

First Selfie¹
Does the Shroud of Turin provide
Scientific evidence of the Resurrection?

CONTENTS

A. The first photograph - ever?	1
B. The Shroud and the Crucifixion	3
The Autopsies.....	3
The scientific evidence of the crucifixion	3
C. The Skeptical fallacies: CNN loses Jesus	4
(a) Carbon dating.....	4
(b) The utter nonsense of the medieval photograph hypothesis.....	5
(c)The historical record of the Shroud	5
The Pray Codex and the four burn holes.....	6
Detail of the burn holes from the Pray Codex.....	7
Coins and Icons.....	8
The Testimony of a French Knight.....	9
D. The Harry Potter, Magic and the Resurrection	9
E. Additional Resources.....	10

David Rolfe and Pam Moon have published on the web an intriguing video entitled [A Grave Injustice: An Investigation into "The First Selfie."](#) ("Grave Injustice")² The video is narrated by James Phelps, better known to some as Fred Weasley of the Harry Potter films. The subject is the Shroud of Turin.

A. The first photograph - ever?

Given the fact that the first photograph is generally credited to Joseph Nicéphore Niépce ("Niepce") in 1826, it would be a stretch to credit the Shroud of Turin as the "first photograph." Yet that is precisely what Professor Gail Buckland has done.³ If that is an acceptable tag for the Shroud, then tagging the Shroud as the "first selfie" may also be appropriate. Let me explain why.

This is the story of a black and white photograph taken of the Shroud in 1898 that caused a religious, historical, and scientific controversy that persists to this day. Part of the controversy is that the subject of the photograph contains an image which is itself a negative image and appears as a positive image in photographic negatives of the Shroud. *Sacre bleu!*

In 1839, Sir John Herschel coined the word "photograph." It was a combination of the Greek word for light "photo" and the English word "graph" for a written depiction.⁴ The process of producing photographs became photography. The principal instrument of producing photographs was the photographic camera.

For more than 150 years, the principal method of taking and preserving photographs was a three step process that involved the capturing of an image of an object by a camera upon a light sensitive medium usually film. When developed the film recorded a negative image of black and white gradations of tone that were reversed. The printing of that negative reversed the negative image to positive and a true image was printed. Color photos were subject to the same process. Until the advent of digital cameras in the mid nineteen-seventies that electronically stored images, the image to negative to positive process was the dominant mode of photography.

Photographing the Shroud

For nearly 500 years, a piece of ancient yellowed linen cloth has been kept in the Cathedral of St. John the Baptist in Turin, Italy and venerated as the burial cloth of Jesus Christ. If you were to measure the cloth in the ancient Assyrian metric system it would be 2 cubits by 8 cubits. Measured in the English system it is approximately 14 feet 3 inches long by 3 feet 7 inches wide. Measured in the modern metric system 4.4m by 1.1m.

The most important feature of the Shroud is a faint, mysterious image front and back of a man who appears to have been a victim of crucifixion. Close examination reveals red stains that give the appearance of blood. A fire in 1532 caused holes and scorches that were repaired two years later and had been visible as white triangles with thin black edges that are the scorch marks. In 2002, the patches were removed in a controversial restoration of the Shroud.

Secondo Pia photographed the Shroud in 1898. He was astounded to discover that the body image captured on his photographic glass plate was not a "negative image" but a "positive" one. It could only mean that body image on the Shroud was a negative image. That was impossible. Unheard of! Pia was so startled by the positive image of Jesus in his photograph negative that he nearly dropped the glass plate.

In 1980, Professor Gail Buckland of Cooper Union, an expert on the history of photography, wrote concerning the Shroud image on the linen: "If it is authentic, then this is the first photograph of a man who lived almost two thousand years ago." Professor Buckland concluded that that image on shroud was a negative it: "[I]s a positive print of the shroud as it appears to the naked eye and resembles a photographic negative. ... [A]ctual photographic negatives taken of the shroud ... appear to be positive."

The following image on the left shows the face of the man in the Shroud as it appears in negative form on the Shroud. The image on the right is a negative of an actual photograph of the same face image on the Shroud. Because the image of the face on the Shroud is a negative, the photograph presents the image as a positive image. Note that red blood stains on the Shroud appear red but on the photograph they appear white. That means that only the body image itself was the negative image on the Shroud. The rest of the Shroud and its markings are natural colors and appear in negatives of photographs as a negative image.



Was Professor Buckland's designation of the Shroud as the first photograph metaphorical – or is the image on the Shroud in fact a photographic negative? To understand why this is an insightful comment on the nature of the Shroud image and its importance, we must first have understanding of the history of photography. Whether the Shroud dates to circa 1355 CE when it was first exhibited in Lirey, France by French Knight Geoffrey I de Charney (hereafter "Geoffrey I") or circa 33 CE when Christ was crucified, it clearly was not created by a photographic camera. The first photographs taken by a camera date to the early nineteenth century.

Even if the Shroud wasn't Christ's authentic burial cloth, but a medieval forgery, it would still be at least metaphorically the "first photograph" because the Shroud with its image dates to no later than 1355 CE when it was exhibited in Lirey. There is ample evidence for the shroud's existence before 1355.

In 1453, Duke Louis of the House of Savoy had obtained the Shroud from de Charney's granddaughter. Eventually, it was permanently kept and closely guarded by the Savoy's in their capital, Turin where it was from time to time exhibited.

In 1848, the *Statuto* established the House of Savoy as the royal family of Sardinia and ultimately all of Italy. In 1898, to celebrate the *Statuto's* 50th anniversary, King Umberto of Savoy authorized a public exposition of the Shroud at the Cathedral. Secondo Pia was designated to take the first photographs of the Shroud.

Was Pia in fact photographing the First Selfie? Was the selfie "photographer" the Deity, itself?

B. The Shroud and the Crucifixion

The Autopsies

When someone has died and there is a question about the cause of death, a medical expert will conduct an examination (autopsy) of the deceased's body and from the conditions (facts) observed draw conclusions about the circumstances of death. Those facts are scientific findings by scientists.

The autopsy is conducted by a qualified forensic pathologist who is a doctor and has training and experience in the conduct of autopsies, the analysis of the conditions observed and the determination of what those conditions mean.

As a matter of fact, the Shroud image possesses enough sharp detail to allow for just such an examination and has been examined by eminent qualified pathologists and scientists. Among them were Paul Vignon, Pierre Barbet, Robert Bucklin, Malcolm Cameron, Giuseppe Caselli, R. W Hynek, G. Judica-Cordiglia, Francesco La Cava, Hermann Moedder, Anthony Sava, David Willis, and Fredrick Zugibe.⁵ Generally, they are in significant agreement as to the facts concerning of the man in Shroud: death by crucifixion in manner described by Scripture including a post mortem spear wound below his heart, a cap of thorns, and nails being driven through his wrists.

While they cannot directly answer the question of what happened to his body, they can identify the time period at which it parted company from Shroud. In fact, the image was formed in a microsecond, most likely at the time the Shroud and the time the body parted company

The late Robert Bucklin, who performed thousands of autopsies in his career, appears in *Grave Injustice*. A complete report of an autopsy of the image on the shroud performed by him appears on the Internet at <http://www.shroud.com/bucklin.htm>

Doctor Bucklin concluded after a thorough examination:

"It is the ultimate responsibility of the medical examiner to confirm by whatever means are available to him the identity of the deceased, as well as to determine the manner of this death. In the case of Man on the Shroud, the forensic pathologist will have information relative to the circumstances of death by crucifixion which he can support by his anatomic findings. He will be aware that the individual whose image is depicted on the cloth has undergone puncture injuries to his wrists and feet, puncture injuries to his head, multiple traumatic whip-like injuries to his back and postmortem puncture injury to his chest area which has released both blood and a water type of fluid. From this data, it is not an unreasonable conclusion for the forensic pathologist to determine that only one person historically has undergone this sequence of events. That person is Jesus Christ."

The scientific evidence of the crucifixion

There is available on the internet an excellent analysis by Pam Moon of the injuries inflicted on Jesus as described and/or predicted by scripture and the Shroud's physical evidence of their infliction on Jesus. http://www.shroudofturinexhibition.com/Shroud_of_Turin_exhibition/Biblical_Injuries_of_Jesus_1.html.

There are two important scientific observations that establish the time frame for the creation of the image: (1) the experts found that the image is in a state of rigor mortis and (2) there was no evidence of putrefaction byproducts staining the Shroud that result from the decay of the body. The two are related. Rigor mortis is caused by the stiffening of the muscles of the body in the position they were in at the time of death. Generally speaking the rigor mortis releases (relaxes) approximately 48 hours after death. That release is caused by the decaying (putrefaction) of body tissue including the muscles. The lack of putrefaction byproduct stains on the Shroud and the state of rigor mortis both indicate that the body

image was probably created within 48 hours of death. That would be before three o'clock Sunday afternoon if the time of death was as scriptural accounts indicate Friday at 3:00 PM.

There is a positive feedback to the issue of the authenticity of the Shroud and the state of the body image. The presence of rigor mortis and lack of putrefaction stains indicate the image was formed by the body of a crucified man and the image would then probably place the time of its creation at sometime before 3:00 PM Sunday. Scripture claims the body was discovered missing by Mary Magdalene shortly after daybreak on that Sunday.

If the Shroud image is a forgery, the forger must have been one of the most learned persons of the Middle Ages, circa 1355.

As John Walsh wrote in *the Shroud*:

"Only this much is certain: The Shroud of Turin is either the most awesome and instructive relic of Jesus Christ in existence - showing us in its stark simplicity how He appeared to men - or it is one of the most ingenious, most unbelievable clever, products of the human mind and hand on record. It is one or the other; there is no middle ground."⁶

C. *The Skeptical fallacies: CNN loses Jesus*

Teilhard de Chardin in *The Phenomenon of Man* anticipated a convergence of science and religion leading to a scientific analysis of the actions and direction of God in creating the existence that we know. Nowhere is that convergence more evident than in the study of the Shroud of Turin. There is a trio of intellectual disciplines that must be included in any analysis: Science, History and Theology. Any one who attempts to address the issue of the Shroud's authenticity who doesn't understand this trio is akin to one of the blind men describing an elephant: It's a snake, no it's a tree, no it's a wall.

Anyone seeking to comment on the Shroud must not just nod to the trio, he or she must develop some understanding of each as it relates to the Shroud. An unfortunate example of the blind men error is the first episode of CNN's "Finding Jesus" broadcast Sunday, March 1, 2015 that addressed the issue of the authenticity of the Shroud of Turin, was a concoction of largely blind men (and women) defining an elephant.

There were three principal elements in the skepticism expressed on the program that reflect the thrust of skeptical dismissal of the Shroud authenticity: (a) carbon dating; (b) a fantasy that it could be a photograph created by medieval photographers; and (c) the lack of history of the Shroud prior to its first display in Lirey in 1355. Let's examine these skeptical claims in that order.

(a) Carbon dating

Art historian Thomas de Wesselow wrote this about the carbon dating of the Shroud:

"The carbon dating of the Shroud will probably go down in history as one of the greatest fiascos in the history of science. It would make an excellent case study for any sociologist interested in exploring the ways in which science is affected by professional biases, prejudices and ambitions, not to mention religious (and irreligious) beliefs."⁷

By calling it a fiasco, he may have understated his case. *Grave Injustice* explains how the carbon dating labs sabotaged the protocols for the carbon dating process and eliminated the plans for concurrent scientific examination by the Shroud of Turin Research Project ("STURP").⁸

STURP conducted the only comprehensive scientific examination of the Shroud in 1978. STURP proposed a new series of tests to the Vatican in 1982, which included carbon dating by seven laboratories including Oxford, Tucson and Zurich and four others.

Harry Gove was director of one of the seven labs: Nuclear Structure Research Laboratory at the University of Rochester. Gove was proud of his remarkable accomplishments but he was a man who in one observer's words: "Had an ego that arrived a half hour before he did." He wrote a memoir that included vivid description of the efforts by the C14 labs to exclude STURP from any further examination in

the process. His ego appears to have clouded his self-awareness of the process he was describing. For example he clearly documented a conflict of interest. Michael Tite was selected to referee the activities of the three C14 labs at the same time he was seeking an appointment at one of them (Oxford)⁹

There are five individuals who played central roles in debunking the carbon dating tests: Sue Benford, Joe Marino, Barrie Schwartz, Ray Rogers (with several scientist-associates) and Pam Moon. Sue Benford and Joe Marino were a husband and wife team who first developed the hypothesis that the corner of the Shroud had been subject to repairs by a method of invisible reweaving, obtained expert advice that they were correct and then reported the same to Shroud conference in Orvieto, Italy. Schwartz published the results on the Shroud.com webpage and received an angry telephone call from Ray Rogers who angrily asked what he was doing publishing something from the "lunatic fringe" and that he could prove them wrong in "five minutes." Schwartz told Rogers that if he could do it, he would publish it on Shroud.com. Rogers did not call back in five minutes, it was several hours. His report was just two words: "They're right."

Rogers, who was suffering from end stage cancer, devoted the last three and a half years of his life to research and examination of fibers from the Shroud, including some from the sample area. He passed away in 2005.

There was controversy and skeptics who denied the validity of Ray's work. In 2014, Pam Moon obtained the copy of a picture of the Oxford sample and obtained expert opinions that verified the work of Rogers. The C14 tests were thoroughly rebutted – not for the quality of the C14 tests but because the samples were taken from the "worst possible place."

(b) The utter nonsense of the medieval photograph hypothesis

Barrie Schwartz was the documenting photographer of the 1978 STURP examination of the Shroud who would in 1996 establish the most widely used Shroud resource on the internet: Shroud.com. The genesis of Shroud.com occurred when a friend called him and said that he had read that the Shroud of Turin was a medieval photograph created by Leonardo Da Vinci. That was absurd and its absurdity inspired Schwartz to create a web page so that there would be on the Internet a place where accurate information and materials could be made available.

The absurdity of the photograph claim did not die however. For in *Finding Jesus*, CNN devoted substantial time to the work of South African art historian Nicholas Allen who claimed to have replicated the Shroud of Turin image by using a *camera obscura* and chemicals available in the Middle Ages. There were even several minutes of time devoted to reenacting how a group of conspirators might have done it.

There is absolutely NO evidence that the record of the use of a *camera obscura* and photosensitive materials until the eighteenth century and it was not perfected until the nineteenth. In 2000, Schwartz published a detailed rebuttal of the Allen hypothesis including pictures of his "photographs."¹⁰

Da Vinci has been tagged as the greatest genius in the history of humanity. He documented his ideas and discoveries in voluminous texts. Photography historian Josef Maria Eder credits him as being the true discoverer of the *camera obscura*.¹¹ There is no record of da Vinci or anyone else prior to the mid 1770's experimenting with photo sensitive chemicals and the camera obscura.

(c) The historical record of the Shroud

None are so blind as those that will not see.¹² Those that claim that there is no history of the Shroud prior to Lirey exhibition are clearly those that have eyes and will not see.

The Pray Codex and the four burn holes.



There is a repetitious pattern of the four small burn holes on the Shroud that form an “L” that changes from right to left configuration twice, indicating that the Shroud was folded in four parts when the burning incident (whatever it was) occurred. The configuration is less distinct on the bottom layers



There is in the National Library of Budapest a manuscript referred to as the “Pray Codex” named for Jesuit priest György Pray, who discovered it in 1770. It is the oldest example of Hungarian literature in existence and was produced circa 1192-1195 CE.¹³ The Pray Codex is not a great work of art. However, it is an important marker in the history of the Shroud for it establishes the existence of the Shroud years before the earliest date allowed by the controversial 1988 carbon dating. In *The Shroud*, Ian Wilson described the Pray Codex and its significance in detail.

©National Szecheny Library
Budapest Hungary

“[N]ot only do we yet again see the awkward arm crossing, this time, most unusually, Jesus is represented as totally nude, exactly as on the Shroud. Again exactly as in the case of the Shroud, all four fingers on each of Jesus’ hands can be seen, but no thumbs. Just over Jesus’ right eye there is a single forehead bloodstain. Delineated in red, this is located in exactly the same position as that very distinctive reverse ‘3’-shaped stain on Jesus’ forehead on the Shroud that we noted earlier. Exactly as in the case of the Shroud, the cloth in which Jesus is being wrapped is of double body length type, the second half, as known from other versions of the same scene, extending over Joseph of Arimathea’s shoulder. *If all this is not enough, the cover of what appears to be the tomb is decorated with a herringbone pattern in which can be seen four holes in an identical arrangement to the so-called ‘poker-holes’...*”¹⁴ (Emphasis added)

Detail of the burn holes from the Pray Codex



The origin of the four burn holes is a mystery for others have discerned that they are not "poker holes." It has been suggested that the Shroud was subjected to a trial by fire. Chemist Ray Rogers and others hypothesize that they may have resulted from burning incense having dropped on the Shroud at some point in time. Whatever that point of time is, the Pray Codex necessarily predated the time frame claimed by the labs which dated the Shroud to 1250 at the earliest.



In this enlargement of two of the burn holes on the Shroud, we can see the charred circle surrounding the hole and underneath the pattern of the Holland Cloth that was added as a backing to the Shroud circa 1534. It is not charred.

©1978 Mark Evans Collection, STERA, Inc.

But the speculations are beside the point. Whatever the cause, there exists a distinct pattern of four holes set in a right angle in the Shroud that is roughly the shape of a knight's move in chess that is repeated four times. The holes resulted from burning of some kind and upon close examination include smaller, secondary burn perforations. It appears that the Shroud was first folded length wise and then folded once again width wise. Also, the fourth and third layers are somewhat less distinct compared to the first two layers.

The repetition makes perfect sense if the Shroud had been folded in four and something burned through the four layers - the lowest layer burn holes would not be as sharply defined as the first. Because the Shroud was folded, the angle is as two different orientations (left or right). The clearest burn holes appear on the dorsal (bottom) part of the image while those on the ventral (top) are less distinct.

While the technique of the monk who drew the Pray Codex is not refined, his two representations of the set of four burn holes are consistent with burn holes on the Shroud. Many copies of the Shroud with the representation of the four burn holes do not indicate one important attribute of the burn holes – the charred edges of the burn holes.

Unless the artist had seen the Shroud, what are the odds that an ancient artist drawing a representation of Christ being entombed would draw a Shroud with burn holes that match the Shroud more than a century before the Shroud's first public exhibition and decades before the earliest date allowed for the linen by the flawed carbon dating? Coincidence?

By themselves, the evidence of the burn holes may not be conclusive but it is certainly persuasive along with all the other circumstances of the Codex that the artist who created the Codex at some time must have seen the Shroud or a painting of the Shroud. No painted representation of the Shroud contains burn holes with actual charred edges. The painted representations of the Shroud are copies of an original or copies of copies. The holes in the Shroud are clearly real holes in the linen cloth encircled with a charred ring from the instrumentality that caused the burn holes. That original Shroud is the shroud now in Turin. The burn holes are the Shroud's fingerprints. The "finger prints" on the Pray Codex predate the time period for the existence of the linen determined by the carbon dating. They are evidence of the Shroud's existence before 1260 the earliest time compatible with the carbon dating.

Coins and Icons

Other Evidence of the Shroud's existence before 1260 was marshaled by David Gibson and Michael McKinley in the printed version of their book *Finding Jesus* which was the basis for the CNN television series. Gibson and McKinley are the co-creators and consulting producers to the CNN *Finding Jesus* series. Multiple other sources place the Shroud in Constantinople not later than 944 CE. (Ian Wilson and Dan Scavone) and as early as early as 574 CE. (Jack Markwardt)

Both Markwardt and Wilson describe the dramatic change that depictions of Christ underwent in the sixth century. According to Markwardt:

"In the late sixth century, the portrayal of Jesus as a mature and bearded man suddenly achieved ascendancy over all other depictions of him, and two eminent scholars, completely without any reference to the Turin Shroud, concluded that this ascendant portrayal derived from an archetype image. Hans Belting, an eminent modern art historian, believes that this archetype was selected from "a convenient repertory" of extant Jesus images and that its unremarkable origin was concealed behind legends of miraculously-produced *acheiropoietos* [not made by the hand of man] images. On the other hand, the estimable eighteenth-century historian, Edward Gibbon, believes that this archetype was itself a recently-discovered *acheiropoietos* image which was propagated by Christians, desirous of establishing a standard likeness for Jesus, "in the camps and cities of the Eastern empire" This archetype is identifiable through artistic and textual evidence."¹⁵

The new artistic portrayal of Jesus depicted him as a mature and bearded man having parted hair flowing in two different directions, with one part coming to rest on a shoulder and the other disappearing behind his neck – one of hallmarks of the Shroud.



"With regard to art, the new "Pantocrator Type" portrayal of Jesus depicted him as a mature and bearded man having parted hair flowing in two different directions, with one part coming to rest on a shoulder and the other disappearing behind his neck. The most notable examples of such portrayals have Constantinopolitan roots, including an icon located in the St. Catherine Monastery" (Citations omitted)



Byzantine Emperor Justinian II caused a coin to be minted, one face of which was a depiction of Christ that exhibited the same unique markings that appear on the Shroud. Note the flow of the hair in two different directions.

The Testimony of a French Knight

There is more: an eyewitness account of exhibitions of a linen shroud that is more than arguably the Shroud of Turin. The witness was a French knight who participated in a siege of Constantinople during the Fourth Crusade which ended with the "Christian" knights looting Constantinople and stripping it of all its cherished relics that could be carried away. Among them was the linen cloth that is now the Shroud of Turin.

This is how Gibson and McKinley described it their book *Finding Jesus*:

"In 1203, a Flemish knight named Robert de Clari, fighting with the Fourth Crusade then camped in Constantinople, noted that a church within the city's Blachernae Palace put on a very special exhibition every Friday. On display wasn't just the holy image of the face of Jesus, but the actual cloth in which Christ had been buried. In 1205 de Clari composed a more detailed account: 'There was a Church which was call[ed] My Lady Saint Mary of Blachernae, where there was the shroud (syndoinēs) in which Our Lord had been wrapped, which every Friday, raised itself upright so that one could see the form (figure) of Our Lord on it, and no one either Greek or French, ever knew what became of this shroud (syndoinēs) when the city was taken [by the Crusaders].'"¹⁶

What happened to the Shroud after Constantinople was looted by the French? Wilson has favored the idea that it came into possession of the Order of the Knights Templar in France. The Order was suppressed in 1307 by French King Philip the Fair. On March 19, 1314, its Grandmaster, Jacques DeMolay along with the Order's Master of Normandy Geoffrey de Charny were burned at the stake. That Geoffrey *may* have been related to the Geoffrey de Charny who was the documented *owner* of the Shroud in 1355. Others argue that after the looting of Constantinople by French knights during the Fourth Crusade it came into the possession of Orthon de Is Roche who eventually removed it to France.¹⁷

This is not a complete recitation of the reported history of the Shroud prior to 1532. Yet when someone baldy states that there is *NO* evidence of the Shroud's history before Lirey, he, or she, is simply, and demonstrably, wrong.

D. The Harry Potter, Magic and the Resurrection

"Who knew reality could be so mysterious? Why has this been kept such a secret? It's fascinating. I want to find out more!"

*James Phelps,
a/k/a Fred Weasley*

There may be a mysterious synergy at work between Harry Potter and the Shroud. Harry Potter veteran James Phelps is the narrator of *Grave Injustice*, which begins with a clip from the recently released movie *Risen*. In the movie, Roman Tribune Clavius is tasked by Pontius Pilate to find the body of Jesus of Nazareth, which has disappeared from its tomb... Tom Felton, who was Draco Malfoy in the Potter series, is an aide to Clavius.



Tom Felton and Joseph Fiennes with the Shroud of Jesus a/k/a Shroud of Turin

Conservative Christians have been scandalized by the Potter series because they believe its emphasis on magic endangers the young and subjects to the influences of the Devil. Catholic reaction has been mixed, even drawing a [favorable review from L'Osservatore Romano](#), the Vatican newspaper.

Those whose minds are straight-jacketed by what they believe science to be are missing where science is headed. Concepts such as Teilhard de Chardin's noosphere or Carl Jung's collective unconsciousness were once regarded with scientific disdain. Now some scientists hypothesize "Quantum information of the universe." [Stuart Hameroff](#) suggests an explanation of near death experiences. When a person dies, the brain unloads its consciousness into the Quantum information of the universe. The information is recalled when life is resuscitated; something like cloud computing. Are we not on the verge of the magical when we deal with such concepts?

When my adult son Michael lost his long struggle with kidney disease in 1977, I inaugurated my blog *Living Free* with a piece in which I used "event horizon" as a metaphor for death. It was entitled: [Reflections on Mourning: Coping with the Ultimate "Event Horizon."](#) I also used a quotation from Tennessee Williams to metaphorically analogize love to "Quantum Entanglement." I am not so sure they are metaphors now. They may be the reality.

Isabel Piczek is a physicist and an artist. She has described the Shroud image as an "event horizon." It is perhaps an image of the dead Jesus created in a nanosecond as He was entering new dimension or stage of existence that we call the Resurrection.

The atheist or the committed agnostic will never accept the possibility of the Resurrection and reject it out of hand as magical thinking. Shroud scholar Russ Breault¹⁸ asked the question in the video *The Real Face of Jesus*: "Is it possible that the 14 foot piece of linen cloth captured the greatest paranormal event of all time?"

Is the Shroud scientific evidence of a magical event? So? What we don't understand we may reject but that doesn't mean it is unreal just because it appears to be magical. Maybe Harry Potter fans will understand.

E. Additional Resources

The Shroud of Turin Website
Barrie M. Schwartz, Editor
<https://www.shroud.com/>

Cold Case: The Shroud of Turin
(\$3.00 fee to rent for 30 days).
<https://vimeo.com/ondemand/coldcasetheshroudofturin>

David Hines
Shroud Knows Details of the Crime Scene
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vnfU5Ei-zcY>

de Wesselow, Thomas, *The Sign: The Shroud of Turin and the Secret of the Resurrection* (Penguin Group New York, 2012)

*The Coming of the Quantum Christ:
The Shroud of Turin and the Apocalypse of Selfishness.*
John Klotz
Information on purchasing:
http://johnklotz.blogspot.com/2015_01_01_archive.html

Critique of CNN's *Finding Jesus*.
John Klotz
<http://www.shroud.com/pdfs/klotzcnn.pdf>

¹ The description of the Shroud of Turin as the "First Selfie" was first used by David Rolfe and Pam Moon in their video: "A Grave Injustice: An Investigation into the "First Selfie." which may be viewed at <http://www.shroudenigma.com/>

² Archaeologist William Meacham and your author are listed as consultants.

³ Buckland, Gail. p. 146, *The First Photographs, People, Places, and Phenomena as Captured for the First Time by the Camera* (MacMillan, New York 1980)

⁴ On Line Entomology Dictionary, <http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=photograph> and http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=graph

⁵ Meacham, William, *The Authentication of the Turin Shroud: An Issue in Archaeological Epistemology*, <http://www.shroud.com/meacham2.htm>.

⁶ Walsh, John, Preface, xi-xii, *The Shroud*, (Random House, New York, 1963)

⁷ De Wesselow, Thomas, *The Sign: The Shroud of Turin and the Secret of the Resurrection* (p. 172). (Penguin Group New York, 2012) (Cited hereafter as "de Wesselow")

⁸ *A Grave Injustice* minutes 5:54-17:57

⁹ Harry E Gove. *Relic, Icon or Hoax?: Carbon Dating the Turin Shroud* (Kindle Location 3492). Kindle Edition.

¹⁰ <http://www.shroud.com/pdfs/orvieto.pdf>

¹¹ Eder, Josef Maria, *History of Photography* , translated by Edward Epstein (Columbia University Press, 1945)

¹² Attributed to various individuals but based upon Jeremiah 5:21

¹³ De Wesselow, supra note 7

¹⁴ Ian Wilson (2010-03-20). *The Shroud* (Kindle Locations 3409-3418 Random House UK. Kindle Edition).

¹⁵ Jack Markwardt, "Modern Scholarship and the History of the Turin Shroud," p.24 <http://www.shroud.com/pdfs/stlmarkwardtpaper.pdf>

¹⁶ Gibson, David; McKinley, Michael, p. 219, *Finding Jesus: Faith. Fact. Forgery: Six Holy Objects That Tell the Remarkable Story of the Gospels* (St. Martin's Press. Kindle Edition 2015)

¹⁷ Orthon de la Roche is a French knight who became Duke of Athens as a reward for outstanding services during the Constantinople sack. De La Roche was the great grandfather of Jeanne de Vergy, Geoffrey 1's wife. See the note by Cesar Barta, "Orthon de la Roche" BSTS News Letter, October 5, 2008 (<http://www.shroud.com/pdfs/n67part6.pdf>). If true, when Geoffrey I's (and Jeanne de Vergy's) daughter married Orthon de la Roche's great grandson (reinforcing the blood-line ownership of the Shroud) and then moved the Shroud to the de la Roche castle, the Shroud was returned to a previous home

¹⁸ Breault is President of The Shroud of Turin Education Project Inc. and host of www.ShroudEncounter.com.

Shroud photographs ©1978 Barrie M. Schwartz Collection, STERA, Inc.