

## RECENTLY PUBLISHED

*History, Science, Theology and the Shroud; Proceedings of the St. Louis Symposium*, St. Louis, Missouri, June 22-23, 1991. Edited by Aram Berard, S.J. 357 pp, black & white illus.

On the spacious lawn of St. Louis Abbey, as relatives and alumni greeted friends gathering for Homecoming festivities, Brother Joe Marino, member of this Benedictine community, was introduced to a guest as "the monk all wrapped up in the Shroud". That was about the time when Bro. Joe had just begun to send out his *Source Sheet*, now fully developed as *Sources for Information and Materials on the Shroud of Turin*. Even before he began this work, the young Benedictine was already nurturing the idea of a symposium that would emphasize the theological aspects of the Holy Shroud.

I mention this — laying to rest the periods of uncertainty, of opposition, of immense effort — because — with all due credit to those who sponsored his undertaking — the symposium was the realization of Bro. Joe's own idea. And since this book of the Proceedings is restricted to the publication of the papers presented, Bro. Joe Marino's name nowhere appears.

The Shroud has often been discussed in the light of theology, usually with intent to bolster the Relic's "authenticity" by reference to certain Scripture passages. But we have heard very little that is new. Our little army, camped in soggy tents, tramps bravely up and down a well-trodden plot while vast unresearched fields and mysterious forests stretch to endless horizons.

Invert the proposition: Can the Shroud illuminate the tenets of theology?

Perhaps the first step is to scientifically demonstrate the happy obsolescence of the old conflict between science and religion. In his paper, "Thoughts on the Unification of Religion and Science in the 20th Century and Beyond", Physicist John Jackson, whose pace has never been pedestrian, shows how physics and theology become one through the Anthropic Principle. Dr. Jackson presented a second paper, on the "mechanical transparency" of the Body permitting the "collapse" of the Linen, a paper similar to his 1990 article in *Spectrum* #34.

In the realm of "new physics", Isabel Piczek diagrams what, in my simple-minded understanding, seems to be the mechanics of the Resurrection. More down to earth, her second paper, "Is the Shroud a Painting?" is an abbreviated version of her talk given at the New York Symposium of 1991. Isabel Piczek is an experienced artist. Her instruction of artists' techniques and materials has nothing in common with mere academics, nor is her familiarity with Medieval

Art based solely on books. After giving knowledgeable reasons why the Image on this supple Cloth cannot be by the hand of man, Miss Piczek goes to work, setting up studio-experiments to clarify some of the uncertainties about the position of the Body as it lay in the Shroud.

Frank Tribbe calls forth the mystics; the Templars are invoked at Templecombe by Rex Morgan; Daniel Scavone surveys Byzantium. The Whangers discover images of a crown of thorns, of nails, the lance, the dice, and other things imprinted on the Cloth, while Mario Moroni's paper reiterates the claim of a coin on the right eyelid.

The Rev. Albert Dreisbach carefully presents the episode about the young man who left his "sindon" in the hands of the "enemy" (Mk. 14:51-52) as a proleptic reference to Christ who emerged from the bonds of death leaving his "sindon" in the tomb (Mk 15:45, 46). The theme alerts us to the possibility that there could very well be other cryptic references to the Shroud in the New Testament. I am thinking of Galatians 3:1-4. Rev. Dreisbach spoke later, asking "Did Peter See More Than an Empty Shroud?" One of those queries that only the protagonist himself can truly answer.

Dr. David Mayschak neatly applies Thomistic theology to the Shroud (in *Spectrum* #4, Vera Barclay timidly comments on the same passage from Aquinas). Dr. Robert Dinegar, I think, believes in the Shroud even though he tries to excuse its medieval provenance by a sort of iconoclasm. He quotes Gonella's definition of a fake as "something constructed to deceive". Dinegar is emphatic: "Most assuredly", he exclaims, "the image on the Shroud is, neither in itself nor in what it represents, a deception!"

An excellent discourse was prepared for this symposium by Brother Bruno Bonnet-Eymard: "Study of Original Documents of the Archives of the Diocese of Troyes with Particular Reference to the Memorandum of Pierre d'Arcis".

On the whole, speakers adhered closely to the assigned theme, applying their expertise to its relation with the theology of the Shroud. One wonders how Paul Maloney might have addressed theological aspects, since he spoke on conservation. His paper is not included in the *Proceedings* due to a previous publishing commitment.

The volume is well-edited although someone spilled a pound or two of commas all over the texts, causing the reader many a stumble. For information on obtaining a copy of this book, please write to: Bro. Joe Marino, O.S.B. / St. Louis Abbey / 500 S. Mason Rd. / St. Louis MO 63141-8500.

In the Easter 1992 *Sources for Information and Materials on the Shroud of Turin*, Bro. Joe Marino reprints four not-so-recent articles dealing with the Shroud and Art.

P. A. Beecher (1924), considering the image on the Shroud, shows

himself to be keenly perceptive and easily conversant in art history. Recalling Father Thurston's statement in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* that the image on the sheet was painted in the XIV<sup>th</sup> century, probably by a monk, Beecher remarks: "... there was no painter, simply because there is no painting. If a painting, then where are the pigments?"

Rev. Edward Wuenschel, C.S.S.R. writing in 1941, calls attention to the beardless symbolic types of Jesus giving way to the more mature Apollo or Orpheus models, an observation developed by Rev. Heinrich Pfeiffer, S.J. (for example, see *Spectrum* #9 & 10).

Sister Michael Kilmer in 1944 predicts that modern artists will turn from the traditional representations to the more virile Shroud figure.

In 1958, Vera Barclay, always thinking independently, proceeds from the Shroud as Relic to the Shroud as Revelation. Quoting Dom Silvester Houédard's claim that of all the relics of Jesus, the Shroud is "the one Christ chose to be his legacy to the twentieth century", Miss Barclay makes the cogent observation that "Perhaps it was because of this claim that theologians began to be cautious. For as long as the Shroud was regarded simply as one of the relics of the Passion, no theologian worried about it.... If the Shroud is the Lord's legacy ... then something very special has loomed over the theological horizon".

HOLGER KERSTEN and ELMAR R. GRUBER: *Das Jesus Komplott; Die Wahrheit über das "Turiner Grabtuch"* . (The Jesus Conspiracy; The Truth about the "Turin Shroud".) Langen Muller, Munich 1992. 448 pp., black & white illus.

Blurb-writers for the dust jackets of Shroud books invariably enthuse that "this book reads like a detective novel". A recommendation that, for most of us, holds little promise. By title and by blurb, *The Jesus Conspiracy* hints a *Kriminalroman*, and indeed the plot is perfidious and even compounded. True to the genre, the text is so gripping that one unwillingly puts the book down. Otherwise, there is nothing here that could be classified as entertainment.

With the meticulous thoroughness characteristic of the Germanic *Sinn*, the two young authors have marshalled sindonic information from Abgar to Zaninotto, augmenting that with their own research and personal interviews. The heavy tome, solidly bound with a look of seriousness and durability, bulges with sheaves of history, science, Biblical texts and apocryphal writings, archeology, forensic medicine.... The bibliography lists some 250 authors; of reference notes, arranged according to the chapters, there are 247. A reasonably complete Index. A Foreword and an Epilogue, signed by both authors. The whole flawlessly edited.

This fact-laden text could be deadly stuff were it not for the inexorable rhythm of the development. Both authors judiciously employ

the timeless trick of putting the reader on the spot by leading him into provocative questions, then giving the answers in the most unsuspected ways. Kersten begins Part I with the dire date of 13 October 1988, announcing that three laboratories had carbon dated the Shroud to the Middle Ages. He wonders if, finally, the "myth-destroying authority of the scientific method, once more," would utterly dash all hopes in the truth of something extraordinary. And if such be the case, then "the story of the Turin Shroud ends here, and the search begins for the cleverest forgery ever known".

A disconcerting introduction. But Part I, "The Relic and Science", is reassuringly familiar as it moves swiftly from 1898 through the Paris symposium in 1989. Kersten attended the symposium, and records conversations he had with several of the key figures.

Elmar Gruber takes Part II, "The Cloth in the Shadow of History": the Mandylion, the Fourth Crusade, Templars, and the "official" story concerning Marguerite de Charny's transfer of the Shroud to the House of Savoy; then the 1988 judgment that the Shroud is a medieval forgery. In Part III, however, Gruber approaches the problem from another angle. In "The Secret of Golgotha" he starts with two burials described in the Gospel of John. We are led into the company of the Essenes, where Jesus, in the wilderness (Mk 1:12-13) passed his novitiate. We learn of marvelous burial spices, and of a wonderful drink of opium given to Jesus on the cross. For this is the secret, the *Wahrheit über das Turiner Grabtuch*: Jesus did not die on the cross. The issue of blood and water from the side wound proves that he was still alive when the Shroud was draped over him in the tomb.

Everybody knows that a corpse does not bleed. (But not everybody knows that if you puncture the side of a sac distended with liquid, then that liquid will run out the hole and no pump is needed.)

There is no dearth of literature on this subject. Dr. William B. Primrose (+1977), surgeon in two Glasgow hospitals, studied the Shroud and earnestly expounded his medical opinion. The lance wound, which he "identified for the first time on the Shroud", was only a superficial scratch in the abdomen. "Christ lived to be a very old man [120 years] with a very small abdominal scar."

Just before the 1978 Exposition of the Shroud, Rodney Hoare of the British Society for the Turin Shroud argued the affirmative in his article, "Was Jesus buried alive?" (*Gente*) and in his book, *The Testimony of the Shroud* (London, 1978). Hans Naber, alias John Reban/ Kurt Berna, a German, was employed in Switzerland when he saw "visions" of the crucifixion that inspired him to acrimonious attacks in endless publications and pompous letters to the Vatican. But perhaps the first to diagnose Jesus' "apparent death" as a fainting fit was none other than Mohammed, High Priest of Allah, in the VII<sup>th</sup> century.

Jesus' recovery ties in neatly with the legend that he died in

Kashmir. "Kashmir" means "Paradise on Earth". That is the place Jesus referred to when he said to the Good Thief as they both hung on their crosses: "Today you will be with me in Paradise". He miscalculated his timing, because he did not reach Kashmir/ Paradise until a bit later. The Good Thief, poor soul, didn't make it at all. In India, the enigma of the crucifixion was, by Divine Providence, revealed to the mystic Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. It was he who found Jesus' tomb in Srinigar and built over it the impressive mausoleum. Before his death in 1908, he founded the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam, whose members count in the thousands worldwide.

Among books on the subject: Andreas Faber-Kaiser's *Jesú vivio y murio en Cashemire* (Barcelona, 1976) was translated into English, *Jesus died in Kashmir* (London, 1977); and later into Italian. In 1982, Siegfried Obermeier came out with *Starb Jesus in Kaschmir? Das Geheimnis seines Lebens and Wirkens in Indien* (Did Jesus die in Kashmir? The secret of his life and works in India). In this connection, it is only fair to mention that Jesus lived a long life (106 years) as a hermit/teacher on the Japanese island of Honshu. He is buried there too.

In various versions, Jesus, taken down unconscious from the cross but still alive, was tended by his friends and helped to escape. Gruber asks, Resurrected (from the dead) or Getting up (after a recovery)? (Der Auferstandene oder der Aufgestandene?) Accompanied by his Mother (her tomb still exists in Pakistan) he set off to India in search of the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel. While he was in Damascus with St. Paul, he received a letter from King Abgar of Edessa. Eusebius transcribed their correspondence. So he and his Mother stopped in Edessa to visit the king. By some oversight, it is not recorded that he presented Abgar with his portrait.

Best of all, Holger Kersten, when a young man of 24, traveled to Kashmir in 1979. His book *Jesus lebte in Indien* appeared in 1983. The author treats us to a color photo of Jesus' footprints, in stone, hard by his sepulchre. Huge flat wedges with splayed toes and a gash on each sole — the nail marks. The imprints must be genuine because they match the grotesque indentations preserved in the church of St. Sebastian on the via Appia Antica. I have heard that the same footprints are venerated on Mt. Tabor....

No farther need we peregrinate the legendary trails, for the authors do not lead us on these excursions: they head for another destination.

Having established that the Shroud is the authentic burial cloth of Jesus Christ, they unequivocally brand the medieval date as false. The carbon test was a deliberate manipulation to falsify the true age.

Who are the men who stand behind the scenes pulling the strings in this unholy power play? And why? Of course, I am not supposed to spoil the suspense by telling you whodunit. But....

Who had the most to lose if a first century date had been verified,

thus proving, for all intents and purposes, that this cloth indeed bears the real Image of Christ as he lay in the tomb? The answer to that is elucidated, the authors tell us, in the secret of Golgotha: the Man of the Shroud was not dead. *And if Christ be not risen from the dead ... then is your faith in vain.* (I Cor. 15:14).

DANIEL RAFFARD DE BRIENNE: *Le Saint Suaire dit Vrai!* , Les Dossiers de Renaissance Catholique, Issy-les-Moulineux, 1992.

The 45 pages of "The Holy Shroud Tells the Truth!" present in literary form Mr. Raffard de Brienne's slide lecture. Slide lectures are generally attended by people whose curiosity has been awakened, who want to know what the Shroud is all about. Geared to neophytes, a presentation must inevitably skim the surface of Shroud studies.

Invariable is the format for a beginner's introduction: description of the Object, history, modern research.... A few words about the Bishop d'Arcis leads into a very clear layman's-level explanation of carbon 14, a question that never fails to perplex an audience. The fifth chapter, "The Passion According to the Holy Shroud" is based on Barbet.

Mr. Raffard de Brienne has written a booklet in which no problem peeks around the pages to disturb the equanimity. Even the unacceptable events of 21 April 1988 are treated with a benignity that reveals more of the author than of his discourse. Chapter Seven identifies the Figure and gives reasons for saying that the Shroud is proof of the Resurrection.

There is a Preface by André van Cauwenberghe; a Bibliography of principal works; numerous black & white illustrations, some full page.

I could not read this little booklet until I had used Post-it Notes (7!) to cover the harsh, hideous and distorted drawing that presumes to represent the Holy Face on the cover and at the end of the chapters. It is inconceivable to me that artists' (?) interpretations, of whatever quality, should be preferred to the sublime beauty of the True Face of Christ on the Shroud.

The lead article in *Collegamento pro Sindone*, September-October, brings another appeal by Don Luigi Fossati, S.D.B., for scientists to consider the possibilities of using the Holland cloth support on the back of the Shroud as a control in the event of a future dating test. This is not some bright idea that just occurred to him; he has urged the use of the backing cloth on several occasions for more than 35 years (first in *Osservatore Romano*, 26 June 1955).

As the renowned sindonologist points out, we know the exact date that the cloth was stitched to the Shroud: April, 1534. So obviously appropriate is the support cloth as a dating control that there seems no reason to explain it to readers of *Spectrum*.

Don Fossati tries yet again, in an article published in Ivrea on 10 September 1992. After the fire of 1532, the Poor Clare nuns united the two fabrics across the entire surface by regular, closely-spaced stitches, invisible on the Shroud side. For four hundred and fifty-odd years, the two have been thus intimately undivided. Since the case is unique, Fossati emphasizes, there is no precedent from which one could make a guess as to whether there has been contaminating interaction, apart from the various replacement sheets of silk sandwiching the Shroud/Holland cloth, topside and underside. Whatever the outcome of an eventual dating experiment, the new data would be invaluable.

The May—June issue of *Collegamento* offers readers, as it often does, an unusual article: "The Islamic Version of the Holy Shroud", by Si Manza Boubakeur, Honorary Rector of the Muslim Institute of the Mosque in Paris.

The author begins with a sage dictum: "Fortunate is the person who, putting himself above the religious antagonisms, the astonishing legends and cultural prejudices, can arrive at a conclusion about the historical complexities and the spiritual significance of this relic!" That person, the author promises, will discover that the incoherence is infused with wisdom and, under the weighty burden of contradictions and myths, he will find a logic.

Steeped in Muslim history, the author refers to sources that record the Holy Handkerchief in Edessa and its transfer to Constantinople on 15 August 944. "The object, let us repeat, according to the Muslim version, was a *mindil*, handkerchief, napkin; and not a *sudarium* (Latin) nor a *sinclon* (Greek). What became of it is not known; what is certain is that its fate and its legend were transferred from Asia to Europe, with [Europe's] passion for relics, its taste for legends, its mania for miraculous manifestations in contempt, very often, of Church doctrine."

Beyond his Muslim sources, the author's information is scanty and erroneous: "Marguerite de la Rochelle in 1359 displayed a linen cloth of 1 m x 20 cm...." Out of four parts of the sentence, three are wrong. No wonder he concludes thus: "The Vatican, we know, did not await the opinion of the pseudo-chemists and the myth makers to reject the authenticity of this strange relic."

Clearly, His Excellency has been misinformed about the European history of the Shroud. Had he been content to develop his first paragraph we would have been better edified.

But his insistent repetition of the word "handkerchief" to designate the *ikon al mandil* of Edessa can only raise again the irritating question about the material characteristics of the object received in Constantinople on 15 August 944.

In the September *Soudarion*, Si Hamza Boubakeur's paper appeared in a Flemish translation by Remi van Haelst. The June issue of *Soudarion* must have been fascinating, devoted especially to studies of the still-evasive "Mandyliion". In particular, the articles by

Hilda Leynen and O. Boie seem to me, with my limited understanding of the Flemish tongue, to present some new research. Most interesting was a kind of chronology, "Two-thousand-year Shroud history", under place-name headings, outlined by Boie.

*Shroud News* #72, August 1992, is dedicated exclusively to the memory of Group Captain Leonard Cheshire. Lord Cheshire's interest in the Shroud and his worldwide charitable foundations are given their due, but the pages wherein Rex Morgan, stirred by his school-boy recollections, pays fervent tribute to a great war-time hero, evoke a more personal response.

Gordon Deery, founder of the Holy Face Association in Montreal, courageously launched a "Holy Face Newsletter" in March of this year. Mr. Deery has been promoting Shroud studies, particularly in their devotional aspect, for a long time. We wish him every success in his new venture.

*Sindon* #2, December 1991, and #3, December 1992, were received in January of this year, bringing a wealth of important articles and news of significant events. An adequate review of these issues would require more space than *Spectrum* #41 can spare, and a cursory review would not be fair to the scholarly contributors.