

Re: Radiocarbon dating of Shroud of Turin wrong?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-01/2279.html>

bernard_connor_at_yahoo.co.uk

Date: 01/30/05

Date: 30 Jan 2005 00:00:53 -0800

I.E_Johansson wrote:

> "Bernardz" <Bernard_zzz@REMOVEhotmail.com> skrev i meddelandet
> news:MPG.1c66f9f147bf8364989c06@news...
>> In article <IBVKd.15618\$d5.130812@newsb.telia.net>,
>> inger_e.xjohansson@telia.xcom says...
>>>
>>> "Bernardz" <Bernard_zzz@REMOVEhotmail.com> skrev i meddelandet
>>> news:MPG.1c66c8eb1f1838ab989c02@news...
>>>> In article <2eUKd.5090\$7w5.872@newsfe5-gui.ntli.net>,
>>>> martin.reboul@SPAMFUKvirgin.net says...
>>>>>
>>>>> So, we have to ask the question – where is the real one? Any
ideas?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> The real one is not a question but a challenge to prove that
it is
>>>>> medieval or not!
>>>>
>>>> Bernardz,
>>>> isn't this one of the most common problems. While we might prove
that
> it's
>>> not medieval that doesn't say more than that the cloths might be
older,
>>> which btw I have a slight memory having seen a dating which might
> suggest.
>>> That's not the same as saying that it's more the time of Christ.
The
> cloth
>>> might be from those days but how can we possibly say that the
'picture'
> is
>>> even if it was/will be possible to establish that the cloth isn't
> medieval?
>>> Hope I am not expressing myself in a cryptic way.
>>

sci.archaeology: Re: Radiocarbon dating of Shroud of Turin wrong?

> >

> > *I think you have the problem here with the added problem that it is very*

> > *hard to disprove a negative eg how do you disprove that there is no*

> > *black forest cake on the moon!*

>

> *Sorry but that's one of the thing I meant but of course I didn't express me*

> *very well. Ok once more: Even if the shroud itself turned out to be older*

> *than Medieval no matter if it was shown to be from the time of Christ, that*

> *neither makes the 'photo' from same time nor does it directly imply that the*

> *'photo' can't be medieval. Thus if the shroud could be called A and A was*

> *shown to be medieval that doesn't say anything about the 'photo' here called*

> *B. The impact of this would be that it's almost impossible to prove that B*

> *is a forgery no matter that B is to be found on A. Which leads to what you*

> *wrote that proving the combination of B on A (from a theoretical view B is a*

> *part of A) to be non-genuine. The reasons for this are two: problems to*

> *prove a negative conclusion as well as problems to prove when an added part*

> *of a 'dated' artifact was added.*

> >

> > *One theory maybe that some old burial site was dug up, say in medieval*

> > *times with its ancient prayer shawl relatively intact. Parts of it were*

> > *fixed and a new picture placed on it.*

>

> *That's general the case in areas where the plough turned up and changed the*

> *strata-layers in the humus part of the ground. I totally agree.*

> >

> > *Another might be that some ancient picture of a person was etched on the*

> > *shawl and it was *fixed* up in medieval times.*

>

> *One of the early Madonna paintings comes to mind. Don't remember who it is*

> *supposed to have been painted of. Anyhow up in the upper right corner there*

> *is a piece added to a tree. That is according to the scholar we had for the*

> *course of picture-analyses a symbol which wasn't used until 1200's.*

Re: Radiocarbon dating of Shroud of Turin wrong?

sci.archaeology: Re: Radiocarbon dating of Shroud of Turin wrong?

- > *Many cherubs are also said to have had their cloth added later on when the*
- > *Medieval Church took the stand that nude persons were sin.*
- > *The list can be as long as we want.*
- > *I totally agree with your points.*
- >>
- >> *In both cases C-14 tests will come up with different results depending*
- >> *on which parts are being tested.*
- >>
- > *That's true. What I had in mind was if there could be an additive result*
- > *due to the combination. Can that be the case? In other word could a possible*
- > *contimination occur of close or around such added part.*
- >
- > *Inger E*
- >
- >>
- >>
- >>
- >> --
- >> *If you give people more money, they can spend it*
- >>
- >> *Observations of Bernard – No 71*
- >>
- >>

Three separate samples were sent to different Physics laboratories. All three proved conclusively that the shroud was medieval.

Superstitious Crusaders were sold "relics" by wily Muslim merchants.

As Jesus was raised bodily into Heaven, the only relic of him was his foreskin removed at the time of his circumcision. It disappeared from an Italian monastery in Italy ca 1970.

Presumably it rose into Heaven to be reunited with the rest of the heavenly body of Jesus.

Bernard Connor