

RECENTLY PUBLISHED

LUIGI FOSSATI, S.D.B., "E utile l'analisi radiocarbonica?" *Studi Cattolici* #300, Feb. 1986. Pp. 130-134.

The question becomes insistent: Can radiocarbon analysis be of use to us in our study of the Turin Shroud? There is no simple answer; the issues are complex. But Don Fossati examines them with the objectivity and expertise of a scientist and the serenity of a Buddha. In the first sections of his article, the Author explains C14 methods, then their application to the Shroud. He calls attention to the problems involved in the cleansing of the threads, which are covered with extraneous materials; the choice of laboratories would be another decision. He proposes rigid conditions for control and procedure in order to insure the best possible outcome of the testing.

But there are further aspects to be considered. In 1980, R. Gallino had written: "Now that it is possible to obtain a date...from a small bit of thread, it is clear that such a direct scientific test...could furnish an extremely valuable contribution—even while acknowledging that dating is but one element for approaching the reality of the Shroud." This statement sets the keynote for Don Fossati's discourse on what might be expected after the tests are done.

If the radiocarbon test were to give a positive result, showing, even with the inevitable margin of error in the measuring, that the relic could date back to the First Century, those persons who do not accept [authenticity] would have to take into account this new addition to a prospect already abundantly furnished with favorable proofs, and they would at least have to reexamine their positions of doubt and prejudice. Obviously, in their judgment, the final word, *This is Christ*, would still not be provided. That conclusion does emerge, however, from the interdisciplinary research already accomplished; evidence sufficiently probative and such as to offer the moral certitude that this Shroud is a true, sincere and genuine witness to the passion, death and resurrection of Christ.

If the result is positive, certifying that the cloth goes back to the time of Christ, all the various hypotheses of an image made, in good or bad faith, by an artist in some later century, would be shown to be unfounded.

Fossati does not see an end to the matter if the result is negative, dating the Shroud to a more recent century. This would annul the possibility that it was used in the burial of Christ, but

one would still have to demonstrate:

- Who is the person who left his imprint on that cloth;
- Who created the image, if it is a forgery;
- Where, how, when and why was it made?

Until it is scientifically and apodictically demonstrated, with valid proofs, that it is a forgery, the Holy Shroud, with its somatic and haematic imprints, will continue to be a sign of the Father's love for humankind, manifested in the passion and death of Christ and so graphically represented, in all the various phases, on the Linen.

All the questions raised in exegetics, archaeology etc., and inherent in the silent periods of Shroud history, do not demolish that reality which will always be an undecipherable mystery for all those who approach the Shroud with preconceived opinions and without humility. The Author reflects, pensively, that there are so many mysteries in nature which have not been satisfactorily explained! And yet, they exist....

Since the Shroud imprints portray all the details of Christ's passion in a way totally beyond the ability of an artist to depict them, we are left with a possibility that they may be the result of a divine intervention at some time in history. If so, even if the Turin Shroud is not the actual burial cloth of Christ, it will continue to be—like other famous miraculous icons—a sign that inspires and fosters devotion to Our Lord.

Some writers observe that if the Shroud was in fact the cloth used in the burial of Christ, a radiocarbon analysis could be disturbed, in some way, by the phenomenon of the resurrection, consequently the results might not be accurate. Thus they liken the resurrection of Christ to a mere natural occurrence, not taking into account the sharp distinction between the natural order and the supernatural order.

The resurrection is essentially a mystery, a matter of faith; it cannot be analyzed according to scientific cognitions. As for that sharp distinction between natural and supernatural, one must assume that everything that materially exists on the Shroud has a non-miraculous origin. Nevertheless, if, in spite of all the research, no reasonable explanation can be given for the complex totality of Shroud problems, then, and only then, can we admit—and we should admit—that to produce this unique Object, superior forces intervened.

To conclude, the Author reiterates the pressing necessity for an in-depth study of other objects related, historically or iconographically, to the Shroud; especially the Holy Face of Genoa, the Veronica of St. Peter's, the Edessa Image of the Vatican Palace, on which the support cloth, visible in some places, seems to be a herringbone weave. (See *Spectrum* 3, pp. 18-31).

Copious notes accompany this article.

D.C.

A.-M. DUBARLE, O.P., *Histoire ancienne du Linceul de Turin*, (1986), O.E.I.L., 12 rue du Dragon, 75006 Paris. Pp. 176, Illus. 125 French francs.

Research on the Holy Shroud extends into every field of study; the more one searches, the more one finds that there is always something new to discover. The recent publication, as the title indicates, aims to present the ancient history of the Holy Shroud from earliest times up to its presence in Constantinople in 1204, as witnessed by Robert de Clari. While the Relic has come down to us entire, the lack of explicit documents leaves in obscurity this long period in its history. The Author has undertaken this arduous theme with patience and perseverance over a span of many years of research.

Father Dubarle, trained at the Ecole Biblique et Archeologique of Jerusalem, is internationally known for his exegetical studies. His interest in the Shroud goes back to 1938, when he visited the 1937-38 World Fair in Paris, and saw the full-size photographs of the Shroud exhibited in the Vatican pavilion. Thus for almost 50 years, he has been involved with the Relic.

Some of his writings on the Shroud are listed on p. 163. It is worthwhile to recall the first, his review of F.-M. Braun, O.P., "Le Linceul de Turin et l'Evangile de Saint Jean," Tournai 1939, (extract of the articles published in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*). Fr. Braun had written that the authenticity of the Shroud is incompatible with St. John's Gospel. In his review, the young Fr. Dubarle was so bold as to propose new ways to evaluate and interpret difficult scriptural passages, referring in particular to John's account of the burial of Christ (*Revue des Sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 29, 1940, bibliographic supplement pp. 3-4). He said clearly that the philological study, however useful it might be, could hardly be decisive against the authenticity of the Shroud and that the discovery of new archaeological and literary documents could very well require changes in certain interpretations up to that time believed to be valid and immutable.

On the basis of this premise, we can be certain that the present research has been conducted in all seriousness, as is further demonstrated by the abundance of notes and works consulted.

Chapter One (pp. 13-32), a "History of the History", surveys a panorama of the authors (E. Dobschütz, S. Runciman, P. Vignon, P. Savio, M. Green, P. de Gail, W. Bulst, I. Wilson, P. Cazzola, R. Drews) who, more or less amply and more or less precisely, had dealt with the specific argument of this research. The second chapter (pp. 33-77) documents the presence of the Shroud in Constantinople. Especially important is section 3, which examines the iconographic evidence (pp. 42-50) and clarifies, in some ways, the accounts of Robert de Clari and Nicholas

Mesarites, analyzed in the two preceding sections.

Chapters Three to Six (pp. 79-121) are dedicated to the Edessa Image, which the Author, in the wake of Ian Wilson's hypothesis, identifies with the Holy Shroud. In these pages, texts from many authors, known and less known, are acutely and minutely analyzed. From the arrival of the Edessa Image to Constantinople, commemorated annually with solemnity during its long sojourn there, the Author leads back in time to Edessa, tracing through a crowded list of passages which celebrate the fame of that image as a portrait of Christ. At first, the actuality Mandyllion-Sheet-Shroud is founded only on incidental evidence; the Author demonstrates the gradual clarification which goes on to affirmation of the identification of that mysterious Object really not made by the hand of man.

On the question of whether or not certain representations of the Face of Christ depended from the Edessa Image, Fr. Dubarle expresses this judgment:

If an examination of this image was ever made, after its discovery near the end of the VIth century, in order to furnish directions to painters and other artists, the fact was not divulged. The image not-made-by-the-hand-of-man did not attract interest because it offered to one's gaze the physiognomy of Christ. Rather than a depiction, it was an efficacious presence, a warranty of protection. It was on this account that it could arouse in the emperor of Byzantium the desire to possess it.

The seventh chapter (pp. 123-143) critically examines several ancient texts which have been invoked to document the presence of the Shroud in Jerusalem and Constantinople, but which the Author does not consider to be sufficiently probative.

The last chapter reviews the hypotheses of various modern authors who are contrary to the authenticity of the Shroud. Dubarle writes:

Several of the essays examined in this chapter admit that the linen contained the mortal remains of a man tortured in the manner of Jesus: according to A. Brisset, a crucifixion in Jerusalem in the Vth century; in the VIIth c., again in Palestine, according to P. S. Gramaglia; in the XIth c. at Constantinople, according to G. Brunet. Other essays give the opinion that the Shroud is an image made by man: at Edessa in the VIIth or VIIIth century according to A. Cameron; in France in the XIVth c. according to A. Wild.

Apropos of these, one could make two observations, even if they are not wholly pertinent to the present study: 1) The remarkable diversity of opinions on the explanations of the Shroud imprint; 2) If, in the opinions of these commentators, a forger of the past had conceived and realized the Shroud with the imprints that we see, we shall have to consider him far more intelligent and skilful than those experimenters who, with all

the modern resources of technology at their disposition, have not been capable of the same accomplishment, that is, to give us a cloth with the negative imprints, frontal and dorsal, of a corpse.

In the discursive exposition of the subject matter, the rigorous documentation and scrupulous examination of texts, the reader will find a logic which dispels much of the obscurity of this period of Shroud history. And it seems appropriate to terminate this review with the words of the Author himself:

The present research is an effort to assemble the literary and iconographic data that can be related to the Shroud of Turin. Each one by itself would have but a faint demonstrative value in favor of its authenticity. It is the possibility of arranging them in an almost uninterrupted series which gives them force. There still remains a discontinuity between the too-laconic text of the Gospel according to the Hebrews and the attestations to the presence of an image in Edessa. The conviction of the Shroud's authenticity results from the accumulation of a large number of indications. No other theory can flatter itself to reunite so many.

LUIGI FOSSATI

WERNER BULST, S.J., "Christusikone—Edessabild—Turiner Grabtuch", *Hermeneia* I, 2/3 August 1985. Pp. 42-61. Illus., 5 in color.

Hermeneia is a fledgling quarterly devoted to the iconography of the Eastern Church (see *Spectrum* 16, p. 34). In this forum, Father Bulst's discussion of one of the major Shroud problems cannot fail the notice of Byzantine iconologists, who, until very recently, have completely overlooked the possible influence of the Shroud in art.

The guideposts toward a solution are always iconography, legend and history. The gathering point is always Edessa, where Ian Wilson first signalled the presence of the Turin Shroud, still unrevealed but revered as the Mandylion not-made-by-hands. To reach Edessa, Father Dubarle, in the book reviewed above, starts out from Constantinople; in *Christusikone*, Father Bulst departs from pre-Christian Rome, proposing that the Edessa Image must have been a true likeness of Christ, because otherwise it would not have been acceptable. His argument is based on the fact that Roman emperors promoted homage to their sovereignty by setting up statues of themselves all across the empire. So faithful were the portraits of each that they can still be identified. When Constantine converted to Christianity, he transferred the emperor-cult to Christ; now it was Christ who reigned supreme in the Constantinian basilicas. This is the period, Bulst notes, in which the symbolic representation of Christ, such as the Good Shepherd, gave way to an

image with long hair and a beard; which is to say, a personal likeness. Bulst writes: "Considering Roman image-ideology, this role [as sovereign] of the Christ image was only conceivable if people were convinced that this was a faithful representation of Christ."

Bulst recalls the importance of Edessa in Roman, Byzantine and Church history. Coming under Roman rule in 165, by 190 Edessa was the seat of a bishopric and a theological center. The famous image not-made-by-hands had been brought to Abgar, King of Edessa, while Christ was still living, or according to another version of the legend, just after his Ascension. It is rarely pointed out, and Bulst does not mention it, that of the nine Edessan kings named Abgar, the first who became Christian was Abgar IX, who reigned from 179-216 (Toynbee, *The Crucible of Christianity*).

Bulst quotes Dobschütz to the effect that while the Abgar legend developed in various forms, the chief point always consisted of an imprint on a cloth. But Eusebius (writing ca. 325) and Procopius (*Persian Wars*, 550) know only of a purported letter sent by Christ to Abgar; they say nothing about a Christ image. The first to mention such an image was Evagrius, writing in 594. He reports that a Christ image not-made-by-hands saved the city from Persian attack in 544.

Bulst quotes an interesting text from Dobschütz which illustrates the high veneration accorded to the icon while it was in Edessa. The icon was kept in a golden shrine "leaving only the face free" but permanently covered by a costly veil. Only the Metropolitan, twice a year, could change the veil. With a damp sponge, he touched the cloth (or shrine) [Author's parenthesis] and with this holy water he sprinkled the people. The period in which this rite was performed is not given.

In a summary of the latest scientific research on the Shroud, the Author considers Wilson's *tetradiplon* theory alongside Jackson's foldmark schema (*Spectrum* 11). The following section identifies the Crucified figure on the Shroud as Jesus Christ. Thus, having laid the groundwork on the Edessa Image and the Turin Shroud, the Author compares the two and pronounces them one and the same.

"From Edessa to Constantinople" includes the impressions of the imperial princes on viewing the Holy Mandyllion on its arrival to Constantinople, 15 August 944. The princes complain that "Nothing can be seen except a face". Constantius thinks he sees "eyes" and "ears". That the princes saw nothing on the cloth, now presumably out of its golden shrine and unfolded to its entire length, argues in favor of the theory that it was the Shroud; for we know that, aside from the bloodstains—strangely not mentioned in this passage—the diffused image cannot be seen at close range. The Author points out that this passage is

of the highest importance for the identification of the Edessa Image with the Turin Shroud, since it is the only authentic description of the Edessa Image we have before its transfer to Europe.

This is a surprising statement, since it is generally accepted that the imaged cloth seen by Robert de Clari, some 260 years later, was the Shroud now in Turin. Father Bulst doubts that it was the Shroud that de Clari saw. In the Pharos chapel, de Clari sees two silver urns, one containing a tile, the other a towel or Mandyllion which, according to Byzantine tradition, were discovered in the Edessan wall. (This is not the tradition reported by de Clari. See *Spectrum* 17, p. 27, at end of Note.) But the *sydoine* which the "poor knight" saw exposed at the Blacherna palace, Bulst believes was a representation of the Man of Sorrows or an epitaphios.

What became of the Mandyllion? A burial cloth appears in Lirey in the middle of the XIVth century, and in 1578 it is transferred to Turin, where it remains.

Within the triangle Christ icon—Edessa Image—Turin Shroud, the Author has fitted together the principal elements of his vast research. His often original interpretations of texts are thought-provoking, compelling a reader to penetrate new channels to find, perhaps new light, perhaps additional questions. His study, supported by 83 notes, sets his seal on the theory that the Christ icon not-made-by-hands is indeed a true portrait, "far more so than one had dared to hope".

D.C.

WERNER BULST, S.J.: "Turiner Grabtuch and Exegese heute, II.: Neues zur Geschichte des Tuches", *Biblische Zeitschrift* 30 (1986) pp. 70-91. 6 illus. Schoningh, Paderborn, W. Germany. "Christusikone—Edessabild—Turiner Grabtuch", *Hermeneia* I, 2/3 (1985) pp. 42-61. 15 illus.

The first part of the *Biblische Zeitschrift* article was reviewed in *Spectrum* 11 (June 1984, p. 42). The second part, subtitled "New Information about the History of the Shroud", covers the material published in *Hermeneia*, reviewed above. In both articles, the Author employs the method initiated in 1938 by P. Vignon (*Le Saint-Suaire de Turin...*) and taken up by I. Wilson in 1978 (*The Turin Shroud*). The data derived, on the one hand from iconography and from written texts on the other, coincide, allowing us to affirm that in the VIth century the Shroud now in Turin was known and furnished a model for representations of Christ.

The Author relates that Justinian, emperor of Constantinople (527-565), reconstructed the walls of Edessa, which had been destroyed by a flood in 525. This city in the Upper Mesopotamia

was a frontier-post against the Persian empire. In the Sinai and at Ravenna, Justinian constructed other frontier-posts against other enemies. In the churches of these places, there are representations of Christ that call to mind the imprints on the Shroud. It is probable that Justinian considered the Edessa Image, rediscovered during the Persian siege of the city (544), as a guarantee of divine protection against the invaders.

Other representations of this era also resemble the Shroud. The eyes, wide open, correspond to the direct aspect of the imprints, whereas today we are accustomed to seeing the eyes closed, as revealed by the photographic negative.

The Edessa Image was transferred to Constantinople in 944. At the time of the Fourth Crusade, it was still kept in the sanctuary of the Boucoleon palace. What Robert de Clari saw in the Blacherna church was a picture representing the Man of Sorrows. Here, the Author departs from the general opinion of recent historians.

To the six or seven hypotheses already formulated concerning the transfer of the Shroud to France and its arrival to Lirey, Bulst adds a new one (hinted at but not yet clearly expressed in *Hermeneia*, pp. 57-58). He proposes that the Shroud would have been the cloth attached to a board (*sancta toella tabule inserta*) ceded in 1247 to King Saint-Louis by Baudouin II, the Latin emperor. By inheritance, the Shroud would have passed from Louis IX to his great-great-grandson, John II the Good. John II, then, would have given it to Geoffroy de Charny, whom he held in great honor.

The objections raised in 1389 by Pierre d'Arcis, bishop of Troyes, against the expositions, are of little value. They were advanced by a man who never saw the Shroud. They neglect the fact that a previous bishop, Henri de Poitiers, who, according to d'Arcis, had also protested, nevertheless consecrated the Lirey chapel and praised Geoffroy's piety, soon after the discovery of the "scandal".

These two articles are based on a knowledge rich in artistic matters and an attentive methodology. They merit consideration even though some objections here and there arise in the mind of the reviewer. But this is not the place to discuss them.

A.-M. DUBARLE, O.P.

REMI VAN HAELST: *Het Gelaat van Kristus; de Lijkwade van Turijn*, De Vliet, Antwerp, 1986. 355 pages; generously illustrated; 8 color plates.

Remi Van Haelst has published a number of articles as his Shroud research progressed. The present book is the result of extraordinary ferreting, not only in the traditional sources, such as

Chifflet and Vignon, but also in obscure archives and forgotten periodicals. Much of the information is new and often surprising. Not all of it is accurate, nor is consistency an outstanding feature.

But the book was not written for the scholar. It is destined for a general public. Keeping this in mind, even a critical sindonologist should find the book good reading.

However a chapter starts off, it could end up anywhere, having wandered into many bypaths where history, science, legend, or some bizarre anecdote all become part of a strange and wonderful landscape.

This all-embracing narrative would have been seriously impeded by reference notes, and so there are none. Sources are often cited in the text: for example, a 1902 newspaper article alerts the author to folio 24 in the Archives of Mons (1448-49), which records that Mme. de la Roche, who had in her custody "what is called the Holy Shroud of Our Lord", came to that city on July 6 and ordered some French wine. Mme. de la Roche, of course, was none other than Marguerite de Charny, widow of Humbert de la Roche et Villersexel. But why she stayed "incognito" in that town, the Author hazards that, in Mons, she was beyond the authority of the Bishop of Luik. The book abounds with such tantalizing fragments of information.

No aspect of Shroud studies has been neglected. Mr. Van Haelst had the cooperation of New Testament scholars and exegetes, who translated Greek and Latin passages; librarians opened precious incunabula; archivists, museum curators, church sacristans, university professors, all assisted him. Scientists and sindonologists around the world were consulted, and to all those who helped, in any way, Remi Van Haelst not only expresses his hearty gratitude, but gives thanks to each as he goes along. It is a friendly book, warm and enthusiastic, filled with wonder and triple exclamation points, each chapter an adventure inspired by the Holy Shroud of Christ.

The Author set out to tell everything he could find out about the Shroud. He has succeeded in doing precisely that.

Nota bene: Facing p. 288, there is a color reproduction of G. Tamburelli's computer elaboration of the Holy Face, enhancing the bloodflows in red. As presented, the picture is meaningless, but it becomes quite clear when you turn the book upside-down.

D. C.

THOMAS J. PORTER, JR.: "Shrouded in mystery", *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 31 March 1986.

Newspaper reporting about the Holy Shroud typically has been error-riddled and has leaned toward the sensational. Imagine, then the delight at seeing the entire "Science Week"

page of the Pittsburgh paper exhibiting none of the usual drawbacks and clichés. Thomas J. Porter, Jr., Post-Gazette staff writer, deftly described the numerous features of the cloth and addressed many of the crucial aspects of Shroud research, both pro and con: the importance of dating the cloth; Max Frei's pollen studies; Pierluigi Baima Bollone's typing of the blood and identification of myrrh and aloes in the linen; Walter McCrone's continued contention that the Shroud image and bloodstains are the handiwork of a skilled painter; and numerous other aspects of research. The sidebar on two C14 dating methods elucidated the rather exotic processes for non-scientific readers. Care was given to position the illustrations attractively, and the captions were clear and helpful.

This article followed in the wake of the Elizabethtown (Pa.) conference on the Shroud on February 15-16 and the near-universal reporting of the opinions of only one of the several researchers present at the meeting. Porter is to be commended for addressing a complex and frequently emotional subject in a factual and unbiased manner. He has given an adequate overview of the current state of affairs regarding Shroud research, considering the need to say volumes in a limited space.

DAVID SCHULTZ

FRITZ WILLIAMS: "The Shroud of Turin", *Apprise*, Vol. 5 #10, April 1986; Box 2954, Harrisburg, PA 17105. Three reproductions of the Shroud.

Apprise is published by Harrisburg's public television station, WITF-TV. Basically a monthly program guide, the large-format magazine carries articles of cultural, educational and social interest to readers in south-central Pennsylvania. Out of this homey locality, *Apprise* stepped into international attention on the heels of the Shroud Conference at Elizabethtown College, held in February of this year.

Barely five columns long, Fritz Williams' article is proof that brevity need not be superficial. The article is a lively report on the Elizabethtown Conference, which brought together topflight researchers representing both sides of the authenticity question. Not only did the speakers present an up-to-date survey of Shroud research, but they also indicated research that still needs to be done. In the context of the issues discussed, the Author introduces the essential information about the Shroud in its scientific, historical and descriptive aspects. While scientists are careful to avoid religious implications, Mr. Williams remarks: "Religious belief stands outside the purview of both science and history, and these disciplines can only examine the conditions in which faith operates."

If any of the 40,000 readers of *Apprise* had never paid much

heed to news about the Shroud, this article will convince them that here is a subject on which they must learn more.

Mr. Williams, Senior Writer on the staff of *Apprise*, was well-prepared to write this report. He has had theological training, experience in parish ministry; and has done graduate work in Ancient Near Eastern Studies and the Old Testament.

The idea for this Conference was the "brainchild" of Prof. W. Wesley McDonald, longtime student of sindonology. Taking us behind the scenes, Williams reveals that at first the Cultural Events Committee of the College was reluctant to host a symposium on the Shroud. It turned out to be a landmark event. It is to be hoped that Elizabethtown College will stand as an example to other institutes of higher learning; that these will begin to realize the scientific and historical importance of this challenging Image on a Cloth, and will see the academic need to establish an interdisciplinary Department of Sindonology.

D.C.

PHILIPPE FERRY: "L'Enigme du Linceul", *La Foi Aujourd'hui*, Paris, May 1986. Pp. 8-19.

A probing editorial by Hervé Boulic introduces this "Dossier" on the Shroud, compiled by Philippe Ferry. Large pictures attract the prospective reader. A brief text frames quotations from A. Legrand, Abbé R. Laurentin, Rev. A.-M. Dubarle, Mons. J.-C. Thomas.... Six common questions, posed and answered, are followed by the account of Jesus' burial given in the twentieth chapter of St. John's Gospel. The Dossier is completed with an interview with Rev. Joseph Thomas, S.J., concerning the Shroud's significance for faith.

MARA QUADRI: "La Sindone tra gli ateisti" (The Shroud among the atheists), *Avvenire*, 23 April 1986, p. 20.

Mara Quadri, of the Italian Center for the Study of Christian Russia, extensively reviews an article published in a Soviet periodical, *Science and Religion*. The scope of this magazine, in the words of its editor, is "to propagate with firmness the Marxist-Lenin ideology and scientific materialism, organizing the spread of atheism..." The article reviewed, "The Shroud of Turin: imprint of a corpse or work of an artist?", was written by two historians, Arutjunov and Zukovskaja. Quadri remarks that, strangely, this article does not respond to the editorial objectives. The two historians have given a correct and precise presentation of the historical and scientific information about the Shroud, and are familiar with the most recent research. Their attitude, Quadri remarks, is correct and impartial. Their conclusion is worth quoting: "To conclude, we observe that the

Shroud is testimony to the death of a man by crucifixion, and this happened in the times of the Roman Empire; the details coincide with those of the crucifixion and burial of Christ, described in the Gospel of John. If, finally, one may be permitted to believe that the man is Jesus Christ of the Gospels, this is not a question of science but of faith, and does not have any part in those mysteries of the Shroud which science can resolve."

OSWALD SCHEUERMANN: "Wie ist das Abbild entstanden? Forschungsergebnisse and Fragen zum Turiner Grabtuch", *Der Fels*, Regensburg 1986. Pp. 115-121.

The Author asks, How did the image originate? Research results are surveyed and further questions raised about the Turin Shroud. He describes his experiments, in which he obtained images involving physical-chemical factors in combination with electron emissions. He shows that this combination has the power to produce an image on linen, and that his experiments appear to agree with the image-transfer characteristics observed on the Shroud. Couched in technical language, the article will be understandable to few outside the circles of specialized scientists.

WILLIAM MEACHAM: "On the Archaeological Evidence for a Coin-on-Eye Jewish Burial Custom in the First Century A.D.", *Biblical Archaeologist*, March 1986. Vol. 45 #1, Pp. 56-59.

Meacham questions some of the reports by Rachel Hachlili and Ann Killebrew, who reply to his comments (p. 59f). Finally, L. Y. Rahmani gives his views in "Whose Likeness and Inscription Is This? (Mark 12:16)."

ALSO RECEIVED:

The Holy Shroud Guild News Letter, May 1986. Father Adam J. Otterbein, C.S.S.R., President of the Guild, reports an increased interest in the Shroud during Lent. The Elizabethtown Symposium is described, and Fritz Williams' article in *Apprise* is quoted. Mention is made of the article by Dr. Edwards in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*. And a clarification is given to the frequent question, "Why has the Shroud not been carbon-dated?"

The two inside pages are Fr. Peter Rinaldi's glowing report on the Hong Kong Exhibit and Symposium.

"One of the milestones of Shroud modern history"; so begins Rex Morgan's account of the Shroud Exhibit of the Brooks Institute of Photography, held in Hong Kong March 3-9 and in Macau, March 11-16. According to Morgan, the Exhibit was

seen by more than 200,000 people in Hong Kong. On March 4, some of the world's most eminent sindonologists assembled for a panel discussion, followed by an open forum of questions from the audience. The speakers were: Fr. Peter Rinaldi, Drs. A. Adler, L. Gonella, J. Heller, as well as I. Wilson, R. Morgan, and W. Meacham.

In fact, it was William Meacham who organized the committees and the events, after many months of planning with Morgan.

In *Shroud News* #34, April 1986, Morgan reports on the activities. He tells his story with all the freshness of the excitement and triumph of this landmark event. For those readers who do not receive *Shroud News*, here again is the address:

Shroud News
The Runciman Press
Box 86, P.O.
Manly 2095
New South Wales
Australia

SPECTRUM INDEX

20 pages; \$3.50 + 50¢ postage

The Index covers issues from the Pilot (Dec. 1981) through #15 (June 1985). It is divided into ten sections: Contents of each issue; Recently Published; News & Activities; Correspondence; In Memoriam; Question Corner; Commemorations; Editor's Angle; Articles in alphabetical order; Index of Authors.

Each section is arranged for quick and easy location of any item and for cross-reference to other sections.