humour, smiling, and strangely surrounded by the consideration of everyone present. He stalled on every question he was asked, and returned home feeling very relaxed.  However, on the very first day, the 7th September 1989, seventeen months after the event, the Italian Franco Testore announced for the first time the weights of the samples at every stage of their removal, on the 21st April 1988, from the Holy Shroud: a strip of cloth of 81 x 16 mm was divided into three pieces, which were then sent, under seals, to representatives of the laboratories who were present when the samples had been taken. There was a considerable difference, almost double, compared with the official dimensions published by ***Nature***. Incredible!  Testore continues: "Because the laboratories had asked for a sample weighing *at least* 50 mg, the piece was further cut into two more or less equal parts, whose respective weights were 154.9 mg for the first piece, and 144.8 mg for the second, with a loss of about 0.3 mg".  Further surprise! The laboratories had asked for a sample of at least 50 mg. All right. But since it was possible to give *more*... what was the difficulty? Why not give it *all*? 100 mg each one! For one very simple reason: the samples brought by Tite from the Bock collection of the Victoria and Albert Museum, to replace those of the Shroud, had been "prepared from a strip of 7 x 1 cm", as the ***Nature*** report says. For the substitution to be possible, it was absolutely necessary to reduce this difference in quantity, otherwise the fraudulent manoeuvre would be discovered.  There was something even more serious. Through pushing Testore and Riggi into a corner during the weeks that followed (Oct - Nov 1989), we ended by discovering that one of the samples sent to the laboratories was in two pieces! IN SEARCH OF THE EVIDENCE ***14 November 1989 :*** we wrote to Professors Wölfli, Hall and Donahue, of the laboratories of Zurich, Oxford and Tucson, enclosing the page of Testore's report, in its second version, giving the weights of the three samples. We asked them if they would kindly send us 1° photos of the samples received by them, 2° details of their weights, 3° an answer to the following question: Did you note that the Shroud sample weighing 53.7 mg was in two pieces (39.6 + 14.1 mg)? Were you informed of this fact at Turin on the day when the samples were taken?  Wölfli replied by return of post: "1° The sample of the Shroud weighing 53.7 mg did consist of two pieces, for the reason very exactly described on page 3 of Testore's report. Not only was I informed of this fact, I saw it with my own eyes. 2o I received a sample of only one piece, precisely that of 52.8 mg, according to the weight given by the textile experts in Turin." He made no allusion to our request for photos.  Hall kept us waiting for his reply. Here it is, dated the 24th November, signed by his secretary: "Professor Hall has retired one month ago and is not willing to enter into any correspondence regarding the S of T."  As for Donahue, he promised over the telephone to send us a photo and answers to our questions after consulting his laboratory journal. He kept his promise. His reply is dated the 5th December. He declared that he had read the CRC n° 257, *The victory of the Holy Shroud won by science* (October 1989), with great interest, asked for a copy of the English edition (n° 223), then he answered our questions. On their return to Tucson in April 1988, Damon and he cut the Shroud sample into four fragments, weighing respectively: 13.86, 12.39, 14.27 and 11.83 mg. Total: 52.36 mg. He enclosed a photograph of one of these fragments taken through the microscope.  But to our surprise, when contacted by telephone during the following days, and asked about the way he had cut the sub-sample photographed, he became evasive, did not answer our three urgent letters of the 13th, 21st and 29th December 1989, and then, for ten months, he kept absolute silence! He did not even acknowledge the receipt of our*Appeal to the " twenty-one"*.  ***January 1990***. We ask the Victoria and Albert Museum for access to the reserve collection where the cloths from Canon Bock's collection are stacked. They replied that this reserve was closed for reorganisation. Presumption was transformed into certainty; that is where Tite finally found his "double" of the Holy Shroud. Especially as the dating of these cloths (14th -15th century) poses the experts with a dating problem exactly like that posed by sample n° 1.  In our ***Appeal to the "twenty-one" co-authors of the report on the carbon 14 dating of the Holy Shroud***, published in the CRC n° 224 (November-December 1989, p. 11-14, English edition), we put two questions. The first concerned "the arithmetical proof of a substitution of samples":  "The question we put to you is, therefore, very precise, and your answer will be decisive. Either your report is erroneous: the sample n° 1, which you dated, did not come from a strip measuring 70 x 10 mm, and you must point out the error. Or your report is exact, in which case the strip measuring 70 x 10 mm, analysed by you, did not come from the Holy Shroud. You have most certainly been the victims of a substitution of the samples, and your report improperly concludes that "the linen of the Shroud of Turin is mediaeval". Gauge the enormity of the fraud!  The second question instanced "a major fault in the statistical analysis":  "Our question: did you consent to this undue extension of the interval of confidence before the official proclamation of the 13th October 1988? We venture to hope that your reply is negative, and that you will withdraw your signatures before the 13 October 1990."  ***29-30 April 1990 :*** The Cagliari Congress on the theme: *La datazione della Sindone*. The programme included a communication from Professor Hall with the promising title: "An attempt to answer criticism concerning the dating of the Shroud." But he did not come. Once again, he is beaten through default.  ***Paris, April 1990 :*** still no answer to our *"Appeal"*, but a secret meeting among the carbonari to settle the answer to give to our attacks. Oxford, having stated that their Shroud sample was all of one piece, Wölfli turned to Jull of Arizona and said: "But then, Jim, since it was neither Oxford nor I who received a sample in two pieces, was it you then?"  "Well... yes", Jull answered!  The date of our Mutualité conference was approaching, and so we wrote to the twenty-one signatories of the *Nature* report of 13 October 1990 to badger them. Donahue was so sure that he could demonstrate our error, that we decided to take him at his word, setting off on a 19,000 km return journey at the end of October.  On our arrival, Damon, the head of the laboratory, was away on a journey, as though by chance! Donahue stuck to his opinion: "As far as I am concerned, the piece that we got can easily come from a 1 x 7 strip." For him, what Tite wrote in the *Nature* report is reliable, because Tite himself took the measurements indicated, with precision! As for the statements made by Riggi and Testore, Donahue did not hide the fact that he totally disregarded them. Between ourselves, he said, they are "not very smart"...  As for knowing whether their sample n° 1 was in one or two pieces, Dr. Jull, who himself proceeded with cutting it into sub-samples, no longer knows. In our presence, he made several attempts on the board, trying to show, with obvious sincerity, how he would have cut the four sub-samples, taking into account the small additional strip admitted by Testore. Each time, he ended in five pieces!  Toolin, the chemist who proceeded with the cleaning of the sub-samples, declared: "For me, it was in one piece."  Donahue, who was their boss, put an end to the discussion by refusing point blank to answer: "We have no photograph and no written record." That will be his last word.  The explanation is quite simple: Jull could not remember having seen the sample in two pieces on the Monday; whereas Donahue had seen it on the Sunday, but had made the small piece disappear, of necessity! If he had left it there, one of the four associates would certainly have let the cat out of the bag by thoughtlessly exclaiming: "Ah! yes, there was a sample in two pieces. But it was the sample of the mummy and not of the Shroud." That would have been enough for the whole manoeuvre to be discovered.  Damon was absent, as I have said. We called him the following week from Paris. He replied clearly and with no hesitation: "The sample was in the form of a rectangle. Not a square, but a rectangle. I have my notes and I have photographs." And he added: "Actually, our procedures were videotaped by our public broadcast people. We refused to let the BBC come or any others. What we did do, we did save a piece which is in a safe... in case there were a controversy... This piece under proper authority from the Church could be released."  Even so, it was strange that Donahue did not show us this piece during our visit. But this is a privilege Damon reserves for the "authorities". And there, he is quite safe: no danger for the criminals from that quarter. As Teddy Hall noted with satisfaction: "**No effort was made by any Catholic official to argue about the resulting date.**" Take note!  Who are we to believe? Donahue who repeated to us, throughout the day he spent with us: *no records and no photograph*. Or Damon, who claimed, but at the end of a telephone line 10,000 km away, *photographs and TV record*, and declared that he had kept a fragment of the Holy Shroud?  ***2-3 March 1991, Douglas Donahue passes to an admission***, at the international symposium held at Columbia University (New York) on *"The Shroud of Turin, the present state of the question"*. Donahue declared that the Holy Shroud sample received by his laboratory "**was indeed in two pieces: the one weighed about 14 mg, and the other 40 mg. The total weight of the Shroud sample was about 50 mg**". A strange sum! This time, he is telling the truth at last, but it does not tally with the weights we noted down from the laboratory notebook at Tucson on the 26th October. Nothing astonishing about that, for these weights were those of the *substitute* sample n° 1, which no one had thought of reducing to 40 mg.  In fact, the Holy Shroud sample did not weigh more than 40 mg, when it was taken from tube n° 3, labelled "Cleopatra's mummy". And the piece of 14 mg? It is in reserve. That no doubt is the piece which was used to provide a photograph, in December 1989, but with no indication of its weight. This time, in New York, in March 1991, Donahue projected it on the screen and declared:  "Here's a photograph, taken through the microscope, of a fragment of the sample corresponding to a quarter of what we received. Dimensions: 0.5 x 1.5 cm. Weight: 14 mg."  This farce, unparalleled in the history of science, other than the Piltdown affair, is thus reduced to its blinding inconsistency, if we sum it up thus:  At Tucson, the Holy Shroud tube presents the sample under seal when it is received on Sunday the 24th April, according to [figure 7](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud3.htm#figure 7) and... sealed again (!) on Monday the 25thApril; but by then the 14 mg piece has disappeared... and as for the 40 mg piece, **it has put on weight**! There is no need to go any further in order to accuse the people of Tucson of having substituted a mediaeval cloth for the linen of the Holy Shroud. Let them show us the 14 mg piece and the whole business will be settled amicably and at little cost.  If it belongs to the so-called "mummy", we have the proof of substitution and the reason for this: the date 14th - 15th century. If it belongs to the Holy Shroud, there is no need even to submit it to the tendetron: it is of the same origin as the sample transferred from 1 to 3, and under this mendacious label, it shares its authenticity and date: between 11 and 64 AD. A "five star result", to use the language of Jacques Évin.  But we shall get no answer. In the meanwhile, the three laboratories, and the honourable Tite and His Eminence Ballestrero, and the Italians all pushed their personal research a little further, and they all know that the Holy Shroud, on every count, falls within the fatal age range of 11-64. Between the years 11 and 64, the year of Christ's death: 30 or 33 are the most likely years.  So, let no one talk any more about it, and let it all go up in smoke! That is the best solution for the peace of the world. THE FRAUD RECONSTITUTED AND PROVED Denis Dutton, of the Canterbury Fine Arts, a determined opponent of the authenticity of the Holy Shroud, was worried in May 1987: "It would not do if it were possible to suspect, for example, that linen fibres from a mummy had been sent to the laboratories, instead and in place of real samples from the shroud." Tite's answer was that he was able to take care of that!  It did not even enter Dutton's mind that the reverse might be suspected: the premeditation of a perfect crime, consisting in reversing the samples and thus burying the Holy Shroud beneath the label of a "linen associated" with a " Cleopatra’s mummy", dating from the first century. Yet such was Dr. Tite's plan: |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A. The premeditation of a perfect crime:** **a) At Turin, when the samples were taken**, Tite introduced *into tube 1*: the sample of the Holy Shroud; *into tube 2*: a medieval cloth (11th-12th century); *into tube 3*: under the false label "linen associated with a mummy of Cleopatra", a sample of 14th century cloth, a "double" of the Holy Shroud. **b) *In each laboratory***, after changing round samples 1 and 3: *tube 1*, labelled "Shroud", contains the Holy Shroud's double, the pseudo-mummy. *tube 2*, no change. *tube 3*, labelled "mummy", contains the Holy Shroud. **c) *Results to be obtained***: *Sample 1*: 14th century... is the pseudo-mummy declared to be the Holy Shroud! *Sample 2*: 11th-12th century... is the mediaeval cloth. *Sample 3*: 1st century… is the Holy Shroud declared to be the mummy! | | The intended switching of the samples | |
| **B. The realisation, modified three times, made the crime patent:** **a) At Turin**, on the 21st April 1988, Dr. Tite introduced *into tube 1*: the Holy Shroud; *into tube 2*: the 12th century cloth; *into tube 3*: a piece of cloth from a 14th-15th century collection; *into an envelope 4*: threads from a 13th century cope. **b) *In the laboratories***, too late a dating for sample 1, the Shroud's "double", necessitated substituting sample 4 for sample 1, perhaps in part at Zurich, but certainly at Oxford. **c) *Vulnerable results***: technically perfect, statistically unacceptable:     *Sample 1*: statistical analysis demonstrates the heterogeneity of the sampling.     *Sample 2*: as expected.     *Sample 3*: the substitute is not very consistent with the dates of the Cleopatra mummy known to history (2nd century), nor with the dates obtained in 1987 by means of the classical carbon 14 dating method, an unverified dating: 110 BC - 75 AD. On the other hand, it falls exactly within the years expected for the Holy Shroud: 11- 64 AD, that is 37 ± 27, completing the proof that the Holy Shroud was buried beneath the label of a forgotten mummy.      *Sample 4*: admirably dated by efficient machines. | | The actual switching of the samples | |
| POSTFACE BY THE ABBÉ GEORGES DE NANTESTHE HOLY SHROUD SAVED, FROM THE FLAMES Dear Brother Bruno de Jésus,  What a joy to receive from you this sindonological synthesis of your twenty years’ work – a work of faultless science and of loving adoration. The only thing missing was this postface which I had promised you... when this terrible fire of Friday the 11th April made us fear for a moment – an eternity! – that the sacred Relic had been consumed in the flames, reduced to ashes in its silver coffin, imprisoned in its crystal tomb. It was a dreadful moment, not a matter for anecdote, for it was feared that this fire, which was not due to chance, might be the tragic end of this Shroud, all too similar to the death of Him who had once been wrapped in it, at the end of some disturbing satanic *"role play"*: this linen cloth imprinted with the effigy of Jesus, stained with His Blood, thrown onto the fire by the godless after being judged and condemned as a work of forgery by the "International Scientific Community", with no protest from the Church, on Holy Saturday 1997, on the French television channel ARTE!   |  | | --- | | The chapel housing the Turin Shroud on fire, April 1997 |  |  | | --- | | *Figure 12: Night of the 11th to the 12th April. Behind the high altar of Turin cathedral, the "Guarino Guarini"chapel, the*Sainte Chapelle*of the Holy Shroud, is prey to the flames. To this day, the firemen have not yet specified the causes of the fire, but the Public Prosecutor of Turin has opened an enquiry: "If the magistrates favour the short-circuit track, it is only by way of hypothesis; in this way, it will be possible eventually to find indicators that will force out different answers. It goes without saying that the only hypothesis to be discarded straight away is that the fire was caused by chance" (*La Stampa *of Turin, 14th April). Besides, the workmen who were working on the restoration of the chapel affirm that they removed all appliances and cut off the electricity. The hypothesis of an attack, therefore, remains the only probability: a dispatch from the AFP agency, dated the 13th April, states that "according to certain reports, not officially confirmed, four or five fires, all situated in the chapel, have been detected". The London*Sunday Times *has no hesitation in headlining the story: "It is the Maffia that is to blame". A very revealing fact: the burnt chapel communicates by a door and corridors with rooms in the neighbouring Royal Palace, where a dinner in honour of the secretary General of UNO, Kofi Annan, had just ended at the very moment when the fire was declared. Investigators are checking the identity of all the guests. Vittorio Messori, the Pope’s historiographer, has no doubt: "Believe me, someone wanted to burn the Shroud: I do not exclude an international plot, and I would suspect either Masonic circles or Islamic fundamentalists" (*Oggi, *16-23 April). Might it be that the occult forces that shackled the work of Saint John Bosco at the end of the last century, in Turin itself, are still as fierce as ever against all that is Catholic?*(Photo AFP/ Marco Durante) |   At that moment, it appeared to me that this sacred Shroud was like a double, an understudy of Jesus, left by Himself on this earth to prolong His Presence, to relive His Mystery, like a silent, but terribly vulnerable, witness!  Thus I found it impossible to believe in its total disappearance, still less to resign myself to it. Should it not, like the beloved disciple of the Lord, stay with His own until He comes again?  Then, sadly turning the pages of this masterpiece, which you have happily given us, of true science and of pious love, the Holy Shroud seemed to me to be throbbing with life, mysteriously associated with the joys and trials of the Church, after its Lord had left it lying there in His tomb on Easter morning as an inheritance for His own...  In fact, it accompanies His Church throughout the centuries and follows the same stages as those lived by its Master. That is apparent from one chapter to the next of your thirty pages, as we read of its model in the thirty years of His Gospel, up to His death. On the evening of this 11th April I had only three or four pages left to recall not the death of the Holy Shroud, but its life, its victory, its apotheosis next year, 1998! despite the recent controversies and battles which it was important for me to relate and to situate as a way of the Cross for the *soudarion,*the image-witness of its Master, before sharing His eternal glory. And now was it to perish in the flames? At any rate it had to escape from that!  We wanted to know all about this certain and obvious attack, and about this rescue acclaimed by the good people of Turin, supporting the firemen and then dragging this man with the iron sledgehammer and his trophy intact out of that furnace. I then scanned the whole length of those nineteen centuries of life, open to so many chance storms and dangers, whence this relic of Jesus Christ once again emerged victorious in silent testimony to its imperishable Royalty. Might the sacred Object therefore follow its Master, behind and at some distance, until the consummation of the world?  The most beautiful thing, no doubt, is that though absorbed in the thousand difficulties of your powerful demonstration, you would not have noticed that in retracing the adventures of the life of this Holy Relic, you spoke of it in the same terms that you would have used to relate the obscure appearance and then the epiphany of Jesus at Bethlehem and, a few pages further on, to tell us of the long hidden life of this sacred Object, passing unnoticed from Jerusalem to Edessa, then to Constantinople, ending finally at our little Lirey... just like the life of Jesus at Nazareth.  What will come next for Jesus? for His double? The same story. A public life with its many expositions, miracles and pilgrimages, similar in all respects to the "Galilean idyll" where the Gospel shows us Jesus blessing little children, allowing lepers to approach Him, sinners to touch Him and multiplying works of mercy. The Pharisees attributed Jesus’ success to the power of the devil; similarly, modern scientists attribute the never ending fervour of these enormous crowds to sorcery !  It is then that we cannot fail to see, oh Jesus, that Your Shroud, Your double, was the substitute, for yet a thousand years, of Your Presence. But to this rather scientific word, I much prefer this other expression which alone is Catholic: the Sacrament of Your Holy Face, of Your intimate warmth and human charm, as the Eucharist is the Sacrament of Your Love.  Twice before, in times past, it has been touched by fire and licked by the flames, or had holes made in it by the fiery flow of molten metal. But they were just hapless events, mindless attacks, dangers contained by the almighty Providence of our beloved Heavenly Father. And the holes left in the material, the patches sewn on by the pious Poor Clares of Chambéry, preserve the moving traces of these misadventures as a warning for us: not to turn our eyes, thoughts and hearts away from this divine Relic, if we wish to keep it in our midst! Never to neglect our devotion to it, if, in return, we wish to have our towns and countryside blessed, and our parishes and all creatures sanctified, just as the shadow of Jesus worked miracles.  It is precisely in these times which open our modern age that this Shroud became the focus of attraction for kings and princes, for the bishops and learned men of all Christendom, surrounded by the crowds attracted in their wake. It passed from Lirey to Chambéry, from Chambéry to Turin, where the generosity of the Savoyard kings and multitudes of donors made it possible to build this Guarini chapel, a worthy casket at last for this treasure! And when Jesus was at the height of His preaching, was it not then that crowds of poor people and the sick pressed around Jesus, but also the great of this earth and the rich, avid for their sins to be forgiven, for their souls to be saved and for their happiness to be restored in view of Eternal Life?  However, although it was not as clearly seen as it is in the Gospel when the Lord went up to Jerusalem, various movements ran through the Christian people; their minds were agitated by Satan’s thoughts. As Jesus found Himself gradually being tormented by the Sadducees, the Scribes and the Pharisees... so the most renowned relic in the world has been subject, during these last centuries, to much sarcasm on the part of the Philosophers, and contempt on the part of heretics and of the godless; you referred to Calvin! and Rabelais... Heretics and scoffers go hand in hand. Expositions became rarer. The cult of relics was targeted by freethinkers, and pilgrimages were targeted by libertines who liked to travel only for their pleasure, in search of the world’s pagan beauties.   |  | | --- | | The Turin Shroud being rescued |  |  | | --- | | *Figure 13: The glass protecting the reliquary which contained the Holy Shroud was reputed to be unbreakable. The mechanism for opening the compartment was blocked because of the difference in temperature with the outside. It is then that the Turin fireman, Mario Trematore, intervened: "I thought I heard the voice of God calling me; it was as though I had been given strength from on High to break this glass with sledgehammer blows, whilst the ceiling was threatening to fall on us at any moment" (*Oggi*, 16-23 April). The fireman declared: "If it had been a painting by Giotto or Michelangelo, even of great value, I would not have lifted my little finger". But, at this crucial moment, he said to himself: "You’ve got to save this emblem of Christendom, a relic worshipped by two billion people" (*Il Corriere della Sera*, 14 April). The next day, the Archbishop of Turin, Cardinal Saldarini, opened the reliquary to make sure that the Holy Shroud had not suffered any damage; experts have advised that in future it should be exposed unfolded for better preservation. (Photo AFP/Raidue).* |   On the other hand, paintings and sculptures brought so much pleasure and also spiritual joy to devout souls, that relics suffered a certain disaffection. What was there to see in them? What secret beauties did they hold? They only regained their lustre on great days of pilgrimage, ceremonies and expositions in the presence of crowds of people.  The effrontery of anti-authority unbelievers mounted up and up, even into the ranks of the clergy. Thus it was that a certain Canon (!) Ulysse Chevalier took the liberty, in his modernism, of interpreting Saint John’s Gospel so falsely as to conclude that it would be impossible for a shroud enveloping the body of Jesus to be present in the tomb. And from there he invented a whole fable, to the joy of the godless, concluding in the falsehood of the Holy Shroud, which, he claimed, had been painted on its arrival at Lirey... Legends that will be taken up by our forgers !  Is not this similar to what Jesus suffered in the last months of His public life, when He will be the subject of terrible defamation and persecution, going so far as to create a void around Him and threatening Him with a cruel death by stoning at the hands of the people? One would not have given Jesus long to live at that period, no more than one would have expected the Turin pilgrimage to be maintained at the end of the 19th century. That was exactly a hundred years ago!  I am not saying that the Holy Shroud was rescued from that state by miracle, nor that it was transfigured as was Jesus on the Holy Mountain. But this delicate cloth, this Sacrament of the presence of Jesus, had within its fibres all sorts of unknown or as yet unperceived beauties and perfections. It was the photograph of 1898 that instantly and effortlessly brought out the figure, the image, the striking and undeniable reproduction of Jesus Son of God. Immediately, pious souls, and sometimes unbelievers like Delage, felt moved and drawn by the Holy Shroud, as Zachaeus, Mary Magdalene, the Samaritan woman and Matthew the publican were drawn by Jesus. Despite the barrage of a modernist clergy, of the anticlerical Sorbonne and of the atheistic world of science, the silent, pure, sweet and humble Glory of Jesus began to radiate from Turin, over Rome and Paris, over the whole of France as well as throughout the world.  After the Second World War, it was the turn of the United States to be touched by the grace of this divine Face. The STURP team landed in Turin with their tons of the most up-to-date and efficient instruments in order to pin down the invisible, to track and detect the supernatural or – more likely! – the fraud, with equal freedom for some to allow themselves to be convinced and for others to denounce the trickery when they discover it... but no one did discover it, and everyone admired what their machines proclaimed, like the pagans themselves who believed in Jesus on seeing his miracles testifying to His goodness. The boldness of these young scientists was admirable and their hearts were crystal clear. They began to be friends for you.  It was during those thirty-three days of John Paul I’s charismatic reign, the days of that unforgettable exposition, which, unknown to us, were to be, for the Holy Shroud in Turin and for the Good Shepherd in Rome, their Palm Sunday before the Passion! Like the Apostles, we did not imagine that this triumph would provoke so much hatred in their own House, going as far as a monstrous and murderous attack by poison for the one, and by fire for the other !  Three fine years of study and of devotion were still to run for the devotees of the Holy Shroud (1978-1981). Do you remember, Brother Bruno, our enthusiasm, our fervour, and the sindonological confraternity showing great esteem for you. In those times when nobody as yet worked on the sacred Relic for money, for his own glory, for his personal ambition... nor for the Enemy! The people involved were all idealistic – too much so! – and generous – but one can never be too generous... They were like the entourage of disciples around Jesus. We began to dream of a restoration of the faith in the world under this conquering standard.   |  | | --- | | The destruction wrought by the fire |  |  | | --- | | *Figure 14: Desolation on the day after the attack. The debris of broken glass and torn embroidery around the crystal prison which housed the Holy Shroud reveals the full devastation of the previous night. Behind the door, and in the Sainte Chapelle of the Holy Shroud situated just above, everything is burnt to cinders. The precious Relic was usually kept in this chapel, which had been built by the Duke of Savoy in the 17th century for the precise purpose of housing it, but it had been removed from there since the 4th May 1990 for restoration work to be done. In the foreground, to the right, the high altar steps can be seen. The hell unleashed did not prevail: the notable Relic was saved, as well as the sacred Hosts in the Tabernacle. Cardinal Saldarini celebrated a Mass of thanksgiving at the Consolata on Sunday evening, in the presence of more than a thousand people. In his homily, he said that "this may not have been a miracle, but at any rate it was a great divine grace, which allowed the cathedral to be spared and the Shroud to be saved –* *this shroud which is unique in history and in all time and which refers us to Christ’s Passion"* (PhotoAFP) |   The parallel begun between the Gospel and this story, dissuaded us from any such innocent hopes. "Do you not know that the Son of Man had to suffer in order to enter into His Glory?" and again, in the words of Saint Paul, "that it is through much tribulation that we must enter the Kingdom of God?" We watched as supposed historians, physicists, chemists and scientists of many disciplines approached, introduced themselves and elbowed their way into leading positions, sowing confusion and obscurity amid the programmes and results of our former teams, who were kept out of their proceedings and for whom traps were laid.. There was this Englishman, Wilson, who made a flying start with his venturesome reconstruction of the early history of the Holy Shroud, and Sox, who turned coat and cast doubt on all our work, disorientating the faithful. And this American, McCrone, who seized hold of samples brought back from Turin by Rogers, invented traces of painting on the Shroud, and immediately trumpeted throughout the world that the supposed relic was nothing more than a 14th century painting. And this man was upheld by the information maffia... and the Church maffia too, for ten years ! Laurentin, among others, supported him, and why ? It was from these same circles that the perverse plan was born of focusing the whole of sindonological research on the dating of the cloth by means of the Carbon 14 test; thus proofs that could be read by all were to be replaced by unverifiable numerical data, the whole thing to be handed over, in confidence, to *their*machines and to *their*technicians. Given this universal infatuation, we had to content ourselves with multiplying warnings to the public and to the wise to be wary of such a lottery: the sacred Shroud of Jesus Christ, imprinted with His shadow and with His Blood, to be delivered to whom and to what? We felt a death threat weigh on us from an unbelieving world, using its last chance to mount this conspiracy.  In an atmosphere no less agonising than that of the trial of Jesus in Saint John’s Gospel, everything went very quickly, out of our sight and away from all control. The High Priest had removed Jesus from any friendly hand; of the laboratories engaged, only those of the Church’s enemies were chosen, and their secular sanhedrin entered the Cathedral apartments, as though entering a dance hall, to begin their dating operations with methods and machines that were reliable but were in the hands of unknown men acting on secret orders, all sworn by oath on their lives to the one foreman and controller, Tite, who had been given possession of everything by the last of the Apostles, his accomplice.  The sad result reached us from the mouth of the latter, and by the chalk of the former writing on the blackboard of victory: with that, our silent Witness was discredited, demeaned, degraded from its sublime rank to that of a work of forgery, to that of any old rag stained with human blood "or pig’s blood". Such was the hideous blasphemy in which ended the most certain crime, the most sacrilegious manipulation ever dreamed of by the Devil! Well, it was announced, without batting an eyelid, by the duty Judas, and the Church was obliged to believe it by all her complacent hierarchy.  The remarkable thing is that, with the help of a few devoted friends, sustained by your vow of obedience and the order given to go further still in pursuit of the tricksters, Brother Bruno, you brought to bear all the elements of the most fantastic scientific and police investigation of the century: we were able to establish every stage of this amazing trickery conducted from beginning to end by this Tite, and approved by this B. in the name of the Church. And since then, it is not the tricksters who have been paying for their crime, locked away in some penitentiary. It is the saviours of this renowned Relic whom the world and the Church have made to share in the discredit of the Holy Shroud.   |  | | --- | | Putting out the fire in the Turin Cathedral |  |  | | --- | | *Figure 15: Funds for the reconstruction of the chapel have already been allocated by the Italian government and by the Municipality of Turin; a popular subscription launched by the newspapers brought in a thousand million lire in two days. Even if the restoration proves to be difficult, the public exposition planned for April 1998 will go ahead, and the city authorities have declared that "for that date everything will be in order"*. (Photo Associated Press). |   Such is the order of the Powers of darkness that govern the Church and the world today. It is our intimate happiness to remain in this proclaimed ignominy, in this apparent solitude with the Lord’s beloved apostle, the pardoned Magdalene and the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Mother of us all. For in the dawn, an immense contrite crowd can be seen slowly advancing towards this Golgotha and this garden where the secret of the Holy Shroud is kept secret, in expectation of its resurrection.  But events have moved faster than my pen... The High Priests and the Scribes, the Sadducees and the Pharisees of this world, whom I know not, have met together since then. They explained to the crowds on French television during Holy Week that Jesus was a false Messiah of whom nothing should be believed and from whom nothing should be expected. Then, for fear that we might still look on "Him Whom they pierced", they set fire to it. But the sacred Relic was saved by its faithful people. A miracle of the Shroud today, as of the Church tomorrow, rising as Jesus rose on Easter morning, *Christus hodie, heri et in saecula*.  The place of the sacrilegious *mescolamento,*a sacrilege committed at the hands of the wicked, has been purified by the fire which they lit, thus doing full justice. But the divine relic was saved so that the infinite mercy of our Saviour and of His divine Mother might be made to shine in this place. It is for us, through your study, Brother Bruno, to make the Good News known to all souls of good will: Jesus is risen! His Shroud has been saved from the ashes! Together, let us go and adore Him.  ***And I ask our friends Jacques and Françoise Mourot: Why not a thousand pilgrims next year, in two planes, three planes, and a train for Turin?***  Brother Georges de Nantes | |
| SUPPORTING ARTICLES The following articles, dispersed throughout the printed edition, have been grouped together here to avoid breaking up the main narrative. | |
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| AN IMAGE NOT MADE BY HUMAN HANDS  |  |  | | --- | --- | | Positive image of the shroud | Diagram  of the shroud | | *Figure 16: positive photograph of the Holy Shroud laid out on a table especially designed by the American scientists for the tests done in October 1978. This is how fifty generations of Christians saw the image of the Holy Shroud from the Apostles down to our times, when the invention of photography suddenly revealed its unsuspected beauty (below,*[*figure 17*](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud6.htm#photo)*), as the process passed from negative to positive. In contemplating these features and these stains of Precious Blood, the mystical soul discovers treasures of gentleness, goodness, peace, mercy, infinite Wisdom and beatifying Beauty streaming from this image, even in its original aspect, disconcerting though it be.* | |   **THE "SYDOINE" OF THE LORD**  ***Constantinople, August 1203.***Robert de Clari, a knight from Picardy, contemplates in the Church of Our Lady Saint Mary of Blachernae, the "sydoine" of the Lord, which is stood "upright" every Friday *"si que on i pooit bien veir le figure Nostre Seigneur "* (so that the figure of Our Lord can clearly be seen).  "Figure" signifies not only the face, but the form of the whole body. The following year, the Crusaders ransacked the city and "*nul ne seut on onques, ne Griu, ne Franchois, que li sydoines devint quand la vile fu prise"* (no one ever knew, neither Greek nor French, what became of the Shroud when the city was taken) (*The Conquest of Constantinople*, 42).  Two years before, Nicolas Mésaritès, guardian of the relics kept at Saint Mary of the Pharos, the *"sainte-chapelle"* of the imperial palace, recalled the mysteries of Christ’s life perpetuated by the presence of the relics in that place: "Here He rises again, as shown by the Shroud and the cloths [...].***They are of linen*** (*apo linou*) [...]. They withstand corruption, for they wrapped the ineffable Dead Christ, ***naked and perfumed***, after the Passion."  The Holy Shroud now kept in Turin, a herring bone weave "linen" cloth, is this same Relic, marked with the imprints of the "naked, ineffable Dead", Jesus Christ Our Lord, shrouded in this cloth after having been "perfumed". In the middle of the Cloth, two Body imprints are distinguishable, meeting at the heads without, however, touching. One is of the front image of the Body and the other is of the back, inverted as though in a mirror.  The explanation is quite simple: at the moment of entombment, the Body of Jesus was laid on its back over half the length of the Shroud, which was then pulled down over the head and over the front of the Body down to the feet.  The Blood which flows from the wounds in the hands, the feet and the side, trickling into the small of the back, forming droplets on the forehead and the nape of the neck is indeed, in visible light, the colour of "dried blood", as Barbet had observed in 1933 when the Holy Shroud appeared on the steps of the *Duomo;*a "crimson" colour noticed by Brooks in September 1978.  On the other hand, it loses its colour under ultra violet rays: "Highly absorbent. No colour. Fluorescent edges around certain zones", notes Pellicori. Which is in agreement with the laboratory data where the blood as a whole shows a total absorption. These fluorescent borders associated with blood flows, as well as the numerous flagellation marks, powerfully suggest, therefore, the presence of blood serum.  Confirmed by the chemistry of the micro-traces taken from the surface of the Cloth: *"****The blood stains are composed of haemoglobin and also react positively to the albumin test.****"* THE PHOTOGRAPH OF JESUS  |  | | --- | | shroud2.jpg (23626 bytes) | | *Figure 17: the photographic negative of the Holy Shroud reveals the most beautiful portrait of Christ that ever was, because it the direct reproduction of His features, His*... *true photograph! It is Jesus crucified and risen. It is the revelation of His Sacred Heart.* |   **THE DIVINE SURPRISE**  ***Turin, May 1898***. On the fringes of an exhibition of sacred art, the Holy Shroud was displayed above the high altar of the Cathedral of Saint John the Baptist. A Salesian from Provence, the thirty seven year old ***Don Noël Noguier de Malijay***, one of the first French Salesians to have been admitted to the noviciate by Don Bosco himself, was absorbed "in meditative contemplation, as all were inspired to do by such a wonderful testimony of the Passion and Death of Our Lord Jesus Christ", as he himself relates.  He was at that time a teacher of physics and chemistry at the international high school of Valsalice. He continues: "But besides pious thoughts, I soon developed a scientific preoccupation (you will forgive a science teacher for such a thing) concerning the authenticity of the famous shroud. That is why I meticulously examined every slightest detail of this double imprint of Our Lord’s Body, which stood out sufficiently from this cloth, despite the effect of time, together with the numerous scorch marks left on the Shroud after a fire and stains resulting from tests applied in the Middle Ages, and which no painting could have withstood." The fact that the image has remained stable through fire and water and reagents capable of changing any colouring, sums up to this day the specific chemistry of the image and constitutes an "ongoing mystery".  The research programme to come later is already drawn up in the questions which the young and learned Salesian put to himself: "1. What is the nature or, if you like, the chemical or physical cause of the impression of the strokes that have reproduced and preserved the image of the divine Saviour? 2. Is this image *positive or negative?*"  A surprising question, which inspired Don Noguier, "from the very first day of the solemn exposition, with the idea of having the Holy Shroud photographed". He will recount later how this idea occurred to him – an idea which we can regard as the most brilliant intuition of the century. Looking through a pain of powerful binoculars, he noticed that "the body reliefs were of a darker shade, whereas the deep set or receding parts were of a lighter shade; it did not take me long to compare the image of the Shroud to some kind of negative photograph. Long conversant, moreover, with photographic art, it quickly occurred to me that a photographic reproduction of this extraordinary document would yield interesting results. That is why I congratulate myself today on having been among those who then exerted themselves to have the Relic photographed, despite a certain opposition which was happily overcome."  Secundo Pia was merely the one designated by the King of Italy to carry out this idea of Don Noguier (during the night of the 28th to the 29th May 1898). Besides, he was not the only one, nor even the first. Don Noguier, "foreseeing that he would be able to obtain directly on the photographic plate a positive image of Christ", had already taken photos which verified his intuition: from the semi-darkness of the background of the cloth, light in reality (above, [figure 16](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud6.htm#image)), made dark through photographic inversion (across, [figure 17](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud6.htm#photo)), there appeared, luminous, the perfect positive image of a real human body of athletic beauty.  **THE THIRD DIMENSION**  Not only is the image a negative, but it registers the body relief. Using a volunteer who had allowed himself to be draped as the Holy Shroud was draped, Jackson and Jumper studied experimentally the relationship between the body-cloth distance, on the one hand, and the intensity of the image, on the other. The hypothesis of an inversely proportional relationship, the mathematical formula of which would allow the body’s natural volume to be reconstituted, was found to be unequivocally verified one day, in a way that was quite unexpected, by Bill Mottern working on the VP8 in 1976. Further proof of authenticity, renewing the surprise of Don Noguier’s photo, in so far as everybody had forgotten that it was another Frenchman of genius, ***Gabriel Quidor***, Don Noguier’s contemporary, who had already formulated and verified this hypothesis seventy years before.  Thereafter, the facts are there, excluding the idea of a false shroud of Christ having been fabricated in the Middle Ages. Before 1898, no one had seen the real and true image of the Body of Jesus crucified, His admirable Head and His incomparable Face, as the photographic inversion, the *negative,*shows here. All anybody had seen were these mysterious brown stains on the linen cloth (above, [figure 17](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud6.htm#photo)), but only *positively,*and without the benefit of photography, stains which, taken as a whole, define an enigmatic and disturbing silhouette of a supine human, wounded moreover, killed and wrapped bleeding in this shroud. THE HOLY SHROUD OF LIREY Not long after the capture of Constantinople by the Crusaders in 1204, the Holy Shroud was removed to Athens. The following year, the nephew of the emperor Isaac II Angelus complained about this to Pope Innocent III, demanding among all the treasures stolen from his uncle, "who is holy", the relics, and "among them, the most sacred object of all, the Shroud" which is presently "at Athens" (1205). The Shroud then passes into the possession of the Charpignys, a noble Franco-Greek family of Morea. Agnes de Charpigny, Dame of the Vostitza, the wife of Dreux de Charny, eldest brother of Geoffroy, Lord of Lirey, brought this *"saincte relique"* to France.  Thus, after having sojourned in the East for twelve centuries, the Holy Shroud was shown for the first time in the West in Champagne, by the canons of the collegiate church of Lirey, founded by Geoffroy de Charny.  As is recognised by the anonymous archive document known as the *"Mémoire de Pierre d’Arcis"* (1389), "far from being restricted to the kingdom of France, [the news] spread throughout the whole world, as it were, so much so that from every point in the universe, masses of people flocked" [to see it] in a vast upsurge of faith and devotion, comparable to what was seen in 1978 and to what we shall see again tomorrow: an exposition lasting forty-three days drew three and a half million pilgrims, filing past the sacred Relic non-stop.  ***Diocese of Troyes, Saturday 28 May 1356.***By letter duly signed and sealed, given in his palace of Aix-en-Othe, his summer residence, Henri, elected to and confirmed in the episcopal see of Troyes since 1354, grants the noble knight Geoffroy de Charny, lord of Savoisy and of Lirey, "approval, authority and decision" in the "divine worship" celebrated in the collegial church by the said Lord, in so far as, the bishop adds, "we have been informed by the legitimate documents". You will search in vain for this piece in the voluminous archive files published by Ulysse Chevalier. It does not figure there at all.  This approval was again confirmed by a bull of indulgence dated the 5th June 1357, co-signed by twelve bishops, addressed to all the pilgrims visiting the said church and venerating the relics to be found there, *reliquias ibi existentes.*  A pilgrimage medal, a sort of lead medal worn by pilgrims in the Middle Ages, now kept at the Musée de Cluny (a real sized reproduction of which appears in CRC n0237, English edition, p. 23, figure 11; enlargement, ibid., p. 22, fig. 10), provides unquestionable proof that the Holy Shroud figured among the said "relics".  It represents two figures vested in copes – whose heads have disappeared – holding the Holy Shroud full length as though they were taking it from its reliquary, itself struck on *the right*(on the left for the reader) with the arms of Geoffroy de Charny, who met his death at the battle of Poitiers on the 19th September 1356.  We shall not be surprised to see this great swell of fervour giving rise to a furious polemic, as witnessed to by the "Mémoire" attributed to Pierre d’Arcis, Henri de Poitiers’ successor in the episcopal see of Troyes; document dated... 1389! A close study of these distant events, gives one the inescapable impression of dealing with "something known" ; like a repetition, six hundred years in advance, of the events of the 20th century. Even the dates coincide!  1356 : we are in the years following the Holy Year of the Jubilee for 1350, which drew immense pilgrimages to Rome, where the "Veil of Veronica" was venerated. The faith was so alive in those times that any evocation of the Passion of Jesus caused a stir. And so these crowds did not move out of curiosity, but out of devotion, of tender compassion for the sufferings of our gentle Saviour, for the grief of His Mother the Virgin standing at the foot of the Cross.  In 1350, on the threshold of the modern age, effigies of the Holy Shroud in fact renewed the effect of the stigmata which the "Poverello" of Assisi had displayed in his own flesh in the previous century.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Positive frontal image of the Shroud | Negative frontal image of the Shroud | | *Figure 18: Jesus was an athlete: the facial imprint allows His height to be evaluated at 1.80 m; and His build allows His weight to be evaluated at 80 kg. When in full health, Jesus must have radiated an extraordinary charm, the revelation of which has been reserved to our times of photography. Before then, painters and mosaic artists took as their model this inexplicable and unaesthetic imprint, copying it positively, even if it meant interpreting it (cf. for example, the Holy Face of Laon, reproduced in CRC 237, Eng. ed., p. 22; Christ the Pantocrator of Daphni, CRC 217, Eng. ed., p. 11, the Holy Faces of Genoa and of the Vatican, ibid., p. 12, the Christ of Sinai, CRC 237, Eng. ed., p. 9; the umbella of John VII, ibid., p. 10). It is an untenable contradiction to claim that this vague body form might itself be a work of art produced, in some way or other, with the impossible intention of making it appear****positively****, through photography, as the imprint left by Jesus on His Shroud.*  *On the one hand, it is a fact that the copyists of modern times, from the 16th to the 19th centuries, thinking that they were dealing with the positive image of the body of Jesus Christ imprinted on this Shroud, arranged things so as to free it from its vagueness, feeling their way towards its...****negative****which will not appear until 1898 (cf. for example, the epitaphios of the cathedral of Smolensk, reproduced in SS II, p. 101).*  *On the other hand, any supposed mediaeval forger would have had to work backwards, starting from an individual copied, sculptured or traced positively, in order to end with something ghostly, disturbing and incomplete (cf. Joe Nickell’s scumble, reproduced in SS I, p. 93!)... unacceptable to the Church, meaningless and repulsive for the devout, but powerfully traced and done so as to appear, through the invention of photography, as an incomparable image of Jesus Christ? It is impossible.* | *Figure 19: What do we see on this image? The ugliness of the suffering servant (Is 53), or the beauty of the most beautiful of the children of men (Ps 45)? The Fathers of the Church are divided. The question is renewed again today. Penetrating the depth of the mystery of the Redemption, the Abbé de Nantes constructs an admirable "aesthetic of the Holy Shroud":*  *"We have here a man of great physical beauty. Tall, well built, muscular, of athletic virility, showing the full form of this perfectly developed being. We still have to eliminate the defects in the linen cloth to see this slender height and the magnificent bearing of the head. If we go into detail, we notice the finesse of the shoulders, the wrists, the elegance of the hands made to seem even longer by the thumb being retracted in the hand.The Face is magnificent: of an immense serenity, a gentle and humble majesty. The brow is wide and open. The eyebrows are very firmly drawn, the nose imposing and the head is long.This Body and this Face are those of a Leader."*  *And yet He has chosen to leave us this photo of His ugliness, the image of Him "whose look was as it were hidden" (Is 53. 3), who is like a worm (Ps 22) in the act of His Passion: the body naked and torn apart, the chest raised, the face puffy, the lips swollen and tight, as though bursting. But it is an ugliness that is beautiful "because it speaks of virtue, of sacrifice, of heroism, of suffering willed out of love for us, for our redemption". It is the dramatic aesthetic of the sorrowful mysteries.*  *Furthermore, for one who is not put off by this ugliness and who carries on in a vigorous act of faith, the height of beauty is revealed: "It is beautiful like a dissonance evoking the things of the hereafter." Hyperbolic aesthetic of the glorious mysteries: "This Holy Face suddenly radiates a goodness which streams from the fold of the eyelids. The very noble, very open and radiant brow prevails over the faults of the lower half of the face and the burst lips. It shines with the glory of God. The very beautiful sweetness of a call to love falls from these lips being presented for a kiss.*Ecce sponsus*, ‘Behold the bridegroom’. Thus has God loved."* |    THE HOLY SHROUD OF CHAMBÉRY 1453 is the year when Constantinople was taken by the Ottoman Turks. In retrospect one shudders to think what would have become of the Holy Shroud had the Crusaders not removed it from there in 1204! Or rather: let us admire the ways of Providence...  In that year, Marguerite de Charny, granddaughter of Geoffroy, made a gift of the Holy Shroud to Duke Louis of Savoy and to his spouse Anne de Lusignan. At first, these princes attached the notable Relic to their portable chapel. Regarding it as a palladium, they took it with them wherever they went: to Bresse, to Piedmont, to Savoy and to Switzerland. Then from 1502, they entrusted it to the canons of the collegiate founded by the Duchess of Yolande, sister of Louis XI, and her spouse the Blessed Amadeus IX, to be kept in the chapel of the castle of Chambéry, to which Pope Sixtus IV granted the title of *"Sainte Chapelle du Saint Suaire"*, with indulgences and privileges. In his treatise *De sanguine Christi*, this Pontiff claims for the Linen Cloth *"****the homage and adoration due to the Cross by virtue of the divine Blood with which it is stained.****"*  There then begins an era of public veneration for the "Holy Shroud of Chambéry", which will last for two centuries, the scale of which is difficult for us to imagine today. It has to be said that the Church encouraged it with all her authority; the approval of the Sovereign Pontiffs was added to the official favour shown by princes. In 1506, Pope Julius II authorised public devotion to the Relic by means of a Bull wherein he designated it as *"****the notable shroud in which Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself was wrapped in the tomb****"*. He fixed an annual feast day for the Holy Shroud, with a proper Mass and office, to be kept on the 4th May, the day after the feast of the Finding of the Holy Cross. He also claimed for the Relic the honours due to the Cross, that is to say, veneration and adoration. According to this maxim which fell much later from the lips of the ***Blessed Valfré*** of the Oratory (1629-1710), chaplain to Duke Victor-Amadeus II and his spouse, Anne of Orleans:  *"****The Cross receives the living Saviour and gives Him back dead; the shroud receives the dead Saviour and restores Him alive****."*  The Holy Shroud is shown to crowds of pilgrims twice a year: on the 4th May for the feast and on Good Friday. These solemn expositions will witness immense crowds of pilgrims from every social class: kings, princes, lords, burgesses and village people. In 1516, François I, whose devotion to the Holy Shroud was due to his mother, Louise of Savoy, came to Lyons on pilgrimage, with all his court, on foot, clothed in an alb, as an act of thanksgiving for the victory of Marignano.   |  | | --- | | The Hands on the Shroud |  |  | | --- | | Figure 20: The hands tell of unspeakable suffering. Only four fingers are visible: the thumb is hidden in the palm by a contraction reflex, which testifies to the most atrocious suffering imaginable, caused by a lesion of the median nerve. |   1516 is also the year when Marguerite of Austria ordered an artist, whose identity is a matter of controversy, to paint a copy of the Holy Shroud, which copy is now kept in the Church of Saint Gommaire, at Lierre in Belgium. It is the first of a long series of such copies, which are now very useful, not just as a record of the history of devotion to the Holy Shroud, but more especially to illustrate all the blunders which a "forger" would inevitably have made, from the Renaissance to the 19th century, as indeed during the Middle Ages and at any time...  In 1532, during the night of the 3rd to the 4th December, a raging fire broke out in the Sainte Chapelle of Chambéry. One of the canons saved the silver reliquary, as the metal was already beginning to melt. The irradiation of the red hot metal, and no doubt a few drops of molten silver spilt on to the corner of the folded linen inside, burned it. Consequently, when the cloth was unfolded, there were as many scorch marks as there were folds in the linen cloth. The water thrown over the cloth to put out the fire left those diamond shaped marks with the burnt edging, which we see along the whole length of the longitudinal axis: they too follow the order of the folds as does the symmetry of the scorch marks. By what miracle did the two silhouettes remain safe, in the middle of the Sheet, framed by the two scorch lines!  The following year, 1533, the damaged Holy Shroud was not displayed for the 4th May, and rumour immediately spread that it had disappeared. We find an echo of this in Rabelais, where Gargantua is made to say:  "When Brother John set about punishing the miscreants who were picking the monks’ grapes, some made a vow to Saint James, others to the Holy Shroud of Chambéry. But it burned three months later, so much so that not a single shred of it was saved." A barefaced lie, but one that at least testifies to the popular custom of invoking the "Holy Shroud of Chambéry" on a par with Saint James.  The Protestants swore a particular hatred for this devotion. Calvin is venomous: "When one Shroud has been burned, they always find a new one the next day. They said it was indeed the same one as that of the day before, which had been saved from the fire by miracle; but the painting was so fresh that the lying availed nothing, if there were eyes to look."  Pope Clement VII set in progress an official recognition of the Relic. Then the Holy Shroud was carried in procession to the convent of Saint Clare where it stayed for fifteen days. Whilst praying, the Poor Clares knelt and sewed patches into the areas that had been burned, then backed the Holy Shroud with a length of Holland cloth to reinforce it. And on the 2ndMay 1534, the Relic was returned to the Sainte Chapelle, to the sound of all the bells ringing in the town. A witness wrote:  "There were a great many pilgrims who came from Rome, from Jerusalem and from several other distant countries." Thus it can be stated that the Holy Shroud of Chambéry was Christendom’s principal pilgrimage destination at that period. THE HOLY SHROUD OF TURIN **14 September 1578**, the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, the Holy Shroud makes its entrance into Turin, become the capital of the House of Savoy, greeted by artillery salvos. Duke Emmanuel-Philibert had had it transported on men’s backs, over the mountains, at the time of the pilgrimage of ***Saint Charles Borromeo***, Archbishop of Milan, who came to fulfil a vow that he had made in answer to his prayer that his diocese be delivered from the plague.  The holy archbishop, escorted by a small group of priests and members of his household, left Milan on the 6th October. During the whole journey, covered on foot, the pilgrims meditated on Our Lord’s Passion, recited the office and prayers, and sang canticles. Saint Charles Borromeo’s entrance into the Piedmontese capital, to the booming of canon and harquebus, was triumphal. The following Sunday, the Holy Shroud was displayed publicly in the square of the palazzo ducale.  The Relic never returned to Chambéry, and that was a further Providential arrangement. For two hundred years later, the Sainte-Chapelle of Chambéry will be ransacked by the French troops of the Revolution.  The 17th century marks a sort of apogee with the devotion brought to the Holy Shroud by ***Saint François de Sales***. "The copy of this sacred effigy was his favourite image, wrote Mgr Camus, Bishop of Belley, his friend and neighbour. He had it in embroidery, in painting, in oils, in line engraving, in illumination, in half relief and engraving. He put it in his bedroom, in his chapel, in his oratory, in his study, in his living room, in his gallery, everywhere."  "It is the country’s shield, the holy bishop would say; it is our great Relic... Certainly, I have a particular reason for being devoted to it, for my mother dedicated me to Our Lord, when I was in her womb, before this holy standard of our salvation."  This was an allusion to the exposition of the 21st July 1566, at the collegiate church of Annecy, Notre Dame de Liesse; Françoise de Boisy, who was only fifteen years old, kneeling beside her pious husband, thirty years older than herself, whilst contemplating with tearful compassion the bleeding effigies of her Saviour, had asked Him that the child she bore might be a boy and that this son would become a priest. A month later, she gave birth to a son, her first born, the future François de Sales.   |  | | --- | | The Feet on the Shroud |  |  | | --- | | Figure 21: a single nail pierced the two feet, the one crossed over the other. That is why only the right foot marked the Shroud with a complete imprint of the sole, whence a flow of blood has spilt over onto the linen (to the left). The left foot (to the right) has only left an imprint of the heel, because the extremity of this foot rested on that of the other. |   That is why this saint had a life long devotion for this Relic, the devotion of the predestined, imprinted with tender compassion and full of love. We find this gently expressed in a better he wrote to Saint Jeanne de Chantal, dated the 4th May 1614 (see below).  Less is known of the devotion of the ***Blessed Sebastian Valfré*** for the Holy Shroud, and his zeal for spreading it. He considered that an exposition was as good as a homily. He wrote to the Duke: "Oh! how much it said, even though it did not speak when Your Royal Highness approached the Sacred Cloth to kiss it. It will certainly have offered your soul peace and will have declared war on sin. May God grant us the grace of being struck in our hearts by such a rare sermon so that they remain with Jesus Christ, in the hands of Him to Whom all human hearts belong, especially those of princes and kings."  Duke Emmanuel-Philibert had ordered in his will, in 1580, the construction of a church for the safe keeping of the Relic. More than a hundred years had to pass before this project was realised – a project that would never have seen the light of day without Valfré’s constant appeals: "I feel impelled to beg Your Royal Highness to have the chapel of the Holy Shroud completed as a matter of urgency. Because I ought not to resist such an impulse, I tell it to you, hoping that you will construct an even more magnificent chapel in your heart." (Cesare Fava, *Vita e tempi del Beato Sebastiano Valfré*, Torino 1984, p. 265-268)  Finally, on the 1st June 1704, the Relic was transferred to the chapel built in the apse of the cathedral by the Theatine father, Guarino Guarini.   |  | | --- | | THE DEVOTION OF A PREDESTINED SOUL Annecy, 4 May 1614.  Whilst waiting to seeing you, my very dear Mother, my soul greets yours with a thousand greetings. May God fill your whole soul with the life and death of His Son Our Lord!  At about this time, a year ago, I was in Turin, and, whilst displaying the Holy Shroud to such a great crowd of people, a few drops of sweat fell from my face on to this Holy Shroud itself. Whereupon, our heart made this wish: May it please You, Saviour of my life, to mingle my unworthy sweat with Yours, and let my blood, my life, my affections merge with the merits of Your sacred sweat!  My very dear Mother, the Prince Cardinal was somewhat annoyed that my sweat dripped onto the Holy Shroud of my Saviour; but it came to my heart to tell him that Our Lord was not so delicate, and that He only shed His sweat and His blood for them to be mingled with ours, in order to give us the price of eternal life. And so, may our sighs be joined with His, so that they may ascend in an odour of sweetness before the Eternal Father.  But what am I going to recall? I saw that when my brothers were ill in their childhood, my mother would make them sleep in a shirt of my father’s, saying that the sweat of fathers was salutary for children. Oh, may our heart sleep, on this holy day, in the Shroud of our divine Father, wrapped in His sweat and in His blood; and there, may it be, as if at the very death of this divine Saviour, buried in the sepulchre, with a constant resolution to remain always dead to itself until it rises again to eternal glory. We are buried, says the Apostle, with Jesus Christ in death here below, so that we may no more live according to the old life, but according to the new. Amen.  Francis Bishop of Geneva. 4 May 1614.  (Oeuvres complètes, édition d’Annecy, 1910, t. XVI, p. 177). | | | |
| APPENDICESTHE MYSTERIES OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM Let us remember that the ***British Museum*** enjoys a solid reputation as a forger. A masonic bastion of scientific atheism, its militant Darwinism has for long served as its religion. To give it a "scientific" foundation and guarantee its definitive triumph over the Catholic doctrine of creation, Arthur Smith-Woodward and Charles Dawson, the Mike Tite and Teddy Hall of the *Belle époque*, did not hesitate to set up, at great expense, the hoax of the "Piltdown Man", which deceived the scientific world for forty years, from 1912 to 1953. They put together some palaeontological remains from collection pieces made up to create the "missing link" in the supposed chain from monkey to man: the "Dawn Man": a human skull and a simian jaw. They benefited from the eager collaboration of the ecclesiastical world – even then! – in the person of the young Jesuit, Teilhard de Chardin, and of the Franciscan, Bergounioux.  Silencing every objection raised by the most renowned palaeontologists of the period – the Englishmen Keith and Waterstone, and the famous Frenchman, Marcellin Boule, convinced transformist though he was – the British Museum succeeded, on the strength of its prestige alone, "above all suspicion", in sustaining this enormous trickery, even shaking Boule himself and finally winning over his successor who headed the Institute of human palaeontology, Henri Vallois, professor at the National Museum of natural history and director of the Museum of Man, by means of a fraudulent fluorine *dating*!  If there is an institution in the world which the Church should have challenged, it is the British Museum ! On the other hand, if there is an institution above all suspicion, on the unanimous admission of the international scientific community, it is the Pontifical Academy of Sciences. But it was the latter that was ousted in favour of the former!   |  | | --- | | *Letter from Dr. Tite to Jacques Évin, in which he asks him to obtain a piece of 14th* *century cloth identical in every respect to that of the Holy Shroud, so that it might be mistaken for it. Here we have a carefully crafted plot well on its way to come up with a false Holy Shroud ! and capable of providing the result that will allow them to proclaim: the "shroud of Turin" was fabricated in the Middle Ages; it never enveloped the Body of Christ!*  **The British Museum** Research Laboratory  Dr. J. Évin. Radiocarbon Laboratory Villeurbanne, France.  Our reference: MST/IMP   London, 12 February 1988  Dear Dr. Évin,  Thank you very much for your most helpful and encouraging letter of 8th February.  *Certainly, limiting the number of laboratories involved in dating the Shroud makes my task somewhat easier*(my emphasis!).  I would certainly very much welcome any assistance that you can give in obtaining a *mediaeval control sample, which is as similar as possible in terms of weave and colour as the Shroud*, (again I emphasise this search for a double, a likeness to the Holy Shroud!) since at present, I am not certain whether the British Museum will be able to provide such a sample (fancy that ! and why ?)  Firstly, therefore, in answer to your specific questions: 1. The total sample would need to be 6 cm2(i.e. about 120 mg.) 2. The material of the sample should be linen. I enclose a photocopy of some photographs *which give some indication of the weave of the Shroud*(again, I emphasise). 3. We are looking for a sample which dates from the 13th or 14th century AD, *preferably from the 14th* (again, I emphasise). 4. The historical precision should obviously be as good as possible, *but one would certainly consider*(?) *samples with an age range of fifty to a hundred years*(everything is so strange in this letter that, again, I must emphasise these mysterious words). 5. There is no need for the sample to come from a well known textile. 6. I suppose I could come to France to collect the samples. The idea certainly appeals to me. *But I do not really think that this is necessary* (there being the risk of me and my double not passing unnoticed!). It would *probably be satisfactory to use the postal service*(incognito consignment). 7. I think that one would want to include the name of the museum that provided the sample in the final publication, if this were in fact possible (there’s the alibi).  On the bases of these answers, it would seem that your third suggestion as a source of possible material, the Cluny Museum in Paris, would be the most suitable. I have, therefore, written a letter to Mme Joubert-Caillet – copy enclosed – asking her if she would be able and willing to help in this matter.  Again, thank you very much indeed for your kind offer of assistance, which is very much appreciated. As you say, I hope that the project will give us an opportunity to meet again.  With best wishes, yours sincerely,  Signed: M.S. Tite. |    THE INTRIGUES OF THE BRITISH MUSEUMby David Boyce On the 14th October 1988, a press conference was held at the British Museum at which the Holy Shroud was declared to be a hoax by Dr. Michael Tite, at that time director of the British Museum research laboratory, accompanied by Professor Edward Hall, then director of the Research Laboratory for Archaeology and History of Art at Oxford University, and by the physicist Robert Hedges.  You all saw the [photograph](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud3.htm#figure 9) in the CRC of these three gentlemen sitting very complacently before a blackboard on which was chalked the dates 1260-1390, followed by an exclamation mark. We need to bear in mind this very well known fact, because what follows will show just how the British Museum tried to pass itself off as neutral in this whole affair.  The English public, with its innate anti-Catholic prejudice, had no difficulty in accepting this news, for Professor Hall, it seems, had already leaked it to the *Evening Standard*of the 26th August 1988, where it was front page news proclaimed in big headlines, long before publication of the official report and without consultation with the American and Swiss laboratories.  After the 13th October, we had to wait four months for the official report to appear, a four page article in the review *Nature*, not subject to peer control by the scientific world. I then telephoned Professor Hall in Oxford to ask when we would receive the detailed report of the tests performed in Oxford on the linen of the Holy Shroud. He very curtly replied that there would be no further report other than that published by *Nature*.  In the meanwhile, there was a change of personnel. Professor Hall resigned and would answer no more questions on the subject. Dr. Tite replaced him as Director of the Research Laboratory for Archaeology and History of Art at Oxford, and Dr. Mark Jones took over from Dr. Tite at the British Museum. Then, on the 25th March 1989, *The Daily Telegraph*revealed that £1 million sterling had been donated by rich friends of Hall’s to provide for Tite’s post at Oxford. The day of the payment: Good Friday! One can guess who these "rich friends" are: by choosing the pay off day in this way, they reveal their identity despite themselves. For those who know Oxford, this news is all the more astounding for many university chairs remain unfilled for lack of funds. DOCTOR TITE THROWS OFF THE MASK On the 10th March 1990, there took place at Haslemere, a small town in Surrey, a conference entitled *"Fake"*, given by Dr. Tite to about a hundred people of the Haslemere Museum Society. His lecture was in fact a resumé of the large exhibition, also called *"Fake"*, which had just opened at the British Museum. Dr. Tite began his talk with an account of archaeological and artistic fakes, but it was clear that the main, not to say only, interest of this lecture was the Holy Shroud, of which a full length negative photograph was projected onto the screen.  In the course of his talk, he admitted the mysterious nature of this image: the fact that not a trace of pigment is to be found on the cloth and that the image is coded to produce a three dimensional effect.  He then completely disorientated us by projecting onto the screen the mathematical tables which figure in the *Nature*report, the value of which no one was able to judge, and launched into hair-brained explanations for the origin of the image of the Holy Shroud, whilst those in the audience seemed to have suspended their critical faculties, bemused no doubt by this display of "higher mathematics". He began by quoting the "evidence" of Pierre d’Arcis, bishop of Troyes, who claimed to have known the artist who painted the image on the cloth. Fortunately, someone in the audience immediately remarked: "But you’ve already said there is no pigment on the cloth."  He then put forward the grotesque hypothesis of a Crusader crucified by the Saracens in the 14th century, and whose decomposing body vapours supposedly left an imprint on the cloth in which it was buried. Either he knows nothing of the work of the American STURP team, who have proved the inanity of this hypothesis, or he holds their work in contempt. At this point, I intervened to say that the vapour theory is incompatible with the image we see, for a cloth wrapped round a body would inevitably distort any image produced; furthermore, the light and dark shades of the Shroud image are a function of the distance between the cloth and the body, which produces the three-dimensional effect.  He had to yield before both objections and ended by saying that there remained a lot of research to be done into the formation of the image, but that he would never accept the hypothesis whereby the surface of the cloth was scorched by the *flash* of the Resurrection. There is an implication here that, though Tite may refuse to believe in the Resurrection, he nevertheless knows the true date of the Holy Shroud: contemporary with the Resurrection!  After the lecture, I approached Dr. Tite privately to ask him about a letter of his that had been published in the *Catholic Herald* on the 12th January 1990, in which he regretted having used the word *"fake"* in speaking of the Holy Shroud of Turin. Given that he had just delivered a lecture in which the Holy Shroud figured as a fake, did he now have second thoughts about that letter? He answered: "If I had known that my letter to Gonella would be published in the press, I would have added a line to explain myself better."  I then asked him whether he knew the works of Brother Bruno on the Holy Shroud. He answered with a guffaw. I put the question again and, yes, he did know them. "When are you going to answer the accusations formulated by Brother Bruno?" – "Who? What?" – "You yourself, and those who took part in the tests on the Holy Shroud." – "We have already answered." – "But you haven’t. Brother Bruno has proved that the weight and size of the samples taken at Turin do not correspond to the weight and size of the samples given to the three laboratories." He did not deny the accusation, but laid the blame elsewhere: "You’ll have to ask the Italians about that. Ask Riggi. It is for Turin to answer that question."  Dr. Tite gave the impression of a man who feared that things might turn out badly and was looking for someone on whom to pin the blame. What is more, he did not seem equal to the great responsibility with which the Vatican had entrusted him. That could be the Vatican’s fault, not his. He showed an incredible lack of seriousness and, above all, a great contempt towards the American specialists as well as towards the non-specialists of his Haslemere audience. THE INSULTS OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM The exhibition organised by the British Museum from the 9th March to the 2nd September 1990 under the title of *"Fake? The art of deception"* brought together a collection of various objects ranging from archaeological artefacts to false Cartier jewels. The *Piltdown Man* hoax figured prominently, guaranteeing the perfect neutrality of the organisers with regard to both believers and unbelievers*.*But the main attraction of the exhibition was the section entitled "Scientific detection of fakes and counterfeits", at the centre of which the visitor was confronted by the largest object in the whole exhibition: a life size photograph of the entire Holy Shroud "obtained by courtesy of Kevin Moran, Belmont, North Carolina, USA". The object is presented in the exhibition catalogue with the following notice: "The Turin Shroud. This linen cloth, some 4.25m in length, bears the shadowy image of the front and back of a man who appears to have been scourged and crucified, and is therefore believed to have been Christ’s burial shroud. Its history is known with certainty back to about AD 1350, when it was in the possession of the de Charny family in France. Even then it appears to have caused something of a religious furore, being declared by some to be a fake and by others to be the true Shroud. In 1898 the first ever photography of the shroud revealed that when seen in negative the image is strikingly lifelike. This discovery and subsequent medical findings fuelled suggestions that the cloth could conceivably be genuine.  "A fragment of the cloth was recently removed for radiocarbon dating, and samples measuring only a few square centimetres (equivalent to about 50mg) were apportioned to three accelerator laboratories in Oxford, Zurich and Tucson, Arizona. The British Museum was asked to participate in the certification of the sampling and the statistical analysis of the results. The calibrated radiocarbon result, published in the journal *Nature* in 1989, was 1260-1390, which corresponds well with the Shroud’s first appearance in France. However, until it can be properly established how this striking image came into being, the mystery remains incompletely solved." Signed: Sheridan Bowman, one of the "twenty-one" co-authors of the *Nature* report.  Nothing here reveals any bias for or against the Holy Shroud’s authenticity. But for the British Museum, it is a fake, full stop.  It is only when I brought the exhibition catalogue to Brother Bruno that I saw, because he pointed it out to me, that the photograph in this catalogue is not actually of the Holy Shroud but is a photographic negative of the Holy Face (see [figure 6](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud3.htm#figure 6)), which is not the same thing. Nobody had seen this negative image before 1898, when it was taken by Secundo Pia. A photographic positive of what was seen "in the Middle Ages" (see [figure 3](http://www.crc-internet.org/shroud2.htm#figure 3)) would convince no one that the author of the Holy Shroud was a forger.  After the closure of the exhibition, I telephoned Dr. Tite at Oxford to forewarn him of our congress today and to invite him to send a declaration if he so wished. I tried to make him understand that in presenting a photographic negative of 1898 as a work of 1260-1390 he himself was committing a fraud. His answer was that he had not considered the question and that, any way, he was no longer director of the British Museum and that the exhibition had been set up after his departure for Oxford. He wished to say nothing and advised me to contact Dr. Mark Jones, his successor at the British Museum. Repeating *"OK!"* several times, he signified that the conversation was ended.  A few days later, I telephoned Dr. Mark Jones at the British Museum to say that in presenting a photographic negative of the Holy Face in the exhibition catalogue as the Holy Shroud, he himself was misleading the public. He was embarrassed and sought to place the blame on Dr. Bowman. He insisted, however, that the Museum made no judgement about the authenticity of the Holy Shroud and that it only figured in the exhibition as an example of detection techniques. Yes, except that the photograph of the Shroud was the largest object and centrepiece in an exhibition entitled "FAKE". I asked him how long it had taken to set up such an exhibition. "Two years",he answered, immediately adding, "But why do you ask me that?"He had guessed perfectly the point of my question, for he continued by explaining that the inclusion of the Holy Shroud in this exhibition was really an after thought, a last minute idea. Unlike Dr. Tite, Dr. Jones was in no hurry to put the phone down and tried to defend himself for having wanted to present the Holy Shroud. But he insisted that the Oxford tests did prove its mediaeval origin. I answered that it is precisely the validity of those tests that is being contested. He then expressed regret for having written in the blurb on the back cover of the catalogue: "What is a fake, and why are they fabricated? Did the forgers of the Turin Shroud and of the *Piltdown Man* have the same motives?" In the second edition of the catalogue, this question has been eliminated.  He still insisted on the perfect neutrality of the British Museum in this whole affair. This time, it was I who wanted to bring the conversation to an end for I had heard enough. If all these gentlemen are so sure that the Holy Shroud is a fake, why do they boast of their "discovery" before some and apologise for it before others? *Qui s’excuse s’accuse.*  DAVID BOYCE. IN THE  BEGINNING: SAINT VERONICA The apocryphal books show a constant interest in the Shroud of Our Lord, from the Gospel to the Hebrews (end of the 1st century) to the Gospel of Gamaliel (5th century). Perhaps even then, in the eyes of the early community itself, it constituted evidence in support of the fact of the Resurrection.  No less constant is the fact that the Acts of Pilate or the Gospel of Nicodemus (5th century) give the name of Bérénice or Veronica to the woman cured of an issue of blood by touching the hem of Jesus’ garment (Lk 8.43-48). These apocryphal writings are full of very ancient traditions, for Justin and Tertullian already mention the Acts of Pilate in the 2nd century. Now, the story of this holy woman is linked, from the most distant origins going back to evangelical times, to the full-length image of Christ.  Everything is told as though Bérénice-Veronica, the woman cured of the issue of blood by Jesus, had kept the Holy Shroud discovered by Peter and John in the empty tomb on Easter morning. It is this memory that kept alive the traditional title of "Veil of Veronica" at the beginning, to designate this extraordinary relic itself. |
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| THE DATING OF THE IMAGE BY MEANS OF PALAEOGRAPHY ***THE IMAGE DATED TO WITHIN TWO YEARS***   |  | | --- | | http://www.crc-internet.org/images/filas.jpg  *Father Francis Filas, SJ, mathematician, physicist and theologian, professor of Loyola University, Chicago, recalled to God on the 15th February 1985, aged 69 years.* |   Our historical investigation finds striking confirmation through palaeography, which dates the *image*to within two years. Our late lamented friend, Father Filas, sent us the complete file of this discovery, which, to his credit, he brought to completion though not having initiated it himself. This fact needs to be recalled, for it all began with a consensus of American scientists, vouched for by the preliminary work of the STURP team at Albuquerque in 1977 and by Jumper’s communication to the Congress of Turin in 1978. But it all ended in such a persecution of Father Filas starting from the meeting at Los Alamos in 1979, that to this day his file is as good as banned worldwide.  Why? For one reason only, which is totally alien to science: because we have here a dating *of the image*, and not just of the cloth, dating it to almost the actual year of the *Event* itself. It is the stamp or seal of Pontius Pilate, giving a date to which no scientist can raise any objection. Unless he maintains, as does Laurentin, who wrote to me saying that he can see nothing! Might as well deny the light of day in broad daylight. Judge for yourselves.  ***PILATE’S LEPTON***  It is the three-dimensional analysis (figure 27) which gave birth to this hypothesis, but even a look at an ordinary photograph will clearly reveal a kind of disc placed over each eyelid, dark on the positive and light on the negative.   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | http://www.crc-internet.org/images/vp8.jpg  Figure 27: Close-up of the Face and facial and dorsal images as the appear on the video terminal of the VP8 image analyser. | http://www.crc-internet.org/images/coin1.jpg  Figure 28: The enlargement of the eyelid shows an imprint of the same size (15mm) and the same cut as this coin (to its left) stamped with the astrologer's staff, the emblem of Pontius Pilate.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | http://www.crc-internet.org/images/eyelid1.jpg | http://www.crc-internet.org/images/eyelid2.jpg | Figure 29: The imprint of the astrologer's staff bordered on its curved side with four Greek letters: Y CAI. | |   An enlargement of this imprint, on the right eyelid (figure 28), enabled Father Filas to recognise the imprint of a coin struck under Pontius Pilate: the same size, same cut, the same effigy, the astrologer’s staff (figure 29), the same inscription recognisable, from four quite legible letters, as a certain coin duly catalogued for the years 16, 17 and 18 of Tiberius Caesar, which would be the years 29, 30 and 31 of our era (figure 28).   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Figure 30: Three types of coins corresponding to the cut, to the motif and to the inscription of that which closed the eyes of Jesus. On the obverse side, all three bear the staff in the centre with the inscription TIBEPIOY KAICAPOC round the border. | | | a).On the reverse side of the first coin, there is a crown of laurels surrounding the inscription LIS which signifies the year 16 of the reign of Tiberius, the year 29 of our era. | http://www.crc-internet.org/images/coin2.jpg | | b). On the reverse side of the second coin, LIZ indicates the year 17 of the reign of Tiberius, the year 30 of our era. | http://www.crc-internet.org/images/coin3.jpg | | b). On the reverse side of the third coin, LIH indicates the year 18 of the reign of Tiberius, the year 31 of our era. | http://www.crc-internet.org/images/coin4.jpg |   ***AN ANOMALY THAT DOES NOT DECEIVE***  Confirmed by three-dimensional analysis (figure 31), the discovery was found to be definitively corroborated by its very fruitfulness, for it led to some unexpected progress in numismatic science. Four Greek letters, Y CAI, are in fact all that are needed to reconstruct the inscription TIBEPIO [Y KAI] CAPOC, "of Tiberius Caesar". But there is an anomaly: on the Holy Shroud a Latin C replaces the initial Greek K of KAICAPOC, which figures on all the coin collections known up to 1980 (see figure 32).   |  |  | | --- | --- | | http://www.crc-internet.org/images/coin5.jpg  Figure 31: Confirmation of the three-dimensional analysis. The letters Y CAI are clearly visible at the top left, as well as the staff and even the outline of the coin. | http://www.crc-internet.org/images/coin6.jpgFigure 32: above, a coin of Pontius Pilate with the staff surmounted by the letters CAICAPOC, with a Latin 'C' instead of the Greek 'K'.  Below: the imprint superimposed on a coin of Pontius Pilate shows that the letters Y CAI form the visible part on the Holy Shroud of the Greek inscription:  TIBEPIO [Y CAI] CAPOC,  "of Tiberius Caesar", with the same anomaly: 'C' instead of 'K'. |   Thereafter, to those who accused Father Filas of letting his imagination run away with him or of taking his *desires* for reality, he answered that, not being a numismatist, he had so little desire to see a coin of Pilate’s that "before I accidentally stumbled on this, he wrote to me, I would not have known a Pilate coin from a hole in the wall". He was obliged, therefore, to consult the numismatic specialists, and it was then that his discovery proved to be so little the work of his imagination that it was responsible for a positive progress in the study of numismatics itself. It revealed that the anomaly observed on the Holy Shroud and already recognised as being of common usage in inscriptions but hitherto unknown in numismatics, existed identically on other collection coins struck under Pontius Pilate, which no one had noticed before.  We have here a document dated within a year or two by the express Will of Him Who caused this Image to be imprinted on the cloth. For one would have expected to see shards of broken pottery used for covering the eyes, as was the Jewish custom, but it would not have been possible to read a date from them. Whereas the little coin proclaims: it is "under Pontius Pilate" that this Man suffered. |