A Formal Rebuttal of Andrea Nicolotti's Medieval-Icon Thesis in Light of Interdisciplinary Evidence on the Shroud of Turin

Otangelo Grasso, written with the support and assistance of AI tools.
Independent researcher, Aracaju, SE, Brazil
email: otangelograsso@gmail.com
ORCID: Orcid ID: 0009-0005-6942-0593
December 2025

This rebuttal engages Nicolotti's historical-critical reading of the Shroud of Turin and assesses it against the convergent scientific evidence from forensic, chemical, botanical, and textile analyses.

1) Scope and Limitations: The Problem of Methodological Exclusion

Andrea Nicolotti's work treats the Shroud primarily as a late-medieval devotional object whose history begins in fourteenth-century France, with the 1988 radiocarbon result functioning as the central chronological constraint. On that basis, he reinterprets earlier references to image-bearing cloths as unrelated legends and regards scientific arguments for authenticity as secondary, apologetic, and methodologically weak.

This approach usefully critiques hagiographic excess and warns against credulous legend-building. Yet it succeeds only by *methodologically excluding* the physical datasets that make the Shroud a unique scientific object. Nicolotti's framework narrows the evidential field in three critical ways:

1. It privileges Western documentary silence before Lirey over independent physical data from the cloth itself.
2. It isolates the Shroud from the Sudarium of Oviedo, despite detailed forensic correlations between the two objects.[1,2]
3. It treats the image as a conventional iconographic product, without engaging its three-dimensional encoding, chemical superficiality, or the non-pigment nature of the chromophore.[17,24]

Once the full set of forensic, chemical, textile, and botanical data is brought into play, the medieval-icon thesis ceases to offer a coherent account of the object under examination.

2) The Irreducible Anomaly: Forensic Congruence with the Sudarium of Oviedo

A central blind spot in Nicolotti's narrative is the Sudarium of Oviedo, a blood-stained face cloth documented in Spain centuries before the Shroud's appearance in Lirey. His reconstruction effectively assumes that the Shroud is a stand-alone French creation. This omission is a critical gap. Peer-reviewed forensic work documents more than 120 precise points of congruence between bloodstain patterns on the Sudarium and those on the Shroud's facial region.[1,2] These are specific matches in stain boundaries, flow direction, and deformation around the nose and mouth, encoding a shared sequence of upright and horizontal positions of the same head—blood flow in a vertical position (crucifixion) followed by re-positioning horizontally (burial preparation). Chemical and hematological analyses show compatible blood characteristics on both cloths, including features linked with asphyxial death and severe

trauma.[6] Additional studies report red blood cells, mineral inclusions, and fluid ratios consistent with pulmonary edema in a crucifixion context.[3,4] Both cloths also exhibit the same rare AB blood group and pollen from Jerusalem-area flora, including *Gundelia tournefortii*.[9]

Historically, the Sudarium is attested in Iberia centuries before the Shroud appears in Western sources, and its documented transfer route from Jerusalem via North Africa fits the known political disruptions of the early seventh century.[8] The probability that a fourteenth-century French forger, unaware of this cloth, produced a Shroud whose bloodstains later matched the independently preserved Sudarium with such forensic precision is vanishingly small. Taken together, these factors imply that the two cloths derive from the same injured individual, with the Sudarium historically traceable long before the fourteenth century. Nicolotti's model does not address this integrated body of evidence.

3) Blood Chemistry and Clot Dynamics vs. Painted Icon

In a medieval-icon framework, one expects pigments or some form of applied colorant to generate both image and "blood." Nicolotti's forgery scenario presupposes the "blood" is paint. The chemical and optical evidence refutes this assumption. Spectroscopic studies have consistently identified genuine blood on the cloth, including hemoglobin derivatives, serum albumin, and high bilirubin levels associated with massive trauma.[3,6] These spectra do not match medieval pigments or binders, but degraded blood products characteristic of real biological fluids. Heller and Adler's chemical work found no binding media or paint vehicle appropriate for a medieval artist, and showed that the yellow image tone arises from localized modification of the linen cellulose itself.[17] Ultraviolet fluorescence photography revealed serum halos surrounding many bloodstains, including around the head and wrist areas; these halos are only visible under UV light and correspond to serum separation and retraction after clotting.[18, 17] Such halos and the sharply defined clot borders reflect the behavior of drying blood interacting with cloth over time, not the static gesture of a brush. The blood clots display crisp edges and signs of clot retraction, indicating the cloth adhered to actual clots on skin and was later detached. Microscopic work on vacuumed micro-particles confirms a mixture of dust, pollen, and degraded blood-related material in ways consistent with long-term exposure and burial context, not recent artistic manufacture.[14] A medieval forger under this model would need to be a forensic hematologist centuries ahead of his time, deliberately reproducing microscopic serum diffusion, realistic clot behavior, and UV-detectable serum halos that would not be discovered for centuries. A convincing medieval-forgery scenario would need to explain why an artisan introduced biochemically realistic clot dynamics detectable only under ultraviolet imaging. Nicolotti's critique does not engage this level of detail.

4) The Image as Technological Anachronism

The body image is the Shroud's most striking anomaly. Nicolotti often frames the Shroud within broader iconographic traditions, assuming the image can be assimilated to standard pictorial techniques. Yet optical and physical studies show that the Shroud image behaves in ways unknown in medieval and early modern art. His thesis offers no viable mechanism for its production. Microscopy reveals that the image resides only on the outermost fibrils of the linen threads, with discoloration confined to a superficial layer on the order of tenths of a micron (200–400 nanometers); the core of the fibers remains unaltered.[17,16] Gilbert and Gilbert's reflectance and fluorescence spectrometry confirmed the absence of organic pigments consistent with paint on the body image.[22] FTIR and Raman spectroscopy have failed to identify dyes or paints; the chromophore appears to be oxidized, dehydrated cellulose.[21] The

grayscale intensity of the image varies as a function of cloth-to-body distance, such that when processed in a VP-8 Image Analyzer or equivalent 3D software, it yields a coherent three-dimensional relief of the body, unlike ordinary photographs, paintings, or rubbings.[25,24] This implies that brightness encodes spatial information. The image also behaves as a natural photographic negative, a fact discovered only in 1898. A fourteenth-century artist had no conceptual framework for "negative" imaging or distance-correlated grayscale encoding. Attempts to reproduce Shroud-like images with heat, chemicals, or bas-relief contact have so far generated artifacts that match only a subset of these characteristics. Short-pulse ultraviolet and vacuum-UV laser experiments have demonstrated that it is possible to create extremely superficial discoloration on linen, but they do so under laboratory conditions using high-energy equipment unavailable in the Middle Ages, and still fail to replicate the full suite of Shroud image properties simultaneously.[23,] [26]

To preserve the medieval-forgery thesis, one must posit an artisan who:
– Discovered how to chemically modify linen surfaces at sub-micron depth without binders or pigments.
– Embedded cloth-to-body distance information in grayscale intensity.
– Produced a negative image centuries before photography.

This "forgery" hypothesis thus posits a technological miracle more inexplicable than the relic it seeks to demystify. Nicolotti would need to posit an undocumented technique that simultaneously encodes distance-dependent grayscale information, produces sub-micron superficiality without pigment, and anticipates 3D imaging behavior unknown before modern technology. His writings do not offer such a mechanism, nor do they critically interact with the technical literature that establishes these constraints.

5) Anatomical, Pathological, and Crucifixion-Specific Features

Nicolotti's framework treats the Shroud within standard iconographic traditions. Yet medical and anatomical analysis shows that the cloth encodes features that transcend standard medieval imagery and reflect direct contact with a real corpse that has undergone extreme trauma. Maxillofacial studies reveal displacement of the mandible, nasal injuries, and swelling patterns consistent with blunt-force trauma to the face.[5] Detailed mapping of scourge marks indicates two executioners striking with Roman *flagrum*-type instruments from different angles, with over one hundred dumbbell-shaped marks matching what is known from archaeology and Roman legal practice.[7,27] Forensic analyses of rigor mortis and body posture show a corpse fixed in a position characteristic of crucifixion, with joint stiffening and muscle contraction corresponding to being suspended by the arms before burial.[28] The thoracic region shows signs consistent with pleural effusion, and the posture reflects rigor mortis in a crucified body. The nail wounds are located in the wrists (Destot's space) rather than the palms, and the thumb retraction matches median nerve damage—details that are at odds with much medieval art yet consistent with modern anatomical understanding of crucifixion injuries and mechanical studies of how a crucified body can be supported.[6,7] These features do not arise naturally from copying existing icons; they reflect a forensic reconstruction of crucifixion trauma unknown in medieval iconography. There is no evidence that fourteenth-century artists possessed this integrated anatomical and pathophysiological understanding. Nicolotti's thesis, centered on literary and iconographic parallels, does not supply an artisan or workshop context capable of generating such medically precise data in the fourteenth century.

6) Botanical, Genetic, and Particulate Evidence for Eastern Origin

The medieval-French hypothesis tacitly assumes a Western origin of both cloth and image. A medieval French origin predicts a Western European environmental signature. Botanical and DNA studies point in a different direction. Palynological work has identified pollen grains from species characteristic of the Jerusalem area, including *Gundelia tournefortii*, in concentrations that strongly suggest exposure in a Middle Eastern environment, not just incidental contamination in later centuries.[9, 10] The assemblage fits a trajectory from Judea through Anatolia to Europe. Micro-particle analysis of dust and mineral debris vacuumed from the fibers shows a mix consistent with a burial environment and long-term handling, including material compatible with limestone and soil from the region. Particulate studies report limestone dust on the foot and knee regions with composition comparable to travertine aragonite found in Jerusalem tombs, suggesting direct contact with local stone.[14] Genetic studies of the cloth's surface DNA revealed a mixture of human haplogroups from multiple regions (including the Near East) and plant DNA reflecting contact with species typical of the Mediterranean and Middle Eastern world. The diversity indicates centuries of contact with pilgrims from broad geographic origins, but it also underlines an early Eastern context rather than an exclusively French one.[11,12] These findings do not "prove" authenticity on their own, but they are significantly at odds with a narrative in which the cloth originates as a medieval French creation without a long history in the Eastern Mediterranean. They reinforce the historical and forensic indicators of an early Eastern milieu for the cloth before its documented Western appearance. Nicolotti's analysis does not integrate this evidential block into his reconstruction.

7) Textile Structure, Aging Studies, and Radiocarbon Constraints

Nicolotti assigns decisive weight to the 1260–1390 CE radiocarbon range, treating it as chronologically conclusive and granting it near-absolute authority. This result comes from a single, localized sample and conflicts with other evidence. A balanced methodology does not discard mechanical, spectroscopic, and archaeological data to preserve a single contested radiocarbon sample. Independent textile work has shown that the sample area used in 1988 contained cotton interweaving and dye traces (including alizarin) inconsistent with the rest of the Shroud's linen, supporting the hypothesis of a medieval repair or reweaving that would bias the radiocarbon result.[29] The radiocarbon result may date the repair, not the Shroud itself. Mechanical and spectroscopic aging studies of Shroud fibers, using tensile strength, loss of elasticity, and vibrational spectroscopy (FTIR and Raman), have placed the linen within a timeframe centered between roughly 300 BCE and 400 CE.[20,21] These non-destructive methods converge with the historical and archaeological picture of a 1st-century cloth. Archaeological comparison with first-century burial textiles from Jerusalem has confirmed that a three-to-one herringbone twill of the Shroud's type fits the regional textile repertoire of the early Roman period rather than being a standard medieval Western product. Comparative textile work demonstrates the Shroud's weave is compatible with luxury textiles from the early Roman Levant; similar patterns have been found in 1st-century Jerusalem burials.[15] Radiocarbon dating remains an important tool, but in this case it must be weighed against localized repair evidence, mechanical aging data, and archaeological parallels. Treating a single corner measurement as a global verdict, while ignoring conflicting physical and historical indicators, is methodologically unbalanced. Nicolotti does not engage the technical literature that questions the representativeness of the 1988 sample.

Historical Continuity and Pre-Fourteenth-Century Witnesses

Nicolotti's historical argument rests heavily on the absence of explicit Western documentation of the Shroud before the fourteenth century. The scientific and historical literature collects Eastern and Western sources that, while not offering photographic-level descriptions, are consistent with a burial cloth bearing the full body image of Christ, known in Constantinople and referenced in liturgical and imperial texts centuries earlier.[8] Ian Wilson's analysis of the cloth's possible trajectory from Jerusalem to Edessa and then to Constantinople, before its disappearance after 1204, does not claim to "prove" identity, but it does present a historically plausible pathway for a single image-bearing cloth to move from East to West.[8] This scenario aligns naturally with the botanical and particulate indications of Eastern exposure, and with the Sudarium's independently documented presence in Spain. Nicolotti's reconstruction, by contrast, tends to treat each of these strands—pollen data, Eastern textual references, Constantinopolitan relic traditions—as isolated or irrelevant, rather than as components of a functionally integrated historical picture.

9) Conclusion: The Requirements of a Critical Approach

Nicolotti's work raises useful questions about hagiographic embellishment, legend growth, and the risks of over-reading fragmentary historical evidence. Those cautions deserve attention and reflect legitimate scholarly concerns. Yet when his medieval-icon thesis is tested against the full range of interdisciplinary data, serious deficiencies appear. Maintaining a late-medieval forgery hypothesis requires assuming:

1. **A forger accidentally reproduced the precise bloodstain patterns of the independently documented Sudarium of Oviedo.** The probability that a fourteenth-century artisan, unaware of the Sudarium preserved in Spain, created blood patterns that match it in over 120 forensic details is vanishingly small.

2. **An artist whose "paint" behaves spectroscopically and under UV imaging exactly like traumatized, clotted blood with serum halos.** The bloodstains exhibit biochemistry, clot dynamics, and UV-detectable serum separation characteristic of real biological fluids, not medieval pigments.

3. **A technique producing a sub-micron, pigment-free image encoding 3D distance data and functioning as a photographic negative centuries before photography.** The image's superficiality, lack of pigment, distance-encoded grayscale, and negative properties cannot be explained by any known medieval artistic method.

4. **A French origin for a cloth with Near Eastern pollen, dust, and textile parallels pointing to a 1st-century Eastern context.** Botanical, particulate, and textile evidence consistently points to Jerusalem and the Levant, not medieval France.

5. **A radiocarbon sample from a repaired corner is representative of the entire cloth.** Chemical evidence of medieval repair in the sample area undermines its relevance to dating the original linen.

This construction depends on a chain of coincidences and undocumented technologies that strain historical plausibility far more than the phenomenon it seeks to explain. Skepticism, in this instance, has crafted a thesis more contrived than acknowledging the object's anomalous character. A historically and scientifically responsible account of the Shroud must grapple with

these converging lines of evidence. A genuinely evidence-driven approach does not begin with the conclusion that the Shroud must be medieval. It allows the object, studied across disciplines, to define credible hypotheses. When they are considered together, the Shroud of Turin is no longer well described as a simple medieval icon; it presents instead an integrated complexity of forensic, chemical, and historical features that align far more naturally with its interpretation as an authentic first-century burial cloth from the Jerusalem milieu, bearing the marks of a unique and unexplained physical process, whose later documented history in the West begins in the fourteenth century.

References

1. Barta, C., Álvarez, R., Ordóñez, M.A., Sánchez, A., & García, J. (2015). New coincidence between Shroud of Turin and Sudarium of Oviedo. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 15. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20151500008. (Uses XRF to compare blood-stain chemistry on both cloths.)

2. Hermosilla, A.S. (2015). Commonalities between the Shroud of Turin and the Sudarium of Oviedo. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 15. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20151500007. (Documents forensic pattern and folding correspondences indicating shared use.)

3. Heller, J.H., & Adler, A.D. (1980). Blood on the Shroud of Turin. *Applied Optics*, 19(16), 2742–2744. https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.19.002742. (Spectroscopic confirmation of real blood components on linen fibers.)

4. Lucotte, G. (2015). Red Blood Cells on the Turin Shroud. *Jacobs Journal of Hematology*, 1, 1–24. https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=1869598. (Microscopic study of red cells and mineral traces on facial bloodstains.)

5. Majorana, A., Bardellini, E., Gulino, G., Conti, G., Farronato, G., & Rodella, L. (2015). The Turin Shroud face: The evidence of maxillo-facial trauma. *Folia Morphologica*, 74(2), 212–218. https://doi.org/10.5603/FM.2015.0033. (Cephalometric analysis of facial injuries.)

6. Svensson, N., & Heimburger, T. (2012). Forensic aspects and blood chemistry of the Turin Shroud Man. *Scientific Research and Essays*, 7(29), 2513–2525. https://doi.org/10.5897/SRE12.385. (Synthesizes blood chemistry consistent with crucifixion trauma.)

7. Bevilacqua, M., Fanti, G., D'Arienzo, M., et al. (2014). How was the Turin Shroud Man crucified? *Injury*, 45(Suppl 6), S142–S148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2014.10.039. (Reconstructs crucifixion posture from wound distribution.)

8. Grasso, O. (2024). *From Forensics to Faith: The Shroud of Turin's History and Authenticity Under Scrutiny*. Amazon Digital Services. Paperback (540 pages). https://www.amazon.com/dp/B0CV81QVH9 (Comprehensive examination of the Shroud of Turin covering what can be seen on the Shroud, its history, scientific examination, carbon dating, image formation, fabric and blood evidence, and biblical comparisons.)

9. Boi, M. (2017). Pollen on the Shroud of Turin: The probable trace left by anointing and embalming. *Archaeometry*, 59, 316–330. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/arcm.12269. (Identifies pollen assemblages consistent with first-century Judean rituals.)

10. Lucotte, G. (2015). Exploration of the Face of the Turin Shroud. Pollens Studied by SEM Analysis. *Archaeological Discovery*, 3(4), 158–178. https://doi.org/10.4236/ad.2015.34014. (SEM study of pollen and micro-debris on the facial area.)

11. Barcaccia, G., et al. (2015). Uncovering the sources of DNA found on the Turin Shroud. *Scientific Reports*, 5, 14484. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep14484. (Analyzes human and plant DNA diversity on the cloth.)

12. Barcaccia, G., et al. (2021). Author Correction: Uncovering the sources of DNA found on the Turin Shroud. *Scientific Reports*, 11, 6971. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350300426_Author_Correction_Uncovering_the_sources_of_DNA_found_on_the_Turin_Shroud. (Clarifies DNA origin and handling in the 2015 study.)

13. Lucotte, G. (2016). Hematite, Biotite and Cinnabar on the Face of the Turin Shroud: Microscopy and SEM-EDX Analysis. *Open Journal of Applied Sciences*, 6, 601–625. https://doi.org/10.4236/ojapps.2016.69061. (Describes mineral inclusions and surface contaminants.)

14. Calliari, I., & Canovaro, C. (2015). Analysis of micro-particles vacuumed from the Turin Shroud. *MATEC Web of Conferences*, 36. https://www.matec-conferences.org/articles/matecconf/pdf/2015/17/matecconf_wopsas2015_03002.pdf. (Characterizes dust, fibers, and environmental particles from the cloth.)

15. Shamir, O. (2015). A burial textile from the first century CE in Jerusalem compared to Roman textiles in the land of Israel and the Turin Shroud. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 15. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20151500010. (Compares Shroud weave to dated regional textiles.)

16. Fanti, G. (2015). Introductory Paper: Scientific Results on the Turin Shroud Coming from a Paduan University Research Project. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 15. https://www.matec-conferences.org/articles/matecconf/abs/2015/17/matecconf_wopsas2015_00001/matecconf_wopsas2015_00001.html. (Overviews multi-spectral and mechanical investigations on the Shroud.)

17. Heller, J.H., & Adler, A.D. (1981). A Chemical Investigation of the Shroud of Turin. *Canadian Society Forensic Science Journal*, 14(3), 81–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/00085030.1981.10756882. (Establishes that the body image is due to altered cellulose rather than pigment.)

18. Miller, V.D., & Pellicori, S.F. (1981). Ultraviolet Fluorescence Photography of the Shroud of Turin. *Journal of Biological Photography*, 49(3), 71–85. https://www.shroud.com/pdfs/UV%20Fluorescence%20Miller%20Pellicori%201981%20OCRsm.pdf. (Uses UV imaging to distinguish blood from body image and reveal serum halos.)

19. Pellicori, S. (2020). UV fluorescence imagery of the Turin Shroud – digitally revisited. *International Journal of Archaeology*, 8(2), 32–36. https://www.academia.edu/44363706. (Re-examines UV fluorescence data with digital enhancements.)

20. Fanti, G., & Basso, R. (2017). Mechanical Characterization of Linen Fibers: The Turin Shroud Dating. *International Journal of Reliability, Quality and Safety Engineering*, 24(2), 1750006. https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218539317500061. (Uses tensile testing to estimate an age window for Shroud fibers.)

21. Fanti, G., et al. (2013). Non-destructive dating of ancient flax textiles by vibrational spectroscopy. *Vibrational Spectroscopy*, 67, 61–70.https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0924203113000490. (Applies FTIR/Raman methods to estimate textile ages.)

22. Gilbert, R., & Gilbert, M. (1980). Ultraviolet-visible reflectance and fluorescence spectra of the Shroud of Turin. *Applied Optics*, 19(12), 1930–1936. https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.19.001930. (Shows absence of conventional pigments in the body image.)

23. Di Lazzaro, P., et al. (2012). Superficial and Shroud-like coloration of linen by short laser pulses in the vacuum ultraviolet. *Applied Optics*, 51(36), 8567–8578. https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.51.008567. (Explores UV-laser-induced superficial discoloration as a partial analogue.)

24. Jackson, J.P., Jumper, E.J., & Ercoline, W.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. https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.23.002244. (Demonstrates distance-encoded grayscale behavior of the image.)

25. Shroud.com Research Library. https://www.shroud.com/library.htm. (Repository of STURP reports and related 3D-analysis work.)

26. Baldacchini, G., et al. (2010). Deep Ultraviolet Radiation Simulates the Turin Shroud Image. *Journal of Imaging Science and Technology*, 54(4), 040302. https://doi.org/10.2352/J.ImagingSci.Technol.2010.54.4.040302. (Experiments with DUV radiation on linen as a partial physical analogue.)

27. Bucklin, R. (1982). The Shroud of Turin: A Pathologist's Viewpoint. Legal Medicine Annual, 33-39..https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3645465. (Pathological assessment of injuries visible on the Shroud image.)

28. Lavoie, G.R. (2019). Rigor mortis and body position on the Shroud of Turin. *Forensic Science and Technology*, 5(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.17352/pjfst.000027. (Analyzes rigor mortis and posture in relation to crucifixion.)

29. Rogers, R.N. (2005). Studies on the radiocarbon sample from the Shroud of Turin. *Thermochimica Acta*, 425(1–2), 189–194. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0040603104004745. (Provides chemical evidence that the C-14 sample region differs from the main cloth, consistent with repair.)