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Two important points rise with this lecture. First, this is “A” Christian response, the indefinite article meaning that it is one of many. Second, it is my response, though any or all of it may become, if it is not already, your response to Islam.

Then there is the problem — and a sticky one at that — of determining just which type of Islam I am here addressing. It is not the Islam of Elijah Muhammad and Louis Farrakhan, called The Nation of Islam, or, to their disdain, The Black Muslims. Nor is it the Islam of any of the other groups that are labeled heretical, unorthodox or heterodox by more traditional or conservative adherents. Nor shall I address, in isolation one from the other, Sunni or Shi’ah Islam. Rather, I shall be addressing traditional or orthodox Islam in a general fashion, with no particular or special reference to factions of any kind. The topics I have chosen are pertinent to my response and the doctrines or issues associated with them are those that, in my opinion, are affirmed by the majority of Muslims. With this, though, there will be implied particularities according to factions, but they will not be stated explicitly.

Now for foundational preliminaries, and I begin with an epistemological question: Why is it and how is it that I view my Christian response in such a way that (a) I am properly warranted in my response, and (b) my response accords with objective reality?

First, the Bible is reliable and trustworthy as a document or collection of documents. We see that when the disciplines of archaeology, comparative manuscript studies, and comparative historical studies are focused on the Bible. Second, the Bible speaks of who Jesus is and what he has done in space and time. This second point must not be glossed over lightly, for here we have to do with the crux of the matter: Jesus is the unique self-disclosure of God in space and time in and through his incarnation, resurrection and ascension, producing the one continuous whole that is the historical Christ event, from incarnation to ascension in space and time, all this expressing the one historical Jesus.

Therefore, the Christ event, whereby we know who the triune God is and what the triune God has done, is doing, and will do, is not only that by which, in which, and through which we ultimately interpret the Old and New Testaments, but is also the metanarrative, the grand story for all humanity, that exists objectively and absolutely, regardless of recognition.
of it. It therefore provides the necessary objective ground of the Christian faith.

Christ as the self-disclosure of God in space and time is truth that exists whether one seizes it or not. It is Truth with a capital “T,” and it is discovered, not created by any one particular linguistic, social and religious community that is merely one among scores of other religious communities. These epistemological ingredients properly warrant my response and render my response true to reality. Now, on to other things.

How do I view Muslims, the term defined and interpreted as “those who have submitted to Allah”? Most basically I view them as loved by God and created in the image of God just as I am. Further, they – everyone of them – have been touched by God’s prevenient grace, enabling everyone of them, past, present and future, to accept the riches of the gospel of Christ Jesus. Moreover, I am called to love them. But there is as well a demonic side of the coin. “The god of this world,” says the scripture, “has blinded the minds of the unbelieving so that they might not see the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God” (2 Cor. 4:4). Connected theologically to this is a phenomenon occurring when you push things back to the beginning, to the early chapters of Genesis, the fall of humanity recorded therein and its effect unfolding in the history of the world from that time. Islam is one of many fallen expressions of religions or religiosity, falling short of the knowledge and proper ontological and universal expression that God intends of himself, that expression having been revealed in space-time history in the disclosure of himself in the person of Jesus Christ in his incarnation and resurrection and ascension. So, though I, in the spirit of the apostle Paul as he stood in the midst of the Areopagus, take note of or even in a further missiological sense compliment and utilize my view of Muslims as “religious in all aspects,” I am forced also to believe the opposite side of the coin, which is that Islam is a fallen expression of religion fueled by the enemy of our souls.

Many Muslims and I share a common ground: The Pentateuch, the Psalms of David, and the Gospels of Jesus are divinely revealed. In practice most Muslims ignore the contents of the Psalms and the Gospels, though they pay some attention to the Pentateuch. For example, the story of Abraham bears importance. In conversation with Muslims, after getting to know them a bit and therefore establishing some kind of personal relationship, I will ask them if they’ve ever read, for example, the Gospel of John. Many simply have not. But then, once they read the Gospel of John they will be faced with a dilemma – what it says about Jesus in several areas is in direct contradiction to what the Qur’an teaches about Jesus. The Gospels, then, pose great difficulties for many Muslims, not the least being
that Christianity, in their eyes a divinely revealed religion, is now at odds with Qur’anic Islam’s assertions concerning Jesus.

That we must be ready for defense and proclamation of the deity of Christ is evidenced by many Muslims who get their cues from Muslim apologists who make indicative statements of denial of the deity of Christ. In some cases they use arguments very much akin to those of such pseudo-Christian religions as Jehovah’s Witnesses. We must be informed and ready to proclaim and, if needed, defend. Consider John 1:1a which affirms the eternal pre-existence of the Word, clause b his eternal pre-existence with the Father, and clause c his eternal ontological equality with God the Father. Over against John 1:3, where “all things became,” ginomai, John employs the imperfect tense of eimi in John 1.1, which I take, on both grammatical and contextual grounds, as past tense, continuous action, in reference to the pre-incarnate Jesus. He existed, therefore, continuously or eternally, a theme illustrated in John 8:58, where ginomai or “to become” is used for Abraham, who is part of the “all things” that “became” in John 1:3, and the divine eimi, “I am,” is stated by Jesus. This lends conclusive weight to my interpretation of the imperfect tense as past time, continuous or eternal when seen in the light of “creation to become,” ginomai, “God is,” eimi, in Psalm 90:2, 89:2 in the LXX: “Before the mountains to become,” ginomai, “you are,” second person form of “I am” or eimi.

Jesus, then, is confessed as eternally God the Son, who, as we read in John 1:14, became flesh and dwelt a while among us, and that we beheld his glory. Seen here is explicit reference to Exodus 40:34-35, where the tabernacle, in the LXX the noun skene, is filled with the glory of Yahweh. It is no coincidence that John uses the verbal derivative of skene, tabernacle, which is eskenosen, in communicating that the eternal Word “dwelt” among us and closely connects that with beholding his, Jesus’, glory. Further, he is “full of grace and truth,” a covenantal phrase found in Exodus 34:6, where Yahweh is rab besed ve emeth, “full of grace and truth.” With Jesus, then, we have to do with Yahweh in the flesh, who dwelt among us.

Once the Muslim has read the Gospel it forces at least three scenarios. First, one may simply ignore the dilemma. Second, one may be startled to find out that the Jesus of the Gospels is quite different from that of the Qur’an, at which point we might emphasize in evangelism that the Qur’an speaks of the Bible as “the Book of God,” “the Word of God,” and, most importantly, “a light and guidance to Man” and “a decision for all matters.” Third, one may assert that, although Christians are, as the Qur’an states, “People of the Book,” that book has been corrupted. Here the Qur’an is seen as the final word of Allah in corrective to the corrupt nature of the Bible, abrogating the Bible, setting it aside in deference to the pure
word of Allah.

For Muslims who exist in this third scenario, I respond by asking, “Can you offer objective evidence outside of the Qur’an to support your assertion that the Bible has been corrupted?” A close reading of the text-critical notes in, for example, the NA 27th edition of the Greek New Testament reveals that no Christian essential doctrine is threatened by textual variants or, to put it crudely, manuscript corruption. These essential doctrines include the person of Christ as both God and man, truly fully God by nature having incarnated in union with a true and full human nature, being crucified on the cross, having risen from the dead in the same body that died on the cross, and having ascended as the Lord of glory, now living as the one mediator between God the Father and humanity. All these doctrines the Qur’an denies.

This now raises the issue over the question: “Is the God of the Muslim the God of the Bible?” Yes and no. In the first sense, that of “Yes,” we know there is only one God by nature, as inferred in Galatians 4:8. In the theological context of God being God over all, “Yes” is the answer. However, and this is a very big “However,” the god revealed in the Qur’an is not the true and living God. The true and living God is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. God is triune. With the Qur’an’s denial of Jesus as God the Son, it therefore cannot affirm the triune God. It, rather, affirms a god who is, to use Paul’s terminology in Galatians 4:8, by nature no god. Further, in various places of the Old Testament, mention is made of false gods, and I am not averse to such terminology in reference to the god of the Qur’an and therefore to the god of Muslims who embrace its teaching on Jesus and in its explicit denial of the Trinity. In the covenantal sense, and this is a very importance sense, “where the rubber meets the road,” the god of the Qur’anic Muslim is not the God of the Bible.

Moreover, are we sure that Qur’anic Muslims would answer that their God is the same as the Christian God? After all, do not many Muslims accuse Christians of the unpardonable sin of shirk, which is association of something with Allah, and which is the foundation of all sin, because we confess Jesus as God the Son, the son of Mary? Consider Sura 5:75: “They do blaspheme who say ‘God is Christ the son of Mary.’” Regarding further denials of the Christ of the Bible, let’s allow the Qur’an again to speak. In Sura 4:171 in A. Yusuf Ali’s translation we read, “Christ Jesus was (no more than) an apostle of God. Say not ‘Trinity.’ Desist. It will be better for you. (Far exalted is He) above having a son.” To put it another way and to restate my conclusion, the one true God of the universe is triune; Jesus as God the Son is an indispensable aspect of the doctrine of God as triune; Muslims following the teaching of the Qur’an reject Jesus as God the Son; therefore the god of the Qur’an and Qur’anic Muslims is
not the God of the Bible.

Regarding the Trinity, this is where the proverbial rubber again meets the road. It is in many senses the most fundamental and essential doctrine of the Christian faith, yet one of the most difficult to communicate effectively to those who, for a variety of reasons, are either puzzled by it, doubt it, or outright reject it. Note that in addition to fundamental misunderstandings on the part of the Qur’an and on the parts of many Muslims, there are more informed Muslims who know of the nuanced and theologically informed Christian language of the Trinity who nonetheless deny it and accuse Christians of blasphemy for believing such things. For these reasons the missiologically savvy know that a reasoned scriptural defense and proclamation of the Trinity doctrine is called for in the context of apologetics and evangelism “on the ground,” that is, the Christian must be ready to present a relatively quick and concise reasoned and scriptural doctrine of the Trinity when in dialogue with Muslims. Granted that a properly foundational and subsequent coherent view of the reliability of the Bible has either been taken for granted or has been presented and defended by the Christian, we might communicate the doctrine as follows:

A. God is infinite and we are finite.

B. The Bible we now possess is essentially not corrupted and is “a light and guidance to humanity” and “a decision for all matters.”

C. Therefore we cannot fully comprehend how the one God is three persons because God is infinite and we are finite, but we may apprehend that the one God is three persons because it is taught in “the Book.”

D. Now the doctrine itself: There is one God. Isaiah 43:10, “You are my witnesses that you may know, believe and understand that I am. Before me no god was formed, neither will there be after me. Secondly, we have in the New Testament three persons, and they are each called God. In 2 Peter 1:17 we have a person called the Father, and he is called God. In John 20:28 we have a person called the Son or Jesus, and he is called God. In Acts 5:3-4 we have a person called the Holy Spirit and he is equated with God. Though we cannot fully comprehend it we can apprehend it, the three persons are the one God. In Matthew 28:19 we read that disciples are to be baptized “in the name” or authority “of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.” This occurs in the context of covenant, and here the three nouns, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, are each separated by kai (“and”) and are each preceded by the definite article (“the”), indicating that they are separate, distinct persons that are the one name into whom and under whose authority
believers stand.

Norman Geisler and Abdul Saleeb bring out a very astute observation regarding the doctrine of the Trinity in relationship to the Islamic doctrine of the eternal nature of “uncreatedness” of the Qur’an, a relationship, by the way, that may be employed not only and simply as an apologetic, but an apologetic that becomes for both Muslim and Christian a common ground upon which to begin to understand a fundamental ingredient common to both doctrines. Is it not true that the Muslim, in acknowledging the eternal nature of the Qur’an coming from the eternal template in heaven known as “the Mother of the Book” (cf. 13:39), admits to an entity, in this case admittedly an impersonal entity, that is in some sense co-eternal with Allah, that being the eternal Qur’an, or, in some cases in order to soften the charge that some thing separate from Allah eternally co-exists with Allah, that the eternal book is the “speech of Allah”? In the first case, that of an eternal book co-existing with Allah, there is indeed some other entity besides Allah that is eternal, that being the Mother of the Book! In the second case, as Geisler and Saleeb note, if the Qur’an comes from the eternal attribute called the speech of God, and if Allah possesses other divine eternal attributes not identical to Allah and somewhat distinguishable from Allah, is this not implicit admission to, though I admit this is of an ontologically impersonal nature, a plurality in unity in the being of Allah?3

Allow me to register a parenthetical caveat here regarding another doctrine. I often hear Christians and others say, and read others communicating, that both Islam and Christianity affirm the virgin birth, implying that the two religions believe in the same virgin birth. But such is not the case, simply for this reason: The biblical doctrine of the virgin birth has to do with God the Word becoming flesh, a doctrine denied by Qur’anic Islam. Qur’anic Islam therefore affirms a virgin birth, but does not affirm the biblical virgin birth.

I move on now to the doctrine of salvation, which is also understood as success, prosperity, well-being, or bliss. Arguably “The Greatest” heavyweight boxing champion Muhammad Ali was interviewed for the December 2001 issue of Reader’s Digest. Obviously this was on the heels of the murderous act at the hands of Muslims on September 11. Ali was asked, “What does your faith mean to you?” This, by the way, is an excellent question to ask Muslims as we engage them in conversation. Ali’s response was, “[It] means [a] ticket to heaven.” But then Ali immediately followed with this: “One day we’re all going to die, and God’s going to judge us, [our] good and bad deeds. [If the] bad outweighs the good, you go to hell; if the good outweighs the bad, you go to heaven.”

Ali may have well been referring to Sura 23:102-103: “Those whose
balance (of good deeds) is heavy, — they will attain salvation: But those whose balance is light, will be those who have lost their souls; in Hell they will abide.”

The Qur’an is quite intense about the doctrines of heaven and hell. Jane Smith and Y. Haddad write in *The Islamic Understanding of Death and Resurrection*, “So intense is the Qur’anic concern for and insistence on the day to come when all will be held accountable for their faith and their actions, that the ethical teachings contained in the Book must be understood in the light of this reality.”

Even within Islam’s insistence on determinism, where Allah alone determines one’s salvation, effort on the part of the Muslim is essential. Note now that the doctrine of balance of good deeds versus bad deeds on the scales of justice lend to Islam’s general denial of deathbed salvation. As Frederick Denny writes, “God will not accept the repentance of one who is at the verge of death. There must have been an established pattern of repentance and good works.”

Connected with this is the general Islamic doctrine that human beings are not born sinful. Rather, they are born inherently good, and they are sinners because they sin. Denny goes on to state that this further lends to absence in Islamic doctrine of the need for substitutionary atonement to redeem sinners. It is here that the prescriptive acts that please Allah, and the descriptive acts that warrant his judgment, are found throughout the Qur’an and the “Report” concerning the deeds and sayings of Muhammad, known as the Hadith, second in authority for Muslims behind the Qur’an.

In response to this, having established, to whatever quantitative extent based on the needs of the Muslim, the reliability of the Bible, I would share with the Muslim that I am one of “the people of the Book,” and that this reliable book, the book which is “a decision for all matters,” testifies to Jesus Christ as God the Son, and that Jesus was the only one who perfectly “submitted” to the will of God. I would share that Abraham saw the day when Jesus would come (John 8:56) and perfectly submit to God, and that Abraham saw this through a sacrificial system performed *by him*, noted in Genesis 12 and following. I would share that a very important example of this is found in Genesis 15, where the two pieces of each of the animals that had been sacrificed were laid out, and that God, rather than Abraham, passed between the pieces, communicating — taking ancient near eastern covenant ratification ceremonies as the context — “If you do not keep this covenant, let this happen to me.” I would share that Abraham saw the coming of Jesus in all this, John 8:56, where Jesus, the one perfect “submitter” to God, and God himself, “let this happen to him,” and that if we believe in Jesus’ sacrifice on the cross, as recorded in this most reliable book, “we may *know;* *know;* *know;* *know;* “that we have eternal life,” 1 John 5:13. I
would share that only then, after being saved by grace through faith in Christ alone, does God further enable us to do good works as he continues his work of *really*, ontologically, making us holy and setting us apart for service unto him, and that left to ourselves the scales of justice tip far on the side of bad deeds. And, finally, I would share what that means. It means dying to yourself and living for God and others.

As you can tell by now, a vital and eternally important part of my response to Islam is focus on the doctrines of who God is, who Jesus is, and salvation. As eternally important as these are, there is an important part of the response that I have not yet shared with you. I must strive for a holistic response to Islam. What does that look like? It could take on several forms, but whatever the form, it will not exclude the eternally important truths just discussed.

Now, I hope to possess, in the words of missiologist Peter Kuzmic, a theology that is missiologically informed, and a missiology that is theologically based. That bears repeating: A theology that is missiologically informed, and a missiology that is theologically based. That might look like this:

A Christian couple decides to invite some Muslim acquaintances over for dinner in order to build a bridge for a developing relationship that will lead to sharing the Gospel. It would be most advantageous if they did a little searching on certain Islamic doctrinal and religio-cultural dynamics, like food, dress and drink. There are, after all, Islamic prohibitions against certain foods. Swine is forbidden; the meat of animals that have not been ritually killed is forbidden; wine and other alcoholic substances are forbidden. Yet, in doing their homework the Christian couple find that it is all too difficult to be sensitive to all the restrictions and even the circumstances when restrictions are lifted. What should they do? Further, they have found out that in the Qur’an, Sura 5:51, it states that Muslims should not take Jews and Christians for friends, which means, according to A. Yusuf Ali, do not look to them for help and comfort.

Well, hoping that there may be some nuanced understanding of Sûrah 5:51 that they are not aware of, they call their acquaintances anyway, inviting them to dinner and asking them what the evening should look like from their religious perspective. They ask about food, drink, dress, house ornaments, etc. What would they like to eat, drink and experience?

Now it may be that these are Muslims who want to adapt to *our* religio-cultural paradigms – a phenomenon, by the way, that we don’t emphasize enough as an alternative and as a possible expectation on *our* parts – and this in and of itself might be a witness to them; that is, the fact that this Christian couple took the time to call and talk about this issue not only startles but impresses the invitees. Or, it might be the case that they will
adapt to the Christian couple’s religio-cultural norms for the sake of their evangelism of the Christian couple. Or, it may be that the Muslim acquaintances are very much indeed concerned with Islamic prohibitions, in which case they are equally thankful and impressed. After a few dinners like this one, the Christian couple might begin asking, by the leading of the Holy Spirit, religious ice-breaking questions such as, “What does your religion mean to you?” Not only is this an ice-breaking question, but the answer one receives from the Muslim is also a gauge to determine the measure of commitment on the part of the Muslim. From the answer to this question the Christian can also begin to get a handle on whether the Muslim is both emotionally and intellectually converted, converted in only one of these, or simply a cultural Muslim. All these are important signposts for the specific approach the Christian takes in the process that leads to the presentation of the Gospel to the Muslim.

An ongoing posture of sensitivity to religio-cultural dynamics in the way described above, coupled with a knowledge of the further missiological categories of living in holiness to glorify the triune God, use of apologetics, use of biblical interpretation, doctrinal knowledge and the confidence it fosters, and Gospel proclamation makes the Christian approach to evangelism a holistic one.

Now on to my final issue. During his interview with Reader’s Digest, which, by the way, was scheduled in advance to occur on September 11, Muhammad Ali was asked, “Tell us your reaction to the attacks this morning.” He replied, “Killing like that can never be justified. Islam is a religion of peace. It does not promote terrorism or killing people.” Speaking of the murderers, Ali stated, “They are not real Muslims.”

My question is, “Is one able rightly to justify, in the Qur’an and in the Hadith, the killing of infidels or unbelievers, in the name of Allah and for the cause of Allah?”

I would like us to ponder a few hermeneutical ingredients from an Islamic perspective toward the answer to this question. First is the nature of the Qur’an. The overwhelming view of Muslims, irregardless of historical issues of debate among themselves, is that the Qur’an is uncreated. The Qur’an we possess today is a perfect facsimile of what is called “the Mother of the Book,” the eternal Qur’an. The Qur’an, then, is uncreated, eternal, and is a deposit of the eternal speech of Allah from heaven.

Second, the Hadith, literally, “speech,” “report,” or “account,” is the traditions communicating to Muslims the deeds and sayings of the prophet Muhammad. In a sense the Hadith acquires its epistemological and practical authority in the Qur’an itself, which states in 33:21, “Ye have indeed in the apostle of God a beautiful pattern (of conduct) for anyone whose hope is in God and the final day.” So important, therefore, is the Hadith that in its
subsequent years of development through today Muslims have looked upon the Hadith to guide them in affairs that the Qur’an does not address. Note, though, that in reality the Hadith does not exhaust every possible event in human life that begs for an answer, so in many cases the whole of Islamic doctrine and law must be pondered over for the appropriate answer.

Nonetheless, I might generally suppose that the Qur’an and the Hadith are to be consulted in the hermeneutical quest to answer our question, “Does Qur’anic Islam justify murdering in the name of Allah?” Put another way, “Were the hijacker/terrorists on solid Qur’anic Islamic ground when they carried out this murderous act?” Or, put yet another way, “Were the hijacker/terrorists on plausible Qur’anic Islamic ground when they carried out the murderous act?”

Back to the eternal nature of the Qur’an: Could it be that given the eternal nature of the Qur’an we have to do with a book that is not pinned down and limited by historical context? Unlike the Bible, which is God’s revelation in historical and cultural settings, and mediated through historical persons and their intellects and events in such a way that by its very nature it should be interpreted within these historical and cultural settings, the Qur’an is itself eternal, the eternal speech of Allah, given to a passive and illiterate Muhammad. Could it be then, that what we have with the Qur’an is the eternal speech of Allah existing in a sense in higher parallel but eternal fashion with the separate, ongoing and non-eternal events of history, allowing the Qur’an to come to every situation and circumstance in the same way today just as in the early days of Islam? And with this, might the verses of the Qur’an, the eternal speech of Allah, and their interpretation, not be limited to, not simply be relegated to, historical events of the past?

With all the foregoing in mind, that is, with the issues of the eternal nature of the Qur’an and the place of the Qur’an and the Hadith in the lives of Muslims, allow me to quote some verses from both the Qur’an and the Hadith that may be specifically related to the events of September 11.

The Qur’an, Sura 47:4: “When ye meet the unbelievers (in fight), smite at their necks.” Sura 9:5: “But when the forbidden months are past, then fight and slay the Pagans wherever ye find them.” Sura 9:29: “Fight those who believe not in God nor the Last Day.” In Al-Bukhari’s Hadith we read, “Allah’s Apostle was asked, ‘What is the best deed?’ He replied, ‘To believe in Allah and his apostle (Muhammad).’ The questioner then asked, ‘What is the next (in goodness)?’ He replied, ‘To participate in Jihad (religious fighting) in Allah’s cause.’ The questioner again asked, ‘What is the next (in goodness)?’ He replied, ‘To perform Hajj (pilgrimage to Mecca).’”

Startling here is that Jihad in the sense of religious fighting is placed before the important Hajj, the pilgrimage to Mecca.
Perhaps the reason that Jihad is placed before the Hajj in goodness, that is, it is qualitatively better, is that the Hajj does not guarantee one’s admission into heaven, but engaging in holy war does. In the Hadith we read the recorded words of Muhammad: “The person who participates in (holy battles) in Allah’s cause and nothing compels him to do so except belief in Allah and his Apostles, will be recompensed by Allah either with a reward, or booty (if he survives) or will be admitted to paradise (if he is killed in the battle as a martyr).”

Putting all this in its context of the events of September 11, where the murderous act took place in America, combined with the general attitude of the Muslims carrying out this deed that America is “Christian,” we read in the Hadith Muhammad saying, “Whoever takes up arms against us, is not from us,” and “Whoever changed his Islamic religion, then kill him.”

I am not convinced that Qur’anic Islam is a religion of peace.
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