The Historical Position of the Catholic Church on the Authenticity of the Shroud of Turin:

Pontifical Recognitions of the Sindone

Otangelo Grasso

Independent Researcher, Aracaju, SE, Brazil

otangelograsso@gmail.com · ORCID: 0009-0005-6942-0593

May 2026 · Written with the support and assistance of AI tools.

Abstract

This article surveys the documented history of papal and pontifical engagement with the Shroud of Turin, or Sindone, from the earliest attested ecclesiastical references through the pontificate of Leo XIV. It examines how successive popes and ecclesiastical authorities have recognized, regulated, authorized, or commented upon the relic across seven centuries of documented history. The survey distinguishes between liturgical authorizations (feasts, Masses, Offices, breviary entries); indulgence grants; canonical recognitions; devotional permissions; and modern papal statements.

The article argues that the Catholic Church has never issued a binding dogmatic definition concerning the historical authenticity of the Shroud. Nevertheless, the cumulative record of pontifical action reveals a sustained and unusually strong institutional posture toward the Shroud as a sacred object worthy of public veneration. Particular attention is given to the decisive Savoyard-liturgical phase of the sixteenth century, especially the acts of Julius II in 1506, the approval of the Feast, Mass, and Office of the Holy Shroud, and the later liturgical formula Tuam Sindonem veneramur, Domine; tuam recolimus Passionem.

Keywords: *Shroud of Turin; Sindone; Catholic Church; pontifical recognition; relic veneration; Julius II; Holy Shroud Office; Tuam Sindonem veneramur; House of Savoy; Turin Cathedral; papal history; liturgy.*

1. Introduction

The Shroud of Turin is a linen cloth measuring approximately 4.4 by 1.1 metres, bearing the faint double image — dorsal and frontal — of a man whose wounds correspond in striking detail to the Gospel accounts of the Passion of Jesus of Nazareth. It is preserved in the Cathedral of Saint John the Baptist in Turin, Italy, and has been the object of intense religious, historical, artistic, and

scientific attention. Within Catholic tradition, however, the Shroud's importance does not rest only on modern scientific discussion. Long before photography, forensic pathology, or radiocarbon testing, the Shroud had already entered the historical life of the Church through relic veneration, public ostensions, liturgical texts, indulgences, and papal acts.

Purpose of this paper: This article makes no claim about the Shroud's physical authenticity. It does not attempt to prove or disprove that the cloth wrapped the body of Jesus of Nazareth. Instead, it provides a documented chronological survey of what the Catholic Church has historically said and done regarding the Shroud — through papal bulls, liturgical authorizations, indulgence grants, canonical recognitions, and modern papal addresses. The question is not "Is the Shroud authentic?" but "What has been the Church's recorded institutional posture toward it?"

This distinction is essential. The Catholic Church has never issued a binding dogmatic declaration that the Shroud of Turin is the authentic burial cloth of Jesus Christ. Such restraint is theologically coherent, since the historical authenticity of an archaeological object is not a matter of faith or morals. Pope John Paul II expressed this principle clearly during his address before the Shroud in Turin on 24 May 1998: since the Shroud is not a matter of faith, the Church has no specific competence to pronounce definitively on the scientific questions connected with it.

Yet this restraint must not be confused with indifference. The documentary record shows that the Church did not treat the Shroud as a merely private curiosity. Popes authorized its public veneration, granted indulgences, approved liturgical texts in its honor, recognized its place within the devotional life of the House of Savoy, and repeatedly contemplated it as an image uniquely associated with the Passion of Christ. The Church's position is therefore best described as non-dogmatic but strongly liturgical, devotional, and institutional.

This article surveys that record chronologically, from the Lirey phase (14th–15th centuries), through the Savoyard-liturgical phase (16th–17th centuries), devotional consolidation (17th–19th centuries), and the modern papal era (20th–21st centuries). A dedicated subsection examines the Latin formula Tuam Sindonem veneramur, Domine; tuam recolimus Passionem, which expresses in condensed form the Church's liturgical attitude toward the Shroud.

2. Scope and Methodology

This survey is organized chronologically and divided into five broad periods: (1) the Lirey phase (14th–15th centuries); (2) the Savoyard-liturgical phase (16th–17th centuries); (3) devotional consolidation (17th–19th centuries); (4) the modern papal era (20th–21st centuries); and (5) a brief note on the current pontificate.

The article distinguishes several kinds of ecclesiastical action. A papal statement, an indulgence grant, a canonical recognition, a liturgical authorization, and a dogmatic declaration do not have the same theological weight. A major confusion in discussions of the Shroud arises when these categories are collapsed. The Church's refusal to issue a dogmatic declaration does not erase the significance of liturgical authorization. Likewise, the approval of a feast or Office does not itself constitute a dogmatic definition.

Source reliability grading: Entries are graded as follows — "Primary" refers to a directly consulted papal document, official address, or original text; "Confirmed secondary" refers to information independently attested in reliable historical or liturgical sources (e.g., Savio 1957, Thurston 1911, Wilson 2010); "Secondary report" refers to devotional, sindonological compendia where the original document has not been directly consulted, cited here with the secondary source named in parentheses. This grading is explicitly noted in the summary table.

The survey corrects several recurring errors: the conflation of Julius II's two distinct acts of 1506; the confusion between the Savoyard feast of the Holy Shroud (4 May) and the later Roman Breviary appendix feast (Friday after the Second Sunday of Lent); the omission of Leo X's extension (1514) and Gregory XIII's extension (1582); the neglect of Clement X's approval of a revised Office (1673); and imprecision concerning the formula Tuam Sindonem veneramur.

Before the fourteenth century, there are no secure documentary links between the Turin cloth and a specific papal act. Pre-fourteenth-century material (Mandylion of Edessa, Constantinople) is therefore treated only as contextual background in Section 3.

3. Pre-Documentary Era: Possible Antecedents (Context Only)

The earliest Christian traditions concerning an image-bearing cloth associated with Christ are connected with the Image of Edessa (Mandylion). Some writers (e.g., Wilson 2010) have argued that the Mandylion may have been the Shroud folded to show only the face. For the purposes of this article, the Mandylion tradition is relevant as background to Christian devotion to acheiropoietic images ("not made by human hands") but does not provide a secure papal recognition of the Turin Shroud.

Similarly, a burial cloth associated with Christ was reportedly among the relics preserved in Constantinople before the Fourth Crusade (1204), but no extant papal document from this period directly recognizes the Turin Shroud. These antecedents remain outside the secure pontifical record.

4. The Lirey Phase: Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries

4.1 Clement VI and the Lirey Church Authorization

The first stable Western documentary context for the Shroud is Lirey (diocese of Troyes), connected with the French knight Geoffroi I de Charny. In 1349, Geoffroi petitioned Pope Clement VI for permission to build a collegiate church. The Shroud was subsequently exhibited there. Clement VI authorized the church but issued no formal declaration authenticating the Shroud.

Source: *Confirmed secondary: Wilson 2010, pp. 70–75.*

4.2 Clement VII of Avignon and the First Direct Papal Engagement

The earliest surviving papal acts directly concerning the cloth date from the Avignon obedience under Clement VII (1389–1390). These arose from controversy: Pierre d'Arcis, Bishop of Troyes, opposed the exhibition, asserting it was a painted representation. Clement VII permitted exhibition but required a cautionary formula — that the cloth was not being presented as the true Shroud of Christ, but as a painting or representation. This first direct papal engagement was cautious and juridical, not an authentication.

Source: *Primary: Avignon registers; summary in Savio 1957, pp. 45–50.*

5. The Transition to Savoyard Custody

The transfer of the Shroud to the House of Savoy changed its ecclesiastical trajectory. Under Savoyard custody, the relic became associated with dynastic devotion, public ostensions, and eventually formal liturgical authorization. The Savoy rulers sought papal approval for the public cult, culminating under Julius II in 1506 — the most consequential turning point in the Church's historical reception of the Shroud.

6. The Savoyard-Liturgical Phase: Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries

This phase established the Shroud's liturgical status, gave it a feast, approved a Mass and Office, and expanded its observance across Savoyard territories.

6.1 Sixtus IV: Indulgences and Realist Language (c. 1480)

Pope Sixtus IV granted indulgences to those venerating the Shroud and reportedly used language indicating that in the Shroud "men may look upon the true blood and the portrait of Jesus Christ

Himself." This marked a shift from the Avignon caution toward realist devotional vocabulary, though not a dogmatic definition.

Source: *Confirmed secondary: Savio 1957, p. 89; Thurston 1911.*

6.2 Julius II: The Two Acts of 1506

The pontificate of Julius II produced the most important liturgical acts in the entire pontifical history of the Shroud. Earlier compilations, and a great deal of sindonological literature, routinely conflate these acts into a single undifferentiated "papal approval" of 1506. The historical record is more complex: there were two distinct documents issued within weeks of each other, addressing different objects — one establishing a feast day, the other approving the liturgical texts for that feast. Understanding their separate character is essential for an accurate account of how the Shroud's liturgical status was constructed:

First act (21 or 25 April 1506): Bull Romanus Pontifex authorizing a Feast of the Holy Shroud to be celebrated on 4 May (the day after the Finding of the True Cross). The cloth is described as the praeclarissima sindone — "most famous Shroud" — in which the Saviour was wrapped. A note on the date is required: secondary sources give three dates for this document, not two. The Crispino article in Shroud Spectrum cites the bull as issued on 21 April 1506; the Catholic Encyclopedia (Thurston 1911) gives 25 April 1506; and Fossati (Shroud Spectrum 37) distinguishes this act from the later May 9 approval. The most likely resolution is that the bull authorizing the feast was issued in late April (with 21 or 25 April representing different manuscript traditions or the distinction between date of drafting and date of promulgation), while a subsequent and separate document of 9 May formally approved the Mass and Office texts. None of the available secondary sources engages carefully with the original Vatican register, and the precise date of the first act must await archival verification. Crucially, Nicolotti's study (cited in Savio's Ricerche storiche, Turin, 1957) quotes the Latin text of the 1506 bull directly. The bull does not resolve the adoramus versus veneramur question in favor of one term alone: it deploys both verbs together in an analogical argument: "si sanctam crucem… adoramus et veneramur, dignum profecto videtur et debitum ipsam sindonem… venerari et adorare debere" ("if we adore and venerate the holy cross… it seems fitting and right that the Shroud itself should be venerated and adored"). Both adoramus and veneramur appear in the same sentence, applied first to the Cross, then extended by analogy to the Shroud. The subsequent Office text's eventual settlement on veneramur alone — dropping adoramus — therefore reflects a later theological refinement of the liturgical formula, not the language of the 1506 bull itself.

Source: *Confirmed secondary: Savio 1957, pp. 102–105.*

Second act (9 May 1506): Approval of the Mass and Office of the Holy Shroud, compiled by the Dominican Antoine (Antonio) Pennet at the petition of Duke Carlo III of Savoy and his mother Claudine de Brosse. Cardinal Louis de Gorrevod acted as the political intermediary at Rome. Gorrevod's role deserves specific emphasis: it was through his intervention that Julius II granted

the petition, and it was the same Gorrevod whom Clement VII (the Medici pope) would later send to Chambéry in 1534 to conduct the official canonical recognition of the fire-damaged relic after the Sainte-Chapelle fire of 1532. Gorrevod thus appears at both critical junctures in the Shroud's early Savoyard liturgical history — not merely as a courtier, but as the experienced ecclesiastical broker between the House of Savoy and the Roman curia. The Office compiled by Pennet was not, therefore, an improvised composition: it was the product of Dominican intellectual work, Savoyard dynastic patronage, and curial diplomacy working in concert.

Source: *Confirmed secondary: Savio 1957, pp. 106–110.*

These acts did not define authenticity as a matter of faith, but they integrated the Shroud into public liturgical prayer — a feast, Mass, and Office are structured forms of ecclesial worship. The feast inaugurated under Julius II was initially confined to the Holy Chapel of Chambéry. Its geographic scope would expand in two further stages: Pope Leo X extended it to all of French Savoy on 17 October 1514, and Pope Gregory XIII extended it to the entire Duchy of Savoy on 12 April 1582 — covering territories "on this side and that side of the Alps." This step-by-step geographic expansion reflects the deliberate, cumulative character of the entire Savoyard-liturgical edifice: each act presupposed and built upon those that preceded it.

6.3 The Liturgical Formula Tuam Sindonem veneramur, Domine

Closely connected with this tradition is the Latin formula:

> *Tuam Sindonem veneramur, Domine; tuam recolimus Passionem ("We venerate your Shroud, O Lord; we recall your Passion")*

First attestation: The formula appears in the Savoyard-Dominican Office tradition following the 1506 approvals, and is attested verbatim in digitized office books (Internet Archive: Officia sanctorum pro cleris regalium palatinarum ecclesiarum). It functions in two related ways within the Office: first as a versicle, and then as a short responsory ("Tuam Sindonem — Veneramur, Domine … Tuam recolimus Passionem"). However, the exact wording of the mature formula was not necessarily the wording of the original 1506 composition. Earlier forms of the Mattins verse appear to have used adoramus — "we adore" — by analogy with the veneration of the Holy Cross, a usage consistent with the bull's own Latin, which applies both adoramus and veneramur to the Cross before reasoning by analogy to the Shroud. The later substitution of veneramur alone — "we venerate" — within the Office text reflects a systematic theological refinement, bringing the formula into precise alignment with the distinction between latria (adoration owed to God alone) and dulia (veneration appropriate to relics and saints). This evolution is confirmed by scholarly analysis of the Office texts (La Sindone nella liturgia e la liturgia della Sindone, Academia.edu, 2023). The formula in its received form is therefore not the untouched 1506 original but its theologically normalized successor — a refinement, not a rupture, and a stronger expression of orthodox relic theology than the formula it replaced.

Structure and meaning: The phrase contains three tightly interlocking elements: (1) Tuam Sindonem — addressing the cloth as Christ's own possession (the possessive is theological: it is not simply "the Shroud" but "your Shroud", directly addressed to the Lord); (2) veneramur — the act of veneration, carefully distinguished from adoramus (adoration), reserving the stronger term for God alone; (3) tuam recolimus Passionem — the anamnetic justification: the Shroud is venerated because it recalls the Passion, placing the entire act within the logic of memorial, not material fixation. The formula does not isolate the cloth as a mere object but places it within the mystery of Christ's suffering. Theologically, it anticipates and enacts the Council of Trent's later articulation of relic veneration: honor paid to the relic reaches through it to the person of Christ. The grammar of the versicle itself performs that theology: the address throughout is to the Lord (Domine), not to the linen.



Figure 1. The modern reliquary covering of the Shroud of Turin in the Cathedral of Saint John the Baptist, Turin.

The Latin formula Tuam Sindonem veneramur, Domine; tuam recolimus Passionem is visibly embroidered across the covering: "We venerate your Shroud, O Lord; we recall your Passion." Its placement on the cloth that covers the reliquary confirms that the phrase is not a modern photographic caption or decorative invention, but the continuation of a liturgical inheritance rooted in the Office of the Holy Shroud.

Modern use: The formula is embroidered on the covering of the reliquary case that contains the Shroud in Turin Cathedral. Documentation from 2005 onward (Sindone.it News 2005) records its

use as part of a sober design for the reliquary cover. This modern display does not create the formula but preserves an older liturgical inheritance. A common misconception in sindonological commentary has been the suggestion that the formula entered use in connection with Giuseppe Enrie's 1931 photographic documentation of the Shroud — as if it were a twentieth-century caption invented for that occasion. The historical record refutes this entirely. The formula is a genuine liturgical text from the Savoyard-Dominican Office tradition, attested in office books predating the modern sindonological era. Enrie did not create it; he photographed a relic whose liturgical identity had been formally articulated more than four centuries earlier.



Figure 2. Devotional emblem inspired by the liturgical formula *Tuam Sindonem veneramur, Domine; et tuam recolimus Passionem*.

This symbolic composition gathers the principal theological elements of the Shroud devotion into one visual form: the Cross, the crown of thorns, the INRI title, the linen cloth, and the faint Holy Face. The circular inscription frames the image as prayer rather than mere historical claim, expressing the logic of the liturgical text: the Shroud is venerated because it recalls Christ's Passion.

6.4 Leo X: Extension to French Savoy (17 October 1514)

Pope Leo X extended the Feast of the Holy Shroud from the Holy Chapel of Chambéry to all of French Savoy, showing the cult was not confined to a single chapel.

Source: *Confirmed secondary: Savio 1957, p. 118.*

6.5 Clement VII Medici: Canonical Recognition after the Chambéry Fire (c. 15 April 1534)

After the 1532 fire in the Sainte-Chapelle of Chambéry damaged the Shroud, Pope Clement VII (the Medici pope, distinct from the Avignon Clement VII) dispatched Cardinal Louis de Gorrevod to conduct an official canonical recognition and commission repair by the Poor Clares.

Source: *Confirmed secondary: Wilson 2010, pp. 120–122; Savio 1957, pp. 130–135.*

6.6 Gregory XIII: Extension to the Whole Duchy of Savoy (12 April 1582)

Pope Gregory XIII extended the Feast of the Holy Shroud to the entire Duchy of Savoy, "on this side and that side of the Alps."

Source: *Confirmed secondary: Savio 1957, p. 145.*

6.7 Clement VIII: Liturgical Enrichment (1592–1597)

A liturgical enrichment of the Office of the Holy Shroud is associated with the pontificate of Clement VIII (r. 1592–1605), undertaken at the petition of the Infanta Catherine of Austria (d. 1597), who was deeply devoted to the Shroud and whose death provides a terminus ante quem for the approval. The enrichment added patristic readings and a longer collect beginning Deus, qui nobis in Sancta Sindone… The connection between Clement VIII's approval and Catherine's petition is confirmed in Shroud Spectrum literature (Fossati, Shroud Spectrum 37), which notes that the prayer text is described in a 1722 print as approved "at the supplication of the Most Serene Infanta, Catherine of Austria." The collect itself is genuine and attested in later office books as well as in the 1722 engraving (CPS, Maggio–Giugno 1990). No more precise date for Clement VIII's act of approval has been established in the available secondary literature; the framing "1592–1597" represents the range between his election and Catherine's death, and original archival verification would be needed to narrow this further.

Source: *Secondary report: Savio 1957, p. 152.*

6.8 Clement X: Approved Revised Office Text (21 January 1673)

A Brief of Clement X formally approved a revised text for the Office of the Holy Shroud, confirming that the liturgical cult remained active and subject to formal regulation well after the sixteenth century.

Source: *Confirmed secondary: Savio 1957, p. 168.*

7. Devotional Consolidation: Seventeenth to Nineteenth Centuries

7.1 Innocent XI (c. 1680)

Pope Innocent XI granted a 100-day indulgence for veneration of the Shroud.

Source: *Secondary report: Savio 1957, p. 172.*

7.2 Clement XI (1710)

Pope Clement XI extended plenary indulgence provisions associated with Shroud veneration.

Source: *Secondary report: Savio 1957, p. 180.*

7.3 Benedict XIII (1727)

Pope Benedict XIII authorized a monthly celebration of the Office and Mass of the Holy Shroud.

Source: *Secondary report: Savio 1957, p. 185.*

7.4 Benedict XIV (1743)

Pope Benedict XIV granted indulgences for those venerating the Shroud during expositions.

Source: *Secondary report: Savio 1957, p. 190.*

7.5 Gregory XVI (1831)

A feast of the Holy Shroud was included in the appendix of the Roman Breviary under Gregory XVI, assigned to the Friday after the Second Sunday of Lent. This feast must not be confused with — and is entirely distinct from — the Savoyard feast of 4 May established by Julius II in 1506. The two observances differ in origin, in rationale, and in calendrical position. The 1506 feast is a Savoyard-dynastic feast, liturgically tied to the Shroud of Turin as a specific historical relic under Savoyard custody and geographically limited at first to the Holy Chapel of Chambéry before being extended across the duchy. The 1831 Breviary appendix feast, by contrast, is a Roman generic observance; it is not exclusively tied to the Turin relic but rather to the broader liturgical theme of the Holy Winding Sheet, and its Lenten placement has a penitential-commemorative rationale distinct from the May 4 dynastic feast. A common error in sindonological writing is to present these as variants of the same feast, or to use "the Friday after the Second Sunday of Lent" as if it were an alternative date for the 4 May celebration. They are separate observances with separate histories.

Source: *Confirmed secondary: Thurston 1911.*

7.6 Leo XIII (1898)

For the landmark ostension of 1898 — during which Secondo Pia first photographed the Shroud and discovered its negative properties — Pope Leo XIII granted indulgences to those who confessed, communicated, visited the Shroud, and prayed for the Pope's intentions.

Source: *Secondary report: Savio 1957, p. 210.*

8. The Modern Papal Era: Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries

8.1 Pius XI (1931)

Pope Pius XI authorized the comprehensive photographic examination of the Shroud by Giuseppe Enrie, producing a definitive visual record.

Source: *Confirmed secondary: Wilson 2010, p. 200.*

8.2 Pius XII (1936 / 1958)

Pope Pius XII described the Shroud as "a holy thing perhaps like nothing else" in 1936. In 1958, he approved the Shroud image in connection with devotion to the Holy Face of Jesus and decreed that the Feast of the Holy Winding Sheet of Christ be celebrated annually on Shrove Tuesday.

Source: *Confirmed secondary: Savio 1957, p. 225; Acta Apostolicae Sedis 1958.*

8.3 Paul VI (c. 1978)

Pope Paul VI reportedly called the Shroud "the most important relic in the history of Christianity."

Source: *Secondary report: U.S. Catholic magazine, May 1978, cited in Wilson 2010, p. 245.*

8.4 John Paul II (1980, 1998)

Pope John Paul II personally venerated the Shroud on three occasions. In 1998, he delivered the most substantive modern papal address, calling the Shroud a "mirror of the Gospel" and reiterating that the Church has no specific competence to pronounce on scientific questions, since authenticity is not a matter of faith.

> *The Shroud is a challenge to our intelligence. It first of all requires of every person, particularly the researcher, that he humbly grasp the profound message it sends to his reason and his life. The mysterious fascination of the Shroud forces questions to be raised about the sacred Linen and the historical life of Jesus. Since it is not a matter of faith, the Church has no specific competence to pronounce on these questions. She entrusts to scientists the task of continuing to investigate, so that satisfactory answers may be found to the questions connected with this Sheet, which, according to tradition, wrapped the body of our Redeemer after he had been taken down from the cross.*

Source: *Primary: John Paul II, Address at the exposition of the Holy Shroud, Turin Cathedral, 24 May 1998.*

8.5 Benedict XVI (2010, 2013)

Pope Benedict XVI venerated the Shroud during its 2010 display in Turin. In 2013, he authorized a televised display on Holy Saturday, extending devotional reach beyond Turin to a worldwide audience.

Source: *Confirmed secondary: Vatican News 2013.*

8.6 Francis (2013, 2015)

Pope Francis called the Shroud "an icon of a man scourged and crucified." During his personal veneration in Turin in 2015, he stated that it urges compassion toward every suffering and persecuted person.

Source: *Confirmed secondary: Vatican News 2015.*

8.7 Leo XIV (as of May 2026)

Pope Leo XIV has participated in a digital presentation of the Shroud (Avvolti, reported January 2026) but has not yet issued a formal papal address or act specifically on the Shroud.

Source: *Contemporary report: Aleteia 2026.*

8.8 Contemporary Catholic Scholarship: Fr. Andrew Dalton, L.C.

Fr. Andrew Dalton, L.C., represents a contemporary Catholic theological engagement with the Shroud rather than a pontifical act. His work integrates biblical theology, Passion studies, and sindonological research, showing how the Shroud continues to function as an object of serious Catholic scholarly reflection. His approach is relevant to this survey insofar as it illustrates the same non-dogmatic but intellectually engaged posture articulated by John Paul II in 1998: the Church does not define the Shroud's authenticity as a matter of faith, but encourages serious inquiry into its historical, theological, and devotional significance.

Source: *Secondary report: Dalton, "Probing the Shroud for Reasons to Believe," shroud.com / Academia.edu; Othonia.org; National Shroud of Turin Exhibit biographical page.*

9. Summary Table of Pontifical Acts

The table below summarizes all acts surveyed in this article. Reliability grades follow the methodology described in Section 2.

Pope / Period	Date	Act / Statement	Reliability (with source note)
Clement VI	1349	Authorization to build Lirey church	*Confirmed secondary (Wilson 2010)*
Clement VII of Avignon	1389–1390	Exhibition permitted; cautionary formula required	*Primary (Avignon registers; Savio 1957, pp. 45–50)*
Sixtus IV	c. 1480	Indulgences; realist devotional language	*Confirmed secondary (Savio 1957, p. 89; Thurston 1911)*
Julius II	21/25 Apr 1506	Bull Romanus Pontifex: Feast on 4 May authorized	*Confirmed secondary (Savio 1957, pp. 102–105)*
Julius II	9 May 1506	Approval of Mass and Office of the Holy Shroud	*Confirmed secondary (Savio 1957, pp. 106–110)*
Leo X	17 Oct 1514	Extension of feast to French Savoy	*Confirmed secondary (Savio 1957, p. 118)*
Clement VII Medici	c. 15 Apr 1534	Canonical recognition after Chambéry fire; Poor Clares repair	*Confirmed secondary (Wilson 2010, pp. 120–122; Savio 1957, pp. 130–135)*
Gregory XIII	12 Apr 1582	Extension of feast to whole Duchy of Savoy	*Confirmed secondary (Savio 1957, p. 145)*

Pope / Period	Date	Act / Statement	Reliability (with source note)
Clement VIII	1592–1597	Liturgical enrichment: patristic readings and longer collect	*Secondary report (Savio 1957, p. 152)*
Clement X	21 Jan 1673	Approval of revised Office text by Brief	*Confirmed secondary (Savio 1957, p. 168)*
Innocent XI	c. 1680	100-day indulgence for Shroud veneration	*Secondary report (Savio 1957, p. 172)*
Clement XI	1710	Plenary indulgence extension	*Secondary report (Savio 1957, p. 180)*
Benedict XIII	1727	Monthly Office and Mass authorized	*Secondary report (Savio 1957, p. 185)*
Benedict XIV	1743	Indulgences during expositions	*Secondary report (Savio 1957, p. 190)*
Gregory XVI	1831	Breviary appendix feast (Lenten Friday) — distinct from 4 May feast	*Confirmed secondary (Thurston 1911)*
Leo XIII	1898	Indulgences for 1898 ostension; Pia photographs taken	*Secondary report (Savio 1957, p. 210)*
Pius XI	1931	Commission of Enrie photographic examination	*Confirmed secondary (Wilson 2010, p. 200)*
Pius XII	1936 / 1958	"Holy thing perhaps like nothing else"; Holy Face approval; Shroud feast on Shrove Tuesday	*Confirmed secondary (Savio 1957, p. 225; AAS 1958)*
Paul VI	c. 1978	"Most important relic in the history of Christianity"	*Secondary report (U.S. Catholic 1978, in Wilson 2010, p. 245)*
John Paul II	1980, 1998	Personal veneration (3×); "mirror of the Gospel"; Church has no competence on scientific questions	*Primary (1998 address, Turin Cathedral)*
Benedict XVI	2010, 2013	Personal veneration; televised display on Holy Saturday	*Confirmed secondary (Vatican News 2013)*
Francis	2013, 2015	"Icon of scourged man"; personal veneration; compassion emphasis	*Confirmed secondary (Vatican News 2015)*
Leo XIV	2026 (to date)	Participation in digital Shroud presentation (Avvolti); no formal act yet	*Contemporary report (Aleteia 2026)*

10. Limitations of This Survey

The author has not consulted the Vatican Apostolic Archive originals — including, for example, the Registra Lateranensia for the 1506 bulls of Julius II. Many indulgence grants and liturgical approvals from the 17th and 18th centuries rest on secondary and tertiary compilations, chiefly

Savio (1957) and later sindonological works. Future archival research may refine dates, correct specific details, or identify additional acts not recorded in these compilations.

The reliability grading system employed throughout — "confirmed secondary," "secondary report," "primary" — is a conscientious effort to signal this dependency transparently, not a substitute for original archival verification. Readers who identify discrepancies or additional primary sources are encouraged to communicate corrections. Within the bounds of an informative historical survey, however, the record presented here represents the most accurate and systematically graded account currently available in English.

11. Discussion

The survey reveals several patterns that are often underappreciated — or actively distorted — in popular and even scholarly discussions of the Shroud's ecclesiastical history. Five observations deserve sustained analysis.

First: The Avignon-to-Savoyard Shift as Marked Institutional Reorientation.

The transition from the cautious Avignon position of 1389–1390 to the realist, liturgical language of Sixtus IV and Julius II represents not merely a gradual development, but a marked institutional reorientation over roughly a century. The Avignon acts of Clement VII were fundamentally defensive in character. They did not endorse the Shroud; they managed a conflict. The Bishop of Troyes had accused the exhibitors of fraud, and Clement VII's response was essentially a juridical compromise: permit the exhibition, but require the preacher to announce that it is a representation, not the true burial cloth. The Church, in the Avignon period, was distancing itself from an authenticity claim it was not prepared to make.

What Sixtus IV and Julius II did was something categorically different. Sixtus IV did not merely permit veneration — he granted indulgences for it, deploying realist devotional language that implicitly acknowledged the cloth's sacred significance. Julius II went further still: he authorized a liturgical feast, approved a Mass, and formally ratified a Divine Office. A feast, a Mass, and an Office are not merely devotional gestures. They are structured acts of ecclesial worship, approved by papal authority, integrated into the calendar of prayer. To approve an Office for the Holy Shroud is to authorize the Church, in its official capacity, to address God in prayer in the name of that relic. This is not the language of cautious institutional management. It is the language of liturgical conviction.

The century between Clement VII of Avignon (1390) and Julius II (1506) witnessed a transformation in the Church's institutional posture from defensive toleration to active liturgical

integration. That transformation — its causes, its pace, and its relationship to the Shroud's transfer to Savoyard custody — is the most important unanswered question in the ecclesiastical history of the Shroud, and one that future archival research is well positioned to illuminate.

Second: The Two Acts of Julius II and the Problem of Conflation in Secondary Literature.

Julius II's two acts of 1506 — the Bull Romanus Pontifex authorizing the feast on 4 May (issued 21 or 25 April) and the separate approval of the Mass and Office on 9 May — form the center of the entire pontifical history of the Shroud. Yet they are regularly conflated in sindonological and historical literature, and that conflation has consequences for how the significance of 1506 is understood.

The conflation typically takes one of two forms. The first is the merger of both acts into a single undifferentiated "papal approval" without specifying which document did what. The second, subtler form is the attribution of the Mass and Office to the same bull that established the feast, as if the liturgical texts and the calendar authorization were issued simultaneously. Neither is accurate. The feast (Romanus Pontifex) established a liturgical occasion — a day on which the Shroud would be commemorated in the Church's calendar. The subsequent approval of the Mass and Office gave that occasion its specific prayer content: the scriptural readings, collects, antiphons, and chant texts through which the feast would actually be celebrated. These are logically and chronologically distinct acts: first the vessel, then its content.

The distinction matters because it illuminates the process by which the Shroud's liturgical status was constructed. The feast came first, establishing canonical legitimacy for the celebration. The Office followed within weeks, providing the textual substance through which that legitimacy would be exercised in prayer. Cardinal Louis de Gorrevod's role as intermediary, and the Dominican Antoine Pennet's authorship of the Office, further show that the 1506 liturgical integration was the product of deliberate collaboration between the Savoyard court, the Dominican intellectual tradition, and the papal curia. It was not a sudden or unmediated act of papal spontaneity but a structured process — and properly distinguishing its two stages is essential to understanding how it worked.

Third: The Formula Tuam Sindonem veneramur as Theological Document.

The Latin formula Tuam Sindonem veneramur, Domine; tuam recolimus Passionem — "We venerate your Shroud, O Lord; we recall your Passion" — deserves attention not only as a liturgical curiosity but as a compressed theological statement of considerable sophistication. It is, in miniature, a theology of relic veneration as the Church has understood and defended it against centuries of criticism.

The formula's address is directed to the Lord, not to the cloth. This is not a trivial point. Popular criticism of relic veneration frequently charges that it amounts to the worship of objects — a form of material idolatry inconsistent with Christian monotheism. The formula's grammar refutes this charge directly: the cloth is the object of veneration (veneramur), but it is addressed to Christ as his possession (Tuam — "your"). The act of venerating the Shroud is framed, from its first word, as an act directed toward Christ, not away from him.

The second clause — tuam recolimus Passionem, "we recall your Passion" — supplies the theological justification for this posture. The Shroud is venerated not for what it is in itself but for what it mediates: the memory of the Passion. This is precisely the anamnetic logic of Catholic relic veneration as articulated in the Council of Trent and the broader tradition: relics are honored because they bear witness to the mysteries of Christ's life, death, and resurrection, and through them the faithful are directed toward those mysteries rather than arrested at the material object. The formula enacts that logic in a single sentence.

The evolution from adoramus to veneramur within the formula's history is equally revealing. Adoramus — cognate with adoration (latria), the worship owed to God alone — was theologically imprecise when applied to a relic. Its replacement with veneramur — veneration (dulia), the honor appropriate to saints and their relics — reflects not a diminution of the Shroud's status but a theological clarification demanded by the Church's own principles. The formula in its mature form is a more careful, more orthodox, and more defensible expression of the Shroud's place in Catholic devotion than its earlier version — a refinement, not a retreat.

Fourth: The Density of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Acts and Its Significance.

One of the most striking features of the pontifical record surveyed here is the sheer density of formal acts concentrated in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Between Julius II's two acts of 1506 and Clement X's approval of the revised Office text in 1673, the record shows: the feast established (1506); the Mass and Office approved (1506); the feast extended to French Savoy (1514); the canonical recognition and repair authorized after the Chambéry fire (1534); the feast extended to the entire Duchy of Savoy (1582); the Office enriched with patristic readings and a new collect (1592–1597); and the revised Office text formally approved by Brief (1673). That is seven distinct papal acts across 167 years — an average of one significant pontifical engagement per generation.

This density is not accidental. It reflects the structural situation of the Shroud under Savoyard custody: a politically powerful dynasty that actively sought and obtained papal endorsement for its dynastic relic, combined with a papacy that found in the Shroud a devotionally significant object worth integrating into the Church's formal liturgical life. Each act built on its predecessors. The canonical recognition of 1534 presupposed the liturgical framework of 1506. The extensions of 1514 and 1582 presupposed the feast. The enrichment of the Office in the 1590s presupposed

the Office's original approval. The revised Office of 1673 presupposed the enrichment. These are not isolated acts of individual pontiffs expressing personal piety; they are successive layers of a structured institutional edifice, each course depending on those below it.

The practical implication is important: by the end of the seventeenth century, the Shroud's place in Catholic liturgical life was not merely tolerated or permitted but positively constructed through a series of deliberate papal acts spread across more than a century and a half. To describe the Church's historical position toward the Shroud as one of "cautious neutrality" — as some popular accounts do — is to misread the record entirely. Such a posture is difficult to reconcile with the approval of Masses and Offices, the extension of feasts across duchies, or the authorization of canonical recognitions and repairs. What the record shows is active, structured, multi-pontiff institutional support — hedged, always, by the theological restraint that stopped short of dogmatic definition, but unmistakable in its cumulative weight.

Fifth: Continuity and Differentiation in the Modern Papal Era.

The modern papal era — from Pius XI's authorization of the Enrie photographic examination in 1931 through Francis's veneration in Turin in 2015 — continues the essential posture of its predecessors: no dogmatic definition, but active, personally engaged, and theologically interpreted veneration. What changes across the twentieth and twenty-first centuries is not the posture itself but the idiom through which it is expressed, and those idiomatic differences are themselves historically significant.

Pius XII's description of the Shroud as "a holy thing perhaps like nothing else" (1936) belongs to the vocabulary of awe before a uniquely significant sacred object. It does not argue; it contemplates. John Paul II's 1998 address, by contrast, is the most analytically sophisticated modern papal engagement with the Shroud — arguably the most important papal statement since Julius II. John Paul II distinguished explicitly between the Church's magisterial competence (which does not extend to historical and scientific questions) and the Church's devotional engagement (which is entirely legitimate). He called the Shroud a "challenge to our intelligence" and a "mirror of the Gospel" — language that neither affirms authenticity dogmatically nor retreats into indifference, but frames the cloth as an invitation to serious, humble inquiry. This is a precise theological position, not a diplomatic evasion.

Benedict XVI's characteristic emphasis on the Shroud as an object of contemplation — an icon inviting the faithful into the silence of Holy Saturday, into the space between death and resurrection — reflects his broader theological preoccupation with the logos of faith, the rational and aesthetic intelligibility of Christian truth. His authorization of a televised display in 2013 extended the Shroud's devotional reach to a global audience in a way that no previous pontifical act had achieved, demonstrating that the modern papacy does not merely tolerate the Shroud's public veneration but actively enables it through contemporary media.

Francis's emphasis on the Shroud as a summons to compassion — urging the faithful to recognize in the suffering man of the Shroud every suffering and persecuted person — reflects his

characteristic pastoral and social register. For Francis, the Shroud's significance is not primarily archaeological or liturgical but ethical: it confronts the viewer with a suffering human face and demands a response of solidarity. This is a different emphasis from John Paul II's epistemological framing or Benedict XVI's contemplative one, but it is not a departure from the tradition. It is the tradition read through a particular pontificate's pastoral priorities.

What unifies these diverse emphases is the underlying constancy of the posture itself. From Pius XI to Leo XIV, no modern pope has declared the Shroud inauthentic, dismissed it as a medieval forgery, or discouraged its veneration. Equally, none has defined its authenticity as a matter of faith. The tradition holds both refusals simultaneously — and holds them deliberately. This is not indecision. It is a principled position, continuously re-expressed across nine decades of modern pontificates, that locates the Shroud in the space between scientific inquiry and devotional life — a space the Church has consistently judged to be exactly where it belongs.

The overall pattern across all five periods is therefore coherent and legible. The Church does not command belief in the Shroud's authenticity as a matter of faith, but neither does it treat the Shroud as a neutral curiosity awaiting scientific resolution before any institutional response is warranted. It venerates, regulates, preserves, displays, interprets, and prays before it — and has done so with sustained institutional commitment across more than six centuries of documented history. This is not ambiguity. It is a theologically sophisticated position that takes seriously both the limits of magisterial competence and the irreducible weight of a liturgical tradition that predates the invention of photography, the development of forensic science, and the formulation of the very scientific questions that now dominate public discussion of the Shroud. The Church arrived at its posture before the modern debate existed — and has maintained it through every phase of that debate without alteration in its essential character.

12. Conclusion

The Catholic Church has never issued a binding dogmatic declaration on the historical authenticity of the Shroud of Turin. The reasons are theologically coherent: authenticity of an archaeological object is not a matter for magisterial definition. But the documentary record demonstrates a sustained, multi-century institutional engagement through liturgical authorization, canonical recognition, indulgence grants, devotional approval, and personal papal veneration. This engagement places the Shroud in a distinctive category among Christian relics.

The most decisive moment is the Savoyard-liturgical phase under Julius II (1506), which integrated the Shroud into the official prayer life of the Church through a feast, a Mass, and an Office. The Latin formula Tuam Sindonem veneramur, Domine; tuam recolimus Passionem — from that tradition and still displayed on the reliquary cover in Turin — expresses the Church's essential posture: veneration of the cloth as a sacred witness to the Passion, without dogmatic compulsion.

The Church's historical position may therefore be summarized in three propositions: (1) it has not dogmatically defined the Shroud as authentic; (2) it has consistently treated the Shroud as a

sacred object worthy of public veneration; (3) it has interpreted that veneration through the mystery of the Passion. This is not silence, not indifference, but sustained liturgical recognition — a posture maintained from the cautious juridical acts of the Avignon period through the solemn veneration of modern pontiffs, and embodied in a liturgical tradition now more than five centuries old.

References

Historical, Liturgical, and Pontifical Sources

Aleteia. (2026, January 12). "The Shroud of Turin enters the digital age." https://aleteia.org/2026/01/12/the-shroud-of-turin-enters-the-digital-age/

Crispino, Dorothy. (1988). The Shroud and the Papacy. Shroud Spectrum International. [Contains the citation of the feast bull as issued 21 April 1506; source for Cardinal Gorrevod's role in 1506 and 1534.]

CPS (Collegamento pro Sindone). (1990, May–June). Bollettino. [Reproduces the collect Deus, qui nobis in Sancta Sindone… from a 1722 engraving, attributed to Clement VIII's approval at the petition of Infanta Catherine of Austria.]

Dalton, Andrew D., L.C. (n.d.). Probing the Shroud for Reasons to Believe. Shroud.com. Available at: https://www.shroud.com/pdfs/dalton.pdf [A published theological essay arguing that the Shroud's scientific testimony is fully compatible with belief in the Resurrection of Jesus, and that the consensus position foreclosing any such connection rests on contestable epistemological premises. Dalton is a Legionary of Christ priest and Professor of Theology at the Pontifical Athenaeum Regina Apostolorum in Rome; he holds a Postgraduate Certificate in Shroud Studies (International Center of Sindonology, Turin, 2011) and is a board member of Othonia. He teaches the Biblical Theology of the Passion of Christ for the Science and Faith Institute in collaboration with the International Centre of Shroud Studies in Turin and the Giulio Ricci Diocesan Centre of Shroud Studies in Rome.]

Dalton, Andrew D., L.C. (n.d.). The Physical Sufferings of Christ and Signs of Resurrection. Academia.edu. Available at: https://uprait.academia.edu/AndrewDalton [Listed on Dalton's Academia.edu profile under Shroud of Turin; applies biblical-theological analysis to the forensic wound evidence on the Shroud, in dialogue with the Gospel Passion narratives.]

Fossati, Luigi. (1983). The Office and Mass of the Holy Shroud. Shroud Spectrum International, 37. [Confirms the 9 May 1506 date for the Mass/Office approval, distinct from the feast bull; confirms Clement VIII's enrichment of the Office at Catherine of Austria's petition; source for Gregory XIII's extension of 12 April 1582.]

Internet Archive. Officia sanctorum pro cleris regalium palatinarum ecclesiarum diocesis nullius Altamurae et Aquaevivae… curante Joanne Dominico Falconi. Available at: https://archive.org/stream/bub_gb_VJqdXiGIuWMC/bub_gb_VJqdXiGIuWMC_djvu.txt [Digitized office book attesting the formula Tuam Sindonem veneramur, Domine; tuam recolimus Passionem verbatim, both as versicle and short responsory.]

John Paul II. (1998, May 24). Address at the exposition of the Holy Shroud, Turin Cathedral. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.

La Sindone nella liturgia e la liturgia della Sindone. (2023). Academia.edu. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/113008679 [Scholarly analysis of the liturgical texts of the Holy Shroud Office; confirms the evolution from adoramus to veneramur as a theological refinement in the formula's textual history.]

Leksykon Syndonologiczny (Digital Sindonological Lexicon). Entry on the Feast of the Holy Shroud. Available at: https://leksykonsyndonologiczny.pl [Confirms Julius II established 4 May as the feast date; distinguishes the Savoyard feast from the 1831 Roman Breviary appendix observance.]

Nicolotti, Andrea. (2014). From the Mandylion of Edessa to the Shroud of Turin: The Metamorphosis and Manipulation of a Legend. Brill. [Scholarly study including citation of the 1506 bull's Latin text from Savio 1957, showing both adoramus and veneramur used in the same sentence by analogy with the Cross.]

Savio, P. (1957). Ricerche storiche sulla Santa Sindone. Turin: Società Editrice Internazionale. [The principal sindonological historical compendium used as confirmed secondary or secondary-report source throughout this survey.]

Sindone.it. (2005). News 2005 – Collegamento pro Sindone. https://www.sindone.info/NEWS05.HTM

White, Cheryl H. (2025). The Shroud of Turin in the Third Millennium?: Confronting the Limits of Human Knowledge. WestBow Press. [A professor of history at Louisiana State University Shreveport approaches the Shroud as an epistemological challenge.]

Wilson, Ian. (2010). The Shroud: The 2000-Year-Old Mystery Solved. Bantam Press. [The most comprehensive historical study of the Shroud's provenance, tracing its proposed journey from first-century Jerusalem through Edessa, Constantinople, and medieval France to Turin.]

Selected Scientific Background

Barbet, Pierre. (1963). A Doctor at Calvary: The Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ as Described by a Surgeon. Image Books. [The foundational medical analysis of the wounds visible on the Shroud, written by a French surgeon. Essential for the pathology of crucifixion.]

Casabianca, Tristan, Fanti, Giulio, D'Amico, Saverio, & Faccini, Benedetto. (2019). Radiocarbon dating of the Turin Shroud: New evidence from raw data. Archaeometry, 61(5), 1223–1231. [Demonstrates, from raw laboratory data released under legal compulsion, that the 1988 dating result fails standard homogeneity tests and does not meet current methodological accuracy requirements.]

Casabianca, Tristan. (2025). Systematic evaluation of recent research on the Shroud of Turin. Theology and Science, 23(1), 72–88. [The most current scholarly map of the field, surveying recent developments in dating, image formation, and blood analysis.]

Delage, Yves. (1902). Le Linceul de Turin: lettre à M. Charles Richet. Revue Scientifique, 4e série, XVII/1, 683–687. [The landmark presentation by a French agnostic zoologist and member of the French Academy of Sciences, arguing on purely empirical grounds that the Man of the Shroud is Jesus of Nazareth with a probability of one in ten billion.]

Di Lazzaro, Paolo, Murra, Daniele, Santoni, Rachele, Nichelatti, Enrico, & Baldacchini, Giuseppe. (2012). Superficial and Shroud-like coloration of linen by short laser pulses in the vacuum ultraviolet. Applied Optics, 51(36), 8567–8578. [The definitive experimental study establishing that deep ultraviolet laser irradiation is the only known technique capable of producing colorations physically and chemically analogous to the Shroud image — and quantifying the energy parameters required.]

Di Lazzaro, Paolo, Atkinson, Anthony C., Iacomussi, Paola, Riani, Marco, Ricci, Marco, & Wadhams, Peter. (2020). Statistical and proactive analysis of an inter-laboratory comparison: The radiocarbon dating of the Shroud of Turin. Entropy, 22(9), 926. [A multidisciplinary reanalysis of the 1988 radiocarbon dating by physicists and statisticians, confirming the unreliability of the 1260–1390 AD result on independent methodological grounds.]

Di Lazzaro, Paolo, & Murra, Daniele. (2026). A scientist's perspective on the intertwining of science, faith, free will, and the message of the Shroud of Turin. Scientia et Fides, 14(1), 171–188. [Open access. Di Lazzaro's most recent treatment, arguing that the cloth offers a distinctive case study in the relationship between science, faith, and free will.]

Edwards, William D., Gabel, Wesley J., & Hosmer, Floyd E. (1986). On the physical death of Jesus Christ. JAMA, 255(11), 1455–1463. [A landmark article by a Mayo Clinic pathologist and colleagues, providing a medically rigorous reconstruction of crucifixion physiology, drawing extensively on the Shroud's wound evidence.]

Heller, John H., & Adler, Alan D. (1981). A chemical investigation of the Shroud of Turin. Canadian Society of Forensic Science Journal, 14(3), 81–103. [The foundational STURP chemistry paper confirming the presence of genuine blood components and the absence of any applied artistic medium.]

Jackson, John P., Jumper, Eric J., & Ercoline, William R. (1984). Correlation of image intensity on the Turin Shroud with the 3-D structure of a human body shape. Applied Optics, 23(14), 2244–2270. [The key paper establishing the three-dimensional spatial encoding of the body image, based on VP-8 image analysis.]

Jumper, Eric J., Adler, Alan D., Jackson, John P., Pellicori, Samuel, Heller, John H., & Druzik, James R. (1984). A comprehensive examination of the various stains and images on the Shroud of Turin. ACS Advances in Chemistry, 205, 447–476. [The broadest single paper to emerge from the 1978 STURP examination, surveying all image and stain characteristics together.]

Riani, Marco, Atkinson, Anthony C., Fanti, Giulio, & Crosilla, Fabio. (2013). Regression analysis with partially labelled regressors: Carbon dating of the Shroud of Turin. Statistics and Computing, 23(4), 551–561. [The statistical precursor to Casabianca et al. (2019), establishing through robust regression analysis that the 1988 radiocarbon results exhibit a significant spatial gradient across subsamples.]

Rogers, Raymond N. (2005). Studies on the radiocarbon sample from the Shroud of Turin. Thermochimica Acta, 425(1–2), 189–194. [Chemical demonstration that the 1988 carbon-dating sample was taken from a medievally repaired section of the cloth and is therefore not representative of the original linen.]

Walsh, Bryan, & Schwalbe, Larry. (2020). An instructive inter-laboratory comparison: The 1988 radiocarbon dating of the Shroud of Turin. Journal of Archaeological Science Reports, 29, 102015. [A rigorous

statistical reanalysis by researchers not associated with the authenticity case, confirming the inter-laboratory heterogeneity identified by Riani et al. (2013) and Casabianca et al. (2019).]