

# **Historical Epistemology, Jesus' Resurrection, and the Shroud of Turin**

**© 1999 Gary R. Habermas  
All Rights Reserved  
Reprinted by Permission**

In contemporary studies on the Shroud of Turin, much attention, with good reason, has focused on the crucial roles contributed by sciences like physics, chemistry, and medical analyses. Doubtless, these and related inquiries have contributed more than any others in attempting to solve one of the greatest modern puzzles.

Here we will examine another avenue that is seldom pursued, but which offers some crucial insights for this subject: philosophy of history and its cognate, historical investigation. We will argue that well known principles in these disciplines can also assist us in arriving at some significant distinctions that are centrally relevant in the study of the Shroud of Turin. In fact, in at least two areas, the historical argument is absolutely indispensable if there is even a possibility of moving from this cloth to any connection with Jesus Christ.

Accordingly, we will attempt to do three things. First, we will simply list some epistemic principles from the philosophy of history that help determine how we may best ascertain that particular historical events have occurred. Second, we will address briefly the subject of the resurrection of Jesus, offering some reasons why the literary evidence for this event fulfills many of these criteria. Third, we will look at the Shroud of Turin and ask if there is any correspondence between this archaeological artifact and data that may possibly point to the resurrection of Jesus. We will note both positive and negative areas of correlation. My central thesis is that the application of historiographical principles to the relevant literary sources provides outstanding evidence for the resurrection of Jesus, while there is a less clear, but still noteworthy non-literary path from the Shroud of Turin to Jesus.

I wish to note carefully before we begin that this study can only be undertaken in the sketchiest of terms. Having pursued these subjects in nine previous books and many articles, I will only be able to suggest hints of the directions I am suggesting. Further details may be obtained from these<sup>1</sup> and other writings.<sup>2</sup>

### Historical Epistemology

What determines when an event may be termed “historical”? When are we justified in concluding that it occurred in history? Are there checks and balances that may help us to ascertain when one has arrived at a sufficient amount of evidence? How can these conclusions be known with any degree of assurance?

Perhaps surprisingly, many historians pursue their craft without first pausing to define their enterprise or asking the sorts of meta-historical questions that are necessary in order to provide parameters for their discipline. I will begin on the second level by enumerating some of the historian’s tools, followed by listing some of the most common rules employed in their use.

Initially, the historian gathers potential data. Oxford University philosopher Richard Swinburne presents what he asserts is an exhaustive list of four types of historical evidence, with some overlap between them: our own apparent memories, the testimony of others (either spoken or written), physical traces left behind that may point to the event in question, and the application of scientific principles.<sup>3</sup> Historian Earle Cairns includes basically the same sources, although he arranges them a little differently: nonliterary remains like archaeology, primary and secondary literary documents, living sources, followed by applying critical interaction.<sup>4</sup>

Then the historian may take the existing data for a certain event, and apply an array of criteria that help ascertain what actually occurred in the past. Certain kinds of evidence are valued over others. Here are some examples that apply to written sources: (1) Early evidence is

needed, preferably from (2) eyewitnesses of the occurrences in question. David Hackett Fischer refers to this as “the best relevant evidence,” calling this criterion “the rule of immediacy.”<sup>5</sup> (3) Multiple independent sources significantly strengthen a case. Paul Meier says: “Many facts from antiquity rest on just one ancient source, while two or three sources in agreement generally render the fact unimpeachable.”<sup>6</sup>

Some details are enhanced by (4) what might be called the principle of embarrassment, surprise, or negative report where the writer makes disparaging remarks concerning herself or another person or event towards which they are friendly and have a vested interest.<sup>7</sup> On other occasions, (5) exactly the opposite can also be the case: an antagonistic party agrees about a person or event that is not in their best interests to admit. Maier says “such positive evidence within a hostile source is the strongest kind of evidence . . . if Cicero, who despised Catiline, admitted that the fellow had one good quality--courage--among a host of bad ones then the historian correctly concludes that Catiline was at least courageous.”<sup>8</sup>

Certainly one of the strongest criteria for historicity is (6) building on those data that are thought by a wide range of otherwise diverse historians to be well-established. This is what Christopher Blake terms the “very considerable part of history which is acceptable to the community of professional historians.”<sup>9</sup>

Another test is that of (7) coherence--does the event fit well with other surrounding circumstances? Better yet, does the proposed explanation illuminate other known phenomena and make them more intelligible?

Combining some of these criteria, I have proposed the “minimal facts” historical approach, which uses only those basic data that meet two standards--being exceptionally well-attested on several distinct grounds like those listed above, plus being admitted as historical by the vast

majority of critical scholars who deal with the specific topic. Of these two tests, the initial one (strong verification for multiple reasons) is the most significant.<sup>10</sup>

Other historical rules could also be mentioned.<sup>11</sup> But these are sufficient for our purposes here. Although these standards themselves apply critical perspectives to the historical materials, other criticism must also be employed.<sup>12</sup>

What about non-literary historical sources, such as those derived from archaeological studies? Fischer lists “the authentic remains of an event” as the “very best evidence” we can have, second only to the event itself,<sup>13</sup> which we no longer have at our disposal. So these could be very crucial indicators of historical occurrences. Like literary sources, these artifacts are also subject to critical review, such as appropriate dating procedures, testing for any tampering, the degree to which they have direct or indirect relation to the event in question, and so on.

We will now apply our rather superficial overview of historical procedures to the resurrection of Jesus and the Shroud of Turin. Unfortunately, we will also have to be satisfied with a cursory study of these two areas, as well.

### The Resurrection of Jesus

Here I will quickly summarize just a small amount of the available literary and critical data by categorizing it according to several of the above criteria.<sup>14</sup> Exceptionally early evidence for the resurrection is gathered from a number of sources, the most important of which is the traditional material recorded by Paul in 1 Corinthians 15:3ff. Critical scholars generally date Paul’s reception of this report from 33-38 A.D., which is only three to eight years after the events in question. For ancient literary accounts, in particular, this is simply unprecedented. Theologian Ulrich Wilckens declares that this testimony “indubitably goes back to the oldest phase of all in the history of primitive Christianity.”<sup>15</sup> Historian Hans von Campenhausen asserts: “This account meets all the

demands of historical reliability that could possibly be made of such a text.”<sup>16</sup>

Other early creedal reports in the Book of Acts<sup>17</sup> are also widely acknowledged as containing very early testimony to the death and resurrection of Jesus. John Drane calls this the “earliest evidence” for Jesus’ resurrection and says of these traditions: “But there can be no doubt that in the first few chapters of Acts its author has preserved material from very early sources.”<sup>18</sup>

Further, Paul was himself an eyewitness who believed he saw the risen Jesus. Additionally, he probably received his report from other eyewitnesses, namely Peter and James. This is even admitted by the majority of skeptical, non-Christian scholars who have studied this material. Jewish scholar Pinchas Lapide points out that this report “may be considered as a statement of eyewitnesses.”<sup>19</sup> James D.G. Dunn adds that “it is almost impossible to dispute” that the first Christians had experiences that cannot be explained other than by literal appearances of the risen Jesus.<sup>20</sup>

The multiple, independent sources for the resurrection of Jesus are likewise outstanding. Beyond the early reports in I Corinthians and Acts, other texts like the four Gospels also attest to the early Christian belief in Jesus’ resurrection. Beyond these six writings, there are almost two dozen others from the ancient world that record well over 100 aspects from the life of Jesus. For those who like non-Christian sources, seventeen fall into that category. Of these, about a half-dozen, most notably ancient historians Josephus and Phlegon, record that Jesus appeared to His followers after His death.<sup>21</sup> Such multiple attestation from about every possible category of data is also without parallel in the ancient world.

The highly skeptical Jesus Seminar even admits eight independent sources for Jesus’ teachings, while they hold that just two are often enough to establish a saying of Jesus as authentic.<sup>22</sup> Several of Jesus’ appearances are recorded in more than one source.

There is even additional confirmation from surprising sources. Embarrassing confessions in the Gospels repeatedly declare that Jesus' friends did not believe that He had been raised, despite the testimonies of those who said they had seen Him alive. Their unbelief persisted until after He had appeared to them!<sup>23</sup> Antagonistic testimony is given by Jewish sources that freely admit the empty tomb, even though they attempt to explain the data naturalistically.<sup>24</sup>

We could go on to a variety of other categories of historical evidence, many of which converge to find their best explanation in Jesus' resurrection. These include particulars like a number of independent arguments in favor of the empty tomb, the conversions of Paul and James, two skeptics who became leaders in the ancient church after believing they saw the resurrected Jesus, the radical transformations of others who saw Him, who were willing to die for their faith, the centrality of the resurrection message, and the birth and growth of the church. All of these and more are attested in the earliest, most respected historical sources. Together, we have a coherent picture of what happened in first century Palestine.

But we have also said that historical data must be subjected to critical interaction. So what about attempts to explain the resurrection on purely natural grounds? After all, a resurrection would simply be an incredible event, and these sorts of things are not supposed to happen! However, alternative efforts to explain away this occurrence have fallen on very tough times, as even critics readily admit. This is the case for several reasons.

Initially, the effort to dismiss the resurrection because of its incredibility is an a priori dismissal that stands against the nature of inductive research because it makes assertions before the evidence is assessed. Further, if it is even possible that God exists, such an event is also possible, no matter how unlikely it may seem to us. Additionally, each attempt to dismiss the resurrection naturally is refuted by many well established facts. Moreover, no one hypothesis is

capable of explaining all of the data, even if it is correct! So more than one theory is needed. Most critics know all of this, however, and have themselves criticized and dismissed these attempts long ago.<sup>25</sup>

A last defense of Jesus' resurrection, and perhaps the strongest, can be made by utilizing only the minimal historical facts alone, a method we discussed earlier. We can establish the historicity of this event by using only those facts that are exceptionally well-established on several fronts each, as well as being almost unanimously recognized as historical by virtually all scholars who study this event. These minimal facts alone can perform two huge tasks by themselves: they can refute the major naturalistic hypotheses on the one hand, while providing the strongest evidences for the resurrection on the other. All this is done by using only a very limited, but powerful, cartel of facts that is recognized by almost everyone. In this sense, the resurrection may be established as historical without assuming any special status for the Bible.<sup>26</sup>

In sum, the Christian is on strong critical grounds when affirming the historicity of Jesus' resurrection. Critical scholar Reginald Fuller thinks that the central axis around which the data turn is unassailable: "That within a few weeks after the crucifixion Jesus' disciples came to believe this [that God had raised Jesus from the dead] is one of the indisputable facts of history . . . a fact upon which both believer and unbeliever may agree."<sup>27</sup> A study of the relevant facts shows that this event is the best explanation of what occurred.

### The Shroud of Turin

Do any non-literary artifacts provide assistance in a study of the resurrection of Jesus? Some archaeological discoveries do have some relevance here--like the skeleton of a first century A.D. crucifixion victim named Yohanan and the Nazareth Decree, a Roman prohibition against grave robbing that apparently dates from the time of Emperor Claudius (41-54 A.D.) and may

reflect the Christian teaching of Jesus' resurrection.<sup>28</sup> But without any question, by far the most attention and controversy has been focused on the Shroud of Turin.

Many issues are relevant to any critical discussion of the possibility that the shroud evidences Jesus' resurrection. Among these, at least three matters predominate. How could we possibly know if it wrapped Jesus' body? How might it point to a resurrection? Does this cloth even date from the first century A.D.? I will respond briefly to each.

Initially, I will simply note that two of these three issues are strictly historical in nature. Identifying the man buried in the shroud and the question of the resurrection both require the work of historiography. Apart from the discipline of history, there would be little background against which we might compare any possible scientific data on the shroud. So I would argue that, at least at these two points, the study of history is absolutely indispensable to shroud studies. But the problem is that at each of these two points, current shroud studies seem to be weak, at best.

It seems to me that the only promising way to argue that the shroud could even possibly have been Jesus' (beyond the question of dating) is not satisfied with a straightforward look at similarities between the Gospel depictions of what happened to Jesus, compared to what we see on the cloth. To do so is not only to assume the historicity of the texts,<sup>29</sup> but, perhaps more crucially for our purposes, it fails to distinguish Jesus' crucifixion from the literally thousands of other Jews who were crucified near Jerusalem at about the same time.<sup>30</sup>

Rather, research needs to show, first, that the New Testament descriptions of Jesus' crucifixion are historically and medically accurate. Contemporary shroud studies have done far better on the second<sup>31</sup> than on the first. Then, the key is to ascertain how well this cloth corresponds to the Gospel descriptions in the abnormal areas of crucifixion, where both Jesus and



the man in the shroud had similar wounds. This must be done in order to separate Jesus from the other crucifixion victims.<sup>32</sup>

Examples of abnormal crucifixion procedures to which both Jesus and the man who was buried in the shroud were apparently subjected include the following: the severity of the beating, the sharp objects pressed into the scalp, the side wound (instead of broken ankles), featuring a post-mortem flow of blood and watery fluid. Further, neither was thrown into a common grave or left to the vultures, as was normal, but both were wrapped in linen and buried individually, although still hastily.

Of these “common oddities,” I think that the scalp punctures and side wound are the most irregular. After all, why crown a man who is being crucified as a common criminal? And of all of the possible forms of coup de grace in order to insure the death of the victim, why would both have the same sort of side wound, along with the same attending features? The individual, hasty burials are also out of the ordinary.<sup>33</sup>

In fact, the correspondence between the two is so close that someone might even be tempted to postulate the thesis that someone was purposefully (and sadistically!) crucified precisely in order to look like Jesus. So on this view, the similarities are accounted for by a “copy-cat” scenario.

But interestingly, it is precisely this procedure that creates its own major problems. The cloth would have to mimic the presentation in the Gospels in order to be deemed the burial garment of Jesus, yet this fails to explain why the wrist wounds are not located in the palms, as depicted in Medieval times. Indeed, art historian Phillip McNair states that of the hundreds of examples of Medieval crucifixion art that he has observed, not a single one portrays the wounds in the wrists.<sup>34</sup> Further, the pierced scalp of the man in the shroud arguably represents an object that

covers the entire skull, not the tiny wreathlet of Christian art. With cases like these, the very exceptions themselves are disconfirming, since they so clearly militate against the scenario that the cloth was faked in order to mimic Jesus' death. Exceptions like those on the shroud point away from the copy-cat scenario. Many additional problems abound for this thesis, as well.<sup>35</sup>

So the similarities in abnormal areas of crucifixion procedure are rather astounding. If the shroud passes the other two tests, it would seem that we might be in a position to assert with some degree of likelihood that the Shroud of Turin might just possibly be the same cloth in which Jesus was buried, as reported in the Gospels (Jn. 20:5-7; cf. Lk. 24:12).

Next, what about any possible pointers from the shroud to Jesus' resurrection? Actually, there are a few interesting implications regarding this possibility. First, the body wrapped in the shroud apparently did not decompose. Numerous medical investigators have argued that the man is dead, due to several indicators like the presence of rigor mortis. Yet, scientific testing has not discovered any evidence of decomposition on the cloth. The implications here seem clear: the absence of bodily decomposition means that the body was not in contact with the cloth for a prolonged period of time.

In a Middle Eastern environment in Jesus' time, a significant amount of bodily decomposition would occur even after four days (see Jn. 11:39). While an exact time period cannot be assigned to the contact between the body and the cloth, it was not long enough to cause any such advanced decomposition. So the body was separated from the material after a comparatively short period of time.<sup>36</sup> As Robert Bucklin states, "None of the research done on the Shroud image has produced any evidence that there has been cellular changes such as might be expected as the result of a long postmortem interval."<sup>37</sup>

The second intriguing implication concerns the body's removal from the cloth. We just

noted that the lack of decomposition indicates that the body did not remain in the cloth very long. However, the body does not appear to have been moved by conventional means, either, due to the condition of the bloodstains, which are anatomically correct, including precisely outlined borders, with blood clots intact. If the cloth had been pulled away from the body, the blood clots would have smeared or broken.<sup>38</sup>

Third, the nature of the image on the shroud now comes prominently into focus. While it may be said that no image-creating technique has been clearly established, the leading candidate still seems to be that it is most similar to some kind of radiation. In a little-publicized survey by Robert Wilcox<sup>39</sup> of 26 of the 1978 scientific investigators, most did not give a specific answer concerning the cause of the image. Of the seven who did, five said that they thought it fit into the category of radiation.<sup>40</sup>

Add to this John Jackson's hypothesis of a cloth that collapsed "*into and through* the underlying body structure."<sup>41</sup> This and other tantalizing suggestions over the years add to the possibility of radiation being the best suggestion concerning the cause of the shroud image.<sup>42</sup>

Some would go a step further and relate such a scorch to the resurrection of Jesus, as well, although comparatively few have published these views. Robert Bucklin is an exception. He said, "a few of us have openly expressed our opinions that there is support for the resurrection in the things we see on the Shroud of Turin."<sup>43</sup> Elaborating, Bucklin added, "When this medical information is combined with the physical, chemical, and historical facts, there is strong evidence for Jesus' resurrection."<sup>44</sup>

Fourth, the closer the correspondence between the shroud and the Gospels, the closer we can attempt to tie the shroud phenomena to an historical investigation of Jesus' resurrection. If the shroud is thoroughly consistent with reliable Gospel accounts, one might attempt an argument

that it also corresponds on the subject of Jesus' resurrection. If the shroud is an authentic archaeological artifact and perhaps the actual burial garment of Jesus, thereby corresponding so minutely to His death, could we push on to His resurrection, too, especially in light of the strong historical evidence for this event?

But now we are going too far for the purposes of this essay. The last matter mentioned above still remains. I think that the issue of carbon-14 dating needs to be answered in an authoritative manner. Beyond the many scientific possibilities involving error that have been argued since 1988, one or more need to be experimentally confirmed with specific regard to the shroud. Until this is done, no matter what one's personal convictions might be, I think we are allowing the cart to get out in front of the horse. Much of the interest in the shroud almost undeniably took a downward turn in the Fall of 1988. Even for those who disagree with me about the importance of the carbon-14 results, we should agree, at the very least, that we will continue to talk largely to ourselves until this issue has been answered once and for all.

### Conclusion

The central thesis in my sketchy overview has been that historical investigation is absolutely indispensable if there is even a possibility of moving from the Shroud of Turin to any identification with Jesus Christ's death and His resurrection from the dead. Accordingly, I have listed some principles of historiography, and argued that we have outstanding historical evidence for Jesus' resurrection. While the literary sources provide excellent historical evidence for the resurrection of Jesus, there is a less apparent, but still significant pathway from the non-literary artifact known as the Shroud of Turin to Jesus. Yet, the shadow of the 1988 carbon-14 testing remains a sufficient roadblock that we must answer decisively before we can do much more than talk to ourselves in the "shroud community."

- 
1. For some examples, see the following writings by the author: The Resurrection of Jesus: An Apologetic (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980; Lanham: University Press of America, 1984); Ancient Evidence for the Life of Jesus: Historical Records of His Death and Resurrection (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Publishers, 1984); with Antony Flew, Did Jesus Rise from the Dead? The Resurrection Debate, edited by Terry L. Miethe (San Francisco: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1988); The Historical Jesus: Ancient Evidence for the Life of Christ (Joplin: College Press, 1996); “The Resurrection Appearances of Jesus,” in In Defense of Miracles, edited by R. Douglas Geivett and Gary R. Habermas (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1997), pp. 262-275; “Resurrection Claims in Non-Christian Religions,” Religious Studies, Volume 25 (1989), pp. 167-177; “Knowing that Jesus’ Resurrection Occurred,” Faith and Philosophy, Volume 2 (July, 1985), pp. 295-302; “Jesus’ Resurrection and Contemporary Criticism,” Criswell Theological Review, two parts, Volume 4.1 (Fall, 1989), pp. 159-174 and Volume 4.2 (Fall, 1989), pp. 373-385.
  2. For instances of other noteworthy studies, see Daniel P. Fuller, Easter Faith and History (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965); William Lane Craig, Assessing the New Testament Evidence for the Historicity of the Resurrection of Jesus (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1989); Grant R. Osborne, The Resurrection Narratives (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984).
  3. Richard Swinburne, “Historical Evidence” in Miracles, edited by Richard Swinburne (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1989), pp. 133-135.
  4. Earle E. Cairns, God and Man in Time: A Christian Approach to Historiography (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979), pp. 33-42.
  5. David Hackett Fischer, Historian’s Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970), p. 62. Within this same category, Fischer places “remains” of the event above “direct observations” of it. On the importance of eyewitness testimony in ancient Greek thought, see Ernst Breisach, Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern, Second Edition (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994), p. 38 for instance.
  6. Paul L. Maier, In the Fulness of Time: A Historian Looks at Christmas, Easter, and the Early Church (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1991), p. 197.
  7. Michael Grant, Jesus: An Historian’s Review of the Gospels (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1977), pp. 202-203.
  8. Maier, pp. 198-199.
  9. Christopher Blake, “Can History be Objective?” in Patrick Gardiner, Editor, Theories of History: Readings from Classical and Contemporary Sources (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1959), p. 331.
  10. I apply this twofold test to Jesus’ resurrection, for example, in The Historical Jesus, pp. 158-167 and The Resurrection of Jesus, pp. 24-26, 38-41.

---

11. A noteworthy discussion of this entire topic is C. Behan McCullagh's Justifying Historical Descriptions (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), see especially pp. 17-33. Another major and often quite skeptical criterion of historicity is that of dissimilarity--a saying, for instance, can be attributed to an individual if it cannot be credibly ascribed to other contemporary sources. Grant calls this the "principal valid method of research" (p. 202). Some may propose the test of multiple forms--an idea is more likely to be historical if it occurs in more than one literary pattern. Grant judges that this one is "not very decisive" (p. 201). A significant number of ancient historical studies address the idea of oral tradition and how such can be both identified and corroborated. This is one of the most important topics in contemporary studies of the New Testament (see Habermas, The Historical Jesus, pp. 143-157). The classic work here is Oscar Cullmann's The Earliest Christian Confessions, translated by J.K.S. Reid (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949).

12. Once again, we must skip the discussion of many relevant details due to the scope of the present inquiry. For examples pertaining to ancient history, see Lucian of Samosata, How to Write History (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), especially pp. 7-15; Breisach, pp. 64; 68-69; 72. Contemporary examinations are found in Swinburne, pp. 135-151; Cairns, pp. 49-55.

13. Fischer, p. 62. As we said in note 5 above, Fischer includes these remains along with "direct observations" of the event in his first category of evidence.

14. For details at each of the points in this section, see the sources listed in notes 1-2 above.

15. Ulrich Wilckens, Resurrection, translated by A.M. Stewart (Edinburgh: The Saint Andrew Press, 1977), p. 2.

16. Hans von Campenhausen, "The Events of Easter and the Empty Tomb," in Tradition and Life in the Church (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), p. 44.

17. Contemporary discussion chiefly surrounds Acts 2:22-23, 31; 3:15; 4:10; 5:30-31; 10:39-42; 13:28-30.

18. John Drane, Introducing the New Testament (San Francisco: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1986), p. 99.

19. Pinchas Lapide, The Resurrection of Jesus: A Jewish Perspective (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1983), pp. 98-99.

20. James D.G. Dunn, The Evidence for Jesus (Louisville: The Westminster Press, 1985), p. 75.

21. Details of these ancient non-Christian sources, including a discussion of the disputed portion of Josephus from Antiquities 18:3, are provided in Habermas, The Historical Jesus, Chapter 9.

22. Robert W. Funk, Roy W. Hoover, and the Jesus Seminar, The Five Gospels: The Search for

---

the Authentic Words of Jesus (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1993), pp. 16, 26.

23. See Matt. 28:17; Lk. 24:11, 36-42; Jn. 20:9, 24-29; cf. Acts 1:3.

24. This is reported several places, such as Matt. 28:11-15; Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho 108; Tertullian, On Spectacles 30; Toledoth Jesu.

25. For some details, see Habermas, The Historical Jesus, pp. 69-75, 225-228, 253-255; Habermas, "The Resurrection Appearances of Jesus," pp. 270-274; Craig, pp. 374-378; 397-404; 407-418.

26. For details, see Habermas, The Historical Jesus, pp. 158-167; The Resurrection of Jesus, pp. 24-26, 38-41; "The Resurrection Appearances of Jesus," pp. 263-270. I am not asserting in any way that the Bible is unreliable, only that neither its inspiration nor even its trustworthiness need not be assumed in order to argue for the resurrection.

27. Reginald H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 142.

28. Habermas, The Historical Jesus, Chapter 8; Maier, pp. 165-167, 202-203.

29. This is why Ken Stevenson and I included Chapter 8 on the reliability of Scripture in Verdict on the Shroud: Evidence for the Death and Resurrection of Jesus (Ann Arbor: Servant Books, 1981; Wayne: Dell Publishing Company, Inc., 1982).

30. Josephus, Wars of the Jews, V:XI.1.

31. For just a couple of recent studies on shroud pathology and other medical concerns, see Robert Bucklin, "The Shroud of Turin: Viewpoint of a Forensic Pathologist," Shroud Spectrum International, Volume 1.5 (March, 1982), pp. 2-9; Robert Bucklin, "Postmortem Changes and the Shroud of Turin," Shroud Spectrum International, Volume 14 (March, 1985), pp. 2-6; Gilbert R. Lavoie, Unlocking the Secrets of the Shroud (Allen: Thomas More, 1998).

32. I have argued these points in detail in two articles: "The Shroud of Turin and its Significance for Biblical Studies," Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, Volume 24, Number 1 (March, 1981), pp. 47-54; "The Shroud of Turin: A Rejoinder to Basinger and Basinger," Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, Volume 25, Number 2 (June, 1982), pp. 219-227.

33. Further discussion of these points can be found in the two articles in the previous note, as well as in Stevenson and Habermas, Verdict on the Shroud, Chapter 9; Kenneth E. Stevenson and Gary R. Habermas, The Shroud and the Controversy: Science, Skepticism, and the Search for Authenticity (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Publishers, 1990), Chapter 6.

---

34. Philip McNair. "The Shroud and History: Fantasy, Fake or Fact?" in Face to Face with the Turin Shroud, edited by Peter Jennings (Oxford: Mobray, 1978), p. 35.

35. Of major concern here is the cause of the image, since natural hypotheses such as artistic fakery or body contact (which would presumably be the case with this scenario) have been shown to face myriads of scientific hurdles (see Stevenson and Habermas, Verdict, pp. 191-197; Controversy, pp. 215-221). Other issues include the lack of bodily decomposition on the cloth and the method of bodily separation, the possibility of first century coins over the eyes, and many medical specifications, far beyond what was known in Medieval times. Additional details are found in Stevenson and Habermas, Controversy, pp. 92-94.

36. Personal conversation with Robert Bucklin, April 30, 1981.

37. Bucklin, "Postmortem Changes," p. 5; cf. Bucklin's summary on p. 6: "It is my opinion that no signs of postmortem decomposition appear on the Shroud image . . . ."

38. Bucklin, "Viewpoint of a Forensic Pathologist," p. 5; Bucklin, personal conversation, April 30, 1981.

39. Wilcox wrote one of the earlier books on the subject: Shroud (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1977).

40. Robert Wilcox, "The Shroud: Real or Fake?" The Voice, 26 February, 1982, pp. 11, 14.

41. John P. Jackson, "Is the Image on the Shroud Due to a Process Heretofore Unknown to Modern Science?" Shroud Spectrum International, Number 34 (March, 1990), p. 9.

42. Several of these possibilities are mentioned in Stevenson and Habermas, Controversy, pp. 128-133. A forthcoming volume that looks like it will provide some more possible answers to both the cause of the image and the Carbon-14 issue is by Mark Antonacci, The Resurrection of the Shroud (New York: M. Evans and Company, 1999?).

43. Robert Bucklin, "Afterword," in Stevenson and Habermas, Verdict on the Shroud, p. 190.

44. Robert Bucklin, personal conversation, April 30, 1981.