

[The Shroud of Turin in Light of the Biblical Tradition of Venerating Holy Objects](#) by **Joseph G. Marino** (May 10, 2024). Here is an excerpt from the Introduction: “I don’t have any hard data, but I believe that many evangelical Christians who are quick to dismiss the Shroud would be thrilled if researchers were able to confirm the existence of Noah’s Ark and the Ark of the Covenant. Of course, one big difference between those two objects and the Shroud is that the former are from the Old Testament, whereas the Shroud has a connotation of having a Catholic, rather than a New Testament connection. The New Testament does mention a shroud in connection with Jesus’ burial. Still, a big caveat is that no image, which found on the Shroud of Turin,” is mentioned, which leads many to believe that the Shroud can’t be authentic because the Gospel writers would have mentioned it if it had been there. However, there are good reasons why the image might not have been mentioned. In this article, I will chronicle various objects in the Old and Testaments that considered “holy objects,” a phrase I prefer to use instead of “relics,” which often has negative connotations. I will attempt to show that there is no theological barrier to accepting the Shroud as the authentic burial cloth of Jesus.”

“[More on the Roman flagrum as barbed whip](#)” by **William Meacham** (May 7, 2024). Excerpt from the article: “Back in November of 2022, when I wrote this paper: https://www.academia.edu/89911497/On_Nicolotti_the_Flagrum_and_the_Shroud I assumed that there wasn’t much more that needed or could be said on the subject, until new data was forthcoming. To my mind it was a fairly compelling case, and clear rebuttal of some of the claims made by Nicolotti. His main thesis – that there is no evidence of a Roman flagrum that would have made the marks on the Shroud –while technically still accurate seems very weak, given the circumstantial evidence...”

[The Historicity of Jesus, the Physical Reality of the Resurrection and the Authenticity of the Shroud of Turin -Some Reflections](#) by **Joseph G. Marino** (April 12, 2024). Here is an excerpt from the Introduction: “It occurred to me that if the idea of Jesus as a myth is true, then an incalculable amount of hours has been spent since the 1st century on the concomitant subjects of the Resurrection of Jesus and the Shroud of Turin. If Jesus had never existed, then the Resurrection could not have happened and the Shroud of Turin has become the most intensely-studied artifact in human history without even having a connection to Jesus. The Shroud is an intriguing object. Even Christians who believe it to be authentic acknowledge that its authenticity ultimately has nothing to do with the core values of their faith. But the Shroud exists and seems to accurately match and even enhance the Gospel accounts of the crucifixion of Jesus.”

“[The Radiocarbon dating of the Shroud of Turin and Jacques de Molay; Freemasonry view](#)” by **Pam Moon** (April 3, 2024). Here is an excerpt from the article: “Other than Michael Tite’s beliefs, the four institutions, the British Museum, Oxford, Zurich and Arizona have not speculated on the creation of the Shroud, (who made it, where, when, why or how), and have consigned it to a vacuum in history. Given the importance of academic rigor, why is the Shroud of Turin subjected to this complete lack of curiosity? If, as Cardinal Ballestrero said, there was Freemasonry involvement in the dating of the Shroud of Turin, it could have had the deliberate aim of securing a medieval date for the Shroud, consistent with Jacques de Molay. This paper suggests the number of coincidences should not be ignored. If there was an ulterior motive, then the tests may not have been conducted with scientific neutrality, and the results would have no credibility. If Freemasons were involved, they obtained bona fide relics of the Shroud; obvious because the Shroud was the only herringbone

material. In the 1980s the Catholic Church suffered considerable harm. The financial loss when Banco Ambrosiano collapsed was nothing compared to the damage done to the reputation of the greatest relic of Jesus Christ on earth. There are consistent calls for the Holy Shroud to be re-dated, but until what happened in 1988 is fully understood, including who was involved, it may be ill-advised to consider such a course of action.”

[The Parables of Jesus, the Man Born Blind \(Jn 9:1-41\), and Their Possible Relevance for Examining Various Theological Attitudes Toward the Shroud of Turin](#) by **Joseph G. Marino** (March 23, 2024). Here is an excerpt from the Introduction: A reader might reasonably ask, apropos my title, “Is it appropriate to try to closely connect a biblical story with an object that could be a forgery? In recent decades, there has been an increasing amount of biblical exegesis examining various biblical passages that could be referring to the Shroud, in a sort of coded language known only to Christians, used to keep knowledge from Jews and Romans who would be intent on destroying such an object. Much of this work has been done by biblical and Greek scholar, Larry Stalley. See his site <http://www.theincredibleshroud.com> for more information.

[The OT Admonition to “Seek the Face of God:” The Nexus to the NT – With Consideration of the Shroud of Turin](#) by **Joseph G. Marino** (March 2, 2024). An excerpt from the Introduction: “One of the most prominent phrases in the Old Testament is to “seek the Face of God.” According to the late Canadian theologian, Anselme Longpré, there are more than 600 direct references to that phrase in the Old Testament (Longpré 1985:26). It is paradoxical, given that in Ex 33:18, Moses asks to see God’s face, but God did not grant his request, as no human could withstand the glory of the Face (Ex 33:20). An obvious question is how a spiritual being can have a face. There are two camps: 1) the language is hyperbolic, or 2) the text means what it says. It is beyond the scope of this article to come up with a solution to this dilemma. Either way, the term is theologically-laden. Although I will cite just a few of the 600 OT references to the Face of God, my main focus in this short article is to examine how the NT adapts the phrase to the belief that Jesus was God, and as an adjunct, if the Shroud of Turin, believed by many to be the actual burial cloth of Jesus, can be woven into it. (For some additional OT references, see:

["Analysis of ancient fabrics, example of the Holy Shroud in Turin"](#) by **Giulio Fanti** - *World Scientific News*, 189 (2024) 236-257. (January 24, 2024) (Open Access). Here is an excerpt from the abstract "As it is not always simple to perform a systematic study on an ancient textile considering the complexity of the various techniques that can be applied, this paper considers as an example, the case of the HS (Holy Shroud), discussing the recent tests applied to it with relative results. After a brief presentation of the textile and an explanation of its complexity, the paper presents some tests and results obtained from 1978..."

["Criteria for Evaluating Image Formation Hypotheses for the Shroud of Turin"](#) by **Robert A. Rucker** (January 18, 2024). Here is an excerpt from the abstract: "Multiple hypotheses have been proposed to explain how the front and dorsal images of a crucified man were formed on the Shroud of Turin. This paper recommends criteria for judging the merits of a particular image formation hypothesis regarding whether it could be true. Criteria include: 1) the hypothesis must be consistent with all the scientific evidence that is true about the images, 2) the hypothesis should make predictions that are testable, falsifiable, and possibly unique, and 3) the hypothesis is preferred if it

explains multiple aspects of the Shroud, is simple rather than complex, or is recognized as having 'beauty'.

["About the Shroud Body Image"](#) by Giovanni Fazio and Francesca Riotto. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 2024, 12, 25-31. (January 10, 2024) (Open Access). The abstract: "In this paper, we make a comparison among the results produced by scientists who come from the CISS, from the CICAP and from other sources. We discuss the trends of these origins regarding the formation of the Shroud Body Image. This last one is the most important result which still needs to be obtained from the investigations that are being carried out on the Shroud of Turin. The intention is to discover a relationship between articles and authors. The method used consisted of analysing many articles present in STERA Inc. The result, of the above research, highlights the always present conflict of interest which has inherent possibilities of pitting one against the other and vice versa. Therefore, if we want to achieve the result, we must change our behaviors and start again by obeying only scientific rules, without once again becoming prey to our ideologies. Just delete the Sindonology, to accept the chemical, physical, biological, forensic, textile, etc. sciences."

["List of Current Shroud of Turin Researchers, Their Backgrounds, and Stances Regarding Authenticity"](#) by Joseph G. Marino (January 10, 2024). Excerpts from the introduction: "For this article, I wanted to indicate what position each researcher professes regarding the origin of the cloth There are many more researchers to add. I'm hoping that publishing it now will encourage those not on the list to send me their information so as to be added to the list. If a researcher is on this list and corrections to the data needs to be made, please let me know at JMarino240@aol.com. The article will, of course, be updated as needed and/or more information is gathered directly from researchers themselves."

"The Shroud of Turin: A Response to Ian Wilson" by **Andrea Nicolotti**. *Catholic Historical Review*, Winter 2024, 110(1):102-110 (Behind pay wall only). Excerpt from the letter: "Although his review is titled 'Is the Shroud of Turin a Fake?,' in reality it does not provide any answer to that question. Wilson is a prolific sindonologist: I believe his animosity toward me stems from the fact that, in my studies, I have repeatedly critiqued his theories on the Shroud. In the very brief space afforded me in this letter, I will point out only the most glaring flaws in his review, errors which in my estimation render it wholly unreliable."

["The Shroud of Turin: Christianity's Most Famous Relic"](#) by Andrew R. Casper. Originally published in *Medieval World: Culture and Conflict*, Issue 7, 2023. Here is the introduction: "The Shroud of Turin, the supposed burial cloth of Jesus, is Christianity's most famous and controversial relic. Whereas debates over the authenticity of the bloodstained images of Christ's dead body dominate current discourse on the Shroud, suspicions about its origins go back to the 1300s. But by the 1500s and 1600s, other relics of Christ, which formerly thrived as objects of medieval devotion, underwent fluctuating fortunes that allowed the Shroud to emerge as one of Europe's preeminent Christian artifacts."

