

Holy Shroud, the possible answers of the investigating science

By [National Editorial Team](#)



An illuminating intervention to understand how far we have come in the search for the Truth on the Holy Shroud is summarized in this magnificent intervention by the Spanish forensic doctor Alfonso Sánchez Hermosilla, who is part of the Scientific Committee for studies on the precious find (in the photo, with another prestigious member of the Committee, the engineer and scientist Massimo Rogante). A very pleasant reading that Sánchez Hermosilla gives to the readers of our newspaper.

"The results of the research on the Shroud conducted with the coldness and detachment of scientific methodology do not allow to leave indifferent any researcher capable of isolating himself from prejudices and preconceptions, even if at first sight it seems not to be so: reflection, research and experiments show that preconceptions were incorrect and that 'everything is as it should be'.

It is interesting from the point of view of any branch of science and of course from my personal point of view as a coroner and paleopathologist, it makes it the most interesting archaeological object I know of, closely followed by another object: the Shroud of Oviedo, which will be mentioned later

Given its characteristics, the Shroud of Turin is difficult to investigate, as it is an ancient object of incalculable scientific, historical, metaphysical and probably also economic value. The methodology used, therefore, must be minimally

invasive, or better still, non-invasive, in order not to subject the object itself and the information contained in it to unnecessary stress, but also not to invalidate future research with methods that scientific advances will lead to available to researchers and which, at this moment, we are not even able to imagine.

The first thing that caught my attention when I started investigating the Shroud is that, from the point of view of Forensic and Forensic Medicine, the results "are what they should be and are where they should be", even if at first glance it seems not so, reflection, research and experimentation show that preconceptions were incorrect and that "everything is as it should be". For example, the marks attributed to nail injuries are not on the palms of the hands, as we imagine them, and how they have been represented in the vast majority in works of art that represent this theme throughout the history of Sacred Art. They are where they should be, in the anatomical area called the carpus, which is what we call the wrist. The kind reader allow me a small reminder of what we were taught in elementary school:

- Question: what are the parts of the hand?
- Answer: carpus, metacarpus and fingers.

So, oh surprise! The carpus is part of the hand and not the forearm. This is just an example, the scientific research of the Shroud does not disappoint, at times, very often it surprises and discourages, showing unexpected results which, as a first approximation, seem to confirm the hypothesis that it is not authentic, that it is a brilliant artifact made by human hands with who knows what intentions. But those same results, sometime later, turn out to be the cornerstone that proves otherwise, if they weren't there you might think it's a fake.

Another surprising fact is the image he shows, known as the "Shroud Image", easily identifiable with a human figure, and which skeptics refer to as "a painting", without bothering to prove whether such a claim is certain or not.

Opinions are free, each of us can have what seems best to him. But the facts are immovable, it is not enough to affirm or deny something, in the scientific field it must be demonstrated, with irrefutable proofs, or with experiments that confirm or deny it. And of course, until now, using ancient or modern technologies, no one has been able to reproduce the image of the Shroud with all, yes, WITH ALL its characteristics. The real situation is that, to date, no one knows exactly how it was produced, and no one has managed to reproduce it, not even with the most modern methods.

In fact, no other archaeological object with similar characteristics is known, but not even modern objects, and all this, in any historical, cultural or geographical area.

By itself, the Shroud never ceases to surprise every now and then with new scientific data, but it also turns out that it appears to be related to another archaeological object called the Shroud of Oviedo.

The current situation of the scientific research process is the following: the high number of anthropometric and medical-forensic concordances allows us to conclude that both objects covered the corpse of the same person.

Both objects have concordant information, but also complementary information: when a part of that specific information appears only in one of these objects, however its presence conditions other results in the other, and all this, reciprocally.

Some researchers, very optimistic, believe that within a short time the scientific investigation on the Shroud can be finished. I am not so optimistic. Well, because a single square millimeter of the cloth contains enough information to keep several generations of researchers busy using only the technology available today, not to mention what the future brings.

At the moment, the level of complexity of research is of such magnitude that a multidisciplinary team of researchers that includes practically all branches of human knowledge is absolutely necessary, indeed indispensable. A single scientific specialty would give an absolutely myopic and fragmentary vision of reality. A reality for which no final horizon is perceived, a perceptible limit. If the scientific investigation of the Shroud has an end (let us not confuse the end with the purpose), beyond which there is only nothingness, it is still so far away that it is not even understood”.