

SHROUD BIBLIOGRAPHY

As evident from the foregoing, the literature on the Shroud continues to grow year by year, and although many published books on the subject provide bibliographies, so far no-one has yet produced a master bibliography, i.e. a list of all known available sources. To compile such a bibliography is a monumental task, but it is one which has already begun to be tackled enthusiastically in the States by David Schultz of Milwaukee. David is looking for someone in the United Kingdom to help him with the details of books pertaining to the Shroud in British libraries, that may not be known to him in the U.S.A. Any member willing to help in this way is invited to contact David direct. His address is:

David Schultz,
425 N. Story Parkway,
Milwaukee, WI 53208,
U.S.A.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Rex Morgan *The Holy Shroud and the Earliest Paintings of Christ*, 7 pp. colour, 45 b & w. Bibl. Manly (Australia), The Runciman Press, 1986, 151pp.

Anyone familiar with books and articles on the earliest likenesses of Christ as published in the early part of this century will almost certainly have come across certain water-colour sketches, amongst these a "second century" catacomb painting purporting to be the earliest portrait of Jesus [below left], and a copy of a portrait of Jesus attributed to St. Luke [below right].

The originator of these and other sketches was a somewhat obscure Victorian artist called Thomas Heaphy (1813-1873), author of a rare, lavishly illustrated tome *The Likeness of Christ - Being an Enquiry into the Verisimilitude of the Received Likeness of Our Blessed Lord*, published in 1880, seven years after his death, after editing by his friend Sir Wyke Bayliss, a fellow-member of the Royal Society of British Artists. The sketches, which continue to be reproduced occasionally in books of the present-day, purport to be accurate copies of some of the holiest and most jealously guarded treasures of the Vatican, items preserving the earliest, most authentic likenesses of Jesus, which Heaphy, according to his own account, managed to gain access to, about a century and a half ago, after interminable diplomatic negotiations with the Vatican guardians.

Rex Morgan, Australia's foremost Shroud author [see *Newsletter* no. 13], came across first mention of Heaphy in 1983, and a year later gained access to Heaphy's originals as preserved in the Print Room of the British Library. Noting the extremely early dates which Heaphy gave to the works which he copied, and their similarity to the Shroud face, Morgan believed he had stumbled across an important new line of Shroud research: that the works were corroborative cross-checks to the authenticity of the face as visible on the Turin Shroud. Assuming Heaphy to be an unknown to other Shroud researchers, Morgan wrote up his findings in book form, had his own publishing house set this into type, and only then, in the form of proofs, released copies to other Shroud researchers, including myself.

For me the regrettable feature was that I had already pursued inquiries into Heaphy back in the early stage of my own researches during the 1960s, and had formed the still-held

conclusion that Heaphy's work is so inaccurate, both historically and artistically, that it simply has no legitimate place in any serious study of the earliest likenesses of Jesus. Since Rex Morgan's book essentially accepted Heaphy almost completely at face value, there seemed no way of substantially adjusting such a fundamental judgmental error at such a late stage, and accordingly, although he has made some quite extensive amendments, Rex has had little option but to go ahead and publish with this central flaw remaining.

Despite this obviously serious problem Rex Morgan has in fact fulfilled a long-overdue need for Heaphy's work to be brought to public attention. In the early Victorian era it was a commonplace enough occurrence for the more adventurously inclined to travel the world making sketches of interesting items which, before the age of photography, those back at home would otherwise have no other means of seeing. Some of the sketches of those who went to Egypt, for instance, continue to be valuable to present-day Egyptologists, incorporating, as they often do, details of inscriptions, architectural features, etc., that have subsequently been obliterated or destroyed.

But it is in precisely this respect that Heaphy, working, according to his own account, in those most sacred places that others have not managed to reach, seems to have failed everyone, both of his own time and today. For the problem is that some of the items he copied are today well enough known from photographs, and from subsequent scholastic appraisal, for the loose and fanciful quality of his sketching and datings to be all too apparent. This inevitably breeds distrust of his renderings of works for which we do not have present-day photographs. And since Heaphy almost invariably failed to record the exact circumstances in which he gained access to the most sacred of the likenesses, we have some cause for doubt whether he genuinely managed even to see some of the originals he claimed.

Where Rex Morgan could have provided a most valuable contribution, difficult though the task would have been, would have been to try to track down item by item the works copied by Heaphy, insofar as they still exist to this day. He would have found, for instance, that there are modern photographs and a considerable literature on Heaphy's "Portrait Attributed to St. Luke", to which he devotes chapter 13. Instead of being in the "Bibliotheca of the Vatican" and of "about the middle of the third century", this work is none other than the Acheropita of the Sancta Sanctorum chapel in the Lateran Palace, by no means inaccessible, and reliably dated to c.590 AD.

It is a pity, also, that Rex did not pursue more fully the strange disparity between Heaphy's copies of the Genoa [see below] and St. Silvestro (today Matilda Chapel) "images of Edessa" and these same works as known from modern photographs.

Did Heaphy really, as supposed by Morgan, see these out of their frames? Nothing in any of the modern literature on these gives any indication that these undoubted Byzantine icons are demountable in the manner that would be required for there to be an underlying original of the kind sketched by Heaphy. So is there something we don't know about these icons (one at least of which has been X-rayed)? Or did Heaphy give rather too free vent to his imagination?

The latter view is reinforced by Heaphy's purported sketch of the so-called Veronica [above, left], supported by his eloquent description: "The wet, matted hair, the tears, the blood-drops from the crown of thorns... the calm, nearly closed eyes, the gently parted lips." According to Heaphy this work is "so holy that no layman's eyes may look upon it, and, I am informed, no churchman's, save the Pope's, and his necessary attendants, and even the holy father himself

only inspects it on one day of the year..." If one might wonder from this how Heaphy gained access (he neither gives a date nor explains the circumstances), this wonder only becomes increased when his description is compared with that of the Abbé Barbier de Montault, who on 8th. December 1854 was undeniably granted a specially privileged viewing to celebrate Pope Pius IX's proclamation of the Virgin Mary's Immaculate Conception:

The ... traces are so vaguely delineated, or perhaps so completely effaced, that it needs the best will in the world to be able to distinguish eyes and a nose. What makes it more difficult still is a kind of wire mesh placed over it to stop the linen from falling to pieces. In short, one cannot see the fabric behind, hidden by a useless metal cover, and the place of the impression exhibits only a dark surface, giving no semblance of a human face." [*Annales Archaeologiques* XIII, 86].

By way of corroboration of the Abbé Barbier de Montault's version, a more detailed examination in 1906 by the German scholar Wilpert confirmed that there is no discernible image on the cloth in the Veronica reliquary, the image-bearing cloth that mediaeval pilgrims flocked to see almost certainly having been lost without trace when the troops of Charles V sacked Rome in 1527. [J. Wilpert, *Römische Mosaiken and Malereien II*, 1924, pp.1123ff] One can therefore only conclude that Heaphy in reality never saw the Veronica itself, but most likely simply used as his source of inspiration an Italian engraving of the Holy Face on cloth [p21, right], popular at that time as a tourist souvenir, and based on a Veronica copy in the Church of Jesus, Rome.

Heaphy may well have had no intention to deceive. After more than a century has elapsed it is impossible to determine how much his editor Sir Wyke Baylis doctored and even muddled his material. But the notion that Heaphy has left us, in his sketches or his writings, anything of serious scholarly value, whether in relation to the Shroud or otherwise, needs to be sadly but firmly dismissed. And from this point of view it is a great pity that Rex Morgan, with his most admirable enthusiasm for Shroud studies, should in this instance have unwittingly perpetuated an unworthy myth.

Ian Wilson

Joseph A. Kohlbeck & Eugenia L. Nitowski, "[New Evidence May Explain Image on Shroud of Turin: Chemical Tests Link Shroud to Jerusalem](#)" *Biblical Archaeology Review*, vol 12 no. 4, July/August 1986, pp.18-29.

This is a highly important article detailing the results of the environmental study of the Shroud in Jerusalem, the planning of which we reported in *Newsletter* no. 12. [By way of reminder, Joseph Kohlbeck is an optical crystallographer employed by the Hercules Aerospace Division, the company that produces America's Trident, Poseidon and Pershing missiles. Eugenia Nitowski is an archaeologist who recently took the vows of a Carmelite nun.] Having already noted some unexplained calcium carbonate (limestone) particles amongst the Shroud's fibres Kohlbeck and Nitowski visited Jerusalem in order to obtain samples from the limestone of the ancient rock-cut tombs of Jerusalem, their objective being to determine whether there might be at the microanalytical level any kind of "fingerprint" match between the characteristics of the Jerusalem limestone and that found adhering to the Shroud.

If valid, Kohlbeck and Nitowski's findings appear to be another major breakthrough in the process of authentication of the Shroud. According to Kohlbeck the Jerusalem limestone:

... was primarily travertine aragonite deposited from springs, rather than the more common calcite. Calcite and aragonite differ in their crystalline structure - calcite being rhombohedral and aragonite orthorhombic. Aragonite is less common than calcite. Aragonite is formed under a much narrower range of conditions than calcite. In addition to the aragonite, our Jerusalem samples also contained small quantities of iron and strontium but no lead.

We then examined a calcium sample from the Shroud taken from the area known as the "bloody foot" because his showed a larger concentration of calcium carbonate than other areas. This calcium carbonate turned out to be aragonite, not the more common calcite - and exhibited small amounts of strontium and iron.

Further analysis was conducted by Dr. Ricardo Levi-Setti, of the Enrico Fermi Institute of the University of Chicago, who put both Shroud and Jerusalem samples through his high-resolution scanning ion microprobe and produced graphs; these graphs revealed that the samples were an unusually close match, except for minute pieces of flax that could not be separated from the Shroud's calcium and caused a slight organic variation.

As Kohlbeck goes on to point out, such findings do not prove the Shroud came from Jerusalem, but such an origination would be a very reasonable explanation for the presence of the aragonite.

Kohlbeck and Nitowski also describe interesting results obtained from replicating (via a manikin filled with heated water) the possibility of the Shroud's image having been formed by acids exuded from a body heated to between 110° and 115° F. as a result of a condition known as post-mortem caloricity (or post-mortem fever). Apparently, after a period of incubation in dark, damp tomb-like conditions, an image was obtained in those areas of the manikin's body that retained the heat the longest, the chest and the back. The results were not sufficiently good to be anything more than suggestive, but they have encouraged the two researchers to pursue further experiments of which we will no doubt hear more in future issues.