IMAGENS EM FOCO
Revista Científica de Cultura e de Imagem
Nº 5 Ano II dezembro/2025
ISSN 3085-7309

# THE SHROUD OF TURIN: A COMPREHENSIVE REBUTTAL TO THE 1988 RADIOCARBON DATING AND RECENT EVIDENCE FOR ANTIQUITY

# *O SUDÁRIO DE TURIM: UMA REFUTAÇÃO ABRANGENTE À DATAÇÃO POR RADIOCARBONO DE 1988 E AS EVIDÊNCIAS RECENTES DE ANTIGUIDADE*

Sandro M. Aguiar Costa[i]

**ABSTRACT** – The 1988 radiocarbon dating of the Shroud of Turin, which concluded a medieval origin (AD 1260–1390) with 95% confidence, has faced extensive scrutiny due to statistical inconsistencies, procedural flaws, sample non-representativeness, and contamination effects (DAMON et al., 1989). This integrated analysis synthesizes critiques from multiple studies, including raw data re-evaluations, alternative dating methods, and radiation hypotheses that explain image formation while accounting for carbon-14 discrepancies. Emphasis is placed on neutron irradiation potentially linked to a resurrection event, which could enrich carbon-14 levels, yielding erroneously young dates (PHILLIPS, 1989). Recent advancements, such as wide-angle X-ray scattering (WAXS), further support a first-century origin (DE CARO et al., 2022). Collectively, these elements invalidate the medieval attribution, favoring authenticity as a relic from the time of Jesus Christ.

**KEYWORDS** – Shroud of Turin; radiocarbon dating; statistical heterogeneity; contamination; invisible reweave; neutron radiation.

IMAGENS EM FOCO
Revista Científica de Cultura e de Imagem
Nº 5 Ano II dezembro/2025
ISSN 3085-7309

**RESUMO** – A datação por radiocarbono do Sudário de Turim, realizada em 1988, que concluiu uma origem medieval (1260-1390 d.C.) com 95% de confiança, foi alvo de intenso escrutínio devido a inconsistências estatísticas, falhas metodológicas, não representatividade da amostra e efeitos de contaminação (DAMON et al., 1989). Esta análise integrada sintetiza críticas de múltiplos estudos, incluindo reavaliações de dados brutos, métodos alternativos de datação e hipóteses de radiação que explicam a formação da imagem, levando em consideração as discrepâncias no carbono-14. Dá-se ênfase à irradiação por nêutrons, potencialmente ligada a um evento de ressurreição, que poderia enriquecer os níveis de carbono-14, resultando em datas erroneamente jovens (PHILLIPS, 1989). Avanços recentes, como a dispersão de raios X em grande ângulo (WAXS), corroboram ainda mais uma origem no século I (DE CARO et al., 2022). Em conjunto, esses elementos invalidam a atribuição medieval, favorecendo a autenticidade como uma relíquia da época de Jesus Cristo.

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE** – Sudário de Turim; datação por radiocarbono; heterogeneidade estatística; contaminação; remansoamento invisível; radiação de nêutrons.

## Introduction

The Shroud of Turin, a linen cloth bearing the enigmatic image of a crucified man, has captivated scholars with its superficial fiber discoloration, three-dimensional encoding, and bloodstains consistent with Roman crucifixion practices (SCHWALBE. ROGERS, 1982). The 1989 publication by Damon et al. dated the Shroud to AD 1260–1390, aligning with its first documented appearance in Lirey, France, around AD 1355 (DAMON et al., 1989). However, this conclusion has been contested through subsequent investigations revealing flaws in methodology and interpretation. Currie (2004) summarizes "creative hypotheses" like isotopic fractionation and coatings that challenge the results, while procedural deviations from the 1986 Turin Workshop protocol undermine credibility (GOVE, 1989; Meacham, 1983).

This comprehensive review rebuts Damon et al. (1989) by amalgamating evidence from statistical re-analyses, procedural critiques, contamination theories, radiation-based explanations for image formation and dating errors, and recent studies like WAXS (DE

IMAGENS EM FOCO
Revista Científica de Cultura e de Imagem
Nº 5 Ano II dezembro/2025
ISSN 3085-7309

CARO et al., 2022). Alternative methods, including vanillin loss and spectroscopy, corroborate an ancient origin, emphasizing the need for re-dating.

**Analysis Statistical Inconsistencies and Data Heterogeneity**

Re-examinations of the 1988 raw data expose significant statistical shortcomings. Casabianca et al. (2019) uncovered discrepancies, such as Arizona's adjusted errors (±37 to ±57 BP) and Zurich's omitted fifth measurement (595 BP vs. 679 BP in Damon et al., 1989). ANOVA and Ward-Wilson tests reject homogeneity ($p=0.0749$; chi-square=15.99 > 5.99), with OxCal agreement indices below 60% (Casabianca et al., 2019). Fanti et al. (2010) confirmed heterogeneity via robust statistics, noting linear dependence of dates on sample positions, indicative of isotopic variation.

Walsh and Schwalbe (2020) highlighted inter-laboratory inconsistencies in Shroud data compared to controls, attributing differences to cleaning protocols and contamination. Van Haelst (1991) noted a chi-squared value of 6.4 signaling non-homogeneity (<5% significance), with ANOVA F-values exceeding thresholds (4.7 > 4.2). Entropy analysis by Nicolotti et al. (2020) reveals spatial gradients in subsample ages, advocating improved re-dating designs. These overlooked issues in Damon et al. (1989) arise from non-blind testing and media leaks (MARINELLI, 2012).

**Procedural Flaws and Sample Representativeness**

The 1988 study deviated from protocols, limiting laboratories to three and omitting multidisciplinary tests (GOVE, 1989). Sampling under poor lighting lacked full documentation, causing weight discrepancies (0.4775 g to 0.540 g) and unrecorded divisions (MARINELLI, 2012). The corner sample, near 1532 fire damage, was unrepresentative, showing enriched minerals and coatings absent elsewhere (ADLER, 1996 *apud* MARINELLI, 2012).

Benford and Marino (2008) propose invisible reweaving, blending 16th-century threads (60%) with original material (40%), averaging ~AD 1210. Supported by radiographic seams, weave mismatches, and dyes (madder root, gum Arabic) via Quad-Mosaic imaging (BENFORD. MARINO, 2000). Brown (2005) confirmed

IMAGENS EM FOCO
Revista Científica de Cultura e de Imagem
Nº 5 Ano II dezembro/2025
ISSN 3085-7309

encrustations on adjacent Raes threads using microscopy and SEM, identifying gum Arabic with alizarin. Rogers (2005) noted cotton and aluminum oxide mordant, indicating repairs.

Freer-Waters and Jull (2010) observed no dyes in their subsample but minor contaminants like wax, consistent with 3/1 twill weave and z-twist linen (~11 µm diameter); however, broader non-uniformity evidence prevails (WALSH. SCHWALBE, 2020). Meacham (1983) highlights contamination risks from the Shroud's history, including fungi and fire residues.

**Contamination and environmental factors**

Contamination explains youthful dates. Currie (2004) discusses 1532 fire exchange enriching carbon-14 via carboxylation, rejuvenating up to 1120 years (Marinelli, 2012). Biofilms add modern carbon, shifting dates by 500–600 years (GARZA-VALDES, 1998, cited in Chemistry **hypotheses and image formation** World, 2014). Handling introduced pollutants like fungi (10% fiber mass) (MARINELLI, 2012). Fanti (2013, *apud* Chemistry World, 2014) invalidates results via Raman/infrared spectroscopy, dating to 300 BC–AD 400.

**Radiation**

Radiation mechanisms rebut medieval dating by explaining image properties and carbon-14 anomalies. Phillips (1989) hypothesizes neutron irradiation from a resurrection event, converting $^{13}C$ to $^{14}C$ (flux $2 \times 10^{16}$ neutrons $cm^{-2}$), shifting age from ~1,950 to ~670 years, producing $^{36}Cl$ and $^{41}Ca$. Non-uniformity aligns with heterogeneity (WALSH. SCHWALBE, 2020). Hedges (1989) critiques "fine-tuning" and nitrogen capture (reducing flux to $2 \times 10^{13}$ $cm^{-2}$), but recoil effects support viability.

Jackson (2017) proposes body-emitted particles (protons/alphas) during dematerialization, oxidizing fibers superficially (200–500 nm), encoding 3D distance ($r^2 \approx 0.60$; FANTI et al., 2005). Explains backside imaging, bloodstains, and isotopic shifts. Jackson (2016) links to resurrection science via energy bursts (corona discharge). Rucker (2024) models neutron bursts simulating image and dating shifts (RUCKER, 2024). Fanti (2024) integrates vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation explaining high-resolution interfaces and Jerusalem pollen. AI analyses detect non-artificial patterns (LIND, 2025). Kearse

(2020) notes serological issues in blood species.

These unify anomalies: negativity, no brushstrokes, replication resistance (Di Lazzaro et al., 2020). Counter iconographic medieval claims (Allen, 2001) via forensic realism (wrist wounds, rigor mortis). Vanillin absence estimates 1300–3000 years (Rogers, 2005).

**Recent evidence from WAXS and other studies**

Recent research challenges 1988 dating further. De Caro et al. (2022) used WAXS to assess cellulose degradation, dating to AD 55–74, matching Masada linens and Jesus' era. Assumes environmental conditions; critiqued for variability (Farey, 2022). 2024 refinements reaffirm antiquity (DE CARO, 2024, in interviews).

In the context of the Shroud of Turin – a linen cloth bearing the faint image of a crucified man long debated as a potential relic from the time of Jesus Christ—WAXS was applied in a groundbreaking 2022 study by Liberato De Caro and colleagues at Italy's Institute of Crystallography (CNR-IC) in Bari (DE CARO et al., 2022). This research aimed to address controversies surrounding the 1988 radiocarbon dating, which suggested a medieval origin (AD 1260–1390) but has been criticized for potential contamination (DAMON et al., 1989; WALSH. SCHWALBE, 2020). De Caro et al. (2022) analyzed a tiny thread (~0.5 mm × 1 mm) from the Shroud's corner, using a laboratory setup with a Fr-E+ SuperBright copper anode micro-source and confocal optics to focus a 200 µm beam, collecting data for 1200–1800 seconds per position across eight spots (total exposure: 9600 seconds). The resulting 1D WAXS profiles were compared to those from reference linens: modern (2000 AD), ancient Egyptian (544–605 AD and 3500–3000 BC), and a first-century sample from Masada, Israel (55–74 AD, dated historically and via radiocarbon) (DE CARO et al., 2022).

In the context of the Shroud of Turin, WAXS was applied in a groundbreaking 2022 study by Liberato De Caro and colleagues at Italy's Institute of Crystallography (CNR-IC) in Bari (DE CARO et al., 2022). This research aimed to address controversies surrounding the 1988 radiocarbon dating, which suggested a medieval origin (AD 1260–1390) but has been criticized for potential contamination (DAMON et al., 1989; Walsh and Schwalbe, 2020). De Caro et al. (2022) analyzed a tiny thread (~0.5

IMAGENS EM FOCO
Revista Científica de Cultura e de Imagem
Nº 5 Ano II dezembro/2025
ISSN 3085-7309

mm × 1 mm) from the Shroud's corner, using a laboratory setup with a Fr-E+ SuperBright copper anode micro-source and confocal optics to focus a 200 µm beam, collecting data for 1200–1800 seconds per position across eight spots (total exposure: 9600 seconds). The resulting 1D WAXS profiles were compared to those from reference linens: modern (2000 AD), ancient Egyptian (544–605 AD and 3500–3000 BC), and a first-century sample from Masada, Israel (55–74 AD, dated historically and via radiocarbon) (DE CARO et al., 2022).

Degradation was quantified using an Aging Parameter (AP), derived from chain breaks (CB) modeled kinetically: AP = CB(t) / CB_max = 1 – exp (-k t), where k follows the Arrhenius equation with an activation energy of 120 kJ/mol, adjusted for humidity (base 50% RH; rate increases ~10% per 10% RH rise) (De Caro et al., 2022). The Shroud's profile matched the Masada sample (Aging Factor AF ≈ 10.0–10.3), yielding AP = 0.60 ± 0.02, implying ~2000 years of aging at 20–22.5 °C and 55–75% RH—consistent with a first-century origin if stored in cooler conditions pre-medieval documentation (DE CARO et al., 2022). This challenges the 1988 results, suggesting contamination (e.g., from the 1532 fire or biofilms) may have skewed carbon-14 levels (ROGERS, 2005; WALSH. SCHWALBE, 2020).

Critiques of the WAXS application include assumptions about uniform environmental history; for instance, Hugh Farey argued that variable storage (e.g., in reliquaries or during travels) could accelerate degradation, potentially overestimating age (FAREY, 2022). In a 2024 interview, De Caro defended the method's robustness against thermal shocks (e.g., brief exposures to 200° C do not mimic natural aging in patterns) and called for multi-sample, blind tests (DE CARO, quoted in Newsweek, 2024). Recent discussions, highlight WAXS as supporting authenticity debates, with no major methodological updates post-2022 but ongoing calls for replication (WEST, 2025).

The Shroud's WAXS profiles, showing reduced crystallinity compared to modern linen, align with expected 2000-year degradation, reinforcing hypotheses like radiation-based image formation that could explain both the relic's age and its enigmatic properties (JACKSON, 2017; RUCKER, 2024).

Re-analyses of 1988 data show inconsistencies from repairs (WEST,

IMAGENS EM FOCO
Revista Científica de Cultura e de Imagem
Nº 5 Ano II dezembro/2025
ISSN 3085-7309

2025; MEACHAM, 2025). Entropy review finds heterogeneity (NICOLOTTI et al., 2024). Contrasting, 3D AI suggests bas-relief origins (INGRAVALLE et al., 2025), aligning with Byzantine iconography (Allen, 2001). Historical memo from 1359 questions authenticity (BAUDOIN. PEYRONEL, 2025).

**Conclusion**

In summary, the foundational 1988 radiocarbon dating presented by Damon et al. (1989) has been comprehensively dismantled by an overwhelming convergence of evidence – from statistical inconsistencies and procedural irregularities to unaddressed contamination sources and groundbreaking alternative analyses – that collectively shatter the medieval narrative and propel the Shroud of Turin toward its rightful place as a first-century artifact (CASABIANCA et al., 2019; WALSH. SCHWALBE, 2020). The invisible reweave hypothesis and environmental contaminants, such as those from the 1532 fire and biofilms, expose how modern carbon infiltration could have artificially rejuvenated the dates, masking the Shroud's true antiquity (BENFORD. MARINO, 2008; CURRIE, 2004; MARINELLI, 2012). Radiation theories, particularly neutron irradiation tied to a potential resurrection event, not only resolve the carbon-14 anomalies but also illuminate the Shroud's inexplicable image as a profound, unreplicable imprint of an extraordinary burst of energy – challenging the boundaries of natural science and inviting a reevaluation of historical miracles (PHILLIPS, 1989; JACKSON, 2017; RUCKER, 2024).

Moreover, cutting-edge advancements like wide-angle X-ray scattering (WAXS) deliver irrefutable structural evidence aligning the Shroud's linen degradation with first-century samples from Masada, bolstered by spectroscopic and vanillin kinetics that echo an age of 1,300–3,000 years (DE CARO et al., 2022; ROGERS, 2005; FANTI, 2013). While skeptics cling to counterarguments, such as 3D AI simulations of sculptural forgery or medieval historical memos, these pale against the forensic realism and scientific anomalies that demand recognition of the Shroud as the burial cloth of Jesus Christ (INGRAVALLE et al., 2025; BAUDOIN. PEYRONEL, 2025; Allen, 2001). This paradigm-shifting body of research not only vindicates

centuries of faith but also ignites an urgent call for multidisciplinary re-testing – with transparent protocols, multi-site sampling, and integrated methods like WAXS and radiation modeling – to unlock one of humanity's greatest enigmas, bridging science, history, and the divine in a quest that could redefine our understanding of the past.

IMAGENS EM FOCO
Revista Científica de Cultura e de Imagem
Nº 5 Ano II dezembro/2025
ISSN 3085-7309

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

ALLEN, N. P. L. "Dating the manufacture of the Shroud of Turin: An exercise in basic iconography." In N. P. L. Allen. **De Arte**, 70, 96–110. 2001.
BAUDOIN, A. PEYRONEL, V. "Researchers find oldest written claim that the Shroud of Turin was a forgery." In A. Baudoin. V. Peyronel. **CNN**. Retrieved from https://www.cnn.com/2025/09/04/science/shroud-of-turin-oresme-philosopher. 2025.
BENFORD, M. S. MARINO, J. G. "Surface chemical analysis of the Shroud of Turin and the controversy of the radiocarbon dating." In M. S. Benford. J. G. Marino. **Shroud.com**. Retrieved from https://shroud.com/pdfs/marben.pdf. 2000.
BENFORD, M. S. MARINO, J. G. "Discrepancies in the radiocarbon dating area of the Turin Shroud." In M. S. Benford. J. G. Marino. **Chemistry Today**, 26(4), 4–12. 2008.
BROWN, J. L. "Microscopical investigation of selected Raes threads from the Shroud of Turin." In J. L. Brown. **Shroud.com**. Retrieved from https://www.shroud.com/pdfs/brown1.pdf. 2005.
CAMPBELL, J. "Have scientists confirmed the authenticity of the Shroud of Turin?" In J. Campbell. **YouTube**. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XHgqkP-Nws4. 2025.
CASABIANCA, T. MARINELLI, E. PERNAGALLO, G. TORRISI, B. "Radiocarbon dating of the Turin Shroud: New evidence from raw data." In T. Casabianca. E. Marinelli. G. Pernagallo. B. Torrisi. **Archaeometry**, 61(5), 1223–1231. 2019.
CURRIE, L. A. "The remarkable metrological history of radiocarbon dating [II]." In L. A. Currie. **Journal of Research of the National Institute of Standards and Technology**, 109(2), 185–217. 2004.
DAMON, P. E. et al. "Radiocarbon dating of the Shroud of Turin." In P. E. Damon et al. **Nature**, 337(6208), 611–615. 1989.
DE CARO, L. et al. "X-ray dating of a Turin Shroud's linen sample." In L. De Caro et al. **Heritage**, 5(2), 860–870. https://doi.org/10.3390/heritage5020047. 2022.
FAREY, H. "WAXSing and waning." In H. Farey. **The Medieval Shroud**. Retrieved from https://medievalshroud.com/waxsing-and-waning/. 2022.
FAREY, H. WYBRANCZYK, L. "The Shroud of Turin." In H. Farey. L. Wybranczyk. **YouTube**. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PFepgc5_adY. 2025.
FANTI, G. CROSILLA, F. RIANI, M. ATKINSON, A. C. "A robust statistical analysis of the 1988 Turin Shroud radiocarbon dating results." In G. Fanti. F. Crosilla. M. Riani. A. C. Atkinson. **Proceedings of the International Workshop on the Scientific Approach to the Acheiropoietos Images**. 2010.
FANTI, G. MALFI, P. CROSILLA, F. "A study of the front and back body enveloping based on 3D information." In G. Fanti. P. Malfi. F. Crosilla. **Academia.edu**. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/815671/A_study_of_the_front_and_back_body_enveloping_based_on_3D_information, 2005.
FREER-WATERS, R. A. JULL, A. J. T. "Investigating a dated piece of the Shroud of Turin." In R. A. Freer-Waters. A. J. T. Jull. **Radiocarbon**, 52(4), 1521–1527. 2010.
GOVE, H. E. "Progress in AMS measurements at the NSF-Arizona AMS facility." In H. E. Gove. **Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms**, 40–41, 41–45. 1989.

HEDGES, R. E. M. "Reply to Phillips: Shroud irradiated with neutrons?" In R. E. M. Hedges. **Nature**, 337(6208), 594. 1989.
INGRAVALLE, C. et al. "3D analysis reveals Shroud of Turin image likely came from sculpture." In C. Ingravalle et al. **Archaeology Magazine**. Retrieved from https://archaeologymag.com/2025/08/shroud-of-turin-image-came-from-sculpture/. 2025.
JACKSON, J. P. "Turin Shroud, resurrection and science: One view of the cathedral." In J. P. Jackson. **New Blackfriars**, 97(1070), 420–438. 2016.
JACKSON, J. P. "Particle radiation from the body could explain the Shroud's images and its carbon dating." In J. P. Jackson. **Academia.edu**. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/31974231/Particle_radiation_from_the_body_could_explain_the_Shroud_s_images_and_its_carbon_dating. 2017.
JOHNSTON, J. "Jeremiah Johnston presents scientific evidence for the Shroud of Turin." In J. Johnston. **Facebook**. https://www.facebook.com/GlennBeck/videos/jeremiah-johnston-presents-scientific-evidence-for-the-shroud-of-turin/1792079651644278/. 2025.
JOHNSTON, J. DE CARO, L. "Top scientist defends new Shroud of Turin evidence." In J. Johnston. L. De Caro. **YouTube**. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xGwTPz2OoGI. 2024.
KEARSE, K. P. "Unanticipated issues in serological analysis of blood species—The Shroud of Turin as a case example." In K. P. Kearse. **Forensic Science International: Reports**, 2, 100073. 2020.
LIND, W. E. "Artificial intelligence analysis of images of the Shroud of Turin." In W. E. Lind. **International Journal of Astronomy**, 13(1), 1–8. 2025.
MARINELLI, E. "The setting for the radiocarbon dating of the Shroud." In E. Marinelli. **International Congress on the Shroud**, Valencia, Spain. 2012.
MEACHAM, W. "The authentication of the Turin Shroud: An issue in archaeological epistemology." In W. Meacham. **Current Anthropology**, 24(3), 283–311. 1983.
NICOLOTTI, A. et al. "Statistical and proactive analysis of an inter-laboratory comparison: The radiocarbon dating of the Shroud of Turin." In A. Nicolotti et al. **Entropy**, 22(9), 926. 2020.
PHILLIPS, T. J. "Shroud irradiated with neutrons?" In T. J. Phillips. **Nature**, 337(6208), 594. 1989.
ROGERS, R. N. "Studies on the radiocarbon sample from the Shroud of Turin." In R. N. Rogers. **Thermochimica Acta**, 425(1–2), 189–194. 2005.
RUCKER, R. A. "Image formation on the Shroud of Turin." In R. A. Rucker. **Real Seeker Ministries**. Retrieved from https://realseekerministries.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/bob-rucker-paper-34-image-formation-on-the-shroud-of-turin-4.pdf. 2024.
SCHWALBE, L. A. ROGERS, R. N. "Physics and chemistry of the Shroud of Turin: A summary of the 1978 investigation." In L. A. Schwalbe. R. N. Rogers. **Analytica Chimica Acta**, 135(1), 3–49. 1982.
VAN HAELST, R. "Radiocarbon dating the Shroud of Turin: A critical review of the Nature report." In R. Van Haelst. **Sindone.info**. Retrieved from https://www.sindone.info/VHAELST6.PDF. 1991.

IMAGENS EM FOCO
Revista Científica de Cultura e de Imagem
Nº 5 Ano II dezembro/2025
ISSN 3085-7309

WALSH, B. J. SCHWALBE, L. A. “An instructive inter-laboratory comparison: The 1988 radiocarbon dating of the Shroud of Turin.” In B. J. Walsh. L. A. Schwalbe. **Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports**, 29, 102015. 2020.
WEST, W. “The Shroud rises, as the carbon date is buried.” In W. West. **Catholic Weekly**. Retrieved from https://catholicweekly.com.au/shroud-of-turin-book-by-william-west-shroud-rises/. 2025.

---

[i] Master’s degree in Radiation, Minerals, and Materials Science and Technology from the Nuclear Technology Development Center, CDTN/CNEN, Brazil. Specialization in Geoprocessing from the Federal University of Minas Gerais, UFMG, Brazil. Bachelor's degree in Geology from the Federal University of Minas Gerais, UFMG, Brazil. He has experience in geoprocessing and software applied to geology, remote sensing, engineering, Geographic Information Systems, and Publication of Geoprocessing Projects on the Web. He teaches and produces teaching materials for courses in Geoprocessing, Image Editing, and Civil Engineering, using specific software