


The book was found

Cold-Case Christianity: A Homicide Detective Investigates The Claims Of The Gospels



Synopsis

You can believe because of the evidence, not in spite of it. For the first 35 years of his life, J. Warner Wallace was a devout atheist. After all, how can you believe a claim made about an event in the distant past for which there is little forensic evidence? Then Wallace realized something. Christianity was a lot like the cold cases he solved as a homicide detective - cold cases that turned out to have enough evidence, eyewitnesses, and records to solve. When Wallace applied his skills as an expert detective to the assertions of the New Testament, he came to a startling realization: the case for Christianity was as convincing as any case he'd ever worked as a detective.

Book Information

Audible Audio Edition

Listening Length: 8 hours and 31 minutes

Program Type: Audiobook

Version: Unabridged

Publisher: Oasis Audio

Audible.com Release Date: February 17, 2013

Whispersync for Voice: Ready

Language: English

ASIN: B00BHVEYJE

Best Sellers Rank: #6 in Books > Christian Books & Bibles > History > Historical Theology #15 in Books > Christian Books & Bibles > Ministry & Evangelism > Evangelism #17 in Books > Religion & Spirituality > Religious Studies > Comparative Religion

Customer Reviews

Christian apologetics is a constantly growing and changing scene and although it's the one career path that will absolutely guarantee that you'll never be rich, but there's definitely no shortage of "C-list/B-list" apologists out there. These folks are usually uneducated "discernment ministry" types running their own basement/blog "ministries" and defending the faith against the attacks of skeptics, academics, heretics and YouTube atheists. But, there are also a few "A-List" folks who have respectable education, write books, teach at Christian Colleges/Seminaries, debate Bart Ehrman or Richard Dawkins (two resume-making debaters for Christian apologists) and put on Alaskan cruises devoted to apologetics and worship via buffet. Of the "A-List" apologists, William Lane Craig is one of the biggest, so it's no surprise that several in his circle, the newest of which is J. Warner Wallace, are climbing onto the "A-List" and getting exposure (and plenty of endorsements from the staff and

friends of Biola). All that being said, when I started reading "Cold Case Christianity" by J. Warner Wallace, I already had an idea what to expect: Card-carrying evidentialist apologetics, mainly philosophical defense of Christianity, plenty of party-line towing with regards to the evidentialist apologists (i.e. Craig, Licona, Geisler, Habermas, Strobel, McDowell, Koukl, etc.), and a bit of theological inconsistency. I was not disappointed on that front; the book was what I expected. There was also a lot that I didn't expect, and that is why this book has climbed high on my ladder of apologetics texts. I'll throw down the Pros and Cons of the book:

PROS:

1. The book is wonderfully written and organized. J. Warner Wallace has done an excellent job writing with both clarity and accessibility, presenting his points with little technical jargon and explaining what jargon he uses (more than once too!). The chapters logically flow and the entire book is written with a layman in mind.
2. The book is wonderfully engaging. Being a homicide detective, Wallace has a body of experience that is both foreign and intriguing to your average reader, and he utilizes parallels and descriptions from his police experience very effectively. Also, the book has pictures and a bit of variety in the page layout; these thoughtful insertions keep the chapters from becoming stale and visually repetitive.
3. The book has a very broad scope and serves as a great introduction to a wide variety of apologetic issues (i.e. the resurrection, the arguments for the existence of God, textual criticism, the problem of evil, etc.) without bogging the reader down in details and nuanced argument.
4. Wallace generally presents the counter-arguments to his points well. His responses are clear and concise, and one gets the feeling from reading Wallace that he has had a lot of practical conversations with people regarding the issues under discussion.
5. Wallace usually gives good explanations of the concepts he discusses, like philosophical naturalism (page 25), abductive reasoning (page 33), reasonable doubt (page 131), etc. He's neither wordy nor vague, and he knows how to illustrate a concept effectively.
6. Pages 55-60 contain a great, helpful discussion on the validity and usefulness of circumstantial evidence and its value when compared with direct evidence. This is definitely a place where his experience in the courtroom comes forward and assists him greatly, and this is one subject that many a Christian needs to brush up on for practical purposes.
7. Pages 69-85 contain a very insightful and helpful treatment of eyewitness testimony, as well as excellent interaction with common accusations related to the unreliability of eyewitness testimony.
8. Pages 109-117 contain a fantastic treatment of conspiracy theories, exploring and explaining the practical difficulties for concocting and upholding a lasting conspiracy involving multiple parties. Again, he draws examples from his police experience that prove to be excellent illustrations of his points.
9. Page 131 has a very insightful unpacking of the standard of proof and reasonable doubt vs. possible doubt. Again, Wallace's legal understandings and courtroom

experience provide helpful illustrations here.¹⁰ Pages 135-136 give 2 good responses to the problem of evil: Wallace points to the presuppositional philosophical inconsistencies of the problem of evil (if objective evil exists for the problem to have substance in the first place, there must be a universal standard of "good" by which evil is judged), and also gives what I call the "Ten Trillion Year" response (God is eternal and judges good and evil from his eternal perspective; i.e. ten trillion years from now, the ten thousand years of evil that mankind endured will be considered inconsequential to the 9.9999999 trillion years of comprehensive and continuous good of paradise earth).¹¹ Wallace has incorporated a wide variety of information, including some rather recent stuff from the academic world. One example of this was how on page 192 he included the recent work of Tal Ilan on the frequency and distribution of names in the New Testament world to show how the writers of the Bible were from the geographic location that they claimed. I was also really pleased to see Wallace reference Edwin Yamauchi (page 209) and give a brief discussion of the actual problematic nature of archeological evidence; how most items from history don't actually survive as evidence and our picture of the past, as based on archeological artifacts, is actually amazingly incomplete and inaccurate.¹² On the whole, chapter 12 was excellent, exploring the internal and external corroboration of the Gospels. For the Christian who has recently discovered the popular (and mostly irresponsible) manifestations of doubt regarding the reliability of the New Testament (i.e. Richard Carrier, the movie "Zeitgeist", the skeptics annotated Bible, etc.), this chapter would be a welcome encouragement.¹³ I did appreciate his call for Christians to be case-makers, especially with his cooking analogy on page 260-261. I thought it was a great way of presenting the difference between the biblical office of Evangelist and the Christian who responds to the great commission.¹⁴ His list of books for further reading was great; 2 or 3 books per topic and not too overwhelming, though I did think that some of his books might be significantly above the reading level of someone who might find "Cold Case Christianity" a bit challenging. Going from a 5 page discussion of textual criticism to reading Metzger, Wallace and Comfort is a leap that will likely leave a lot people on their faces. Then again, I'm not really aware of a layman's introduction to textual criticism outside of James White's "The King James Only Controversy", so there possibly is a book that needs to be written there. I'll get right on that.

CONS: Before I address the cons, I must say that most of the things I didn't like about the book were admittedly minor in nature. Only the last 2 con points (points 5 & 6) were ones that I would consider relatively significant.

1. On page 41 Wallace presents the Habermas/Licona "minimal facts" argument for the resurrection. I understand that the "minimal facts" argument for the resurrection is convincing to Christians, but it's actually a really weak argument for most people to use outside of a New Testament studies class in a seminary.

Arguing that "a majority of scholars agree on these four facts" basically assumes that most people on the street care what a majority of "scholars" say. Let's face it; your average atheist/skeptic electrician who's spent a hundred hours on the internet reading about New Testament history (and watching YouTube) thinks he knows as much as most "scholars" and has absolutely no problem dismissing academic consensus in favor of an idiotic theory on some website ("Zeitgeist" anyone?). Beyond that, the first point (Jesus died on the cross and was buried) is actually denied by significant academic skeptics who hold that Jesus did die but was simply tossed in a mass grave (i.e. Marcus Borg and Bart Ehrman are vocal about this). Far more significant than this is the fact that the first point is denied as an unassailable tenet of faith by every Muslim on the planet. Living in a city where 1/3 of the population has immigrated from the Middle East or South Asia, I've long stopped using this argument.² I was sad that on page 66 Wallace includes the transcendental argument for the existence of God in his list of arguments, but doesn't present it to his readers. Not a big deal, but as a presuppositionalist, I felt robbed. Boo hoo for me.³ On page 136 he gives the "love" defense to the practical problem of evil: A world with love is better than a world without love, love requires freedom and in that freedom many choose not to love. I know that idea gets a fair amount of traction in various apologetics circles, but there are at least 2 fatal problems with the "love" defense:^{3a} It's simply contrary to the consistent and explicit teaching of the scriptures with regards to why evil exists (namely that God has decreed that evil occur for his own good purposes i.e. Genesis 50:1-21). I don't find apologists offering an exegetical defense of this idea; it's a rather shallow and sentimental response to a serious problem that portrays the God of the Universe like a teenage girl (poor little guy just wants to be loved).^{3b} Why is a world with love better than a world without love? That whole idea is simply assumed, and I've found that many an atheist/skeptic sees the flaw in this argument instinctively: if a world with love has a world where a majority of people don't experience that love but rather experience war, disease, abuse, suffering, etc., that doesn't actually seem better for most people than alternatives (i.e. not existing at all, being a mentally deficient creature that experiences comfort but not love, etc.).⁴ Wallace writes like many popular apologists and seems to think that the biggest threat to Christianity is aggressive atheism; he repeatedly interacts with both the popular skeptics (Dawkins, Harris, etc.) and the academic atheists (Bart Ehrman), and I think I know why. Everyone who is in apologetics circles for any amount of time hears the scary numbers: 80% (or more) of kids that grow up in church leave the church when they get to college and most apologists (including Wallace) think that the reason is a lack of apologetic instruction. Those 80% of kids want to believe but their nasty philosophy or religious studies professors overwhelm them with arguments against Christianity and those kids, being unprepared, abandon the faith. I would suggest

that this whole paradigm is mistaken and this leads me to my 2 serious points of disagreement with Wallace in the book:5. Wallace seems to argue that the reason people disbelieve the scriptures is because of philosophical naturalism. He comments on this on pages 25-26, and he points to this idea throughout the book (like on page 208 where he suggests that skeptics disbelieve the Bible because of the presumption [without evidence] that the account is false unless corroborated, and this doubt stems from philosophical naturalism.) I would suggest that the Bible is clear that the philosophical naturalism (and every other articulate expression of doubt) is the fruit of unbelief, and unbelief is the natural state of a sinful heart. One place where this is explicitly taught in the scriptures is in the story of John 9-10, where Jesus heals the man born blind and the Pharisees refuse to believe, though the man stands before them with his eyes being healed. The disbelief of the Pharisees is confusing to Jesus' disciples (and the man born blind), and the whole scenario boils over in John 10:22-27, which reads: "At that time the Feast of Dedication took place at Jerusalem. It was winter, and Jesus was walking in the temple, in the colonnade of Solomon. So the Jews gathered around him and said to him, 'How long will you keep us in suspense? If you are the Christ, tell us plainly.'" Jesus answered them, "I told you, and you do not believe. The works that I do in my Father's name bear witness about me, but you do not believe because you are not among my sheep. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me." The whole point there was that the unbelief had nothing to do with the presence of evidence, for the evidence was both public and irrefutable (the man born blind could see). Nowhere in John 9 or 10 does anyone challenge the obvious nature of the evidence; the problem was only with the interpretation of the evidence. The Jews did not interpret the evidence correctly (i.e. they manifested philosophical naturalism that refused the possibility of the miracle proving Christ's claims) because they were not among Christ's sheep (i.e. they still had sinful, unbelieving hearts). Now this may seem like splitting hairs, but abandoning philosophical naturalism for supernaturalism is not synonymous with becoming a believer in the person and work of Christ. As a Christian apologist, I don't want people to abandon philosophical naturalism; I want people to repent of their sin and believe the gospel. This then leads to my final point of disagreement.6. This also manifests in Wallace's one strange idea; the "2 decision Christian" idea. On pages 253-255, Wallace talks about a criminal named Santiago who got saved at a crusade and then became a bank robber for several years but finally got caught by Wallace. What is shocking is Wallace's interpretation of the events: "Santiago made a decision to trust Jesus for his salvation, but he never made a decision to examine the life and teaching of Jesus evidentially. Santiago failed to make a second decision to examine what he believed. He was unable to see his faith as anything more than subjective opinion as he struggled to live in a world of

objective facts. As a result, his beliefs eventually surrendered to the facts of his situation and the pressures of his addiction. He allowed his friends and family situation to influence him, rather than becoming a source of inspiration and truth for his friends and neighborhood. Santiago was a one-decision Christian, and that decision was unsupported by a reasonable examination of the evidence." (page 255) Now this is the description of a guy who was a career criminal: "he made a decision to trust Jesus for his salvation" and Wallace says the problem was that "Santiago was a one-decision Christian". I would dare suggest that Wallace disagrees with the apostle John:

Everyone who makes a practice of sinning also practices lawlessness; sin is lawlessness. You know that he appeared in order to take away sins, and in him there is no sin. No one who abides in him keeps on sinning; no one who keeps on sinning has either seen him or known him." - 1 John

3:4-6 Santiago didn't need to make a second decision to examine what he believed; he wasn't a tier 1 Christian who needed to get to tier 2. It seems fairly clear that Santiago was a guy who, at some time in the past, was made to feel guilty for his sin and was, for whatever reason, lead to believe that if he walked to the front of a building, his life would somehow change and he'd get what he wanted (good marriage, no more addictions, etc.). Santiago had been deceived and now was living a life that proved it. Santiago needed to believe the gospel and repent of his sin (for the first time), and I praise the Lord that during his time in prison, it sounds like he did. FINAL THOUGHTS:- I know that this review has a longer "con" than "pro" section, but I wanted to give a fair and critical review of a book that was deserving of a serious interaction (and I do so out of respect for Wallace as a co-laborer in the gospel and an effort to give helpful feedback, not out of some effort to belittle him). I honestly found "Cold Case Christianity" to be a fantastic general introduction to apologetics.

Wallace and I have some serious theological differences, but those differences don't really manifest with an overwhelming majority of the material in the book. In the future, I'll most likely use "Cold Case Christianity" as a textbook in my introductory apologetics courses for senior high and college-aged kids, and the theological differences we have will be easily addressed in a single lecture. I give Cold Case Christianity 4 solid stars (I'd give it 4.5 if would allow) and a high recommend. ***Update - Jan 25th*** I recently got the chance to hear J. Warner Wallace speak in my town and got the opportunity to talk with him directly. He basically gave a talk that was a 1.25 hour overview of this book, mostly focusing on the second half of the book (establishing the credibility of the Gospels). Wallace was a wonderful speaker who was thoroughly enjoyable to hear, and I appreciated his presentation immensely. After the presentation, I got an opportunity to speak with him privately and he asked me if I had read his book. I admitted that I had read it and had already reviewed it, and we got into a quick discussion about some of my issues with the book (as well as

discussed some of the harsh responses from certain Calvinists, a category in which Wallace apparently places himself). I mentioned several of my personal questions that I had when I read the book (i.e. whether he gave the book of Revelation a late date...and he admitted that he wasn't informed enough on that issue to have an opinion) and then I basically focused on my serious question; the "two decision Christian" issue. Much to my delight, Wallace admitted that he needed to rework that portion of the book and acknowledged that it wasn't near as clear as he wished it was. What he apparently meant with the story of Santiago was that: a. Santiago had made a profession of faith at some time in the past (but was living as if he had not). b. If Santiago had made a decision to study the life and teaching of Jesus, he would have discovered that he was NOT living in proper correspondence to his profession. Wallace wasn't talking about some sort of "second blessing" theology at all, and he wasn't suggesting some sort of wild "no Lordship" position on salvation/sanctification. I definitely look forward to and next revision of the book, and I'd now up my review score from 4.5 to 4.75. I was definitely blessed to be able to get clarification from the horse's mouth (so to speak), and am delighted that Christian Apologetics has a new addition who is both down to earth, more in theological agreement with me than I had previously suspected, and a gentleman to boot.

I'll forego the preliminaries here and just say it: this is the best introductory apologetics book in regards to the historicity of the Gospels I have ever read. If you are looking for a book in that area, get it now. If you are not looking for a book in that area, get it anyway because it is that good. Now, on to the details. The book maps out an investigative journey through Christian history. How did we get the Gospels? Can we trust them? Who was Jesus? Do we know anything about Him? Yet the way that Wallace approaches this question will draw even those who do not care about these topics into the mystery. As a cold-case homicide detective, Wallace approaches these questions with a detective's eye, utilizing his extensive knowledge of the gathering and evaluation of evidence to investigate Christianity forensically. He begins the work with a section on method. He argues that we must learn to acknowledge our presuppositions and be aware of them when we begin an investigation. Like the detective who walks into a crime scene with a preconceived notion of how the murder played out, we can easily fall into the trap of using our expectations about a truth claim to color our investigation of the evidence for that claim. Learning to infer is another vastly important piece of the investigation. People must learn to distinguish between the "possible" and the "reasonable" (34ff). This introduction to "abductive reasoning" is presented in such a way as to make it understandable for those unfamiliar with even the term, while also serving as great training

on how to teach others to reason for those involved in apologetics. Chapter 3, "Think Circumstantially" is perhaps the central chapter for the whole book. Wallace notes that what is necessary in order to provide evidence "beyond a reasonable doubt" is not necessarily "direct evidence." That is, direct evidence-the type of evidence which can prove something all by itself (i.e. seeing it rain outside as proof for it actually raining)-is often thought of to be the standard for truth. Yet if this were the standard for truth, then we would hardly be able to believe anything. The key is to notice that a number of indirect evidences can add up to make the case. For example, if a suspected murderer is known to have had the victim's key, spot cleaned pants (suspected blood stains), matches the height and weight a witness saw leaving the scene of the crime, has boots that matched the description, was nervous during the interview and changed his story, has a baseball bat (a bat was the murder weapon) which has also been bleached and is dented, and the like, these can add up to a very compelling case (57ff). Any one of these evidences would not lead one to say they could reasonably conclude the man was the murderer, but added together they provide a case which pushes the case beyond a reasonable doubt-the man was the murderer. In a similar way, the evidences for the existence of God can add up to a compelling case for the God of classical theism. Wallace then turns to examining a number of these arguments, including the moral, cosmological, fine-tuning, and design arguments. These are each touched on briefly, as a kind of preliminary to consider when turning to the case for the Gospels. Furthermore, the notion of "circumstantial" or cumulative case arguments hints towards the capacity to examine the Bible and the Gospels to see if they are true. Wallace then turns to examining the Gospels-Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John-in light of what he has learned as a detective. He utilizes forensic statement analysis as well as a number of other means by which to investigate witnesses and eyewitness reports to determine whether the Gospels can be trusted. He first turns to Mark and makes an argument that Mark had firsthand contact with Peter, one of the Disciples and an Apostle. He shows how we can search for and find "artifacts"-textual additions that were late into the accounts of the Gospels. None of these are surprises, because we know about them by investigating the evidence we have from the manuscript tradition. By piecing together the puzzle of the evidences for the Gospels, we form a complete picture of Christ (106ff). It is easy to get caught up in "conspiracy theory" types of explanations for the events in the Bible. People argue that all kinds of alternative explanations are possible. Yet Wallace notes again that there is a difference between possible and reasonable. Simply throwing out possible scenarios does nothing to undermine the truth claims of the Gospels if the Gospels' own account is more reasonable. A very important part of Cold-Case Christianity is the notion that we can trace back the "chain of custody" for the Gospels. By arguing that we are able to see how

the New Testament was passed authoritatively from one eyewitness to disciple to disciple and so on, Wallace argues that conspiracy theories which argue the Gospel stories were made up have a much less reasonable explanation than that they are firsthand accounts of what happened. Much of the information in these chapters is compelling and draws on knowledge of the Apostles' and their disciples. It therefore provides a great introduction to church history. Wallace provides a number of other examples and evidences for the New Testament. Each of these could be challenged individually, but to do so would be to miss the forest for the trees. All of these examples are highlighted by real-world stories from Wallace's work as a detective. Readers-even those who are hostile to Christianity-will be drawn in by these examples. It makes reading the book similar to reading a suspense novel, such that readers will not want to put it down. For example, when looking at distinguishing between possible/reasonable, he uses a lengthy illustration of finding a dead body and eliminating various explanations for the cause of death through observations like "having a knife in the back" as making it much less probable that accidental death is a reasonable explanation, despite being possible. The book also has a number of other helpful tools for those interested in learning more. There are sidebars with additional information and definitions, as well as notes from various court cases or law books that explain some of the headier material. Overall, Cold-Case Christianity is the best introduction to the historicity of the Gospels I have ever read. I simply cannot recommend it highly enough. Wallace covers the evidence in a winsome manner and utilizes a unique approach that will cause even disinterested readers to continue reading, just to see what he says next. I pre-ordered two copies to give to friends immediately. I am not exaggerating when I say that this book is a must read for everyone.

I just finished this book and I really enjoyed it. This book is going to be one of the most influential books for skeptics and Christians beginning to get into apologetics. It is really accessible, while still being academically rigorous. I actually enjoyed it more (and think it is a better training tool) than On Guard, and I love Dr. Craig's work. The crime-scene investigator approach is a refreshing remodel of the often dry and books which are not very engaging for those new to the field. My younger brother is currently in the same Criminal Justice program I graduated from and I am going to get this book for him for his birthday, for sure. Really, I can't emphasize enough how much I enjoyed this book. If I had to choose one book to give to a non-Christian interested in examining the evidence for Christianity or a Christian wanting to begin learning how to defend his or her faith, this book would be my choice.

[Download to continue reading...](#)

Cold-Case Christianity: A Homicide Detective Investigates the Claims of the Gospels Cold Calling: for beginners - Cold Calling Techniques that work - Cold Calling Tips (Cold Calling Techniques that work for beginners - Cold calling sales Book 1) The Case for Faith Student Edition: A Journalist Investigates the Toughest Objections to Christianity (Case for ... Series for Students) The Case for a Creator Student Edition: A Journalist Investigates Scientific Evidence that Points Toward God (Case for ... Series for Students) The Miracle Detective: An Investigative Reporter Sets Out to Examine How the Catholic Church Investigates Holy Visions and Discovers His Own Faith God's Crime Scene: A Cold-Case Detective Examines the Evidence for a Divinely Created Universe No God but One: Allah or Jesus?: A Former Muslim Investigates the Evidence for Islam and Christianity The Gnostic Gospels of Jesus: The Definitive Collection of Mystical Gospels and Secret Books about Jesus of Nazareth Inspector Colbeck's Casebook: Thirteen Tales from the Railway Detective (The Railway Detective Series) Pipsie, Nature Detective: The Disappearing Caterpillar (Pipsie, Nature Detective Series) Forecasting Product Liability Claims: Epidemiology and Modeling in the Manville Asbestos Case (Statistics for Biology and Health) Scooby-Doo Set of 8 Mystery Chapter Books (Haunted Castle ~ Snow Monster ~ Fairground Phantom ~ Spooky Strikeout ~ Case of the Haunted Hound ~ Case of the Living Doll ~ Case of the Spinning Spider ~ The Creepy Camp) Homicide: A Year on the Killing Streets Robert Black: The True Story of a Child Rapist and Serial Killer from the United Kingdom (Homicide True Crime Cases Book 1) A Good Month for Murder: The Inside Story of a Homicide Squad Peter Manuel: The Beast of Birkenhead Serial Killer (Homicide True Crime Cases Book 3) Sue Grafton GHI Gift Collection: "G" Is for Gumshoe, "H" Is for Homicide, "I" Is for Innocent (A Kinsey Millhone Novel) H is for Homicide (A Kinsey Millhone Mystery) The Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity (Future of Christianity Trilogy) How Africa Shaped the Christian Mind: Rediscovering the African Seedbed of Western Christianity (Early African Christianity Set)

[Dmca](#)