

Recently Published Papers & Articles

September 30, 2021

[How Raymond Rogers PROVED that the 1988 C-14 dating of the Shroud was WORTHLESS](#) – O.K. – *Academia.edu* – September 25, 2021. Here is an excerpt from the introduction: “In a peer-reviewed article written in 2005 shortly before his death, Raymond Rogers, a chemist from Los Alamos, and a former member of STURP collaboration that examined [the] Shroud in 1978, decisively refuted the 1988 carbon dating of the Shroud of Turin, that indicated the cloth’s origin between 1260 and 1390. The Roger’s work showed that the single sample used for dating and excised from the corner of the Shroud, was actually taken from the restored and not original part of the cloth, and thus the 1988 dating is irrelevant regarding the true age of the Shroud...”

[Why critics of Rogers’ 2005 work refuting the 1988 C-14 dating of the Shroud are wrong](#) – O.K. – *Academia.edu* – September 25, 2021. Here is an excerpt from the introduction: “The 2005 publication of Raymond Rogers work refuting 1988 C-14 dating of the Shroud of Turin met with negative response from many people, for various reasons. Some people were angered that the alleged "conclusive evidence that the linen of the Shroud of Turin is mediaeval" was shattered. Others had different ideas on why the dating was anomalous or could not accept the fact that the corner form which the sample for dating was taken, was actually rewoven, contrary to what appears from direct observations...”

[How much contamination is needed to shift the C-14 date from the 1st to the 14th Century?](#) – O.K. – *Academia.edu* – September 25, 2021. Here is an excerpt from the introduction: “Since the controversial C-14 dating of the Shroud of Turin in 1988 a fierce debate endured about THE validity of the results, allegedly placing the origin of the Shroud between the years 1260 and 1390, instead of circa 30 AD, the time Jesus Christ died. Many theories why the 1988 dating was wrong have been proposed. In 2005 Raymond Rogers proved that the sample taken from a single site from one of the corners of the Shroud came from the repaired instead of original part of the Shroud, and thus 1988 dating is invalid...”

[Editor’s Note: The above three papers were written by the highly respected Polish Sindonologist who prefers to go only by the initials O.K. Consequently, he requested that Joe Marino post his latest papers online via *academia.edu*, which Joe was happy to accommodate. We previously linked to a four-part series on the **[3-D Properties of the Shroud](#)** by O.K., which was originally published in 2015 on the (now defunct but still available) Shroud of Turin Blog page by Dan Porter. To see the depth and extent of O.K.’s research, you can also visit his **[Polish Language Website](#)**.]

[The Greek Words Used in the Gospel Accounts of Jesus’ Burial – Can They be Reconciled with the Turin Shroud?](#) – Joe Marino – *Academia.edu* – September 16, 2021. Here is an excerpt from the introduction: “One of the biggest controversies regarding the Turin Shroud, the reputed burial cloth of Jesus, is whether what can be discerned on the cloth can be reconciled with the gospel accounts of his burial. At first glance, the Synoptic gospels, Matthew, Mark and Luke, seem to differ fairly significantly from John. The Synoptic gospels, with one exception/addition, basically use the word sindon, which is defined as “linen cloth, esp. that which was fine and costly, in which the bodies of the dead were wrapped” (NAS New Testament Greek Lexicon). John uses the word othonia, which can have multiple meanings...”

[Editor’s Note: This paper is archived on the **[Religion & Philosophy](#)** page of this site.]

[The Shroud of Turin: the Fifth Gospel? Or the First Gospel? Or Neither?](#) – **Joe Marino** – *Academia.edu* – September 8, 2021. Here is an excerpt from the introduction: “Debate continues to rage regarding whether the Shroud of Turin, the reputed burial cloth of Jesus, is authentic or not. Extreme passion can often be found from those who believe it is a forgery and from those who believe it is authentic. There are some people who aren’t sure, and certainly, by the very nature of their stance, their passion does not come close to the other two camps. At first glance, the case against authenticity seems fairly strong...” [Editor’s Note: This paper is archived on the [Religion & Philosophy](#) page of this site.]

[The House of Savoy and Roman Catholic Devotion to the Shroud of Turin](#) – **Joe Marino** – *Academia.edu* – September 2, 2021. Here is an excerpt from the introduction: “Most people tend to think of the Shroud of Turin as a “Catholic” relic. While the Church does have a long history with the Shroud, many people don’t know that the Holy See only took ownership of the cloth in 1985, after the last King of Italy, Umberto II, of the House of Savoy, bequeathed it after his death in 1983. The House of Savoy has always had close ties to the Catholic Church. (It was founded in 1033, long before the Protestant Reformation)...” [Editor’s Note: This paper is archived on the [Religion & Philosophy](#) page of this site.]

[John P. Jackson and the Shroud of Turin Research Project](#) – **Joe Marino** – *Academia.edu* – August 31, 2021. Here is an excerpt from the introduction: “I recently wrote articles titled “Raymond N. Rogers and the Shroud of Turin and “Alan D. Adler and the Shroud of Turin.” Both Rogers and Adler were members of the Shroud of Turin Research Project (STURP), which studied the Shroud for five days and 120 consecutive hours in 1978. Their main objective was to determine how the image on the cloth was formed. Despite using the best science and technology available in the late 1970s, they were unable to determine how it was done and ultimately concluded that the image was not the product of an artist. Ph.D. theoretical physicist John P. Jackson was the co-founder of STURP (and gave it the name) and is still active in Shroud research. He and Jewish-born wife Rebecca currently are directors of the Turin Shroud Center of Colorado...”

[Alan D. Adler and the Shroud of Turin](#) – **Joe Marino** – *Academia.edu* – August 27, 2021. Here is an excerpt from the introduction: “...Adler, who died in 2000, was a Ph.D. biochemist and blood porphyrin expert. He did not actually travel to Turin, but he did examine sticky-tapes and worked closely with other STURP members who were present for the examination. I had the pleasure of being with him at various talks and conferences and have some wonderful memories of him. He had the habit when presenting of using the words “in fact;” at a Shroud conference in 1986, a friend of his informed him that he did so twenty-seven times during his talk! I also remember during that talk that he stated he had determined there was definitely blood on the Shroud, saying impishly, “it’s blood, B-L-U-D, blood.” At a conference in 1999, he went over his time limit while giving his presentation and the organizers literally pulled the plug on his microphone. But he was a respected scientist, including by the authorities in Turin...”

[Will there ever be Further Testing on the Shroud of Turin?](#) – **Joe Marino** – *Academia.edu* – August 26, 2021. Here is an excerpt from the introduction: “The first major scientific testing of the Shroud took place in the period 1969-1973. According to an article in 1983 by archaeologist William Meacham, Direct examination of the Shroud by scientific means began in 1969-73 with the appointment of an 11-member Turin Commission (1976) to advise on the preservation of the relic and on specific testing which might be undertaken. Five of its members were scientists, and preliminary studies of samples of the cloth were conducted by them in 1973. A much more detailed examination of the Shroud was carried out by a group of American scientists in 1978-81 as the Shroud of Turin Research Project...”

[Raymond N. Rogers and the Shroud of Turin](#) – **Joe Marino** – *Academia.edu* – August 26, 2021. Here is an excerpt from the introduction: “Anyone familiar with the Shroud of Turin will likely recognize the name of Raymond N. Rogers. He was the Director of Chemical Research for the 1978 Shroud of Turin Research Project (STURP), which studied the cloth for five days around the clock and concluded that the image was not the product of an artist. If one listens only to Shroud skeptics, one would get the impression that STURP was just a bunch of pseudo-scientific religious zealots out to prove that the Shroud was authentic. In fact, most of them were scientists who worked in the U.S.’ space and nuclear programs; only a few of the group were devout Christians. Their main objective was to determine how the image on the cloth was formed...”

[Editor’s Note: Joe received a prompt response to this paper from **Larry Schwalbe**, STURP team member from Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) and a close colleague of Rogers. Here is Larry’s comment (reprinted with permission)]:

“Joe. Thank you for the paper recognizing the life and work of Ray Rogers. With the exception of his wife Joan, I believe I knew him better than anyone else in the project. Those who try to belittle him as "second-rate" have no conception of the scientific intellect, experience, or insights he brought both to his professional work at LANL or to the Shroud project. Indeed, I believe Alan Adler was the only member of the team who could talk to him at his level. To be sure, Ray was a "prickly" character and did not suffer fools lightly. But, as you say, when presented with evidence, he was quite capable of changing his mind both about ideas as well as about people. I miss the guy as I'm sure others do who still want to get to the bottom of the Shroud's mysteries. Larry.”

[Hermeneutic of the Holy Shroud of Turin](#) - **Clelia Albano** – *Academia.edu/Letters* – August 2021. Here is an excerpt from the introduction: “In “Truth and Method”, Hans- Georg Gadamer argues that the artistic event, both in poetry and in visual art, in its appearance and representation is not a mere “illustration”, or a copy, but constitutes an ontological event. As such, the represented image coincides with what it represents; i.e. the image coincides with its own truth. I argue that this hermeneutic approach might be applicable to the Holy Shroud of Turin, although it is not a work of Art (until it is proven otherwise). Inside collective imagery it arose as a mysterious symbol, mostly considered the burial shroud of Christ...”

[Can a Plausible Link be Made Between the Shroud of Turin and the Resurrection of Jesus?](#) – **Joe Marino** – *Academia.edu* – August 25, 2021. Here is an excerpt from the introduction: “One of the reasons that many Christians get excited about the Shroud of Turin, believed by numerous people to be the actual burial cloth of the historical Jesus of Nazareth, is that they believe that the Shroud provides physical evidence – some might even go so far as to say “proof” -- that the Resurrection of Jesus, the linchpin to the establishment of Christianity. Of course, there are myriad hurdles that have to be navigated before getting to that point. First of all, not everyone even accepts the notion that the Resurrection of Jesus happened. In fact, some people deny that Jesus even existed...” [Editor’s Note: This paper is archived on the [Religion & Philosophy](#) page of this site.]

[Review of Primary Claimed Features of the Shroud of Turin That Purport to Show It's Not a Medieval Forgery](#) – **Joe Marino** – *Academia.edu* – August 20, 2021. Here is an excerpt from the introduction: “Researchers who claim that the Shroud of Turin was not produced by medieval artisan or that it is the actual burial cloth of Jesus will enumerate in one form or another various characteristics of the Shroud and/or its image that for them support their positions. Many, if not all of the characteristics, have been challenged by those who believe the Shroud is nothing more than a medieval fake, despite the fact that no method of production proposed by them can duplicate all of the features. It should also be noted that not all neutral or pro-authenticity researchers accept all of the characteristics touted by other like-minded researchers. This article will list some of the major sources for these features...”

[The burial cloth of Jesus Christ or Medieval Art? Evidence for authenticity](#) – **Pam Moon** – *Academia.edu* – August 17, 2021. Here is an excerpt from the introduction: “A concise argument is presented for the authenticity of the Shroud of Turin as the burial linen of Jesus Christ. The paper reasons that the Shroud could not have been created by an artist in 1355, when it was first displayed in Western Europe. The Shroud of Turin Research Project (STuRP) identified the different scientific properties of the Shroud, from image formation to blood flow...”

[Individual Medical Doctors' Viewpoints on the Authenticity of the Shroud of Turin](#) – **Joe Marino** – *Academia.edu* – August 12, 2021. Here is an excerpt from the introduction: “One of the striking features about the study of the Shroud of Turin is how many medical personnel have weighed with their analyses. Starting with French biologist Dr. Paul Vignon in the early 20th-century, most medical doctors who have studied the Shroud believe that the image accurately depicts anatomically and physiologically an actual human body that has undergone the torture of crucifixion. Naturally, there is not a 100% consensus on authenticity or even of specific points such as why the blood is still red or where exactly the wound in the hand is located. But it is impressive that two of the pathologists on the list, Drs. Robert Bucklin and Dr. Frederick Zugibe, who each studied the Shroud about 50 years each and who performed a combined approximate 50,000 (!) autopsies, both believed that the Shroud image was that of a real, crucified man who died...”

[Supplement to \(Book\) “The 1988 C-14 Dating of the Shroud of Turin: A Stunning Exposé”](#) – **Joe Marino** – *Academia.edu* – August 11, 2021. Here is the introduction: “This document is designed as a companion to the book, “The 1988 C-14 Dating of the Shroud of Turin: A Stunning Exposé.” It can basically be read as a condensed/stand-alone version of the book. It previously was on my web site but I have reproduced it for academia.edu for wider dissemination and better ease of editing. Book Obtainable at: https://smile.amazon.com/gp/product/1734813032/ref=dbs_a_def_rwt_bibl_vppi_i1”

[Shroud of Turin ultraviolet light images: color and information content](#) – **Thomas McAvoy** - OSA Publishing, *Applied Optics*, Volume 60, Issue 22, pp. 6604-6613, August 1, 2021. (Abstract only – the full article is behind a pay wall) - Here is the abstract: "This paper builds on an earlier paper [Appl. Opt. 58, 6958 (2019) [\[CrossRef\]](#)] that analyzed web ultraviolet light (uv) photographs of the Shroud of Turin. In the earlier paper, it is shown that the Shroud exhibits very unique spatially varying uv fluorescence properties. The web uv images have colors significantly different from versions of them published in 1981. This paper examines whether the color difference indicates that the web images have deteriorated over time and if so whether information content in them is suspect. The limitations of the methodology used are discussed in the Introduction. Subject to these limitations, it is shown that deterioration probably has not occurred and that significant information can be extracted through image processing of the uv web images." (Cont'd)

[Editor's Note: The above author has expressed certain concerns about the methodology used to scan Vern Miller's original film. He stated, "I did not want researchers using the color corrected images on shroudphotos.com for intensity analysis, which would lead to incorrect results." However, the images would still be viable for use in color analysis, which reveals certain chemical differences on the cloth.]

[The Ramifications of the Image Superficiality on the Turin Shroud](#) – **Joe Marino** – *Academia.edu* – July 22, 2021. Here is an excerpt from the introduction: “One of the most striking features on the Turin Shroud is the superficiality of the image, which was one of the things that most surprised the 1978 Shroud of Turin Research Project “STURP,” a group of mainly American scientists and most of whom worked in the U.S.’ nuclear and space programs, were given permission to study the Shroud, believed by many to be the actual burial cloth of the historical Jesus of Nazareth, for five days around the clock. Their mission was to determine how the image got onto the cloth, no more, no less. They were unable to come up with an answer, and actually concluded the image was not the product of the artist...”

[What are the Implications for the Shroud of Turin of the ENEA High-Intensity Ultraviolet Laser Experiments?](#) – **Joe Marino** – *Academia.edu* – July 7, 2021. Here is an excerpt from the introduction: “...Almost everyone in the world is aware that the Shroud of Turin, the reputed burial cloth of the historical character known as Jesus of Nazareth, was radiocarbon dated in 1988 to AD 1260 – 1390, ostensibly precluding the possibility that it was contemporary with Jesus’ burial. Not as many people are aware that numerous scientists and researchers have challenged those 1988 results, predominantly for two reasons. The first reason was due to the findings of the 1978 Shroud of Turin Research Project (STURP), composed mainly of American scientists who worked in the U.S.’ nuclear and space program; the group, having produced two dozen papers in the scientific peer-reviewed literature, concluded that the image was NOT the product of an artist. The second reason is the questionable actions and numerous irregularities by both the Catholic Church and the three C-14 labs involved in the testing...”

And several older papers you might find interesting:

[Quaranta anni dopo gli esami scientifici sulla Sindone del 1978](#) (Forty years after the scientific examinations on the Shroud of 1978) – **Pierluigi Baima Bollone and Grazia Mattutino** – *Giornale della Accademia di Medicina di Torino* – *Researchgate.net* – January 2020. (Abstract in English, paper in Italian). Here is an excerpt from the abstract: “The article summarizes the development of scientific research on the Shroud, a well-known ancient burial sheet of undefined dating, and the events that led to the direct examinations of the artifact performed by various researchers between 8 and 15 October 1978. On that occasion one of us took 12 threads and from various sites previously considered relevant. The results of the morphological examinations, both with the optic microscope and with the SEM as well as microanalysis, were communicated during the session of May 6th 1981 of the Academy of Medicine of Torino...”

[Sample Handling in Radiocarbon Dating by Accelerator with Special Reference to the Turin Shroud](#) – **Robert Hedges** - *Analytical Proceedings*, February 1990, (v.)27:45. Here is an excerpt from this brief article (which begins with some very technical material): “...The work on the Turin Shroud involved most of the procedures indicated above. A full account is published in *Nature*, 1989, 337 (6208), 611--615. From our point of view, the most important result was that three laboratories could agree over four samples, when measured "blind," to an accuracy of better than 0.5%, although starting with textile samples which had had an unknown but potentially contaminating history...”