The Loom Controversy — Nicolotti's Challenge and the Textile Debate

Author: Otangelo Grasso, *written with the support and assistance of AI tools.*
Affiliation: Independent researcher, Aracaju, SE, Brazil
Correspondence: email: otangelograsso@gmail.com
ORCID: Orcid ID: 0009-0005-6942-0593
Date: February 2026

Turin, Italy. A thread is never just a thread.

Among the many scientific disputes surrounding the Shroud of Turin, few have cut as deeply—or as uncomfortably for those who argue for its antiquity—as Andrea Nicolotti's analysis of the cloth itself. Not an argument about iconography, not a theological dispute, not even a challenge to the radiocarbon dating protocols, Nicolotti's critique operates at a more fundamental level. It concerns the mechanical logic of weaving, the silent grammar of warp and weft that any textile encodes at its moment of creation. His claim is not that the Shroud merely "looks medieval" to the untrained eye. His claim is that the cloth's weaving technology—the specific pattern of its defects, the rhythm of its errors—points to a medieval loom. This is not an argument about belief. It is an argument about looms.

1) The Evidence in the Threads

Let us begin with what is not contested. The Shroud of Turin is a linen cloth, woven from flax fibers, measuring approximately 4.4 meters in length and 1.1 meters in width. Its weave is a three-to-one chevron, or herringbone, twill—a pattern in which each weft thread passes over three warp threads and then under one, reversing direction at regular intervals to create the characteristic zigzag. The yarn itself is spun with a Z-twist, meaning that the fibers were twisted clockwise during spinning, a detail that textile historians note as typical of Mediterranean workmanship.[1]

These facts are accepted by all parties. The controversy begins with something far more subtle: the presence of repeated, systematic errors in the weaving pattern. First documented in detail by the French textile expert Gabriel Vial in his 1989 study for the Centre International d'Étude des Textiles Anciens, these defects appear as structured interruptions in the chevron sequence.[2] Every five threads or so, the expected pattern inverts at the wrong moment, creating a mechanical "stutter" in the loom's rhythm. These are not the random irregularities one might expect from an ancient hand-loomed fabric; they are recurring, patterned, and, crucially, they preserve information about the machine that produced them.

It was the Belgian textile structural analyst Daniël De Jonghe who first recognized what these errors might signify. In his research published in the Bulletin de l'Institut Royal du Patrimoine Artistique, De Jonghe demonstrated that such inversion patterns correspond to a specific warp-threading configuration known in French weaving terminology as *rimettaggio saltuario*—skip threading. This is not a universal feature of looms. It is a particular method of arranging the warp threads on the harnesses, and it carries historical associations: with multi-harness looms, with pedal-operated mechanisms, and with the sophisticated weaving practices that emerged in medieval Europe.

The reasoning here unfolds with the precision of a forensic reconstruction. The defect pattern implies a specific threading method. That threading method implies a particular type of loom. And that loom type, in turn, carries chronological implications. A loom leaves fingerprints. Defects preserve process memory. The question is whether those fingerprints point to first-century Judea or to thirteenth-century France.



2) Nicolotti's Inference

Andrea Nicolotti, a professor of church history at the University of Turin, synthesized these textile observations into a coherent and unsettling argument. In his 2018 study *La Sindone di Torino in quanto tessuto: analisi storica, tecnica, comparativa*, and in subsequent publications, he proposed that the Shroud's defect architecture implies weaving on a four-licci loom with pedals—specifically, a horizontal treadle loom equipped with four shafts.[4]

The historical context is crucial here. Pedal-operated looms, which freed both of the weaver's hands and allowed for more complex patterns, became widespread in Europe only during the medieval period. The horizontal treadle loom with multiple shafts is believed to have reached the Mediterranean area after the fourth century, having arrived from China via trade routes, and was introduced to European weaving centers by artisans in the thirteenth century. There is no secure archaeological or documentary evidence for such technology in first-century Judea, where the available evidence points to simpler, vertical warp-weighted looms or ground looms capable of producing only basic weaves.

Thus emerges Nicolotti's controversial conclusion: the Shroud's weaving mechanics are consistent with medieval technology.[1] If correct, this argument would bypass entirely the debates over carbon dating contamination or the possibility of artistic forgery. It would not matter whether the image was painted or produced by some unknown chemical process; the method of manufacture indicated by the cloth's defects would point to a medieval origin. The threads would testify against antiquity through the mechanical signature of their production.

What gives Nicolotti's critique its particular weight is its grounding in textile engineering rather than stylistic judgment. He is not saying that herringbone weave looks medieval, which would be a subjective assessment easily dismissed. He is saying that the specific pattern of mechanical errors in the weave points to a particular type of loom, and that type of loom is not attested in the first-century Mediterranean world. It is an argument from mechanical causation, not aesthetic impression.

3) The Sindonologist Response

Authenticity-leaning researchers have not ignored Nicolotti's challenge. But their rebuttals, while vigorous, tend not to deny the observations themselves so much as to challenge the chain of inference that leads from those observations to a medieval date. The debate is less about what the Shroud's defects are than about what they can legitimately prove.

The first line of defense comes from textile specialists who caution against over-interpreting weaving defects as chronological markers. Mechthild Flury-Lemberg, the Swiss textile conservator who led the 2002 restoration of the Shroud, has stated plainly that "it is impossible to get a serious result dating a textile by textile analysis alone."[5] Ancient weaving practices were far more variable than the limited surviving evidence might suggest. The textile record is fragmentary and biased toward simpler fabrics, which were more common and thus more likely to be preserved. Complex weaves may have existed in antiquity without leaving archaeological traces, simply because they were rarer and less likely to survive the millennia.

This argument from absence cuts both ways, of course. The lack of evidence for complex looms in first-century Judea does not prove they did not exist, but neither does it prove they did. Sindonologists point to experimental archaeology as a way of testing what ancient looms could

actually accomplish. Studies of warp-weighted looms and vertical two-beam looms have demonstrated that complex twills, including chevron patterns, can be woven without pedals, though with greater difficulty and slower speed.[6] The question is not whether such weaves are theoretically possible on ancient looms, but whether the specific, regular defects seen in the Shroud would predictably arise from those methods.

A more fundamental challenge concerns the diagnostic exclusivity of the error pattern itself. Is the five-thread inversion error uniquely characteristic of pedal-loom weaving? Critics argue that comparative textile defect databases remain too limited to support such a strong claim. Similar irregularities might arise from other causes entirely: tension shifts during weaving, variations in yarn thickness, or even manual correction attempts by an experienced weaver working on a simpler loom. Without exhaustive mapping of the Shroud's defects—a project still restricted by limited access to high-resolution imaging—statistical certainty remains elusive.

Nicolotti himself acknowledges this limitation. Researchers have never been granted unrestricted access to the Shroud for the kind of detailed textile analysis that would be required to fully document the frequency, distribution, and consistency of its weaving errors. The error distribution has not been comprehensively published; frequency analysis remains incomplete; the relationship between local irregularities and systemic patterns is unresolved. Incomplete observation necessarily weakens any deterministic conclusion drawn from that observation.

There is also the question of alternative explanations for the defects. The Shroud has endured a long and violent history: the 1532 fire that scorched its corners, centuries of folding and unfolding for exhibitions, multiple moves between custodians, and at least one documented attempt at repair by Poor Clare nuns following the fire. Could later interventions have introduced or altered the pattern of defects? Yarn slippage over centuries, distortions from reweaving, mechanical stresses from rolling—all these might complicate the attribution of any observed irregularity solely to original manufacture.

Pro-authenticity researchers also point to the discovery of first-century burial cloths from Jerusalem, such as the wool textile from the Ben Hinnom Valley (Akeldama), which demonstrate different weaves than the Shroud's complex herringbone pattern. One such shroud, dated to the first century CE, was made of wool with Z-spun threads, suggesting possible importation from Greece or Italy where Z-spinning was the norm.[7] That these discovered shrouds show simpler weaves suggests that cloths like the Turin Shroud were not typical of the period. But authenticity proponents argue that wealthy individuals—and Joseph of Arimathea is described in the gospels as a rich man—might have afforded superior textiles imported from elsewhere in the Roman Empire. The discovery of a single first-century Jerusalem burial shroud with a simpler weave tells us what was common, not what was possible.

Flury-Lemberg herself has noted that the Shroud's three-to-one herringbone pattern was "special in antiquity because it denoted an extraordinary quality" and that this same pattern appears on a twelfth-century illustration depicting Christ's funeral cloth—"extremely significant, because it shows that the painter was familiar with Christ's Shroud and that he recognized the indubitably exceptional nature of the weave of the cloth."[5] She also identified a peculiar stitching pattern in the seam of one long side of the Shroud, where a three-inch wide strip of the same original fabric was sewn onto a larger segment. This stitching pattern, she argues, is surprisingly similar to the hem of a cloth found in the tombs of the Jewish fortress of

Masada, dating to between 40 BC and 73 AD—a stitch pattern she maintains has never been found in medieval Europe.[5]

Critics, however, challenge this comparison. The Masada textile in question is a wool fragment with a 2:2 balanced diamond twill, not linen with a 3:1 herringbone pattern, and its relevance to the Shroud's seam has been disputed by textile historians who note that the stitching pattern described may be a standard seam for joining pieces of cloth. The debate over the Masada parallel illustrates how even seemingly straightforward comparisons can become contested ground.

Ultimately, authenticity proponents insist that textile analysis must be integrated with other evidence streams. The Shroud is not merely a textile; it is also a forensic record, a chemical puzzle, a historical document, and a devotional object. No single discipline, they argue, can adjudicate its age in isolation. The loom argument must be weighed alongside the ongoing debates over the presence of pigments, the composition of the blood stains, the anatomical precision of the wounds, the three-dimensional encoding of the image, and the unresolved questions surrounding the radiocarbon dating. Each piece of evidence constrains the others, and only in their totality can a coherent picture emerge.



A hyper-realistic reconstruction of a first-century Judean textile workshop, showing artisans spinning flax and weaving linen on vertical looms. Sunlight filters through a small window, illuminating clay loom weights, hanging skeins of yarn, and partially woven fabric displaying a subtle herringbone pattern, capturing the atmosphere of ancient handcrafted textile production.

4) The Limits of Textile Dating

What, then, are we to make of Nicolotti's argument? Even his critics acknowledge its technical sophistication and methodological legitimacy. It is not a facile argument; it engages seriously with the material properties of the object and the historical development of weaving technology. Its strength lies in raising a serious challenge that any comprehensive account of the Shroud must address.

Its weakness lies in the assumption of exclusivity—the claim that this particular pattern of defects could only have arisen from this particular type of loom at this particular historical moment. Textile archaeology rarely yields calendar dates. It yields probability landscapes, regions of greater and lesser likelihood within which a given artifact might be situated. The Shroud's weaving defects shift the probability landscape toward the medieval period, but they do not settle the matter with the certainty that Nicolotti's rhetoric sometimes suggests.

There is also the question of what we do not know about ancient textile production. The archaeological record for first-century Judean weaving is sparse, consisting mainly of fragments from Masada, the Cave of Letters, and a few other sites. These show a range of weaves, but they also show quality textile production. The historian of technology must reckon with the possibility that the full range of ancient weaving capabilities is not represented in the surviving evidence—that workshops in Jerusalem or elsewhere may have produced structures now archaeologically invisible, either because they were rare or because they have not survived.

Nicolotti's response to this objection is characteristically blunt: the absence of evidence for complex looms in first-century Judea, combined with the positive evidence for their emergence in medieval Europe, creates a strong probabilistic case. The burden of proof, he argues, lies with those who would claim the existence of technology for which no evidence exists. Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence, and the claim that first-century weavers possessed pedal looms capable of producing herringbone twill with systematic skip-threading defects is extraordinary indeed.

5) The Deeper Implication

The loom controversy reveals something profound about the Shroud debate as a whole. Science does not merely test the cloth; science interrogates its manufacture, its process memory, its mechanical biography. Every thread carries information about the hands and machines that shaped it. Every defect is a fossilized gesture, a moment of weaverly decision or mechanical constraint preserved across centuries.

If Nicolotti is correct, the Shroud's threads remember medieval pedals. They encode the rhythm of a treadle loom operated by a thirteenth-century Flemish artisan, not a first-century Jewish craftsman. The cloth itself becomes a witness for the prosecution, testifying against its own antiquity through the silent language of its errors.

If his critics are correct, the threads remember something older—and the loom argument becomes another case of technological overconfidence, another instance of scholars mistaking the limits of their knowledge for the limits of the past. The defects might then be read not as chronological markers but as evidence of something else entirely: the skill of ancient weavers,

the variability of pre-industrial production, the complexity of a textile tradition we have only begun to understand.

This is the pattern that repeats across every dimension of Shroud research. Evidence is gathered, inferences are drawn, conclusions are asserted, and counter-inferences are offered in return. The object itself remains silent, yielding its secrets only through the interpretive frameworks we bring to it. And those frameworks are shaped by assumptions—about what is possible, what is probable, what counts as proof—that are themselves contested.

6) The Unanswered Questions

Several questions remain unresolved in the loom controversy, and they point toward the kind of research that might eventually settle it. The first concerns access. Full, high-resolution documentation of the Shroud's weave structure, with comprehensive mapping of every defect across the entire cloth, would provide the data needed to test Nicolotti's claims rigorously. Such documentation does not yet exist, and it is unclear whether the Shroud's custodians will ever permit it.

The second concerns comparative databases. A systematic survey of weaving defects in securely dated textiles from antiquity through the medieval period would establish a baseline against which the Shroud's pattern could be assessed. Such surveys exist for some periods and regions, but they are far from complete. The work of building them continues, and the Shroud's place in the resulting probability landscape may shift as more data accumulate.

The third concerns experimental reconstruction. If skilled weavers working on reconstructed ancient looms could reproduce the Shroud's defect pattern, Nicolotti's inference would be seriously weakened. If they cannot, it would be strengthened. Such experiments have been attempted, but they remain limited in scope and have not produced consensus.

Until these questions are answered, the loom controversy will remain exactly that—a controversy, a live debate among qualified specialists who interpret the same evidence in different ways. And that is perhaps the most important lesson the Shroud has to teach: that honest inquiry can lead reasonable people to different conclusions, and that the mystery of an object does not diminish the value of studying it.

7) The Silent Witness

The Shroud's textile remains an ambiguous witness. Its weave speaks of skill and precision, of patterns carefully executed across a fabric fourteen feet long. Its defects whisper of mechanical constraints, of looms and their limitations, of the stubborn materiality that underlies all human making. Its interpretation divides scholars who share the same evidence and the same commitment to truth.

And like all enduring forensic puzzles, the disagreement does not arise from lack of evidence. It arises from competing models of what evidence can legitimately prove, from different assessments of probability and possibility, from the irreducible gap between observation and inference that characterizes all historical reconstruction. The Shroud is not unique in this respect. It is simply an extreme case—an object so charged with meaning, so weighted with expectation, that every thread becomes a battlefield.

Perhaps this is what it means for an object to be an interface: not a bridge between opposing views, but the ground on which they meet and contend. The Shroud sits at the crossroads of science and faith, history and materiality, trauma and representation. Its threads connect us to a moment of extreme human suffering, and to the millennia of veneration, investigation, and debate that have followed. Whatever else it may be, it is certainly that: a thread connecting past and present, a fabric that refuses to yield its secret, a silent witness to the human need to know.

References

1. Nicolotti, A. (2018). *La Sindone di Torino in quanto tessuto: analisi storica, tecnica, comparativa*. In *Non solum circulatorum ludo similia*. Amazon KDP. Link. (Comprehensive textile-technical critique arguing that weaving defects and loom mechanics are consistent with medieval manufacture, drawing on detailed analysis of the Shroud's weave structure and comparative evidence from medieval textile production.)

2. Vial, G. (1989). *The Shroud of Turin: A Technical Study*. CIETA Bulletin 67. Link. (Foundational textile examination documenting the Shroud's weave structure and inversion irregularities, conducted under the auspices of the Centre International d'Étude des Textiles Anciens with detailed microscopic analysis.)

4. Nicolotti, A. (2025). Unraveling the Myths Surrounding the Shroud of Turin. *Skeptic*, 30(2). Link. (Comprehensive critique of Shroud authenticity claims synthesizing textile analysis, historical documentation, and radiocarbon evidence into a coherent argument for medieval origin.)

5. Flury-Lemberg, M. (2002). Interview: Secrets of the Dead — Shroud of Christ? *PBS*. Link. (First-hand account by the conservator who led the 2002 restoration, discussing the Shroud's weave, the Masada stitch comparison, and the limits of textile dating.)

6. Olsen, A. M. (2020). The Shroud of Turin and the Extra Sheds of Warping Threads. *EXARC Journal*, Issue 2020/4. Link.(Experimental archaeology study demonstrating the feasibility of weaving complex twill patterns, including chevrons, on warp-weighted and vertical looms without pedal mechanisms.)

7. 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, 00010. Link. (Archaeological study of a first-century Jerusalem burial shroud, documenting its wool composition, Z-spun threads, and implications for understanding textile production in the region.)