Evangelicals Encountering Muslims: A Pre-Evangelistic Approach To The Qur'an

by

WESLEY IRVIN JOHNSON

submitted in accordance with the
requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY

in the subject of

MISSIOLOGY

at the

University of South Africa

SUPERVISOR: PROF W A SAAYMAN (DECEASED)

CO-SUPERVISOR: DR KEITH EITEL

Submitted May 2015

1

I declare that *Evangelicals encountering Muslims: a pre-evangelistic approach to the Qur'an* is my own work and that all sources I have used or quoted have been indicated or acknowledged by means of complete references.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr Willem Saayman, my promoter at the University of South Africa. His careful commentary displays an ability to offer correction with an edifying touch. I am grateful for his accepting me as a student, as well as his work towards the success of my writing. Many thanks are due to Marti Gerber for her meticulous editing of my text. I also thank Dr Cecil Ray Taylor, Retired Dean of the School of Religion at the University of Mobile in Mobile, Alabama, for his early and heartfelt confidence in me. He demonstrated to me how a passion for the Great Commission flows from a commitment to the Holy Scriptures. He exhorted me that divine gifts and abilities must be developed. Another professor I am indebted to is Dr Keith Eitel, Dean of the Roy Fish School of Evangelism and Missions at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Texas. He was kind enough to encourage me to believe that I had the ability to complete such a project. Further, he believed that the end product would be a needed word for Evangelicals today. His model of "historical missiology" is one I embrace wholeheartedly. Dr Ed Litton, Pastor of First Baptist Church North Mobile in Saraland, Alabama, is the closest thing I have to a "father in ministry." He was a needed example of strength for me at a critical time. I would not be where I am today without him. Access to and assistance from two school libraries was critical to the completion of my work. Dr George T Washburn, Director of Library Services at Judson College in Marion, Alabama, was an enthusiastic help to me in locating several difficult to find articles and books. Without the gift of a library card from Beeson Divinity School in Birmingham, Alabama, I would not have made it through the oral interviews or opening chapters of this thesis. I am grateful to each library for their care for my life and work. Lynn Mitchell is my oldest

Key Terms

dynamic equivalence model, Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic, Muslim evangelization, elenctics, pre-evangelism, Muslim anthropology, Evangelical contextualization among Muslims.

Bible quotations are taken from the *English Standard Version* (ESV) of the Bible. Qur'an quotations and references are taken from Abdullah Yusuf Ali's *The Holy Qur'an*.

Summary

This thesis looks at the development of Protestant and Evangelical encounter with Muslims from the earliest days of the Modern missions movement. Special attention is given to the dynamic equivalence model (DEM), which resulted in a new method for interpreting the Qur'an called the Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic (CQH).

I begin with the early Protestant ministers among Muslims, such as Martyn and Muir. Pfander's (1910) book, *The balance of truth*, embodies the view that the Qur'an teaches an irrevocable status of inspiration for the Old and New Testaments. The early and mid-twentieth century saw a movement away from usage of the Qur'an during Evangelical encounter with Muslims. Direct model advocates bypass the Qur'an and other religious questions for an immediate presentation of the gospel.

The 1970s saw the development of the DEM, which produced significant changes in how Evangelicals encountered Muslims. Pioneers like Nida, Tabor, and Kraft implemented dynamic equivalence as a model in Evangelical ministry. Concurrently, Accad and Cragg laid groundwork for the CQH.

The DEM creates obscurity in anthropology by promoting an evaluation of cultural forms as essentially neutral. This is extended to religious forms, even the Qur'an. Such a simple, asocial value for symbols is not sufficient to account for all of human life. Cultural forms, especially those intrinsically religious, are parts of a complex system. Meaning cannot be transferred or equivocated with integrity from one context to another without a corresponding re-evaluation of the entire system.

Theological difficulties are also produced by the DEM and the CQH, and include the assigning a quasi-inspirational status to the Qur'an and a denial of unique inspirational status to the Christian Scriptures. If the gospel is communicated through the Qur'an, then it is difficult to deny some level of God-given status to it. Further, the Christian Scriptures are not unique as inspired literature.

My proposal for how to use the Qur'an responsibly looks to Bavinck's elenctics and is presented as Qur'anic pre-evangelism. Rather than communicating Biblical meaning through the Qur'an, Evangelicals can focus on areas of the Qur'an that coincide with a lack of assurance felt by Muslims in anthropology.

Introduction

Since the 1970s, the dynamic equivalence model has gained a prominent place in Evangelical mission. Some periodicals, like the *International Journal of Frontier Missions,* have adopted Kraft's model as the base for operation. Others, including *Evangelical Missions Quarterly*, regularly include articles from the dynamic equivalence school, while entertaining alternative perspectives. Fuller Seminary is home to Kraft and Woodberry, while several other schools of missionary training, such as Columbia International University, teach missiology in keeping with Kraft's model. Writers and practitioners of the model often advocate for an approach to the Qur'an called the Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic, which reads Biblical meaning into the words of the Muslim holy book.

To some degree, Evangelicals have responded to the new approach, and the model it is based on. However, there has been little to link the Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic to the dynamic equivalence model, and still less to offer a viable alternative for Evangelicals as their encounter Muslims. It is of no help that secrecy is employed for field methods and work, because the lack of knowledge makes commentary or challenge difficult or impossible.

This thesis seeks to deal with the theological and missiological base for dynamic equivalence, the model from which the Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic springs. Importantly, I critique five field models that contain the new interpretive method for the Qur'an, to a greater or lesser degree. In that way, when I speak to the theology and missiology of dynamic equivalence and of the Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic it is not conjecture about what could be occurring in Evangelical ministry. Instead, I am speaking to the heart of our work for the Lord Jesus Christ among the nations.

Wesley I. Johnson
South Asia 2015

Contents/Outline

Abbreviations

COCWIT	Conference on Christians and the world of Islam today
COMIC	Conference on media in an Islamic culture
CQH	Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic
DEM	dynamic equivalence model
EMQ	*Evangelical Missions Quarterly*
GC	*Gospel in Context*
IJFM	*International Journal of Frontier Missions*
LCWE	Lausanne Committee on World Evangelization
LCWE 1978	*The Willowbank Report – Gospel and Culture*

LCWE 1980	*The Thailand Report – Christian Witness to Muslims*
MBB	Muslim background believer
MM	*Missiological models in ministry to Muslims*
MW	*Moslim World*
NACOME	North American Conference on Muslim evangelization
PA	*Practical Anthropology*
QT	*The Qur'an's Testimony*
WHLQ	*The way to heaven through the light of the Qur'an*

Footnoting

All referencing in my thesis is according to standard Harvard fashion.

Arabic orthography

Little uniformity exists for transliterating Arabic into English. The long history of Christian commentary on the Muslim holy book adds to the number of translations and transliterations of Islamic material. Schlorff's book, *Missiological models in ministry to Muslims* (2006), is a good representation of current rendering of Islamic terms. His pattern will be the standard for this thesis.

Chapter 1

The research problem, paradigm and literature review

1.1. The research problem

Since the 1970s, Evangelical missiologists have eagerly sought to infuse anthropological insights into theology and mission. The outstanding figure of this anthropologically driven paradigm is Kraft. His book, *Christianity in culture* (1979a)*,* seeks to introduce a dynamic component into the hermeneutics of Evangelicalism in order to move beyond the grammatico-historical towards an ethnolinguistic interpretation. Kraft's model is propounded subsequently by the work of two colleagues. In his 1989 work, in *The Word among us,* Gilliland expands Kraft's theological framework in terms of contextual theology. In *Muslims and Christians on the Emmaus road*, released the same year, Woodberry (1989b) expresses the results of Kraft's hermeneutical contribution in terms of encounter with Muslims.

Kraft's new anthropological paradigm, labeled the dynamic equivalence model (DEM), found ready application to mission around the Muslim world. As early as 1976, Accad (1976:331–333) speaks of using common theological ground by quoting the Qur'an in its agreement with certain Biblical doctrines. Cragg (1979:197) calls for employing the Christian potential of the Qur'an for encounter with Muslims. These and other missiologists and practitioners see themselves as building a new approach in the wake of a new paradigm of mission. Schlorff (2006:127) describes the hermeneutics of the DEM as synthetic, distinguishing it from more traditional analytical approaches. Though some speak out against synthetic hermeneutics in Muslim encounter, advocates of analytical hermeneutics have never produced a viable alternative for encountering Islam on such a deep level.

The Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic for the Qur'an compromises the unique authority of Scripture. It is laden with anthropological, Biblical, and theological incoherence. Is there any hope for a new approach that preserves the depth of cultural

14

and theological engagement found in using the Qur'an in encounter with Muslims, while
maintaining the uniqueness of Biblical authority?

1.2. The purpose

The move to influence theology and missiology with anthropological insights brought many long needed changes, including progressing beyond the vestiges of cultural superiority by emphasizing the development and maturity of national thinking and living. However, Kraft's overemphasis on the subjective component of hermeneutics goes too far. Though the adjustments seem well founded and objective, careful examination of the missiological results suggests a problematic epistemological process. For this reason, it is important that this thesis takes a missiological perspective.

Missiology, though in constant exchange with Scripture and theology, is inevitably concerned with application. Often it serves as a test for the coherence of theology. Examining the methodological results of the DEM's theological projections should make it clear that there is more at play in its hermeneutics than merely increasing ethno-linguistic input into the interpretive process. This thesis proposes a new approach for using the Qur'an in Evangelical encounter with Muslims, one that assumes that the Christian Scripture alone is sufficient as God's personal Word to humanity. It is unique and original because such an approach has yet to be formalized in Evangelical missiology.

1.3. Paradigms: moving towards a new post-enlightenment Evangelical paradigm

Describing the current missiological climate in the west, Bosch (1991:185) says, "There is, on the one hand, a search under way for a new paradigm; on the other hand, such a new paradigm is already presenting itself". Though labeling a paradigm for Evangelicalism is difficult, it is possible to describe the direction in which it is moving. Evangelicals could be described as continuing to search for a new paradigm for mission and theology.

The emergence of contextualization has resulted in two streams of missiology for Evangelicals (Conn 1984:174). The first exhibits, to a greater or lesser extent, a

dependence upon more of an indigenous understanding for contextualization. Contextual terminology is employed and some of the motivation for contextualization is shared with the second stream, but care is given to remain within the boundaries of grammatico-historical hermeneutics. We call it the first stream because it is more traditional in its hermeneutics, and pre-dates the second stream. The second stream is represented by the DEM. It follows the tendency of current social science to emphasize subjectivity, is oriented towards instrumentalism in epistemology (Hiebert 1987:108), and functionalism in anthropology (Conn 1984:174). It seeks to move beyond grammatico-historical hermeneutics to ethno-linguistic interpretation.

In the last few decades the DEM has gained wide acceptance. Not content with meager results in the Islamic world or traditional hermeneutics, the new model seeks answers in anthropology. All cultural forms are considered neutral. Advocates see Scripture as an inspired dynamic classic casebook for the various cultures of the world. Subsequently, they alter traditional hermeneutics to produce an ethno-linguistic interpretation.

Proponents of the first stream criticize Kraft's proposals in *Christianity in culture* (1979a) for tinkering with the hermeneutical process and the meaning of inspiration. In *Contextualization,* Nicholls (2003) struggles with the same issues as the proponents of the DEM, but avoids what he calls the "existential hermeneutics" of the opposing model. Nicholls shows significant depth in the theological, anthropological, and missiological complexities of contextualization. However, like the rest of stream one missiologists, he fails to produce a new model for Evangelical ministry.

Those who disagree with the DEM have remained postured within the older indigenous understanding of contextualization. Schlorff, an early and noteworthy critic of the DEM in mission to Muslims, has proposed a "betrothal model." His book, *Missiological models in ministry to Muslims* (MM) (2006)*,* is thirty years overdue, and fails to build a new model on an expanded hermeneutical base. Nevertheless, the betrothal model has shown considerable promise in maintaining a commitment to the unique authority of Scripture and grammatico-historical interpretation, as well as spelling out ways to relate theology to anthropological concerns.

Some Evangelicals are difficult to classify within a single stream. To support their claims, both streams often reference the writings of Conn and Hiebert. In *Eternal Word and changing worlds* (1984), Conn takes great care to show how the DEM over-compensates for what they feel is problematic in traditional Evangelical theology. His intent is to be an inside voice, influencing the DEM toward a third consciousness that takes better account for the objective elements in theology. His proposal is a trialogue with mission, theology, and anthropology.

Though Hiebert is an insider for the DEM, his writings often seem out of line with his colleagues, even from the time he was a professor at the Fuller Seminary. Such is the case, for instance, when he contributes to works on the DEM such as *The Word among us* (Gilliland 1989). Hiebert's chapter, "Form and meaning in the contextualization of the Gospel," (Hiebert 1989) seems out of place with the surrounding chapters. He speaks not only of incorporating subjective elements into Evangelical hermeneutics, but also of balancing them with objective ones. Thus, he is consistent with his stated critical realistic base.

Understanding the differences in the two streams of Evangelical missiology will allow us to test the validity of the interpretive alterations proposed by the DEM. Their use of the Qur'an in encountering Muslims appears to ascribe the authority of the Scripture to the Muslim holy book. If such a claim is accurate, then a profound incoherence is present in much of Evangelical ministry to Muslims. Furthermore, methodological examination highlights the theological and missiological issues at work below the surface of the theoretical framework of the model.

1.4. Parameters of the study

My purpose is to understand and evaluate the historical, theological, and missiological development of current Evangelical encounter with Muslims, especially in terms of its treatment of the Qur'an. Chapter 2 describes the differing models employed in the last several centuries, calling attention to the theology underlying each and recognizing its place in the progression of thought. Since current methodology is the concern of this thesis, analysis of earlier models will be limited to understanding the historical theological framework they provide and the relevance they have for a pre-evangelistic

methodology. Chapter 3 concerns the origin, basic theory, and resulting missiology of the DEM.

Since the formation of the DEM and its positive use of the Qur'an in encounter with Muslims, opponents have protested to the model and it's hermeneutic for the Muslim holy book. Anthropological and theological objections are explored in chapter 4, testing the coherence and strength of the DEM, and its approach to ministry among Muslims. Due to the missiological nature of this thesis, emphasis is given to the methodology resulting from the DEM, and the fruit it bears.

Five methods for encountering Muslims are examined in chapter 5. The selected methods represent a wide range of Evangelical ministry in the Muslim world. In order to maintain this study's aim at a new approach upon which to construct methods, qualitative analysis is preferred over quantitative. A qualitative analysis of each model determines the influence of the Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic (CQH), as well as what can be preserved and reused.

Chapter 6 presents an alternative approach for Evangelical encounter with Muslims. The purpose is to maintain the depth of interaction seen in the DEM, while avoiding incoherent theology and hermeneutics. Drawing from Bavinck, a pre-evangelistic method of quoting the Qur'an is introduced. Chapter 7 draws final conclusions and makes suggestions for further research.

1.5. Methodology

In chapter 2, a review of the history of Protestant/Evangelical mission to Muslims and examples of each model's view of Islam are given from original sources. The final model, the DEM, is examined in chapter 3. Because DEM advocates give such attention to anthropology, considerable effort must be exerted to understand how culture affects their theology and hermeneutics. In such a historical theological context, the motivation for its synthetic hermeneutic for the Qur'an, the CQH, will be clear.

Chapter 4 will test the DEM and the CQH for coherence and Biblical/theological fidelity. Objectors often fault the DEM as influenced by neo-orthodoxy. If such a claim is true, then it should resemble neo-orthodoxy in methodology. Therefore, its hermeneutic

for the Qur'an and its approach to encounter with Muslims is examined for these resemblances.

Chapter 5 examines Evangelical field models in four ways. Firstly, each approach is summarized briefly. Secondly, each is examined for the presence and extent of the CQH. Thirdly, I examine the place and authority the Christian Scriptures occupy in the method. Fourthly, the depth of interaction with Muslims is explored. Finally, objections to the assessments of this thesis are anticipated and answered.

Chapter 6 presents a new basis for encounter with Muslims. Drawing upon the theological and missiological lessons listed in chapters 3 and 4 and the methodological considerations of chapter 5, a pre-evangelistic/elenctical approach is articulated. Care is given to demonstrate how a pre-evangelistic/elenctical approach preserves depth of interaction with people of other faiths without compromising the uniqueness of Christ or the Christian Scriptures.

The final chapter raises several issues surrounding the topic of this thesis that warrant further study. Evangelicals should reconsider hermeneutics, anthropology, and theology of religion. Furthermore, it is imperative to understand the missiological settings in which all these areas unite. As the twenty-first century progresses, Christian mission cannot afford to do theology in isolation from experience. There must be an intimate connection between Evangelical theological formation and Evangelical ministry, especially ministry involving encounter with people of other faiths.

1.6. Literature review

Due to the volume of missiological material written on encounter with Muslims, only the most important works consulted can be mentioned in the review of literature. Further, since this thesis focuses on the current methodology of Evangelical missiology, non-Evangelical sources come into view only to the extent to which they provide historical and theological context for Evangelical missiology or influence the conclusions of this thesis. It is not possible to mention all works consulted. Readers are pointed to the bibliography and footnotes for full documentation.

The literature review has sections. The first three sections catalog the historical, theological, and missiological development of the two contrasting approaches to the

Qur'an mentioned above. The remaining sections consist of works relating to actual field models employed by Evangelicals today and to proposals for a new way forward. These works include:

1. Works surrounding Evangelical use of the Qur'an in encounter with Muslims
2. Works fostering or employing the CQH
3. Works objecting to the CQH in Evangelical encounter with Muslims
4. Evangelical field models containing the CQH
5. Works related to pre-evangelism and the Qur'an
6. Current works in the area of Evangelical hermeneutics

1.6.1. Works surrounding Evangelical use of the Qur'an in encounter with Muslims

The central topic of this thesis is the hermeneutics behind the ways Evangelicals use the Qur'an in proclamation of Christ to Muslims. Research on such a specific topic is rare. One who does it well is Samuel Schlorff. His book, *Missiological models in ministry to Muslims* (2006:3–30)*,* subdivides the history of ministry to Muslims into six historical approaches. Because the last two approaches are the most important for understanding the historical/theological context for current ministry to Muslims, they receive more attention. However, the mere designation of ministry into historical models presupposes that outside factors shape a given era into an identifiable unit and make it distinguishable from others. The historical nature of ministry and thought also presuppose that such units do not originate in a vacuum but develop in a linear fashion. Consequently, the first four models are examined, albeit in considerably less detail, in order to determine their continued presence and influence. But the investigation focuses on the last two of the models.

1.6.1.1. Works typifying the nineteenth century imperial model

Outstanding primary sources for the imperial period, sometimes called the period of the polemics (1811–1900), include the works of Martyn, Sale, Pfander, Sell, Gairdner, Muir, and Tisdall. Sale's "preliminary discourse," (1857) attached to his translation of the Qur'an, is a classic work of the polemical period. Lee translated several of Martyn's tracts in his book entitled *Controversial tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism* (1824). Pfander's monumental book *The balance of truth* (1910) remains the outstanding example of the polemical approach to encounter with Islam. Sell's book, *The historical development of the* Qur'an (1923) is helpful for discerning how the polemicists understand the nature of the Qur'an.

Schlorff (2006:51–55) highlights Muir's importance for his interpretation of the evolutionary cultural thought of the period. Muir presents his view of the Qur'an and Islam in his two works: *The Coran: its composition and teaching*, *and the testimony it bears to the Holy Scripture* (1896), and *Mohamet and Islam* (1887). Tisdall's works, *The original sources of the Qur'an* (1905) and *Manual of the leading Muhammedan objections to Christianity* (1904), represent the high point of the polemic period before Zwemer arrives on the scene.

Zwemer's writings form a transition point from the polemics into twentieth century methodology. For that reason, his early works, such as *The Moslem Christ* (1912) and *The disintegration of Islam* (1916) must be examined separately from *The Cross above the* Crescent (1941). Zwemer is also important because many of the models currently employed look to him as foundational for their shape. Numerous centers and institutes bear his name. His articles from *The Moslem World,* such as "The use of alms to win converts" (1932) and "Atonement by blood sacrifice in Islam" (1946), highlight the anthropological value Zwemer gives to the religious forms of Islam.

1.6.1.2. Works of the direct and indirect approaches and of the fulfillment model of the Twentieth Century

The later Zwemer provides an early example of the direct approach. By 1941, the year *The Cross and the Crescent* (1941) was published, a shift in his methodology is apparent. Another notable advocate for the direct approach is Wilson. *The Christian message to Islam* (1950) places him in line with the later Zwemer.

Another influential missiologist who also displays a shift in his approach is Gairdner. *The rebuke of Islam* (1920) shows a transition towards the direct approach but maintains much of the cultural problems of the preceding generation. His insights are helpful for formulating a new Evangelical approach for the Qur'an to encounter with Muslims.

The fulfillment model seeks to reverse the negative stance on the nature of Islam handed down from the polemics. Farquahar's book *The crown of Hinduism* (1971) is greatly influenced by Jones. Jones' subsequent works, *The people of the Mosque* (1932) and *Christianity explained to Muslims* (1938), show clear theological distinctions from the polemics and direct approach advocates. Jones's *Christianity explained to Muslims* is an exemplar for the fulfillment view of Islam.

1.6.1.3. Works of the dialectical and dialogical models

Kraemer is a pioneer of the dialectical model. *The Christian message in a non-Christian world* (1956) is one of the most important works of twentieth century missiology. In terms of ministry to Muslims, Kraemer's work calls for a dialectical view of non-Christian religions (Schlorff 2006:18). His influence can also be seen in his development of the ideas of interreligion and interreligious dialogue.

The most important missiologist in the development of current mission to Muslims is Cragg. His work lacks the disapproval of non-Christian religions found in dialectical missiology. *The call of the minaret* (1985b) and *Sandals at the Mosque* (1959) illustrate his positive evaluation of Islam and missiology of fulfillment, while developing the concept of interreligious dialogue (Schlorff 2006:19). *The mind of the Qur'an* (1973) makes explicit his method of reading the Qur'an. Cragg proves to be crucial in the formation of the DEM and its use of the Qur'an.

1.6.1.4. Works of the dynamic equivalence model

Because of the wide impact of the DEM, it is examined in great detail. In terms of bibliography, three sub-classifications are helpful. Firstly, precursors of the DEM are explored. Secondly, various conferences and consultations are mentioned. Finally, formulative writings for the DEM are listed.

1.6.1.5. Works of the precursors to the dynamic equivalence model

At its heart, the DEM is an attempt to read anthropological insights into Evangelical theology. Several precursors must be examined to understand the matrix in which the DEM developed. Nida applies the idea of dynamic equivalence to translation of the Bible, but also investigates its application to hermeneutics and theology. His most important writings are *Customs and cultures* (1954) and *Message and mission* (1960a). Also worth mentioning is *The theory and practice of translation* (1982), which he co-authored with Tabor.

Thorough acquaintance with certain periodicals is indispensable for understanding the DEM. *Practical Anthropology* (PA) was edited by Smalley from 1956–1968 and Tabor from 1968–1972, after which time it was absorbed into *Missiology*. Editorials, as well as articles, display an expansion of anthropology into theology. Another periodical, *Gospel in Context* (GC), was published for only two years. Tabor was editor from its inception in 1978 until its abrupt end in 1979. Though short lived, GC is an important link in the development of the DEM's missiology until the publication of *Christianity in culture* (1979a).

1.6.1.6. Works of various influential conferences and consultations

Shumaker's *Report {of] media in Islamic culture* (1974) contains the reports of the conference held in Marseille in 1974. The Conference on media in an Islamic culture (COMIC) is important for a number of reasons. It is one of the first times Kraft makes direct missiological applications of the theory of dynamic equivalence. Also, its focus on Islam shows that ministry to Muslims represents an important testing ground for the relevance of theory and application in Evangelicalism. The proceedings of the Conference on Christianity and the world of Islam Today (COCWIT), contained in *Missiology* 4(3), confirm that Islamic evangelization is close to the heart of Evangelical mission.

The Lausanne Committee on World Evangelization sponsored several of the most important conferences for Evangelical mission to Muslims. *The Willowbank report – Gospel and culture* (LCWE 1978) from early 1978 marks a significant point for introducing anthropology into missiology in general, and the *Thailand report – Christian witness to Muslims* (LCWE 1980) for mission to Muslims in particular.

The North American Conference on Muslim evangelization (NACOME), held in Colorado Springs in late 1978, was the official birthplace of the DEM's approach to encounter with Muslims. At NACOME, the results of which are published in *The Gospel and Islam: a 1978 compendium* (McCurry 1979), Cragg (1979:197) called for Evangelicals to employ the Christian potential of the Qur'an. The LCWE of 1988 met in Zeist (LCWE 1988), and resulted in Woodberry's *Muslims and Christians on the Emmaus road* (1989b). It contains the theological results of the anthropological and missiological adjustments of the DEM.

1.6.1.7. Works influential in the formulation of the dynamic equivalence model

Kraft's *Communicating Jesus' way* (1999) and his *Communication theory for Christian witness* (1983) are important works for the DEM. *Readings in dynamic indigeneity* (1979), co-authored with Wisely, is another important link in the development of ethnotheology. Along with Gilliland and Woodberry, Kraft has articles in such periodicals as *Missiology* and *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* (EMQ) that address issues central to this thesis. More recently Kraft edited *Appropriate Christianity* (2005a), in which much of the DEM's thinking is rehashed. More attention is given to current missiological results, and several articles written by practitioners among Muslims are included. Also notable is Tabor and Yamamori's *Christopaganism or indigenous Christianity?* (1975).

Though the DEM cannot accurately be labeled neo-orthodox, Kraft and other proponents of the DEM openly reference Bultmann as they forge new hermeneutical paths. Bultmann's *Jesus Christ and mythology* (1958) and his *Essays: philosophical and theological* (1955) are foundational to any understanding of the influences on current Evangelical missiological thought.

Kraft looks to Vos and Coleman to verify his Evangelical credentials. He uses Vos's *Biblical theology* (1973) to define the proper direction of theology and turns to Coleman's understanding in *Issues of theological warfare: Evangelicals and Liberals* (1972) for a definition of Evangelicalism.

The name of Ramm comes up often in *Christianity in culture* (1979a). He even contributes the foreword. Ramm's *Protestant Biblical interpretation* (1970) forms much of the theological understanding of the nature of revelation undergirding the DEM.

1.6.2. Works fostering or employing the Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic, and contextualization in Evangelical ministry to Muslims

Cragg's influence in Evangelical missiology appears most acutely in his understanding and interpretation of the Qur'an. *The event of the Qur'an* (1971) is an introduction to the Qur'an reminiscent of the fulfillment model. *The mind of the Qur'an* (1973) explores the relevance of the Qur'an for all people, from which can be deduced his theology of religion. *The pen and the faith* (1985c) charts current Muslim interpretation of their holy book. The composite of these three reveal the mindset behind Cragg's call for a synthetic hermeneutic for the Qur'an at NACOME.

In his 1976 article "The Qur'an: a bridge to Christian faith", Accad spoke of the use of the Qur'an in Evangelical encounter with Muslims. DEM writers have referenced his influence and contribution at NACOME often. Abdul-Haqq's book, *Sharing your faith with a Muslim* (1980), is another early application of the new method of interpreting the Qur'an. It is especially important because Abdul-Haqq was with the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association.

Important among the works employing the CQH are Parshall's *Muslim evangelism* (2003), originally published as *New paths in Muslim evangelism* in 1980, and *Bridges to Islam* (1983). Parshall may be the most respected voice in ministry to Muslims in the last several decades. His blend of sound thought and experience, along with his being the first to implement contextualization to Muslims aggressively, make interaction with his writings indispensable for any thesis on encounter with Muslims.

No discussion of contextualized ministry to Muslims can avoid the important contribution of Travis. His 1998 article, "The C1 to C6 spectrum," developed the C1–C6 scale for classifying contextual ministry. Another important article by Travis is "Must all Muslims leave 'Islam' to follow Jesus?" (1998b).

Massey vigorously defends C5 ministry. In terms of contextualization among Muslims, C5 work is presently the primary place of disagreement among Evangelicals. Massey responds to Parshall's article "Danger! new directions in contextualization" (1995b) by editing an issue dedicated to defending and explaining the C5 approach. The *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 17(1) is one of the more complete commentaries on C5 work. From Massey's (2000a) lead editorial to the last of the seven articles, it presents Biblical, theological, and missiological justification for the more progressive end of the contextualization spectrum. Another of Massey's (1996) articles, "Planting churches underground in Muslim contexts" helps solidify the vantage point of converts who continue to identify themselves as Muslims.

1.6.3. Works objecting to the dynamic equivalence model and the Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic in Evangelical encounter with Muslims

As with the thinkers who influenced the formation of the DEM and the CQH, only the objectors Kraft and others interact with get attention. Early criticism of the DEM came as a response to the hermeneutical modifications. Specifically, Kraft casts his ideas against Henry's teaching on inspiration in *God, revelation, and authority* (1976). He also inveighs against the views of Packer's *'Fundamentalism' and the Word of God* (1996). Kraft differs with Evangelical teachings on inerrancy and classifies Pinnock's *A defense of Biblical infallibility* (1967) as especially deficient. He is critical of Schaeffer, who speaks out against subjective influences in Evangelical interpretation in *How should we then live* (2005).

As already noted, Nicholls's *Contextualization* (2003) is remarkably precise. Considering it was published about the same time as *Christianity in culture* (1979a), *Contextualization* (2003) displays a significant grasp of the centrality of hermeneutics for directing the course of theology and mission. Fleming is another early missiologist who

questions the move to make Evangelical interpretation a dynamic process. His major work is *Contextualization of theology: an Evangelical assessment* (1980).

A notable critique of ethnohermeneutics comes from Carson. In *Biblical interpretation and the Church: text and context* (1984), Carson tests the DEM for coherence in anthropology and interpretation. This work is partially expanded in *Christ and culture revisited* (2008). Hesselgrave's *Communicating Christ cross-culturally* (1991) and *Contextualization* (2000) show great sensitivity to Kraft's contributions in the communicative process but remain distinct in terms of the meanings of culture, hermeneutics, and contextualization.

The major critic of the CQH in Evangelical ministry is Schlorff. His article, "The hermeneutical crisis in Muslim evangelization" (1980), warns Evangelicals to consider carefully the theological ramifications of the paths they choose. Another article, "The translational model for mission in resistant Muslim society" (2000), proposes replacing the DEM with a more Biblical model. Schlorff, like other Evangelicals, often looks to Hiebert's article "Critical contextualization" (1984) as a way forward. He makes the anthropological/theological assertions from Hiebert's chapter "Form and meaning in the contextualization of the gospel" from *The Word among us* (1989) the backbone of new proposals.

1.6.4. Evangelical field models containing the Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic

Building bridges (1997), by Accad, is the result of decades of ministry to Muslims. It is the expanded posthumously published record of Accad's ministry from the 1970s until his death. He is regarded as one of the architects of the current use of the Qur'an in Evangelical encounter with Muslims. His material has been used extensively in the Middle East. *Building bridges* (1997) takes on added significance because a non-Westerner wrote it.

The Qur'an's testimony (1997) has served as a field model in use in South Asia since the 1990s. It takes a dialogical format and aims at a comprehensive engagement with Islam. Constantly in discussion are the claims of the Bible and the Qur'an. It interacts with the thinking of Muslims on a deeper level than most field models.

The camel (Greeson 2007) is widely employed in South Asia and has a growing exposure in other regions. Though written by a Westerner, it is based upon the practices of several South Asian nationals. Its format is simple and direct, making it easier to teach and pass on than other models.

The way to heaven through the light of the Qur'an (Baroi 2008) is the most sensitive of all the methods under examination. The author is a South Asian national. It makes the most faithful application of the DEM concept of the neutrality of cultural forms. At the same time, it gives great attention to the questions and issues in the minds of Muslims.

Common Ground is a group of Evangelicals that hold regular meetings for the purpose of promoting contextualized ministry among Muslims. It is influential across the Evangelical world. *7 Signs* is the method promoted by Common Ground for encounter with Muslim people, and comprises the final field model I examine. Due to security concerns, it names no author or publisher information. It is passed from person to person in the Common Ground meetings.

1.6.5. Works related to pre-evangelism and the Qur'an

Bavinck's book, *An introduction to the science of missions* (1960), developed a sub-discipline of missiology called elenctics. Unfortunately, Bavinck was before his time. Elenctics was too much like the older polemic ventures to win acceptance at the time of its proposal. This thesis picks up on Bavinck's elenctical evaluation and approach to other religions.

Schlorff responded to Netland's article, "Towards contextualized apologetics" (1988), by proposing a "culture specific apologetic" building upon the kingdom of God in his 1993 article "Muslim ideology and Christian apologetics." Yet no field model resulted from Schlorff's teaching or work. *Missiological models in ministry to Muslims* (2006) looks to Zaka's "Church without walls" (1998) article and approach as an appropriate method utilizing an analytic hermeneutic.

In *The God Who is there* (2005), Schaeffer presents a sweeping commentary on the development of Western culture since the birth of Christianity. He concludes with a section on evangelization in a postmodern world. For encounter with people of

monumental theological or epistemological differences he advocates the practice of "taking the lid off." The idea of testing the beliefs of a person by taking their theology to its natural conclusions is crucial in pinpointing an approach to quoting the Qur'an in encounter with Muslims without giving it Biblical authority.

For the development of the particular pre-evangelistic example of encounter with Muslims set forth in this thesis, two works are important. Ironically, the first is an article by Cragg. In "The riddle of man and the silence of God," Cragg (1993) comments on a sensitive Islamic scholar's discussion of many of the questions arising for Muslims in the postmodern age. When combined with the source book, *A faith for all seasons* (1991) by Akhtar, Cragg's article shows a possible starting point within Islamic mentality for pre-evangelistic encounter.

1.6.6. Works in the area of Evangelical hermeneutics

DEM writers often quote *Blessed rage for order* (1975) by Tracy. Tracy seeks new ways to incorporate non-Christian structures into the Christian Scripture and tradition. For Evangelical writers like Kraft and Gilliland who want to increase the subjective element in theology and hermeneutics, *Blessed rage for order* offers important insights.

The New Testament and the people of God (1992) and *The last word* (2005) are two of Wright's books dealing with reading the New Testament and upholding the authority of Scripture in a postmodern world. Wright values the narrative format of the majority of the Scripture and uses that structure to construct his hermeneutic. His depth of research has earned careful consideration for his views by Evangelicals and non-Evangelicals alike.

Carson and Osborne are two prominent scholars engaging the issue of Evangelical hermeneutics. In *The gagging of God* (2002), Carson offers a sweeping look at intercontinental interpretation. He focuses on evaluating the philosophical trends behind current readings of Scripture. Osborne, in *The hermeneutical spiral* (2006), focuses more on the task of relating interpretation to theology. Wisely he addresses and evaluates contextualization within Biblical theology, showing his view of proper and improper contextualization. Collectively, Carson and Osborne offer nearly 1300 pages of perspective on the nature of reading the Scripture today.

Vanhoozer's *Is there meaning in this text?* (1998) and Clark's *To know and to love God* (2003) are two outstanding examples of Evangelical hermeneutical approaches. Vanhoozer's value is his honest engagement with the epistemological questions raised by postmodernism. Clark shows that the goal of theology is not merely knowledge, but wisdom and love for God. The objective portion of interpretation not discounted, he sees the experiential component of theology as a central component in understanding and responding to the Scripture.

1.7. Thesis statement

The Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic for the Qur'an compromises the unique authority of Scripture. It is laden with anthropological, Biblical, and theological incoherence. I offer a pre-evangelistic approach to using the Qur'an in Evangelical encounter with Muslims. Drawing off Bavinck's (1960) use of elenctics in encounter, I define and provide a practical example of how the Qur'an can be referenced in Evangelical mission. This approach preserves the depth of cultural and theological engagement found in using the Qur'an in encounter with Muslims, while maintaining the Bible's unique authority.

1.8. Delineation of chapters

Chapter 1. The research problem, paradigm and literature review

Chapter 2. Patterns in missionary perceptions of Islam

Chapter 3. The Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic of the dynamic equivalence model

Chapter 4. Objections to the Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic

Chapter 5. The Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic in recent Evangelical mission

Chapter 6. Towards a pre-evangelistic approach to the Qur'an in Evangelical encounter with Muslims

Chapter 7. Conclusion

Chapter 2

Patterns in missionary perceptions of Islam

2.1. The imperial period

A glance over recent literature concerning Evangelical encounter with Muslims indicates that the imperial period, sometimes referred to as the polemical or controversialist period, is something many would like to forget. By the time Wilson wrote *The Christian message to Islam* in 1950 he could say "There has come about a decisive change in missionary technique" (1950:20). Leading authors, such as Parshall and Woodberry, barely mention pioneers like Martyn or Pfander. The scarce references are largely pejorative (Parshall 2003; see also Woodberry 1989b). Though Schlorff gives the polemical writers due historical position, upon reading the writings of the period he is "…struck by the pervasiveness of belief in cultural and religious evolution" (Schlorff 2006:4). His evaluation of the imperial period echoes the general perspective of the late twentieth and early twenty-first century.

It is also important to understand that ideas and decisions do not arise in a vacuum. People usually act upon some sort of cognitive basis, or to use the popular term, paradigm. Paradigm is an apt word to describe the overarching system of inter-related ideas people ascribe to and base decisions upon. However, its popular usage almost makes it a cliché. Paradigms are, by nature, deep level patterns of thought that hold together much of a group's cognitive apparatus. They cannot be exchanged easily or significantly altered without compensating across the whole cognitive structure. For this reason, recognizing the historical theological progression of thought in the imperial period should not be overlooked.

2.1.1. Is Schlorff's evolutionary hypothesis a correct characterization of the imperial period?

According to Schlorff, the writers of the imperial period were "…characterized by an aggressive polemic … which used the Qur'an to disprove Islam. Shaped largely by the colonial model of Western (especially British) imperialism, the polemicists' attitude toward Islam was basically negative" (Schlorff 2006:4). The writings of the imperial period assume that Islam is destined to fail. Is such an understanding of early missionary encounter with Islam a fair assessment? What thought patterns were prevalent at the time, and to what degree were missionary pioneers affected? How did they view humanity and culture? How did all these things affect the way they read and employed the Muslim holy book? When our grasp of how the early missionaries evaluated Islam is sufficient, then we will have a base to understand the reactions of later generations. We will also have greater clarity as to how we, in our own day, should encounter Muslims.

2.1.1.1. Examples of an imperialistic mind

It is the near consensus of writers over the past century that a sort of imperialistic mind was present in missionary thinking and methodology from the time of Martyn until the first portion of the twentieth century (Parshall 1998a:38). We have no need to exert effort to prove it again. However, we should begin by orienting ourselves with the mind of the writers of the period. In their eyes, what is the value of Islam and of the Qur'an?

2.1.1.1.1. In the writings of Henry Martyn

It is not difficult to locate an imperialistic mind in missionary writing prior to the twentieth century. Concerning varieties of mysticism and Sufism, Martyn wrote:

> If, however, after a short trial some progress, how little soever that may be, were found to have been made, then would the candidate for perfection have some hope of being finally successful; but as it is certain that no such progress [towards the Sufi ideal of unity with Deity] has ever been made, how can anyone, with a grain of discernment, hope for ultimate success? (Lee 1824:145).

As a Christian, it is natural for Martyn to somewhat devalue non-Christian religions. However, the quotation reveals a lack of depth in understanding of the place of religion in the minds of adherents. He not merely points out that mystical religion cannot bring perfection, but challenges development on any level. Little to no discernment or religious advancement can be found outside of Christianity. A similar lack of depth in analysis can

32

be seen in Martyn's attribution of the early success of Islam to its use of force (Lee 1824:100). In his eyes, Islam could not have expanded had force not prohibited its challenge. His statement may not be a total misrepresentation of Islam, but it fails to appreciate the complexities involved with the spread of Islam and its early success over much of the Christian world.

2.1.1.1.2. In the writings of Sir William Muir

Muir was among the more influential writers of the imperial period. His biographical portrait, *Mohamet and Islam* (1887), is still useful today. Schlorff calls him one of the architects of the evolutionary view of Islam. Muir states, "As a reformer, Mahomet did, indeed, advance his people to a certain point; but as a Prophet, he left them immovably fixed at that point for all time to come" (Schlorff 2006:5). His view of Islam comes into sharper focus when he describes the world in terms of cultural progress. Islam, due to institutions such as the veil, is hopelessly chained to the bottom of the cultural scale (Muir 1887:245). Again, as with Martyn, we see a lack of depth in understanding the nature of religion in general, and Islam in particular. He focuses on external manifestations and their significance in terms of Western imperial culture, rather than taking into account what particular religious elements signify for Muslims themselves.

Muir solidifies Martyn's cultural scale into a bona fide theory. As Schlorff (2006) observes, Muir objects to Weil's proposal that there could be a reformation in Islam. He says, "Some amelioration and improvement in these things may be attempted, but it will be against the grain and contrary to the law that binds the Muslim conscience" (as quoted in Schlorff 2006:5). Schlorff (2006) seems to assume that the core of what Islam and the Qur'an communicate to the lives of Muslims is rigid and expressed mainly in external conformity. It contains no room for development or interaction with outside forces. It should be noted that Weil was no friend to Islam, and that Muir possesses less confidence in Islam's potential to develop than Weil. Therefore, there is little doubt that Muir's writing displays an imperialistic mind.

2.1.1.1.3. In the writings of William St Clair Tisdall

The imperialistic mind Schlorff (2006) speaks of can be seen also in the writings of Tisdall. In the interest of impartial commentary, it should be pointed out that the introduction to *The Original sources of the Qur'an* (1905) is written from an English perspective. Underlining the Muslim belief that Allah is the singular origin of Islam, Tisdall (1905:7) states, "European readers hardly require proof that such an opinion of the origin of Islam in general and of the Qur'an in particular is untenable." In his mind, even a cursory exposure to Islam and the Qur'an brings a justified rejection. As already stated, many points should cause the Christian to hesitate when reading the Qur'an. We should not, however, assume that Islam fails to deal with any needs of humanity and is at the bottom of some worldwide mono-cultural and religious scale.

There are similar comments in Tisdall's *A manual of the leading Muhammedan objections to Christianity* (1904). His lack of depth and appreciation for the nature of religion can be seen in his agreement with a certain Pennell, mentioned in the text, who says that Muslims possess an "… ineradicable tendency to look upon everything and interpret everything carnally" (Tisdall 1904:22). However, the case can be made that all perspectives of an ontological variety, including Kant's and Calvin's, are closed by nature. There is no need to assemble loads of proof for faith, as natural theology asserts, because the internal weight of foundational convictions are sufficient as a base for thought and life. Islam is no different in that respect.

We have seen ample support for the presence of an imperialistic mind in the writings of the early missionaries. However, it is also apparent that there is more going on than merely a desire to denigrate Islam.

2.1.1.2. Examples against an imperial mind

Despite their tendency to devalue the cultural significance of Islam and the Qur'an, there are points at which the integrity and experience of the imperial period writers allows them to make deeper level commentary about Muslims. At times they acknowledge the veracity of Islam's claim upon the minds and hearts of its people.

2.1.1.2.1. In the writings of George Sale

At the onset of his preliminary discourse to his translation of the Qur'an Sale (1857:1) admits that there are compelling reasons for nations to embrace Islam. On that basis, he urges those in ministry to Muslims to learn as much as they can about it. In general terms, he goes on to describe a multi-faceted agenda of influence that Muhammad employed. The facets include: change from a semi-monotheism to one of a more rigid variety, taking advantage of the cultural decline of the west, and Muhammad appearing at a time of expansion of Arabic learning and writing (Sale 1857:63). It would be presumptuous to say Sale has a developed concept of Islam's ability for cultural advancement. However, it is also apparent that his view is not a simple evolutionary concept of religion and culture.

2.1.1.2.2. In the writings of Carl Gottlieb Pfander

Pfander's book, *The balance of truth* (1910), is the most respected single work of the imperial period. In it he states:

> Belief in the doctrine of the Divine Trinity in Unity abolishes the blind and hopeless belief in a stern and unchangeable Fate, which oppresses the Muslim as much as it does the Hindu. The belief in Fate is one of the chief causes of the apathy which has caused Muslim nations to become unprogressive, and hence to fall behind Christian nations in progress and civilization. The Arabs, the Persians, the Egyptians, and the Turks are at the very least as intellectual, as brave, and as enterprising, as the nations of Europe … If it were not for their fatalism they might renew their strength (Pfander 1910:186).

From his statement we can make two observations about his thoughts on culture, Islam, and humanity's religious nature. Firstly, on some level, Pfander (1910:186) believes in a cultural scale, with Muslims at the bottom and the west at the top. Secondly, he affirms that the lack of development in Islamic peoples is due to their fatalistic beliefs. It is the fatalism that is responsible for the lack of progress, not something inherent in the people themselves. He sees the limitations on a Muslim's face, and lays the blame at the feet of a central tenet of Islam as it appeared in his day. This is more than a mere negative evaluation. It is an explanation for the lack of development. Furthermore, his explanation is explicitly non-egocentric. It is a statement for potential benefit and renewal the gospel can bring to Muslim people.

I am not trying to disprove the presence of an imperialistic mind in Pfander (1910), or the others of the imperial period. I am seeking to read the writings of these

pioneers of ministry to Muslims with equity. Twentieth century mission drew upon centuries of development in thought, science, and experience. New approaches were adopted and have afforded a new depth of understanding into people and cultures. Despite the handicap of a lack of anthropological categories brought, Pfander (1910) was able to make the insightful commentary noted above. What we should see in the writers in the imperial period is not only their shortcomings, but also a growing awareness of the complexities of life and thought in the people of other religions.

2.1.2. What were the outside influences upon the writers of the imperial period?

All ministry and writing is influenced by the time and setting in which it is executed. Primary influences in the imperial period include secular philosophy, empiricism, and higher critical views of the religion of Muhammad. We learn much about ministry practice by understanding how such outside thought found its way into the thought of several important writers.

2.1.2.1. General differences in thought and philosophy

Generally, imperial period writers were thoroughly educated in the West before they began ministry in Eastern settings. Therefore, a non-Westerner with less formal study could follow their Westernized thought. Sometimes these writers made false assumptions about the questions their audience had, or the way in which they could find answers.

2.1.2.1.1. In the writings of Carl Gottlieb Pfander

Pfander (1910:52) notes the Qur'anic comparison of Muhammad's inspiration to the prophets of the Old Testament. In his commentary he says, "Things that are equal to the same thing are equal to each other." This is neat syllogistic thinking, but is too difficult for many Westerners to follow. Those without Western academic training would have additional obstacles to prevent understanding. In another place Pfander (1910:184) tries to communicate sophisticated knowledge with an egocentric tone, saying, "We conclude that existence of the three Most Holy Hypostases in the Divine Unity is not opposed to

enlightened reason." Even if the issue of the Trinity arises often in encounter with Islam, we must not allow the discussion to become so technical that the hearers cannot see a clear relation to life. Pfander (1910) is guilty at this point.

2.1.2.1.2. In the writings of William St. Clair Tisdall

Tisdall's (1904:118–119) discussion on the person of Christ and the nature of the Godhead is even more technical. In the space of two pages he moves from discussing how the three Hypostases of the Godhead can dwell in unity, to the meaning of the eternal begetting of the Son, and to the relation of the divine and human natures in the Messiah. There is no doubt that he encountered educated Muslims who were able to ask such probing questions concerning Christian doctrine. The problem is that he seems to have assumed that the answers that satisfy Western minds would also bring understanding to a Muslim one.

2.1.2.2. The influence of empiricism

Many of the missionaries to Muslim lands during the imperial period were British. It is to be expected that their thinking and actions were influenced by the trends of their times, such as empiricism. This philosophic influence can be seen in a focus on sensory perception.

2.1.2.2.1. In the writings of William St Clair Tisdall

Building upon the previously mentioned Pennell, Tisdall (1904:22) says, "My main endeavor is to try and set forward the spiritual side of the text or doctrine". Later he writes, "You take the Qur'an as a touchstone, and assume it is from God. This, however, you cannot prove" (1904:184). The assumption is that if the readers are able to make a simple transition from their innate perceptions to more developed ones, then they will be able to discern truth from error. However, this assumption cannot explain the authority of the Qur'an in Islam. Faith in the Muslim holy book has remained deeply ingrained since the time of the prophet Muhammad. It abides perpetually unchallenged in the minds of Muslims worldwide. Such uncompromising belief in the Qur'an is one of the greatest points of unity among Muslims. Therefore, Tisdall's (1904) endeavor to set forth the

spiritual side of the text is based upon mistaken a priori judgments. He makes the same assumption in other places as well (Tisdall 1912:4).

2.1.2.2.2. In the writings of Henry Martyn and Sir William Muir

The impact of empiricism is apparent in Martyn's writing when he begins argument with the qualification, "Anyone will, upon observing the operation of his own mind, perceive that however he may labour to render them more agreeable to the nature of the things, or to divest them of the impressions received by the medium of the senses, he cannot advance one step" (Lee 1824:252). He strongly emphasizes empirical perception, and assumes a basic logical orientation in people. It is apparent that he considers little Muslim thinking to be shaped by context; nothing corresponds to reality.

Muir's (1887) assessment of Islam is similar to Martyn (Lee 1824). "It would lead us astray if we sat down to the study of the Coran expecting to find … any settled system of doctrine. The Coran was the reflex of Mahomet's own convictions … His own ideas changed … upon many important points during the progress of His ministry" (Muir 1887:50). As praiseworthy as his writings and efforts are, Muir (1887) fails at a critical point. He expects Muslims to seek aggressively a direct correspondence of the Qur'an to life, even assuming that they should construct some sophisticated system upon it. He fails to see that flexible doctrine is the hallmark of Islamic transcendence as it relates to life. They see life as their prophet did. Muslims do not look for a point-by-point relation to life, as can be found in a system like Evangelical Christianity. Furthermore, Islam has no real doctrine of immanence beyond the Qur'an itself. Though Islam holds that its holy book speaks the truth about life, it does not offer as thorough going an application as is typically found in Christianity. It provides a mild non-invasive ordering to life. Few Muslims would be moved by the quick judgments of Martyn (Lee 1824) or Muir's (1887) accusations.

2.1.2.3. The influence of higher criticism

The influence of the historical-critical approach is seen clearly in the way many figures of the imperial period approached encounter with Muslims. Importantly, some of the writers

influencing them show bias against any type of legitimacy in Islam or veracity in the Qur'an. Higher critics, including Jews, critique the Muslim holy book in the same way as the Bible. The earlier works of those in ministry to Muslims recognize the need to be temperate and discerning. The works from the close of the ninetieth century display a vigorous application of higher criticism. When coupled with a tendency towards a scaled view of world cultures, the trend becomes dangerous.

2.1.2.3.1. George Sale and Humphrey Prideaux

Sale (1857) openly confesses his admiration for Prideaux (1808), crediting him from the opening of the introduction until the later portions of his *Preliminary Discourse* (1857). He considers Prideaux a forerunner in commentary on Islam. Prideaux's *The life of Mohamet* (1808) is an attempt at characterizing Islam's prophet as the chief of all imposters. The expanded title reads, *The truth of imposture, fully displayed in the life of* Mahomet (1808). It should be noted that Sale does recognize the Prideaux's (1808) bias. In interacting with him on the motives of Muhammad he writes that he could not follow "… the assertion of the late learned writer, that he made a nation exchange their idolatry for another religion altogether as bad. Muhammad was no doubt fully satisfied in his conscience" (Sale 1857:74). He often tempers Prideaux's (1808) comments on Muhammad and the Qur'an, saying that Muhammad's actions "… seem inconsistent with the wild notions of a hot-brained religionist" (Sale 1857:75). Sale's tendency to moderate notwithstanding, he is clearly affected by sources that show undue bias against anything Islamic.

2.1.2.3.2. Sir William Muir and Islamic criticism

Whereas Sale (1857) tends to moderate Islamic commentators, Muir's (1887) comments are sometimes even stronger than critics of Islam. He admits taking directly from the thoughts of Weil and Sprenger, though it seems he deems Weil's influence as the most important (Muir 1887:5). Weil was a Jewish scholar known for advancing the idea that Muhammad had epilepsy. Sprenger started the psychological approach to Muhammadian biography. As Schlorff (2006) observes, Muir disallows Weil's idea of a possible reformation in Islam, stating that such advancement would be "… contrary to the law that

binds the Muslim conscience" (Schlorff 2006:7). We may conclude that Schlorff's (2006) depiction of Muir as the center of the evolutionary mind of the imperial period is true. It is also apparent imperial period writings become more and more influenced by higher criticism as time passes.

We should also note another way Muir (1878) disagrees with Weil. Of Weil's comments on the nature of encounter between Christians and Muslims Muir writes, "The same learned author would have the missionary to Mussulmans put by his 'Bible and his Catechism,' and trust to education … the evil lies deeper than that" (Muir 1878:65). Muir did recognize that ministry should begin at a deeper level than merely awaiting a chance at re-education. He saw that a total change is needed in the lives of those we seek to reach. Muir's (1878) ideas on how the gospel interacts with people are much larger than his understanding of culture and religion can support.

2.1.2.3.3. Edward Sell and later imperial period writers

Sell (1923) represents the culmination of higher criticism's effect upon Christian encounter with Muslims. His method of reaching out to Muslims is little more than source criticism of the Qur'an. Sell looks to Noldeke, eminent scholar on Islamic sources, for basic ordering of the Qur'an (Sell 1923:vii). Koelle, whom he quotes throughout *The historical development of the Qur'an* (1923), provides the framework for Sell's understanding of the historical formation of the Qur'an. Writing at the close of the nineteenth century, Koelle's books apply the historical-critical method to Islam, creating an approach to history and faith reminiscent of the search for the historical Jesus (Schlorff 2006:55; for an example of Koelle's influence see Sell 1923:79). Sell often references Geiger, noted rabbinic scholar and reformer of Judaism, on how Islam absorbed or altered much of Jewish thought and practice (see, for instance, Sell 1923:57). There is still value in the work of these and other higher critics. However, their views on the nature of the Qur'an are firmly situated on the a priori assumption that very little of the historical development of Islam is authentic. They see it as little more than an amalgam of rustic Judaism and heretical Christianity. The effect can be seen in Sell's accusation that Muhammad was insincere. He affirms that the prophet's mind was full of doubt because many of Muhammad's statements in the defense of his office do not "…

40

show forth the confident assurance of a man who fully believed in what he said" (Sell 1923:47). If one believes there is some truth in such an idea, then it remains difficult to imagine such an approach being well received by a Muslim audience. It is clear that at critical points Sell (1923) gives too much credence to the claims of higher criticism.

In his writing, Sell (1923) moves beyond the influence of higher critics concerning how Muslims relate the Qur'an to life. The commentators of his day often ridicule the piecemeal arrangement of the Qur'an, claiming its lack of systematic organization diminishes the value of its claims. Growing out of his direct ministry to Muslims, Sell (1923:74) shows great sensitivity in stating, "The Qur'an, as a whole, is not formed on any fixed plan, but just follows the needs and suggestions of the day and the circumstances of the hearer." Though he maintains Muir's (1887) negative evaluation of Islam, development in anthropology is apparent. There was a growing awareness of the ability of culture to widen or narrow in its convictions.

Other later imperial period writers seem to agree with Sell at this point. Gairdner similarly comments:

> Islam, then is not merely a personal religion; nor on the other hand is it merely a political system. But much more, it is, like Brahmanism and some other faiths, a great social system, woven into a texture, compacted into a fabric which covers the whole of life of an individual from the cradle to the grave (1920:135).

Esteemed missionary and author Samuel Zwemer (1912:61–63) elaborates many of the same ideas as Sell and Gairdner.

In conclusion, the writers of the imperial period are influenced from the outside in three important ways. Firstly, though philosophical and critical methodology often caused premature evaluations of Islam, we see a gradual awakening to the place of culture. Secondly, an evolutionary view of religion soon gave way to recognizing development in the lives and thoughts of people of other faiths. Lastly, the imperial period closes with a desire for encounter with Muslims that brings about a turning to the Biblical God.

2.1.3. The legacy of the imperial period

The imperial period should not be dismissed as insignificant. The value of studying it extends well beyond the mere devotional value of pioneer biography. Whether we wish to admit it or not, there is a well-defined historical, theological, and methodological

progression that has rolled down to our day from the age of controversy. The major focus of this thesis has to do with this legacy. In the following chapters, we see the legacy in undeniable fashion. No matter what men write, actions and ministry are always the best measure of thought.

The legacy of the imperial period can be seen in one basic desire, which still exists today. It is the desire to move Muslims from the Qur'an, using it to highlight a need to read the Bible. The desired result is not only bringing the Muslim from the Qur'an to the Bible, but also to the Biblical God. Many writers preserve this legacy. We will examine two outstanding figures: Pfander (1910), who uses the Qur'an in a largely negative sense, and Tisdall (1904), who employs a more positive usage.

2.1.3.1. As Seen in the writings of Carl Gottlieb Pfander

In *The balance of truth* (1910:100), Pfander writes, "The Qur'an calls the Bible 'the Word of God,' and states more than once that God's words cannot be altered … then it follows that the Bible has not been changed." He continues, "Any Muslim who affirms that the Old Testament and the New are corrupt in text … is contradicting the Qur'an." His conclusion is that it is impossible for the Qur'an to teach both the truth of the Scriptures, and their corruption. In his view, which he draws from various Qur'anic references, the purpose of the Muslim holy book is to confirm the Old and New Testaments (Pfander 1910:106). Finally, Pfander (1910:136) notes that the Qur'an teaches that Christ was sinless and born of a virgin. Many of these affirmations from Pfander can be seen in ministry models to Muslims in our own day. Thus Schlorff (2006:66) makes a correct characterization in calling this approach "proof-texting."

Pfander (1910) maintains a negative view of the Qur'an. He holds that the Muslim holy book fails in its primary task of leading the Muslim to God, and says that the Bible is different from any other religious book, especially the Qur'an. The books of other religions teach men nothing of God's design in creation, and offer little in the areas of sanctification and spiritual development. Pfander (1910) views the Old and New Testaments as a gift from God to humanity. The Scriptures not only teach what is good and true, but also bring purity to the human soul (Pfander 1910:146).

2.1.3.2. As Seen in the Writings of William St Clair Tisdall

Tisdall (1904) explains the reason for using the Qur'an to bring Muslims to listen to the Bible. The Christian must begin with what the Muslim understands, because Biblical appeals carry little weight with Muslims. Our first concern is to answer their objections. "The best, nay, almost the only way to do this, as experience has proved, is to show these objections opposed to the Qur'an's own clear statements" (1904:4–5). Tisdall (1904) is very optimistic in this endeavor, even agreeing with Pfander that a good portion of Indian Muslims were in agreement at the time of his writing.

Like most who follow such a line of reasoning, Tisdall says that the Qur'an's actual teaching does not include the idea of abrogation of the Biblical text. Properly understood, it portrays itself as a guide into the truth of the Old and New Testaments. Thus, Tisdall (1904) also proof-texts, only he does so in a positive sense. In his *Manual of objections* (1904), he states that he readily accepts "… all the truth that is in any way common to Christianity and Islam," moving on to show the Muslim "… how much truer are some of their tenets than they have any idea of" (quoted in Schlorff 2006:68). Many of the ideas he expresses concerning Islam in 1904, were also being expressed in relation to the other religions (World Missionary Conference 1910: introduction).

In conclusion to our examination of the pre-World Missionary Conference patterns of missionary perception of Islam, we must recognize the two contrasting lines of understanding. The older perception moves toward a rejection of the Qur'an and employs a more or less confrontational approach. The second perception is more accommodating to the validity of Qur'anic assertions, and moves toward continuity between Christianity and Islam. It is also important to recognize that as the twentieth century progressed, those writing about and participating in ministry to Muslims lost appreciation for their forerunners in the imperial period. We will see that theology continually changed, methods of encounter were altered, and new depth was added in many disciplines. However, those choosing to initiate encounter with Muslims in terms of Muslim thought forms consistently employed the approach mentioned above. They tried to bring Muslims to the God of the Bible by using the Qur'an to establish the validity of the Bible and Christ.

2.2. Twentieth century models

For the most part, the imperial period was a uniform era. As communication and learning improved during the early twentieth century, theology and mission became splintered. Two basic groups emerged for mission to Muslims in the years following the Edinburgh Conference of 1910. The first group maintained the basic theological understanding of Islam of the imperial period, but abandoned the use of the Qur'an as a starting point for encounter. The second group preserved the imperial period's desire to use the Qur'an to bring Muslims to consider the Biblical God, but began to make alterations in theology of religion.

2.2.1. How should the direct/traditional model be classified and what are its primary components and developments?

In *Missiological models in ministry to Muslims* (2006), Schlorff classifies twentieth century models following his source, Bavinck (1960). He outlines two models that arise following the imperial period: the direct and the indirect models. The latter he also describes as the fulfillment model, mistakenly lumping together the indirect and fulfillment models (Schlorff 2006:12). Bavinck (1960:140–142) describes direct model adherents as those who approach encounter with non-Christians without thoroughly addressing the questions and difficulties in the minds of the hearers, preferring to begin immediately with gospel presentation. There may be some advantages to such a path, but Bavinck insists that most of the time contact should be made in the thoughts forms and questions of the audience. This is Bavinck's description of the indirect method. I borrow Schlorff's (2006) basic classification of models, but choose the title "fulfillment" over "indirect" for the second model of ministry.

The direct model descends from the imperial period, and continues into the twenty-first century. Over the course of time it has developed. There is a recognizable distinction between early direct model missionaries, such as Zwemer (1905) and Gairdner (1920), and those who followed later, for example Wilson (1950). Earlier writers tend to be more confrontational, dig deeper into Islam's background and forms, and entertain some of the questions raised by the fulfillment model. Later writers and practitioners tend

to avoid confrontation, and divert communication away from technical aspects towards gospel presentation.

2.2.1.1. Early direct model

Zwemer (1905) and Gairdner (1920) serve as transitional figures into twentieth century mission. Their writings preserve the technical rigor of their predecessors, but show a definite move towards a simple gospel presentation. Zwemer (1905:66) shows great depth in categorizing the fatalism of Islam as a "… pantheism of force … exclusively assigned to God … in such a theology no place is left for absolute good or evil." *The Moslem Christ* (1921) is one of the classic works for encountering Muslims in the early part of the century. Painstakingly he pulls together Qur'anic references and Islamic doctrine and examines them, hoping to make successful appeal to the Muslim mind. If compared to *The glory of the Cross* (1938), it is hard to believe the two share a common author. The later book, in comparison, bypasses the great pillars of religion in the mind of Muslims in order to move immediately to the cross. On the one hand we see the maintaining of a basically negative view of Islam continuing, and on the other a change of strategy for encounter.

Gairdner also shows great insight into the meaning of Islam in his book, *The Muslim idea of God* (1925). His is some of the most sensitive regarding Islam of the early twentieth century. In 1920, he rewrote his influential work, *The reproach of Islam* (1909), changing the name to *The rebuke of Islam* (1920) to make it clear that the intended blame was for Christianity. He writes that the Church has failed historically in ministry to Islam. Gairdner's sensitivity urges him to divert encounter with Muslims from complex methods towards simple ones. He advocates direct preaching of the gospel, and teaches that the best preachers are converts from within Islam. The methods he encourages include public discussion, disputes with individuals, and preaching, as well as medical, institutional, and literary forms of encounter (Gairdner 1920:202–203). As with Zwemer (1911), a developing method of encounter is coupled with the negative evaluation of the value of Islam.

2.2.1.2. Later direct model and results

The changes in methodology that Gairdner (1920) and Zwemer (1928) introduce on how to encounter and communicate to Muslims became solid by mid-twentieth century. Wilson (1950:56–59) states that it is his policy not to take up arguments in general discussion. To the most insistent questioner he gives a tract. He states, "We trust that all such questions will be answered in due time; it is necessary, first that he should understand what Christians consider the Bible to be." A good written example of the direct model is Trotter's *The way of the sevenfold secret* (1926). The writing and message are beautiful, probing, sensitive, and lacking any indirect reference to the Qur'an. It follows Wilson's basic pattern of discussing the Mosaic Law, prophecy, or the life of Christ, with the aim of using the Bible to show that Christ is the final and complete revelation of God. However, careful attention is given to avoiding confrontation. This is the axiom of the direct model. To again quote Wilson (1950:42), "Today he who would present Christ to the Moslem heart should be an expert in avoiding argument." The desire to avoid conflict characterizes the change of method begun by Gairdner (1920) and Zwemer (1928).

A good portion of the motivation for such a strong reaction seems rooted in guilt over a lack of success, and in mounting frustration at a perceived hardness in the mind of Muslims. As referenced above, Gairdner's 1920 revision of *The rebuke of Islam* shows that he feels a strong sense of guilt for the church not having done more to reach the Islamic world. What began as a rising discomfort in Gairdner's mind writing in 1920 became an acute wound in the mind of Wilson writing in 1950. Wilson agrees with Kraemer (1956) that from the innate Muslim feeling of superiority and self-consciousness is born a "… stubborn refusal to open the mind toward another spiritual world. The result of which Islam is such an enigmatic missionary object" (Wilson 1950:83). That is not to say that Wilson's *The Christian message to Islam* (1950), or others within the direct model, are pessimistic. In the writings of these missionaries there is a mounting pressure for success that increases in the latter part of the century, and couples with a desire to avoid the earlier approach that they consider unproductive and divisive.

The result of the full maturation of the direct model is an intense desire to avoid conflict when encountering Muslims. In this way they agree with the fulfillment model. However, they do not seek degrees of truth in Islam. For example, when faced with the

question, already presented in the 1940s, concerning whether converts who refuse to make a strong break with their society are legitimate, Wilson (1950:162–163) wrote, "If we are there to win the Mohammedan lands for Christ … then such an end will no doubt require open confessions and the establishment of an organized church." The direct model seeks an open Christian confession and established churches from their converts.

2.2.2. What are the key aspects and writers of the fulfillment model?

For this thesis, the key aspects of the fulfillment model include: maintenance of the imperial period supposition that the first step of encounter with Muslims should be the removal of misconceptions, a growing and incomplete awareness of humanity's religious experience, and a varying place for repentance in encounter with Muslims.

Writers involved in ministry to Muslims tend to be more pragmatic than their counterparts working among Hindus. As a result, we will examine three outstanding figures often associated with the fulfillment model. Macdonald (1911) and Jones (1932) are examples of writers concerning Islam and Farquhar (1971) represents a missionary to Hindu India. Farquhar wrestles with the questions occupying the mind of Protestant missiology in his day. Missionaries to Muslims borrow and adapt the fulfillment approach. Macdonald and Jones provide the form that encounter with Muslims takes for missionaries not remaining within the direct model. Farquhar gives a holistic perspective into the theological motivations of the period.

2.2.2.1. Duncan Black Macdonald

Macdonald (1911) rejects the controversialist style of the imperial period but preserves its desire to begin with the issues present in the mind of his audience. He has nothing to do with argument, preferring to search for agreement at the point of encounter. Macdonald (1911) never spells out a step-by-step system for ministry. Instead, he recounts visits with Muslims, and offers missiological analysis. His description of a typical meeting begins with introducing religious conversation with Muslims by referencing "our Lord" in greetings and conversation. Macdonald (1911:21–22) is explicit that such statements are not mere semantic conjecture. It is shared, or, in his terminology, "commonplace" truth.

Speaking to Muslims in this way brings questions concerning his apprehension of how his audience understands his message. He considers it a positive thing when Muslims understand that he means to share their deity. He hopes they consider him interested in becoming a Muslim (Macdonald 1911:29). Upon visiting a mystical ritual of a darwish tribe he "… did feel religious reality in it; did feel that behind all this is a real devotional spirit." Participants in the rite "… got something out of it" (Macdonald 1911:165). For Macdonald (1911), there is real value in non-Christian religions, a basis upon which to build. He does not, however, express how to locate, measure, or describe such a base. He represents a definitive shift in the theological evaluation of Islam, moving away from the direct model and searching for shared truth as a starting place.

We learn how Macdonald (1911) arrived at his view of "commonplace" truth when we compare it with his view on Muhammad and the Qur'an. His analysis of Muhammad, like the general form of his writing, was uncustomary for his time. Instead of assembling relevant historical details about the prophet, he seeks to construct the primary influences in the mind of Muhammad, even incorporating the role of a soothsayer in ancient Arabia. He holds that Muhammad was not dishonest about his role as a prophet, as many of his time assumed. Instead, the Islamic prophet was a pathological case, who fell into occasional trance-like states and emerged with a claim of revelation (Macdonald 1911:72). Macdonald examines and interprets the thoughts and history of the prophet as he finds them, not assuming beforehand any false pretense. Such an approach to Muhammad may seem harsh, but is constant with his search for shared truth between Christianity and Islam. It fits neatly with the alterations he makes in Christian encounter with Islam.

Macdonald (1911:80) challenges traditional Islam's stance that the Qur'an was received with little or no activity on the part of the prophet. He writes that it is unimaginable that the revelations "… rose to him from his subconsciousness; that he did not know very well what he was saying and had not his own distinct objects in the way in which he expressed himself." Stopping short of the usual dictation view of Qur'anic inspiration held by Muslims, Macdonald (1911) recognizes the binding convictions that grip the Muslim mind. Here we see a definite progression in thought and ministry. His goal is to understand and share a spiritual experience with Muslims more than to elicit a

favorable or unfavorable response. A negative view of Islam before contact pre-empts reaching "commonplace" truth. His particular position is more aptly termed neutral rather than positive, as the idea of fulfillment seems to indicate. His idea of "commonplace" truth (Macdonald 1911:21–22) can be understood best as an arena of basic shared spirituality. According to Macdonald (1911), Christians and Muslims can experience humanity together and search for God in their religious lives. They do not need completely equivalent beliefs in order to share their religious nature in that way. Obviously, not everyone agrees with his posture on Islam. However, we can appreciate his recognition of a valid spiritual dimension in all people. Macdonald (1911) is among the first missionary writers on Islam to begin to develop deeper level analysis of its anthropology and theological foundation.

An important aspect of encounter with Muslims that Macdonald did not explain is repentance. Even Farquhar (1971:458), the writer most responsible for articulating the fulfillment model, recognizes "the grossest parts" of religion. *The crown of Hinduism* (1971) contains no real place for repentance, but it does begin to acknowledge and explain disagreements between the religions. Macdonald (1911) fails at this point.

2.2.2.2. John Nicol Farquhar

What Macdonald and the World Missionary Conference of 1910 in Edinburgh started, Farquhar expands and lays a foundation for in *The crown of Hinduism* (1971). Farquhar maintains important relation to the previous evolutionary view, while making simultaneous important additions. He writes that the Christian "… sees distinctly the superiority of Christianity to the other religions … The savage goes on, one way or another, with his savage religion, and as we have seen, it really helps him … He gradually picks up a higher culture" (Farquhar 1971:31). Farquhar holds the old evolutionary viewpoint on religion, with Christianity at the pinnacle. However, he augments the view by altering the capacity of humanity to recognize higher truths and progress towards them. As a result, he defines religion as "… the creative, organizing, stimulating, kindling power in human life" (Farquhar 1971:32). Farquhar's fulfillment model as applied to encountering Hindu people is expressed in his claim that "… the

righteous Father of Jesus Christ is the end of the long, noble, passionate, quest of Indian philosophy" (Farquhar 1971:415).

Farquhar (1971) and the fulfillment model are overly optimistic in evaluating humanity's religious capacity and experience. The dialectical model seeks to redefine the capacity of people in religion. Nevertheless, the fulfillment model does focus attention on anthropology as a central concern for Christian mission. Though growing and incomplete, this awareness is discernable in *The crown of Hinduism* (1971). The writings of Jones (1938) and some of the writers of the dynamic equivalence model are a precursor to this motif. The motif includes the assumption of some value, which can vary from a positive to neutral status, behind virtually every part of human life and thought.

2.2.2.3. Lewis Bevan Jones

Jones' (1938) writing has a bigger place for repentance than any of the other writers of this section. He begins with the typical mid-twentieth century insistence that the biggest problem preventing Christianity from successful encounter with Muslims is prejudice in the minds of Muslims (Jones 1938:xii). Then he moves to describing the degrading effects of sin and the need for God to work in the minds and hearts of people. Once the work of God begins it is possible for the sinner to come to God and begin the process of "… surrendering his life, and craving God's pardon … forgiveness only becomes effective in the case of the truly penitent" (Jones 1938:147–148).

Jones (1938) teaches that ministry should be built upon elements of Islam. His experience convinces him that elements of truth within Islam can be explained only by the activity of God's Spirit. "We should rejoice in whatever evidence we can find of the presence of God's Spirit in Islam" (quoted in Bennett 1988:243). He borrows the idea of completion in religion and applies it to Islam. Being a sensitive practitioner as well as a scholar, Jones takes the idea further. He sees through to the end of fulfillment, and declares that God's revelation in Christ cannot be exhaustive. Islam has something genuine to contribute to Christianity. As Bennett (1988:243) aptly summarizes, "God is not precluded from revelatory activity elsewhere. Such revelation may not be 'more complete' than the revelation in Christ but may be supportive of it."

Late twentieth century writers do not credit Jones (1938) for his influence as often as they do Gairdner (1920) and Zwemer (1928). However, the alterations Jones (1938) makes to encounter with Muslims have lasting effects. According to him, encounter takes place in an area of shared spiritual experience and leads to mutual discovery and benefit. Jones thinks this attitude is the best preparation for the Holy Spirit to work, for Muslims to be able to hear and understand the gospel, and for repentance, faith, and renewal to occur. It is important to understand the import of mutuality in spiritual experience because many traditional concepts, such as repentance and renewal, take on a new meaning in its light. This mutual spiritual anthropology in human experience is the meeting place for the seemingly contradictory concepts of repentance for people of other faiths and of fulfillment of non-Christian religions. However, Jones (1938) offers no resolution. Humanity's shared spiritual experience provides no basis for any uniqueness in the Christian message for the Muslim. Repentance becomes fluid, existential, and vague. Later models deal with the same issues and offer various solutions.

2.2.3. What are the basic teachings of the dialectical model, and in what ways did these teachings affect other models?

The dialectical model seeks to integrate the teachings of dialectical theologians, like Barth (1956a), into Christian encounter with people of other faiths. The older imperial model has a largely negative view of Islam. The fulfillment model has a more positive stance on the nature of religion. We will trace the effect of Kraemer's (1956) dialectical missiology upon the development of Evangelicalism.

An important point should be made at the onset of this examination of the dialectical model. It tends to be more theoretical than practical. It did not produce many field models or approaches for meeting and communicating with people of other faiths. However, the model greatly affects the overall shape and direction of missiology. It becomes a defining point for twentieth century mission. Not all Christian missionaries incorporate dialectical theology, but many significant figures of Evangelical mission measure their writings against Kraemer's (1956) categories of religion.

2.2.3.1. A new perspective in the writings of Hendrik Kraemer

It is difficult to understand twentieth century mission without a careful examination of Kraemer (1956). Following the First World War, many were skeptical of traditional ways and methods. In his presentation at the conference of Tambaram, published as *The Christian message in a non-Christian world* (1956), he provided a dialectical framework for mission that reshaped not only how many sought to do mission, but also why. Kraemer's view of religion, upon which his missiology is based, is taken over and adapted from Barth, the early Swiss dialectical theologian widely recognized as the most influential writer in the church during the twentieth century. Barth's (1956b:281–299) opinion on religion is built upon his understanding of the nature of revelation as it comes to humanity. In *The Christian message in a non-Christian world* (1956)*, Kraemer aptly summarizes Barth by writing that revelation is "… an act of God, and an act of divine grace for forlorn man and a forlorn world by which He condescends to reveal His will and His heart, and which, just because it is revelation, remains hidden except to the eye of faith, and even then remains an incomprehensible miracle" (Kraemer 1956:118). Revelation cannot be equated with any text or become a mere object of knowledge for humanity. It can be witnessed to in the Scripture and in the church's proclamation. "Real proclamation," says Barth (1956a:92):

> means God's Word preached … means human talk about God on the basis of the self-objectification of God which is not just there, which cannot be predicted, which does not fit into any plan, which is real only in the freedom of His grace, and in virtue of which He wills at specific times to be the object of this task, and is so according to His good pleasure.

Similarly, the text of Scripture is called the Word of God only as it is part of the event of revelation. "Revelation endangers the Bible that attests it" (Barth 1956a:38). His doctrine of revelation flows from his doctrine of God, and is the single teaching of his that informs and shapes all others.

Proclamation and Scripture could never be equated with revelation in Barth because in his mind that would mean limiting the personality of God Himself. God must have free control over all things, especially His Word. He can use the Bible and Proclamation if He chooses, or He can opt out of such employment. He is not bound in

anyway by anything. Such freedom is the definition of personality, according to Barth (1956a:138). He holds that being a person means being a subject, both logically and ethically. Further, for God's personality to be legitimate His personality must be free "… even in respect of the specific limitations connected with its individuality, able to control its own existence and nature both as particular form and also as living development, and also to select new possibilities of existence and nature" (1956a:138). This utter freedom for God is the hallmark of Barthian theology, and has been replicated in many forms of thought during the years following the Swiss theologian's death. The Bible could not be equated with the Word because doing so would lock God into a grammatical/syntactical framework, comprehended and controlled by humanity. However, God's transcending Word wants to reach the world and speak. It employs instruments, such as the Church and the Bible, which allow it to become immanent and approachable to humanity. Thus revelation, though unbound and divine, is received in the church, and becomes visible and historical through witness (Barth 1956b:220–223).

Barth's (1956b:281–284) view of religion arises from his understanding of revelation. He does not deny the viability of religion outright, because that would require denying the subjective aspect of revelation in which the Holy Spirit is operative. He does labor to distinguish between what he calls the religion of revelation and the revelation of religion. Religion of revelation means religion originated and justified from outside, or based upon God's self-offered and self-manifesting revelation. Revelation of religion refers to religion based upon a substitute human word in place of God's revelation that limits the preeminence of divine revelation. Religion can never be true in itself. "Like justified man, religion is a creature of grace" (Barth 1956b:326). It never stands before revelation, but is subject to it and shaped by it.

Taking his cue from Barth, Kraemer (1956) begins his chapter on the proper attitude towards non-Christian religions by reminding his audience of the two poles of dialectical theology. Firstly, there is the knowledge of God, Who is revealed and active in Christ. God is holy and reconciles to Himself. Secondly, there is the knowledge of humanity. Humanity is the creation of God who has become perverted by a radical self-centeredness (Kraemer 1956:101). These two poles are best understood as restatements of Barth's teaching on God and revelation. Kraemer shows his worth as a missiologist by

insisting that dialecticalism be applicable to life. He admits that the two poles are difficult to work out in life and lead to a problem. With such firm lines drawn between God and humanity, attention must be given to evaluating of the potential, actions, and achievements of humanity. He writes that the whole problem can be expressed in how general revelation and natural theology are understood (Kraemer 1956:103). If people can respond to God's revelation in an appropriate way, then value must be assigned to resulting reason, history, and philosophy. Another related and crucial area for consideration is the value of knowledge, religion, and culture of people with limited or no contact with God's revelation.

True to dialectical form, Kraemer's (1956) first recommendation is to maintain two conditions: apostolic witness and a positive attitude. He states that Christianity is built on a prophetic, "apostolic witness to a divine, transcendental order of life that transcends and judges by virtue of its inherent authority the whole range of historical human life in every period" (Kraemer 1956:104). Whether the evaluation of the thought and actions of people of other faiths is corrective or one of intimate relation, a positive attitude must be maintained. To summarize Kraemer (1956:110) on this issue: if Christianity is true to its nature and mission, then its response to the people of other faiths is always a fierce combination of yes and no. "The most fruitful and legitimate way to analyze and evaluate all religions is to investigate them in light of the revelation in Christ."

The Christian message in a non-Christian world (1956) offers a critique of Barth (1956b) on the important issues of revelation, knowledge, and culture mentioned above. In these areas of "natural" theology and thought, Kraemer expresses disagreement with Barth. He does so by calling for, and at the same time rejecting, a particular kind of natural theology. He says that in precluding the possibility of any kind of natural theology Barth is unrealistic.

> The problem of the relation to the world and all its spheres of life and that of the attitude towards other religions and how God works in them cannot be constantly passed by in silence or left untouched … Even in this fallen world God shines through in a broken, troubled way: in reason, in nature, and in history … Here lie the necessity and legitimacy of Bruner's protest, and of his combat in favor of a critical and right kind of natural theology; for, although beset with many

possibilities of error, we must somehow try to talk about it (Kraemer 1956:120–121).

Kraemer thinks his Biblical realism, the term he proposes for his modified form of Barth's teaching applied to mission, will be exempt of Barth's "… problem of synergism versus monergism" (Kraemer 1956:121). He admits that people of other faiths may have a "… real experience of divine relationship" (Kraemer 1956:121), but denies that it could be of the same quality or sort as if it were based on the revelation in Christ.

Pre-empting the possibility of too swift a dismissal for Kraemer's Biblical realism, Schlorff (2006) points out the error of assuming that his dialectic for mission is equivalent to anti-fulfillment missiology. It is not a simple reaction against fulfillment. "What he is arguing for is a dialectical approach to non-Christian religion, which combines discontinuity and continuity" (Schlorff 2006:18). Kraemer's Biblical realism "… is fully aware of this fundamental and demonic disharmony in mankind" (Schlorff 2006:18). However, it also postulates that above the resulting judgment the disharmony brings "… there rises triumphantly an ultimate divine yes in God's saving Will toward mankind and the world" (Schlorff 2006:18).

Kraemer's (1956) dialectic interlaces repentance and fulfillment, the concepts the direct model minimized and the fulfillment model could not reconcile. However, no clarity is provided as to how the two could be united in resolution. Dialectical theology levels the playing field of all people and all faiths. If the Christian could find and experience God in the midst of his flawed religious pursuits, then so could the Hindu who genuinely sought after the truth as he or she knows it. I will examine the writings of the DEM in the following chapters, and find the same incoherence continues down to our own day.

2.2.3.2. The dialectical model's affect upon the direct model

When proposing his method for evangelism in Muslim lands, Wilson (1950:93–94) references the division between Barth and Brunner. He summarizes Brunner's position as holding that ministry should begin with humanity's need and proceeds to the Bible (Wilson 1950:93-94). Barth (1956b:283) teaches that the point of initial contact is revelation, understood as personal encounter with God. Interestingly, Wilson (1950) follows Barth, but does so out of pragmatic motivation. After acknowledging the validity

of Brunner's approach, he reports that most converts come after exposure to the Christian Scriptures (Wilson 1950:93–94). It would be unfair to say that Wilson (1950) patterns his thought and ministry after the dialectical model, but not unreasonable to call attention to how he situates his work in Barth and Kraemer's stream of thought. His interaction with them also shows, as stated in the opening of this chapter, that models are not static.

Though it would be improper to label him an adherent, the writings of Zwemer (1941) also display the impact of the dialectical model. Interacting with the thought of his day on the nature of humanity's religious experience, he declares, "… No one can deny the elements of strength, of vitality, and of truth in the religion of Islam" (Zwemer 1941:44). He also writes, "… The failure of Islam is the failure to give Christ His rightful place" (Zwemer 1941:48). Here we see a stronger version of the same basic elements present in the writings of Macdonald, Jones, Kraemer, and Hogg. This view acknowledges elements of truth and strength in Islam. However, it sees clearly that Islam fails to acknowledge Christ. In the works of missionaries who assign a higher status to the place of inspiration of the text of the Bible the elements can create a tension. The tension arises because the uniqueness of the Biblical authority is challenged by the possibility of truth from another religious source. It is especially important that this tendency is apparent in Zwemer (1941), since he is more directly influential in the formation of late twentieth century Evangelical forms of encounter than any other writer of his time. We find the same elements of tension in Parshall's appropriately titled book *The Cross and the Crescent* (2002). Though the tension about humanity's spiritual situation is readily apparent in Zwemer's writing, he still views the Qur'an as "… the Procrustean bed for the human mind" (Zwemer 1941:51). He does not progress to the point of removing a basic negative evaluation of intrinsic religious forms, such as the Qur'an.

2.2.4. The dialogical model as seen in the writings of Kenneth Cragg

For many reasons Cragg is one of the most influential missiologists of the last sixty years. His understanding of Islam, its people, and Arabic are impeccable. He also understands many of the life situations that ministering to Muslims require. Having such a grasp of

the issues enables him to speak clearly to the life and ministry of the practitioner, and makes his theory easily applied (Cragg 1993). Finally, he has remarkable abilities in the English language. Such command of the issues coupled with an almost poetic style, rewards him with a large audience. The DEM takes part of its missiology and methodology from Cragg (1979), and the remnant of the direct model defines itself against his position (Schlorff 1980:143). Due to the density and breadth of Cragg's writing, we focus our study on four crucial points: identifying his central concerns, understanding the influence of dialecticalism, examining his proposal of incarnation as solution, and tracing the development of the incarnational motif in his work.

Schlorff (2006:20–21) gives a summary of Cragg's thought and influence. In Cragg's 1956 book, *The call of the Minaret* (1985b), Cragg offers a new approach that is rooted in a positive evaluation of Islam and the doctrine of fulfillment. In *Sandals at the Mosque* (Cragg 1959), written less than five years later, he moves further into exploring restoration in terms of fulfillment. These works comprise a move beyond fulfillment in a unilateral sense to a multi-lateral fulfillment in an open religion. Christ is the fulfillment of both religions. It is a "… Christianity and an Islam both open not just to a clearer understanding of their own sources but also to truth from other sources and perspectives" (Schlorff 2006:20–21).

Though Schlorff's (2006) summary is helpful, he is mistaken about the root of Cragg's position. The primary motivation behind Cragg, as well as the dialogical model, is the view of humanity's common religious experience and capacity. *Sandals at the Mosque* (Cragg 1985b) is written as a theology "… which is on the frontiers of religion in their mutual existence" (Cragg 1959:21). *The event of the Qur'an* (Cragg 1971:10) also states that its purpose is "… an exercise in religious enquiry and in trans-religious openness of heart … a reckoning … in the common context of our single humanity." The underlying concern of *The mind of the Qur'an* (Cragg 1973:8) is "… inter-religious converse and responsibility in the contemporary world." Those following the imperial period are unified in recognizing that something is amiss with their predecessors understanding and approach to people of other faiths. Many thinkers, including Barth, helped to narrow the understanding of the exact point of disagreement by characterizing all religion, including Christianity, negatively. However, Cragg's teaching resonates with

so many because he addresses the greatest single point of weakness and mystery in the minds of Christians as they approach other groups and religions. In order to have confidence in encounter with people of other faiths, Christians must understand the place and value of religion. Even after the turning of the twenty-first century, writers continue "… to grapple more deeply with the vital question of the meaning and multi-faceted nature of Muslim spirituality" (Parshall 2002:20).

Cragg arrives at his perspective on how to approach Islam by adopting a key feature of dialectical thought. Barth's position concerning the nature of humanity's spiritual capacity in religion, as opposed to revelation, can be summed up in the following quotation: "What is the purpose of the universal attempt of religions but to anticipate God, to foist a human product into the place of the word, to make our own images of the One who is known only where He gives Himself to be known?" (Barth 1956b:308). In his view, all religions, including Christianity, are basically the same. Religion is an attempt to thwart grace. Any type of positive occurrence or morally praiseworthy act can be attributed only to the enabling of God through Christ. This summary is inadequate to comprise the whole of Barth's position. It is also inaccurate to say that Cragg and others who incorporate an element of dialectical theology into their thinking follow it with no alterations, or accept all the ramifications of its view of religion. However, Barth (1956b) pulls down the Christian's estimation of his own religious ability. He creates a level field upon which human spirituality is conducted. This is Cragg's (1985b) foundation, and many in the ecumenical movement borrow it. Protestant/Evangelical missiology, from the mid-twentieth century until today, continues to try to come to terms with meaning and capacity of human spirituality.

Introducing his inter-religious take on how Christians and Muslims should encounter one another, Cragg (1985b:157) makes his famous declaration for the existence of a "call within the call" of the minaret. Many do not agree with the scope of his statement. However, we should carefully consider both his grasp of the effect of humanity's common spirituality upon encounter between religions and his assertion that there could be a part of Islam that is binding upon Christians. The uniqueness of Cragg's (1985b) proposal is found in the optimistic stance he takes on the potential of religion in general, and non-Christian religions in particular. He does not reject the dialectical

position on the nature of humanity's spirituality but extends it at a crucial point. If Christian religious experience is of no better quality than Islamic religious experience, then whatever hope is placed in communication between God and the Christian can also be extended to the Muslim. Furthermore, if Christ alone is the measure of true revelation, rather than tradition or the text of Scripture, then why not consider how the Qur'an might also contain something upon which to bring men to Christ? After all, it has much to say about Christ. We examine similar issues when looking at the Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic.

Cragg's (1985b) genius is displayed also in the simplicity and applicability of his approach. He bases it on the incarnation of Christ. For him, a Christianity that is not interpretive is invalid. Mutuality in religious experience carries a duty for the Christian. "Not to care about Islam would be to not care for Christ. To hold back from the fullest meeting with Muslims would be to refrain from the fullest discipleship to Christ" (Cragg 1985b:64). The imperial period writings ignore or downplay the religious experience of Muslims. The direct model bypasses the issue largely, trusting that proper proclamation will bring about needed change. The fulfillment model advocates work to complete Islamic spirituality in Christ. Cragg's method forges a new path, where commonalities between religions lead to mutual edification.

Incarnation, as Cragg (1985b:245–246) teaches it, is different from previous conceptions in two crucial ways. First, the incarnation is not merely a thing of the past. He states:

> Our duty is to carry over the Word that God has uttered, to be the translators of God's speech into the language, the idiom, and the minds of ordinary mortals. Our words are to be the servants of the Word, our lives of His life, our person of His Person.

His view reforms humanity's religious situation optimistically so that contact can be made with God (see Cragg's boast of how the authentic communicator "refuses to believe that the language of God in Christ is beyond anyone's understanding" (Cragg 1985b:246). The incarnation of Christ acts as a matrix where people from different faiths can meet and communicate with God. The natural result of his emphasis on the incarnation is a view of encounter as dialog, with dialog being the enabling device for communication. The basic stance of the incarnational approach is echoed decades later in

Gilliland's *The Word among us* (1989), though DEM advocates do not often employ dialog as a communicative device for encounter with people of other faiths.

In his later work, Cragg (1985a) extends his position further so that the inter-religious enterprise could continue and deepen. In *Jesus and the Muslim* (1985a) Cragg makes another significant modification to the concept of incarnation and its application to encounter with people of other faiths. He maintains the dialectical view of not tying inspiration directly to the text of Scripture, but continues seeking a word from God to break through in the encounter. Then he applies the same to his conception of incarnation. Following the Islamic understanding of prophethood, he calls for an expansion of its definition in application to Christ beyond "… the bare delivery of words into what the whole 'person' of the messenger signifies." We should be aware of truth in Jesus, not just from Him (Cragg 1985a:127–128). In order to provide more room for a type of existential meeting with God during encounter, he further distances his position. Now the need to relate religious experience to Scripture is lessened. God can best be heard while dwelling on the significance of the incarnation, rather than the actual messages containing its record. Cragg's alteration at this point shows the continuing need to find a suitable basis to explain how communication with God can occur in humanity's spirituality.

2.2.5. What is the general missiological landscape of the mid-twentieth Century?

Cragg (1985b) modifies the dialectical position and he establishes incarnation as the basis for encounter with Muslims, helping to set the stage for the DEM to develop. The indirect model was partially enveloped by the forming ecumenical movement. The direct model continues until the 1970s with the same course it had since its inception.

2.2.5.1. The central problem – the nature of humanity's spiritual experience

By the time the World Missionary Conference met in Jerusalem in 1928, most of Christian mission recognized that its position on how to encounter people of other faiths

needed to be reconsidered. Hogg (see Sharpe 1971), Farquhar (1971), and Jones (1932) were early twentieth century writers who identified humanity's common spiritual experience as the area in which encounter should begin. Uncertainty arose as to how or if Christian spirituality should be considered qualitatively different than in the people of other faiths. After Kraemer (1956) introduced a dialectical conception of religion, Cragg (1985b) began establishing his incarnational approach and dialogical format for encounter. All these positions formed in response to the same issue of how to explain the nature and capacity of humanity's spiritual experience.

2.2.5.2. The central task – to bring an encounter with God into humanity's spiritual experience

For Christians of the mid-twentieth century, the problem of how to explain the nature of humanity's spiritual experience was complex. However, the path forward appeared simple to them. By approaching encounter with people of other faiths from the standpoint of the incarnation, all people can experience an encounter with God. The incarnation serves as a unifying factor for mission until the latter part of the century, and remains a significant component of missiology across its spectrum into the twenty-first century. Our task in the next chapter will be to evaluate how this central theme and task of mission from the mid-twentieth century helps to form the DEM, and the resulting change of approach to Islam, the Qur'an, and encounter with Muslims.

Chapter 3

The Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic of the dynamic equivalence model

As noted in chapter 2, mid-twentieth century mission grappled to understand humanity's common spiritual experience and capacity. Many questioned uniqueness in Christianity as a religion, in Christian knowledge, and in Christian spirituality. The questioning had grown since the publishing of Hocking's *Rethinking missions* (1932). Gleaning from the dialectical view of the nature of religion, Cragg (1985b) sought to increase both commonality between peoples of different faiths and the value of differing faith developing from varied positions.

At the same time as these struggles, Evangelicals perceived an acute failure in mission to Muslims (Glasser 1979:13–14). Combined with the uncertainty of how to view humanity's common spiritual nature and capacity, there was pressure to find a new basis of approach for encounter with Muslims (Cragg 1979:197 & Accad 1976:331–335). These two points are of critical importance for my thesis. All of the alterations I examine in this chapter should be understood as answers to the two issues mentioned above.

3.1. What type of focus arose among Evangelicals in the later twentieth century?

This chapter seeks to understand how and why Evangelicals altered their approach to encounter with Muslims. Many questions must be answered. What general changes in missiology occurred in mid-twentieth century mission that affected Evangelical ministry to people of other faiths? What new areas of focus arose? How did Kraft serve as a catalyst for change? How did his proposal of dynamic equivalence alter theology and mission? Specifically, how did Kraft's alterations effect how Evangelicals approach the Qur'an?

3.1.1. The new focus as seen in periodicals

By the 1950s many Evangelicals recognized the importance of the social sciences for theology and mission. To some degree, Evangelicals have always been pragmatic and focused upon ministry rather than abstract reflection. Anthropology seemed full of promise as a way to investigate humanity on deeper levels while maintaining a healthy orientation toward life.

3.1.1.1. *Practical Anthropology*

One of the primary ways Evangelicals learned and employed anthropology was the journal *Practical Anthropology* (PA). During the pilot period Taylor served as compiler and producer of the journal. Smalley edited PA from its official inception in 1956 until 1968. At first the journal was, as the name suggested, an open inquiry in how Evangelicals could give anthropological insights into problems of race, cultural relativism, cross-cultural communication, and more (Taylor 1953:13–14).

As the audience for PA grew it became a forum for recognizing difficulties and obstacles in mission. A survey of entries from the beginning through the 1960s uncovers a rising dissatisfaction with the principles of indigenization. Seng Song (1964) urged that the incarnation be used as a model in order to facilitate movement beyond indigenization. This tendency agrees with Bosch's assertion that by the 1970s the incarnation had become the general model for mission as it progressed toward inculturation (1991:454). Similarly to Seng-Song, noted Japanese missiologist Koyama (1967:100) respectfully but openly takes to task a veteran missionary of fifty years for his lack of depth in communicating with people of Buddhist faith. He accuses McGilvary of assuming fundamental agreements with the Buddhists, rather than carefully sorting out the "Aristotelian pepper and Buddhist salt." Koyama and Seng Song both displayed dissatisfaction with the depth of analysis and interaction that indigenous principles produced. As time progressed the questions and difficulties increased.

Taber edited PA from 1968 to 1972. Under his guidance it sought to expand the scope of anthropology's import into theology and mission. It began calling for deeper levels of understanding and sympathy with people of other faiths, as proven in the July to October issues of 1969 devoted to mythology and its relation to culture, theology, and mission. PA was absorbed into *Missiology* in 1972.

3.1.1.2. *Gospel in Context*

Taber edited *Gospel in Context* (GC) during its brief run from 1978 to 1979. Its stated purpose concerned "… the challenges presented by the new awareness of the church's inevitable incarnation in particular societies and cultures" (Knapp 1978:1). It aimed at elevating the problems of the church being held captive to Western culture and class influences. From its inception it displayed a significant development from the thought of PA. Whereas the previous journal merely called for an increase in anthropological insights into mission, GC names Western culture and theology as frequent hindrances to mission. Further, its scope expanded to call for a reworking of mission on a new epistemic and anthropological base (Krass 1979:27). A good example of this trend can be seen in Taber's article for the first issue. He believes that the anthropologist can say to the theologian that theology "… in its questions, its methods, and its language, is extremely dependent upon conceptual resources that belong to the human culture of theologians" (1978:2). Another good example is Alfred C. Krass's article, "Contextualization for today," where he states:

> Only in a static world could indigenization have been a success. More exactly, to the degree that African or Asian societies remained unchanged, relatively isolated and bounded societies, to that degree the program of indigenization could be meaningful. To the extent that the modern world did not impinge on the traditional world, 'the Gospel' could remain 'supracultural' (1979:28).

These periodicals show how Evangelicals moved gradually towards new methods and desired a new model for expressing their incarnational focus in theology and mission in the 1960s to the 1970s. Investigating a number of consultations and conferences will reveal an acute focus arising to restructure Evangelical mission.

3.1.2. The new focus as seen in various consultations

Kraft's dynamic equivalence model (DEM) forms the theoretical base for the Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic (CQH). My detailing of the development of Evangelical theology focuses on how he and like-minded associates assemble the basic ideas of the DEM in various consultations.

3.1.2.1. Conference on media in an Islamic culture

Shumaker (1974) reports the findings of the Conference on media in an Islamic culture (COMIC), held in Marseille in 1974. Though the report is not the most important in terms of actual theory, it is important in this thesis for two reasons. First, it shows how Evangelicalism refuses to accept meager results for mission in the Muslim world. In many ways ministry to Muslims becomes the vanguard for Evangelical mission. It is natural that the greatest effort to employ anthropological insights, as well as any other advancement, be sought for encounter with Muslims, because failure is felt vividly in that particular area. The Marseille conference does much to highlight this tendency. The report also contains some of Kraft's first formulations of his theory among Evangelicals. In one of his presentations, entitled "Psychological stress factors among Muslims," he appeals for mission workers to seek to foster a "faith renewal movement within Islam" (1974:143). Kraft emerges from the conference as a leading voice for new adaptations in Evangelical mission.

3.1.2.2. Conference on Christians and the world of Islam today

Conference on Christians and the world of Islam today (COCWIT) shows that Kraft's ideas are shared by a number of others, and the conference papers are recorded in *Missiology* 4(3). The High Wycombe Conference reports prove that Kraft's work describes a significant change of mind among Evangelicals. It highlights again the central place ministry to Muslims occupies in Evangelicalism. Though Kraft did not personally attend the conference, it hosts several important figures for the arising DEM, including Kerr, Goldsmith, and McCurry. The best example of how Kraft's ideas effected change is Accad's (1976) presentation, which shows great sensitivity in making an early usage of the CQH. Accad expresses the sentiment of the entire conference in proclaiming that the old kind of missionary to Islam would very soon be a thing of the past (1976:332). Language issues are always an initial difficulty when Evangelicals encounter Muslims. Khair-Ullah (1976:301–316) tackles this problem in his article, "Linguistic hang-ups in communicating to Muslims". Dynamic equivalence is shown not to be merely speculation

or missiological conjecture. There is a direct and immediate connection between theory and practice. Kraft and his peers deserve commendation for such a development.

3.1.2.3. Lausanne Committee on World Evangelization at Willowbank, Bermuda

The Lausanne Committee on World Evangelization (LCWE) conference report (1978) from Willowbank is one of the highest achievements of Evangelicals in the last century. Bosch lauds the conference as a bright and early example of movement towards enculturation in mission (1991:453). He states that the "… incarnational dimension … a 'kind of ongoing incarnation' is very different from any model that had been in vogue for over a thousand years. In this paradigm it is not so much a case of the church being *expanded* (italics his), but of the church being *born anew* (italics his) in each new context" (Bosch 1991:454). The Williowbank 1978 report includes a wide range of Evangelicals. It is more general in that it does not focus on a particular geographic or religious cross-section of the world. Instead, it allows for Evangelicals of the world to come together and formulate some of the changes that need to occur for future thought and ministry. At Willowbank (1978) the majority of Evangelicalism embraces anthropology as an important voice in Christian thought. This is not to say that all believe or promote the same things. Some are sympathetic to Kraft and his understanding of incarnation as dynamic equivalence. Other influential presenters at Willowbank, such as Schaeffer and Packer, are among the group Kraft labels "closed conservatives" (1979: 39–41). Therefore, the Willowbank 1978 proves that Kraft is influential in the Evangelical development of incarnational ministry, but not the lone voice. Both groups agree that incarnation should serve as the model for theology and mission, though just how incarnation is to be understood is not conclusive.

3.1.2.4. The North American Conference on Muslim Evangelization

The North American Conference on Muslim Evangelization (NACOME), or the Glen Eyrie Conference, serves as the birthplace of the DEM approach to incarnation in

general, and to ministry to Muslims in particular. It is at Glen Eyrie that Cragg records his call for utilizing the "Christian potential" of the Qur'an (quoted in Schlorff 2006:77). It is also at NACOME that Kraft thoroughly applies the DEM to Evangelical mission.

Kraft expresses distaste for the prevailing understanding of religion in the late 1970s. He comments:

> Religion most generally refers to a given cultural system made up of cultural structures that are seldom evil in and of themselves. These structures are, however, used to express the basic allegiance of the people who employ them. If this allegiance is to someone or something other than the Christian God, it cannot be regarded neutrally by Christians (1979b:118–119).

According to him, structures within a given cultural system are mostly neutral. Allegiance to another deity is unacceptable. However, most of the meaning involved in a given structure is determined by the way in which it is used, rather than meaning securely locked in the cultural structure itself. Kraft (1979b), and other DEM proponents, would hold onto this idea through the years (Gilliland 2000:331). According to Gilliland's phrasing, people can be trapped inside of structures, but the entrapment results from people-pressure and people-choices. He maintains Kraft's assertion that structures are not inherently slanted in a particular direction.

Kraft (1979b) also applies this dynamic understanding to the religious forms of Islam. He says that the usefulness of Islamic structures is often misunderstood. These forms have long been associated with Islam, and are typically assigned a deeper connection with Islam than is legitimate. A recombination of meaning is possible, especially in the case of Islamic forms. It is particularly possible with Islam because, in forming his new religion, Muhammad was attempting to combine Arabic cultural structures with Judaeo-Christians ones (Kraft 1979b:118).

Kraft's papers at the conferences here examined, his teaching at Fuller Seminary, and his providing a broad theoretical base for the DEM by publishing CC solidify dynamic equivalence as a model. It is easy to see how the DEM approach for ministry to Muslims has its roots in the discussion at NACOME. It is also apparent from the other papers at the conference that his ideas met with considerably more approval than disapproval.

3.2. What are the characteristics of Kraft's dynamic equivalence model?

If we are to understand the CQH, then we must be able to appreciate and evaluate the DEM. Kraft builds his new model upon a central concept, which leads him to a basic conclusion. He draws the concepts of supraculture and dynamic equivalence from Smalley and Nida respectively, and sets forth his answer to the inadequacies of the closed conservatives' position.

3.2.1. The Central Concept of the dynamic equivalence model

Kraft (1979a) lists Smalley as his foremost influence. In an article from PA, Smalley (1955:58–71) proposes the notion of superculture to explain the difference between the realm of God, His attributes, and His truth, and the human cultural realm. Theology cannot prescribe merely how God's truth is worked out in culture. Rather, Smalley holds that God is absolute in His being and in His truth definitively higher and separated from humanity (quoted in Kraft 1979a:120). This idea of culture includes all things related to humanity's understanding, interaction, and expression. In that way anthropological insight is invaluable in the Christian life. Meaning is located primarily in the way the supracultural truth of God is expressed through human cultural vehicles, rather than the vehicles themselves. As Kraft says, "Christianness lies in the 'supracultural' functions and meanings expressed in culture" (1979a:118) Kraft prefers the term "supraculture", believing that it clarifies the intended notion. The understanding of supracultural truth expressed through human culture is the bedrock of the DEM. Thus Kraft takes Smalley's idea and expands it to form the foundation of a new approach to theology and mission.

Schreiter (1985) and Bevins (1992) take issue with Kraft's (1979a:118–120) conception of the theological process, including supraculture. Schreiter indicates that Kraft's model has some resemblance to positivism (1985:8) in that it makes preliminary judgments about culture and religious response based upon outside observations. Bevans (1992) objects to the kernel-husk motif that he sees embedded in dynamic equivalence, and all translation models. He finds it difficult to accept that a "naked gospel" (1992:42)

can ever be obtained, and fears that too often the "baby (doctrine) is thrown out with the bathwater (context)" (1992:42). In general, I concur with the direction of these critiques. However, ethno-theology being a primary goal of Kraft's conception of dynamic equivalence (1979a:292–293) it may be that the case against Kraft listed here is too strong.

I am unsatisfied with supraculture as a basis for inter-cultural communication not because it is too strong in the case for culture, but because it is not strong enough. Clark's (2003:114–121) dialogical model for contextualization is a promising option for mission in the twenty-first century. From within the culture's values, beliefs, and dilemmas, Christians raise questions and offer initial responses as best they can by relating them to the Scripture (2003:114). The process raises new issues and drives them to search out other passages for answers. They will not obtain complete knowledge of the Biblical teachings, but assemble a growing knowledge of relevant texts (2003:114). At each point of the process the believers cultivate sensitivity to both their context, and to the Spirit/Word. "The reading of Scripture does not just lead to, but also requires as its presupposition, an open heart toward God" (2003:114). Christians then allow certain themes – a cultural theology – to emerge and even seek out input from outside the culture, both from other areas and times. Finally, they return to the Scripture and evaluate their emerging theology as the cycle continues (2003:114).

Clark (2003) formulates several important qualifications. To objectors that decry his model, accusing it of a vicious circularity he responds:

> the dialogical circle is not *viciously* (emphasis his) circular; we do not merely presuppose our conclusion. There is the potential for progress toward more profound, more adequate understandings that are driven by Scripture but responsive to the specific issues that arise in particular locales. This is the method of 'successive approximations' (2003:119).

Importantly, he maintains an Evangelical insistence that differing locales can raise a myriad of questions and seeks answers for their questions from within a cultural context that provides input into the formation of theology, but the Bible itself is the final judge of any insight from a cultural frame of reference (2003:119).

Clark also qualifies his model with four points. Firstly, a dialogical model does not assume that principles are culturally neutral or prefer abstract principles to concrete

ones. Instead, it allows for "soft" principalizing (2003:120). Secondly, it sees the Bible itself, rather than its message, core, and essence, as transcultural. The Scriptures, themselves, deal with every culture (2003:120). Thirdly, because his model pictures theology arising from dialogue between Scripture and culture, it is as easily applied in non-Western culture as in a Western one (2003:121). Admittedly, in many situations the Western theological heritage has long dominated the scene, but in the case of a dialogical model the Bible works to broaden the dialogue and include the native voice. Finally, Clark's model presupposes obedience to the Spirit and Word. Dialogue in relationship to the Lord Jesus is impossible without it. Hardening one's heart and resisting God's voice obscure one's reading of the text (2003:121).

3.2.2. The basic conclusion of the dynamic equivalence model

Kraft's (1979a) central concept, supraculture, naturally leads to a basic conclusion. The relationship between the supracultural truth of God and human culture exists in what I am calling an anthropological dialectic. Labeling this relationship a dialectic means that the boundary between supracultural and cultural is firmly fixed. It does not mean that no communication or movement is possible between the two. Instead, it means that any such communication or movement is inherently limited and would be marked by such limitation.

3.2.2.1. The validity of the anthropological dialectic description

Some DEM advocates might not appreciate such a label. However, when properly understood, then such a description is quite appropriate. Bosch (1991) openly advocates dialectic as fundamental to a proper missionary paradigm (367), proper hermeneutics (424–425), and a right relationship between local and global/meta-theology (428). If a missiologist as esteemed as Bosch describes his own thought as dialectical at certain points, then DEM writers ought not to take offense at my usage. Furthermore, Gilliland (1989) constructs his thought and ministry upon Kraft's foundation. In *The Word among*

us, he proposes a dialectic. Citing Beker, Gilliland calls for an understanding of the theology of Paul through the dialectic of "coherent center and local contingencies" (1989:57; also see Taber 1978:3). He means to locate the matrix of theology not only in the writings Paul produced, but also in the situations in which he produced them. The relationship between these two poles in the mind of the apostle Paul is dialectical.

Much of the positive changes towards contextualization occurring in Evangelicalism today come from a careful reading of the Catholic missiologist Schreiter, whose opinion is as respected as any in matters of theological method and mission. Even Schreiter advocates dialectic as a pattern for fostering local theology (1985:20). Labeling the DEM as a dialectical approach to theology and mission is not necessarily a pejorative description. It is far more important to investigate how the model functions, produces methods for encountering and ministering to people of other faiths, and upon what basis it advocates the production of local theologies.

3.2.2.2. Delineation of the anthropological dialectic

Kraft's (1979a) anthropological dialectic can be described as holding that any expression of the absolute in culture is limited along the lines of the latter's finitude. Concerning the work of God in human culture he says, "Christian behavior, therefore, and the specific interactions between God and humans that resulted in it are always cultural, even though God is supracultural … God in His mercy decided consistently to adapt his approach to human beings in cultural contexts" (1979a:122–123). He describes the Christian Scriptures in a similar way. "The Scriptures, like the human beings who serve God, are to be valued for the functions they perform and for the meanings they convey rather than the perfections of their form" (Kraft 1979a:210). Inspiration applies primarily to its function. Regardless of source or genre, all cultural forms are essentially neutral.

Kraft's (1979a) dialectic can also be stated positively. Even the sacred texts of other faiths are adequate to express God's supracultural truth, because there is an essential separation between form and meaning. By this I do not mean to claim that in Kraft's dynamic scheme form and meaning are radically distinct. Instead, the two are related dialectically, with meaning arising primarily from the mind of the receptors of a given message. Dynamic equivalence means that God's truth flows to the receptor culture

as water flows through pipes (Dryness 1990:27). The audience determines the shape of the truth as they receive the message, activating its meaning by shaping it along their cultural structures. In that way the mind of receptors becomes the matrix of meaning, because in it supracultural truth can be stated according to the receptor's interpretive reflexes. As we will examine in later chapters, the CQH channels Biblical truth through the pipes of the Muslim holy book. It is critical that we not immediately dismiss such a hermeneutic for the Qur'an as unorthodox and unacceptable, but understand how the anthropological dialectic of the DEM provides the theoretical basis for it. Chapter 6 examines how a new basis is needed to ensure the Qur'an is properly understood and dealt with when Evangelicals encounter Muslims.

In the dynamic equivalence scheme, the anthropological dialectic is congenital to humanity's condition. Kraft (1979a) states that when there is "… communicational interaction between human beings it is necessary … that they adapt a common frame of reference within which they agree to interact … an unbridged barrier exists between them. Thus it was between God and humans before God spoke to them" (1979a:171). Difficulty in communication pre-exists Adam's sin. It is inherent in the creative order. God is outside the creative order and unbound by it. If He chooses to interact with humanity, then He must bind His revelation to culture and language in order to communicate with people. Speaking to humanity means that God accepts the self-limitation of Himself to finite culture forms. Effectively, communication problems are as much a difficulty for God as for humanity because His communication is marked by human finitude.

3.2.3. Foundational assertions of the dynamic equivalence model

Central to Kraft's (1979a) proposal is his introduction of the supraculture concept into theology and mission. His central concept leads to an anthropological dialectic between supracultural truth and finite culture. The application of this dialectic brings him to a new model, namely dynamic equivalence. On the surface, a dynamic equivalence approach seems only a slight modification. After all, several of the most popular current translations of the Bible take the dynamic equivalence approach. As we examine his

writing carefully we see Kraft's goal is to establish dynamic equivalence not only as a method of Bible translation, but also an entirely new way to read Scripture, understand its meaning, and construct and apply Christian thought.

3.2.3.1. Dynamic equivalence communication

As defined above, the basis for the concept of dynamic equivalence is the anthropological dialectic. Since there is a firm distinction between supraculture and humanity, it is necessary to explain communication before moving to translation. After all, it was difficulty in communicating in cross-cultural settings that led Kraft's mentor, Nida (1960a), to dynamic principles in translation. Smalley's (see Kraft 1979a:120) idea of supraculture that sets the perimeter for Kraft's thought, but Nida tackles the same issues in an actual ministry context. Thus his proposals for translation provide much of how Kraft works out the theory of supraculture into a new model.

3.2.3.1.1. Eugene Nida – originator of dynamic equivalence conception

Nida's writing comes from what he calls a structural parallel between language and religion. Kraft, and others of the DEM, borrows this concept from Nida (Taber 1978:2). Both language and religion use and arrange symbols to convey meaning (Nida 1972:13–14). Religion, like language, has levels of meaning. Firstly, there is deep level meaning, containing supernatural powers (personal and impersonal) and communication between these powers and humanity. Secondly, there is the kernel level, which involves summary actions based upon the deeper structures. For example, God causes a person to dream and receive a message, or a person prays to God for healing. Finally, there are surface level structures. These are more complex patterns of action and life extending from the deeper and kernel levels. Examples of these include: a worship service, communion, and community life. Surface level structures convey the deeper structural meaning only partially. In that way, deep structural meaning cannot be equated with the text of the Bible, or any other form. Literalism is defined as preoccupation with surface level structures at the expense of deeper ones (Nida 1972:15–18).

Nida (1960b) comes to these convictions because he uses the categories and assumptions from information theory to set his understanding for the nature of all communication, even between God and humanity (1960b:97). Communication exists when a source encodes a message that is transmitted to receptors. Nida, Taber, and Kraft use this view of communication to forge a new way forward against what they see as a traditional naïve Biblicism "… which pretends that there are no hermeneutical problems" (Taber 1978:3). According to their modifications, communicating meaning is not simple. As indicated above, there are levels of meaning. Beyond the formal level of meaning associated with the given form of a message or text (syntax and rhetoric), there are referential levels of meaning. A message must be understood in the way it relates to objects and people in the outside world. Therefore, meaning is not fixed and unchangeable in words written on a page. It cannot be equated simply with the message. Meaning must be extracted from the message according to the cultural (referential) understandings of the receptors. By taking these assumptions from information theory, Nida (1972) endorses a receptor-oriented hermeneutic. Such a hermeneutic:

> … consists in much more than mere possession of certain information. The message has meaning only in terms of certain all-embracing structures of thought, which include preeminently the basic presuppositions and tenants of the receptor culture or subculture (1972:10).

Information theory also includes the factors of distance and noise in the process of communication. Distance includes the separation of time and location, as well as differing roles, between source and receptors. Noise is anything that disrupts the communication message during transmission. It can be psychological or literary. Nida enumerates all these, and more, limitations in the process. Such weighty limitations form the underpinning of the previously mentioned anthropological dialectic.

The limitations are so compelling that even revelation from God to humanity is framed inside the bounds of anthropological finitude. Nida (1960b) locates the uniqueness of Christianity in the incarnation of Christ alone. He says that God communicates:

> … not mere concepts about himself (as, for example, in Islam), but he communicates himself in the person of his Son … in the incarnation God 'encoded' his infinite qualities in the limitations of human language and form, and by means of his acts showed us what he is like (1960b:111).

For the DEM, the anthropological dialectic is not a choice. It is the only available path because of the limitations of human culture and expression, which exist as a part of the constitution of humanity. The incarnation represents God's working in, not around, the limits of culture. In speaking of the incarnation, Nida's (1960b) primary goal is to work out a theory for translation. His work tends to dwell on ways that language analysis can promote a better understanding of religion. Therefore, he arrives at the dynamic equivalence model, but does not expound it.

3.2.3.1.2. Kraft's adaptation of Nida's theory

Kraft (1979a) molds Nida's (1960b) communication theory into an idea that he calls "transculturating the message". Transculturation does in culture what translation does in language. In the new scheme it is dynamic, but communication is also tied to historical facts associated with the message. A transcultural approach seeks to represent "… the meanings of the historical events as if they were clothed in contemporary events" (Kraft 1979a:280). It recreates anew the functional equivalent of the historic happenings in a given context. Therefore, Schlorff is overreaching in equating all who employ the CQH to the "new hermeneutic" (2006:72–78). He seems to indicate that using a dynamic equivalence approach can be uniformly equated with synthetic hermeneutics and filling one cultural form with meanings from another (2006:129). He is accurate in describing the tendencies of dynamic equivalence, but neglects a crucial point in the minds of the advocates of dynamic equivalence. Kraft (1979a) seeks to distinguish himself from Bultmann in the way history and message relate (37). Indeed, there is an influential drive within the DEM for introducing an existential component into interpretation, as Schlorff (2006:126) explains. There are some similarities between dynamic equivalence and Gademer and others who build upon Bultmann. However, dynamic equivalent communication seeks to root itself in the historic events surrounding the message. As we investigate further in the next chapter, Schlorff stops short of identifying the dialectic motivation of the DEM as its deficiency. His equation between the DEM and the new hermeneutic is too simplistic.

3.2.3.2. Dynamic equivalence translation

Following Nida, Kraft (1979a) states that a dynamic equivalence translation aims at the equivalence of response rather than equivalence in form. It seeks more than mere communication of information. It looks to produce a responsive element in those who receive the message. Kraft says, "… the new aim is to go beyond the focus of earlier translation theory. There is still focus on words, grammar, and expression – but for the purpose of building a communicational bridge between the author and the contemporary hearer" (1979a:270). He seeks to draw translation efforts away from a plain meanings approach towards a receptor-oriented theory. This change unites the view of supraculture he takes from Smalley with Nida's teaching on translation. Meaning is not found merely within the text, but occurs at the time of reading by the audience in their context.

Translators who follow Nida and Kraft, of whom Brown (2011b) is an excellent example, took the dynamic principles of translation even further. Brown writes many articles for *International Journal of Frontier Missions* (IJFM). One of his primary concerns is making appropriately sensitive translations for the Muslim world. His major contention is that familial titles and concepts, such as son and father, should be translated to convey social relationships instead of biological ones. Sonship can be derived by several different means including procreation, adoption, marriage, or upbringing (2011b:106). "It is crucial to note that social father and biological father are overlapping categories, and a parenting father is in both categories. So a man can be described as a child's social father without implying that he is the child's biological father as well… " (2011b:105). As an example, Brown and the Greys point to how the evangelist in Luke 2 describes both God and Joseph as *pater* to Jesus (2011:106). "The challenge for translators is to find expressions in their target languages that have a similar scope of meaning" (2011a:125). They illustrate the situation superbly by introducing the story of a Muslim lady who begins reading a portion of the Gospel of Luke. Upon seeing familial terms that she believes could imply sexual activity between God and Mary, she discards the Gospel and condemns it for promoting offensive ideas about God (2011b:105). Thus the DEM focus on receptor-oriented translation is maintained, as noted in the "Basic Principles and Procedures for Bible Translation" of the Forum of Bible Agencies

International (2011:149). Brown and the Greys seek to align themselves with the Forum's approach.

For target languages that do not have appropriate non-biological terms for familial phrases, such as "Son of God," Brown and the Greys suggest the rendering "the offspring of God" (2011b:109). They justify such tactics by stating that the phrase "Son of God" refers primarily to ontological aspects of the trinity rather than economic ones. They claim that most theologians recognize that "… the Bible primarily presents an 'economic trinity' in which the role of divine sonship is functional as well as ontological" (2011b: 110). If it is difficult to find clearly non-biological terms in the target language, then the economic aspects of words and phrases should be emphasized. They suggest footnoting the familial term in the translation that references a mini-article. The mini-article would explain several ontological aspects of the phrase that the receptor would be encouraged to consider. They recommend several ontological aspects to be set forth, including the consubstantiality of Father and Son and the eternal begetting of the Son.

Brown and the Greys (2011b) carry forward not only receptor-oriented translation, but also the anthropological dialectic. The dialectic can be seen in their labor to widen the semantic range of difficult terms and concepts for the receptor to excessive proportions, and their promotion of emphasizing the economic aspects of the trinity over the ontological aspects. We visit again the DEM understanding of ontological/economic trinity again in chapter 4. As Brown and the Greys (2011b) state, the terms *pater* and *uios* bare a wide semantic range that include most types of familial relationships, even biological ones. These biological aspects, as well as the concepts they represent, cannot be avoided. In Matthew 1 alone we are presented with a number of biological and social usages. The evangelist presents the genealogy (*genea*) of Christ, Christ as son (*uios*) of David and Abraham, and Christ as born of (*gennao*) Mary. In Luke 3 Christ is called the son (*uios*) of Joseph. Though Luke qualifies his usage of son in relation to Christ, the very same word carries through the remainder of the genealogy and is applied to obvious biological relationships. The Jewish audience of Matthew's day was no less sensitive to the issues of monotheism than Muslims of our own day. Yet no great explanation is given as to why terms that carry biological connotations are included. Only in the most extreme statements, such as Matthew 1:16 and Luke 3:23, are the terms qualified. Further, there is

no doubt that a general familial term, like *uios*, that could include biological meaning is stronger than another word or words that only signify social meaning. There is often great love, devotion, and sacrifice in adoptive or other social fathering relationships. However, if the affections of a biological relationship are ordered and nurtured properly, then the connection it signifies is deeper than any other. A biological father is not any more legitimate of a father than an adoptive one, but his relationship does have a more extensive root.

Translation is on unstable ground if conducted in a way that implies anything less than the strongest relationship within the Godhead. Considering that most of the Islamic world has little place for the practice of adoption, it is likely that some Muslim readers could assume the relationship between God the Father and His Word to be less than the most intimate kind. It is possible that they would assume it to be similar to the relationship between Allah and their own beloved prophet. My point is not to argue about the definitions of such familial statements, or to suggest that Brown and the Greys (2011b) have not done their research. On the contrary, they do a very good job of showing how such terms are used. I am not stating that biological terms should always be used or that translators should be given strict requirements on how to render certain politically charged terms. I am saying that Brown and the Greys (2011b) show the mark of the anthropological dialectic in the extreme emphasis they place upon the receptor. All efforts are exerted to prevent offense or misunderstanding for the receptor. The semantic range for controversial terms must be like a smorgasbord for the translator. While I agree that translations should avoid unnecessary misunderstanding, the sensitivities of the reader should not be such a heavy concern that the message is compromised in the movement from the original language to the target one.

As stated above, the dialectic means that the responsibility is upon God, or in this case the translator of God's message, to remove all obstacles for the receptor. Luke and Matthew stop short of saying that Jesus was Joseph's boy, but continue communicating in terminology that can be difficult for strict monotheists. It seems that the evangelists expect the receptor to read thoughtfully and consider the entirety of their writings, and judge anew the identity of Jesus Christ. We should ask no less of those for whom we translate than the Biblical writers asked of the original audience. As Brown and the Greys

state, the goal of translation should be to "… avoid incorrect meanings that fail to communicate the informational context, feelings, and attitudes of the original inspired text" (2011b:109). It does not appear that the Muslim lady mentioned in the opening of the article had such an appropriate attitude. There are many Muslims who would not give up so quickly. Even if they read a term or idea that seemed difficult, new, or incorrect they would continue. They would search for the big picture of what the Gospel as a whole presents. People born into Muslim families are capable of reading with equity. We must also have confidence in the power of the Holy Spirit to move in the hearts and minds of people of other faiths as the read the Scripture.

3.2.3.3. Dynamic equivalence theologizing

Dynamic equivalence theologizing is a step beyond translation and transculturation of the message. It involves "… reproducing in the contemporary cultural contexts of the theologizing process that Paul and the other scriptural authors exemplify" (Kraft 1979a: 291). Kraft makes important suggestions for theology and mission at this point. In his view, Evangelicals should no longer consider theology a thing that moves from the past to the present, or from the text of the Bible to the current day. Instead, as we reinitiate today the process that occurred when the historic events of the Scriptures were recorded, then we are able to make contact with the contemporary meaning of the supracultural truth of God. The meaning of Scripture is latent until unearthed by the receptors (Kraft 1979a:297). In his book, *Communication theory for Christian witness* (1983), Kraft states, "… the range of meaning covered by any linguistic label is that attached to it by the members of the community, all of whom have experienced it slightly differently" (1983:90). In the case of Scriptural meaning, it must be molded in the conceptual framework of the receivers in order to be actualized. Kraft (1983) labels this process of molding or recreating dynamic equivalence theologizing.

The DEM also brings a new understanding of heresy. Traditionally, heresy is understood as teaching that breaks with the normative doctrine of the church by expressing theology recognized as outside the bounds of the Scripture. From a dynamic perspective, most of what is called heresy in the history books may be labeled improperly. It could be simply that the party in control of what is considered orthodox

refuses to recognize legitimate receptor reflexes that lie outside of their own (Kraft 1979a:296). Dynamic equivalence theologizing means that much of what is called orthodox theology is improper, being locked inside of one aged cultural framework. "For theology, like every other presentation (transculturation) of the Christian message, must be perceived as relevant by the hearers if it is to fulfill its proper function within the Christian movement" (1979a:296). Often when workers transculturate the message, they overemphasize their own cultural reflexes, thereby rendering the gospel irrelevant to the receptors. The DEM tries to solve this problem by bringing to center stage the importance of the intended function of the Bible and the transculturation of the Christian message. The key to relevant perception of the Bible and adequate theologizing is structuring the message according to the cognitive patterns of the receptors. The question we seek to answer in subsequent chapters of this thesis is whether or not the DEM view of supracultural truth expressed through finite cultural forms is adequate to produce such restructuring with Biblical fidelity.

Hoefer displays the effects of the DEM's anthropological dialectic in his article, "Proclaiming a 'theologyless' Christ" (2005). He claims that there is a theologyless character in much of the Scripture. The Synoptic Gospels do little to explain the meaning of the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. The emphasis is upon reporting the facts of the gospel. Likewise, the sermons of Peter and Paul in Acts, as well as the creeds of the early church, take the same approach. Rather than speculate on the meaning of the event of the gospel, the apostles preach that men and women should repent and believe it. Hoefer (2005) states, "… the fact of justification is simply proclaimed, not explained. Faith arises in the heart by the power of the Holy Spirit, not in the mind by the power of theological construct" (2005:98).

Kraft (2005b) writes a response to Hoefer's (2005) article to urge its circulation and acceptance. He proclaims that Hoefer's effort mirrors his assertions in *Christianity in culture* (1979a) and *Appropriate Christianity* (2005a)*,* a connection that reveals what he considers the nature of theology. Theology is generalization upon the basis of the Scripture. Seen in that light, its applicability is very limited. The Bible is understood in a more specific manner than theology in his scheme. It is the inspired classic casebook. It is specific in its writing and its application. Thus it is more useful in life.

Neither Kraft (2005b) nor Hoefer (2005) say that theology is useless, but the anthropological dialectic drives them to give less and less place to any type of narrowing of thought or application. For example, speaking of the more generalized mood of the fourth Gospel, Hoefer (2005) states, "The Gospel of John is a whole different phenomenon" (2005:98). He never explains the place of the Gospel of John in his theologyless world, and never really deals with the epistles of the New Testament. I choose the terminology anthropological dialectic to describe this *a priori* assumption that pushes the DEM. It means that the DEM process of theology begins with allowing new people and cultures the freedom to develop their own theology, unchained by improper outside influence. Freedom requires more and more room for the receptors of the message to react according to their reflexes. The nature of theology is generalizing and somewhat binding. It seeks to make general statements in order to organize thought and life along guidelines. However, dynamic equivalence sees any type of reflection or systematizing as restrictive and static. As we see above in the section on DEM translation, the anthropological dialectic allows progressively less of a voice for theology in mission.

3.2.3.4. Dynamic equivalence epistemology

The DEM flows from the alterations Kraft makes in theory of knowledge. The whole of *Christianity in culture* (1979a) aims at urging Evangelicals beyond what he labels "the static view of knowledge". "A static model (e.g., a road map) simply shows relationships between elements. It shows the items of which a given concept is made up and their arrangements vis-à-vis each other" (Kraft 1979a:32). He attaches this label and description to the view held by Henry, Schaeffer, and Lindsell. Dynamic equivalency focuses on the process of communication and "the priority of content (meanings) over symbols (cultural forms)" (1979a:37). In other words, when people read the Bible they should not seek merely to understand words, but to get beyond those symbols to the meaning of an absolute God. Here Kraft reflects his dependence upon Nida (1960a: chapter 2), who draws his categories of knowledge from information theory.

3.2.3.5. Dynamic equivalence revelation

In the DEM, meaning does not reside simply in forms. Rather, cultural forms, of which the Scriptures would be the example par excellence, can be conduits of meaning. Kraft (1979a) states, "… the supracultural truth exists above and beyond any cultural perception or expression of it. God reveals to us glimpses of this truth via the human languages and cultures of Scripture" (1979a:129). Notice his careful distinction between meaning and form. Meaning is absolute. Forms are finite. Printed words are only one type of communication. "Print is the most successful at preserving in bare bones fashion information coming from another time or another place. But such information becomes set … and loses all life, except what a clever reader can supply" (Kraft 1983:120). Meaning cannot be identified simply with the text of Scripture, even though he classifies the Bible as "high-impact literature" (1979a:121). Instead, the supracultural truth of the absolute God comes to humanity via the text of the Bible. Thus, the Bible is best understood as a tether, or as God's inspired classic casebook for determining the validity of cultural statements of supracultural truth.

This important change in understanding the Bible comes from a change in Kraft's (1979a) view of revelation. According to him, revelation is best understood as present tense phenomena. The older traditional model of revelation as equated with the text of the Christian Scriptures, and illumination as the process whereby the Holy Spirit leads people to recognize it as revelation for the present, is set aside. The Bible is likened to "… the ocean and supracultural truth like the icebergs that float in it" (Kraft 1979a:131). DEM advocates see many of the difficulties and failures Evangelicals have experienced in ministry to Muslims due partly to a mistaken view of Scripture (Caldwell 2000:25). Kraft (1979a) believes a supracultural view of truth in the Scriptures is the needed corrective.

We are able to see how the idea of supraculture assumes a dialectic that limits the revelation of supracultural truth along the lines of human finitude. The interpretive and theological processes also must be reconstructed to compensate for humanity's limitations. The proposal of dynamic equivalence allows for room to make cultural approximations to God's absolute truth, with the Bible as the measure of each new revelation. Thus a new understanding of revelation arises to fit with all the other modifications.

3.3. The dynamic equivalence model's view of cultural forms

The focus of this thesis is the DEM's use of the Qur'an in encounter with Muslims. The first section of this chapter covers the basic theory of Kraft's DEM. Having this in mind, we examine how dynamic equivalence approaches the Qur'an, and in the next chapter judge the validity of the approach. We begin by investigating several writers who build upon dynamic equivalence in formulating methods of encounter to Muslim people.

3.3.1. As seen in the work of J. Dudley Woodberry

Woodberry's (1989a) chapter entitled "Reusing common pillars" in *The Word among us* sets forth the DEM approach to Muslim cultural forms. He begins by confessing that traditional Christian communities, as well as Muslim ones, oppose some elements of contextualization. For example, both groups are known to speak out against Christian usage of Islamic terminology. Woodberry's (1989a) reasoning for persevering in Christian usage of Islamic terms despite opposition is his hope that opposition will be "… alleviated if it were shown how many of the religious terms and worship forms are the heritage of both communities" (1989a:285). He goes on to reinterpret not only the five pillars of Islam, but also a range of forms from how bathing the body in Muslim fashion could be proper preparation for Christian prayer to seeking a contextualized mode for baptism. He also follows Cragg's interpretation of the first pillar. Christians could take advantage of the overlap in meaning between the confessions of the two faiths, agreeing with the assertion that there is only one supreme deity. They would only need to make alterations in relation to the clause concerning Muhammad as Allah's prophet (Woodberry 1989a:295).

Woodberry's (1989a) principle is that if the receptors are correctly informed of the full scope of possible interpretation of their native cultural and religious forms, then they will have a culturally valid reason for maintaining the new interpretation. He does not stop there, but claims that most Islamic forms may be reused because their "… forms, meanings, and functions are sufficiently similar" (1989a:306–307). The importance of his statement for the DEM as it encounters people of other faiths is difficult to overstate. Sufficiently similar in meaning for Woodberry is the missiological restatement of Kraft's (1979a:95) "essentially neutral". This is the test DEM advocates propose to protect

against misuse. However, it is crucial that sufficiently similar in form as a test for the utility of an Islamic cultural form be understood inside of the dynamic equivalence scheme. There is no need for a rigidly undeniable historical connection between any given forms of Christian or Muslim faith. The goal is to find some type of hook in the mind of the receptors that can be approximated as a reusable pillar. Likewise, Gilliland (1989:25) speaks of a correspondence between Scripture and culture. He is not stringently seeking some type of warrant for faith, but hoping for an approximate relation within the dynamic equivalence process. Little effort is set forth to produce a useable system to determine just how similar the forms of different faiths must be. Such a project is not needed if the receptor determines the overlap of meaning between cultural forms to be sufficiently similar.

Woodberry edits the volume containing the 1988 meeting in Zeist of the Lausanne Committee on World Evangelization (LCWE). *Muslims and Christians on the Emmaus road* (1989b) is an outstanding example of the missiological outworking of the alterations called for by the DEM. It focuses specifically on the idea of the Scripture as God's inspired classic casebook worked out in terms of ministry to Muslims. This working out involves establishing the meaning overlap between Scripture and Islamic forms.

Muslims and Christians on the Emmaus road (Woodberry 1989b) includes theological, Biblical, and contextual sections. The introduction gives an overview of the sections, but begins with an overall statement of the book's purpose. The hope is to learn how to construct something of a working ministry to Muslims, given both a common historic heritage and long lasting hostilities (Woodberry 1989b:xiii). This statement shows how the methodology of the DEM altered Evangelical missiology. Before the late 1970s the statement would have enumerated a differing heritage rather than a common one. The common heritage notion must be balanced against the conference writers desire to use the Scripture to rethink the gospel for a Muslims audience. A close reading of the chapters reveals more to this desire than a simple restatement of receptor-oriented communication. These writers see themselves as Evangelicals, and genuinely wish to reconcile their teachings to the Bible.

At the same time as it calls for building upon a common heritage, *Muslims and Christian's on the Emmaus road* (Woodberry 1989b) recognizes difficulty in reconciling

the Qur'an and the Bible. The two sides are seemingly contradictory and form another reflection of the DEM's anthropological dialectic. The section on Biblical foundations of the new approach emphasizes belief in shared truth and reusable forms (1989b:105–196). Chapman's two chapters focus on the nature of gospel witness for Muslims (104–148). Woodberry's (1989b:149–160) chapter seeks unity amidst contrasting views of sin between the people of the two faiths. Huffard and Van Werff's (1989:161–196) chapters speak on common themes and worship motifs. These writers labor to build such common ground, but simultaneously strive to maintain a genuine commitment to the gospel. However, the two positions cannot be reconciled beyond bare theory. Thus Woodberry (1989b) and Chapman (1989a & b) especially pronounce their stances very conservatively. They want to affirm the Scripture and the gospel. Consequently, they strain to find a base for unity between sufficiently similar forms and undeniable differences.

We can illustrate the anthropological dialectic of the DEM and its stance on the essential neutrality/sufficiently similar forms of culture by examining Woodberry's own chapter, entitled "Different diagnoses of the human condition" (1989b:149–160). He reports that while "… differing in details, Qur'anic and Biblical passages on Eden are significantly parallel" (1989b:151). Here we see the anthropological dialectic in meanings that are sufficiently similar but surrounded by significant disagreement. The difficulty in reconciling the two holy books is seen in his conclusion that "… the New Testament spells out the human predicament of which we have seen evidences of in the Qur'an and its interpreters" (1989b:57). The support such evidence supplies is weak because it is based upon a strain of the "marginal" idea of covenant in the Qur'an (1989b: 156). In all his labor, Woodberry hopes that Muslims will agree with his case for the need of a radical solution to humanity's sin problem. It is unlikely his interpretation will be shared, since it requires both a significant admittance of guilt by the receptor and laxity in Qur'anic interpretation. The dialectic has pushed him to move beyond the range of the Islamic receptor's cognitive reflexes. Inherent in receptor-oriented interpretation is the idea of basic affirmation or reorganizing of the thoughts and beliefs already present in the receptor mind.

At times Woodberry (1989b) seems overarching in his interpretation of the Qur'an, and at other times too confident in the possibility of Muslim agreement. If the search for constructing ministry and theology upon sufficiently similar forms concludes in the fashion of his chapter, then it would be useable in some ways. Unfortunately, it does not stop there. It moves on to the CQH. It follows the outworking of the anthropological dialectic and is not content with common ground in peripheral areas of theology. It requires that Islamic cultural forms, even the Qur'an itself, become the vehicle of the supracultural truth of the gospel.

3.3.2. As expounded in the Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic

Mid-twentieth century mission was marked by a frustration with meager results in Muslim ministry and a discontentment with past models. The 1970s saw the rise of the DEM to offer a new approach towards people of other faiths. At the North American Conference on World Evangelization (NACOME), Cragg (1979:197) advocated employing the Christian potential of the Qur'an. At the same conference, Kraft (1979b) voiced a similar exhortation aimed at a new understanding of the mission of Muhammad, one that utilizes a recombination of meaning between Islam and Christianity (Kraft 1979b:114–127). There was a mounting desire among those Evangelicals closely associated with the DEM to use the new model to overcome the perceived failures of past generations and models. For many Evangelicals, this new adaptation of using the Qur'an in encounter with Muslims continues to offer the hope they long for in ministry to Muslims.

3.3.2.1. Fuad Accad's work

Accad (1976) is an early and important voice in favor of utilizing the Christian potential of the Qur'an. His writing is important because of its sensitivity and because he is a non-Western advocate of the DEM. His sensitivity and outside perspective allow for him to come quickly to the natural conclusion of a supracultural concept of truth.

3.3.2.1.1. The Christian potential of the Qur'an

In his presentation at COCWIT entitled "The Qur'an: a bridge to the Christian faith," Accad (1976) labels the holy book of Islam a legitimate crossover for peoples moving from one faith to another. He proclaims boldly the end of the old missionary who had no use for the Qur'an. Accad points out that his proposal is historically rooted in the writing of the esteemed Christian missionary and statesman to Islam, Zwemer (1946:332).

Accad claims that the root of his method is the example of Christ in John 4, as well as Paul in Acts 17. "When Christ wanted the Samaritan woman to abandon her life of anxiety and sin … he did not hesitate to sit beside her … to converse at her level of understanding" (1976:331). In the same way, when Paul wanted to communicate about the true creator to the Athenians he "… spoke to them about an altar they had made for the worship of an unknown God" (Accad 1976:331). Thus Accad sees himself historically, Biblically, and theologically founded in his call for using the Qur'an in encounter with people of Muslim faith.

The terminology may not be original to Accad (1976), but he spoke a sensitive word at a time when many where listening. It took DEM Evangelicals several years to catch up with his vision of using the Qur'an as a bridge to Christian faith for Muslims, but he remains an early example of where the DEM leads. The first edition of IJFM for 2000 sought to establish the Biblical and missiological validity of C5 Muslim ministry, which encourages new believers in the Lord Jesus Christ from Muslim backgrounds to identify themselves as a complete or "Messianic" type of Muslim (Massey 2000a:3). Caldwell finds the most compelling and applicable Biblical example of ministry in the Lord's interaction with the Samaritan woman of John 4 (Caldwell 2000:25–32). Chapman, in *Muslims and Christians on the Emmaus road* (1989a & b), spends considerable effort to situate the DEM approach to encountering Muslims within Paul's method in Acts 17. Accad is not always referenced as the source of these attempts for the Christian use of the Qur'an, but it is clear that current DEM missiologists are saying many of the same things he said decades ago.

3.3.2.1.2. The need to broaden the base of Qur'anic interpretation

As indicated above, the premise of Woodberry's *Muslims and Christians on the Emmaus road* (1989b) is that many historic connections exist between the cultural forms of the two faiths, but most Muslims are unaware of such a link. Accad's (1976) article is a precursor to Woodberry's assertion. Accad states that the major problem between the people of Christian and Muslim faiths is one of misunderstanding. However, he does not exert himself to expound the missiological foundation of his statement. He moves immediately into building his bridge over the Qur'an. He claims that many Qur'anic references only appear to be anti-Trinitarian. These could be understood to combat what Evangelicals consider to be unbiblical doctrines, such as consubstantial associations assigned to God or Mary being incorporated into the Trinity. For example, Surah The Women 4:171 calls Christ "… the word of God and his Spirit." Accad questions, "Aren't these the titles given to Christ by the Bible itself?" (1976:333). If the Qur'an assigns such lofty positions to Christ, then the Christian should be the first to agree. Further, Accad (1976) claims that the mention of word and Spirit is tantamount to identifying a Christian Trinity in the Islamic Scriptures (1976:334). To be fair, there are DEM practitioners who use the Qur'an in similar ways, but would not wish to go as far as he has here.

It is important to question whether or not Accad (1976) is being consistent with the DEM's theory of forms, meanings, and supraculture. He is a respected missiologist of the DEM who writes consistently with the spirit of the model. He advocates a dynamically equivalent reading of the Qur'an to fit the dynamically equivalent interpretation for the Bible. His sensitivity and insight as an early advocate for the CQH should not be overlooked. A significant portion of chapters 5 and 6 are devoted to exploring the depth of the CQH in DEM ministry to Muslims, as well as the validity of the approach.

3.3.2.1.3. The Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic – reading meaning into Islamic forms

There are several different ways the Qur'an can be interpreted in relation to the Christian Scriptures. Firstly, the Qur'an can be referenced in places where it contains a simple historical connection to the Bible. For example, it declares, as does the Bible, that Christ was born of a virgin. Secondly, "… the nineteenth century polemicists, such as Tisdall,

like to quote the Qur'an and other Islamic sources in a radical historical criticism of the Qur'an and of Islamic history with the purpose of bringing Islam 'crashing to the ground'" (Schlorff 1980:144–145). A third way of interpreting the Qur'an is to read Christian meaning into its words. Schlorff (1980) calls this the CQH (Schlorff 1980:145). It occurs when Biblical meaning is infused into the words of the Qur'an. As referenced above, Accad (1976) shows a through-going application of the CQH. He bases his argument of the Christian potential of the Qur'an upon an unwavering belief that it supports fundamental Christian doctrine. Such doctrine includes:

> the genuineness of Christian Scripture … the man-Christ who was, among many other distinguishments, sinless, and the idea of atonement for sins in terms congruent with the biblical atonement in Christ. Unfortunately, the Muslim has no idea, not even the slightest, about what all these important acts of a loving God should mean to him and to his eternal salvation (Accad 1976:338).

According to Accad, practically all the basic components of Christian faith are in the Qur'an. As is shown in chapter 5, some make a complete gospel presentation without mentioning the Christian Scriptures. If pressed for clarification, it is likely he would enumerate a position corresponding to Kraft's essentially neutral cultural forms or Woodberry's sufficiently similar pillars of faith. In the DEM, there is no need, in fact it is impossible, to find an exact match. The expectation of such a tight fit would deny the central concept of supraculture. God is absolute. His truth can only partially be communicated through culture. Accad sees the similar wording between the Bible and Qur'an in calling Christ the word of, or a Word from Allah, and is more than persuaded that a sufficiently similar connection exits. He should not be faulted for being sensitive enough to build upon the anthropological dialectic of the DEM. Upon what basis could DEM advocates object to his CQH method? From a DEM insider's prospective he makes a compelling case that the holy books of Islam and Christianity are sufficiently similar at key points. Abdul-Haqq (1980), a certified evangelist with the Billy Graham evangelistic association and a non-Western commentator, concurs with Accad's judgment on the Qur'an's calling Christ a word from Allah. He writes, "… the expression 'Word from Him' is equal to 'His Word.' It should be plain for any reasonable person to see that the Word of God must have the same nature as God" (Abdul-Haqq 1980:68). In chapter 5 I

examine *The way to heaven through the light of the Qur'an* (Baroi 2008), and discover even deeper possibilities of common ground than Accad mentions.

3.3.2.2. As seen in *Muslims and Christians on the Emmaus road*

Woodberry and the other presenters from the LCWE meeting in 1988 try to be conservative in their employment of the Qur'an. They are careful to list the limits of the ability of Islamic forms to correspond to Biblical ones. Chapman (1989b) takes pains not to equate simply Muslim and Christian understandings of Christ being the word of God (1989b:135). Woodberry hopes that Muslims, "… on the basis of their own writings, will search for a more drastic solution, and that we all, joined in our common sinfulness, may receive the redemption God offers" (1989b:149). He, along with Chapman and the others from the conference, is conservative in his use of Qur'anic materials.

Most of the writers from the 1988 LWCE meeting recorded in *Muslims and Christians on the Emmaus road* carry forward the basic theory and method of the DEM, even if they are not as consistent as Accad (1976). At the onset of the conference, Shenk (1989) records that the participants are "… to hear and understand the truth that is already present" in Islam (Shenk 1989:4). Further, he writes, "Jesus is a figure in the Qur'an, with wonderful qualities and names attributed to Him" (1989:11). Again I point out that if these writers stopped with the idea of factual or historical agreement between Biblical and Qur'anic data at some points, then there would be little problem. Shenk (1989) hopes to forge some common ground with Muslims through the DEM's concept of sufficient similarity to Islamic cultural forms. Cragg concurs by writing about the urgency for "Christianity to diminish the occasions of the enmity within its own power. It must surely interpret into, rather than against, the themes in Islam and the Qur'an which have positive bearing on the witness to God in creation" (Shenk 1989:40). Uddin (1989) reiterates the proposals of Kraft at NACOME and Woodberry in *The Word among us* by declaring that the dangers of syncretism in dynamic equivalent ministry to Muslims is not too great, because "Islam is a post-Judaistic and post-Christian religion which has inculcated Judaistic and Christian teaching in its religious content and forms" (Uddin 1989:268). All

these writers show a desire for moderation in application of dynamic principles. Nevertheless, they maintain a commitment to the anthropological dialectic.

Chapman's (1989a & b) two chapters on Acts 17 are particularly important, because his interpretation of Paul's discourse in the chapter is central to the DEM approach to people of Muslim faith. According to Chapman, "Paul genuinely believes that the Athenians already have some ideas about God … at every point there are extraordinarily close parallels between Paul's words and the teaching of the Qur'an" (1989a:113). At the beginning of his second chapter he states, "… we want to recognize all the common ground we can find between the two faiths, working within that area where the two circles overlap" (1989b:127). Based in receptor-oriented communication principles, his approach requires that Paul not begin merely with the cognitive apparatus of the audience. The apostle must agree with the Athenians, and todays Muslims can agree with almost his entire message. This type of interpretation of Paul's method of encounter centers in a basic agreement between all parties involved, and has become standard in the DEM.

He also gives a tighter theological base for Accad (1976), and others, who apply the CQH. Neatly following the DEM principle of essential neutrality/sufficiently similar cultural forms, he lists several passages of the Qur'an that he believes line up with Acts 17. For example, Acts 17:27 says, "… that they should seek God, and perhaps feel their way toward him and find him. Yet he is actually not far from each one of us" (ESV). Surah Qaf 50:16 states, "It was We Who created man, and We know what dark suggestions his soul makes to him, for We are nearer to him than (his) jugular vein." He lists many other passages that seem to agree. His explanation for how the Islamic prophet could have included so many details from the Christian tradition is that Muhammad was exposed to the preaching of Nestorian monks. However, Chapman (1989a) does not claim the ability to decipher just how the prophet preserved the material, or how it was recorded into the Qur'an. The important point inside the dynamic equivalence scheme is to recognize and appreciate the many similarities between Islam and Christianity. Christians "… probably have far more in common with Muslims than Paul had with his audience in Athens" (Chapman 1989a:116–117).

One of the most telling points of Chapman's (1989) commentaries has to do with how he explains the disagreement in Acts 17 between Paul and the Athenians. He states that it is not enough to deal with cultural issues correctly. There is a corrective or apologetic component to Paul's approach (1989b:117). He credits Gairdner and Cragg as exemplary of how to move towards correction in encounter with Muslims (1989b:118–121). Gairdner, in his translation of one of Al-Ghazali's treatises, suggests that the great Muslim commentator, had he been more consistent to his mysticism, should have come to a more sure knowledge of God. Likewise, Cragg, in various addresses, charges Muslims with not embracing all that the Qur'an could mean in relation to the human condition. Muslims perpetuate a weakening view of humanity's sin. Thus the apologetic element of encounter with people of Muslim faith also becomes dynamic. Correction is more about showing Muslims how they do not take their own faith seriously enough than it is leading them to reject it. In the final pages of his article Chapman does ask several difficult questions of the Muslims, including how and why God would forgive and love humanity (1989b:123–124). However, he admits freely, "We have started from common ground – from propositions which we can affirm without hesitation along with Muslims. We have then tried to recognize frankly the differences between us in answering questions which arise out of these basic convictions" (1989b:124). Chapman requires more in repentance than Gairdner and Cragg, but continues to root repentance in the essential agreement between Islamic and Christian sources. True to the DEM, his model of repentance is dynamic. He urges Muslims to deepen their understanding of and commitment to the Qur'an, rather than move to a Biblical allegiance.

3.3.2.3. The Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic as it coheres to other elements of the dynamic equivalence model's approach to ministry among Muslims

The theory undergirding the CQH is that all cultural forms, even the Scriptures of people of other faiths, are essentially neutral and can be used to express supracultural truth. When a writer or practitioner expresses some limit to this tendency, then he or she produces incoherence at that point. For example, Parshall speaks out against what he considers radical applications of contextualization in his 1998 article in *Evangelical*

Missions Quarterly (EMQ) called "Danger! new directions in contextualization." Massey (2000a) puts together an entire issue of the IJFM to ensure that through-going application of DEM principles would continue center stage in Evangelical mission.

Massey's editorial describes a meeting that he had with Parshall just one month after the publication of Parshall's "Danger" article. Massey explained his conception of C5 ministry for Muslims to Parshall. He says Travis (1998a), who developed the C1–C6 scale for how much of their birth religious affiliation should be retained in the new believer's identity, agrees with his understanding. The primary difference between C4 and C5 is one of identity. C4 people see themselves as Isahi, or converts from Muslims who maintain some of their prior cultural heritage. C5 people see themselves as a new type of Muslim. "After reading 'God's Amazing Diversity in Drawing Muslims to Himself,' … Phil says, 'I don't have any problem with what you've written'" (Massey 2000b:3). The rest of the journal issue sets out answers to Parshall's questions and remove doubt as to the validity of through-going application of the essential neutrality of cultural forms.

According to Massey's summary in the editorial (2000a), Caldwell (2000) proposes that Evangelicals move beyond traditional efforts at planting churches among Muslims and aim at Kingdom sowing, as Christ modeled in John 4 (Massey 2000a:4). In the article, called "Jesus in Samaria: A Paradigm for Church Planting Among Muslims," Caldwell states, "… the church, when understood from a kingdom perspective, is not so much a congregation, as it is a movement, a life, an organism, a seed. According to Jesus' metaphors, the church lives and grows amidst all sorts of other things: weeds, rocks, and dough" (Caldwell 2000:30). He realizes the place the DEM principles take ministry and thought. If the truth that the church is and represents is elastic, as the dynamic scheme demands, then the church itself must take an indefinite nature. Any specific manifestation of membership or doctrine is not forbidden, but moves from a place of distinguished importance. Congregational identity in a tense socio-political environment is deemphasized in theory, and in practice ruled an unnecessary risk. Later issues of the IJFM push the notion of insider movements among Muslims rather than simple efforts at church planting (Nelson 2011:191–194 & Duerkson 2012:161–167).

Caldwell's (2000) alterations are not unconnected to the larger operation of the DEM, or the CQH. We must see the force of the system influencing how questions from a given context or problem are asked and answered. The answers proposed by the DEM are like contrapuntal melodies in a single piece of music. On the surface they seem distinct, yet relate back to the root concept of supraculture and are shaped by the anthropological dialectic. Caldwell (2000) sees no need to push the tight and singular identity upon new believers that congregational ecclesiology produces. To do so could restrict growth. The same motivation that causes him to endorse kingdom sowing instead of church planting leads him to state that new believers may use Islamic terms and concepts, providing that the forms are reshaped and revised by Biblical content (2000: 29). The difficult aspect to reconcile is Caldwell's insistence that the authority of the Qur'an should not be questioned (2007:27). It seems to me that the assumption is that time and exposure to the Christian Scripture will lead the MBB where he or she should be in understanding the place of the Muslim holy book. Interestingly, Caldwell never states that the Qur'an must, at any point, be set aside.

In their article, "First-century Jews and twentieth century Muslims," Jameson and Scalevich (2000) "… show the remarkable Biblical similarities between todays Messianic Muslims and first century Jewish followers of the way" (Massey 2000a:4). The anthropological dialectic pushes DEM advocates to locate more substantial spirituality in the people of Islam. Natural questions about syncretism arise, and are dealt with by Jameson and Scalevich (2000). "Is there a danger of syncretism? Certainly! But like Jewish believers of the first century, these twentieth century Muslim believers feel that the opportunity to be lights amidst the darkness outweighs this risk" (2000:35). The DEM's anthropological dialectic extends to preclude any objection on the basis of syncretism. It is not that they consider syncretism okay, but that the essential neutrality of any given set of cultural elements cannot be questioned. To do so would be considered egocentric, and also a sign of disbelief in the ability of God to produce fruit in the MBB's life and culture.

Practically, the previously quoted statement from Jameson and Scalevich (2000) seems somewhat idealistic. One important thing to consider for why some MBBs follow such a course is not boldness, but fear. When asked by community Muslims about

94

matters relating to Christ, then they must choose whether or not to credit the Spirit and the gospel for giving them new life or iterate that they are still within the bounds of the community as the DEM suggests. For example, if a Muslim hears of a new MBB talking about Christ and asks, "Tell me, who do you understand Christ to be? Are you still a Muslim?" then he or she might reply, "I am a complete Muslim, a follower of the Straight Way." Typically in an actual conversation the Muslim will push for clarity by asking them to choose either Christian or Muslim as an identity. The DEM creates a *tertium quid*. My point is not to label these people cultic or judge their faith. I am saying that the identity created by the DEM does little to foster boldness and risk in witness, as the authors declare. Quite to the contrary, it produces a neither/nor type of identity that is less than indigenous. The new identity is dynamic. It focuses upon maintaining an elasticity that provides the bearer options on defining his or herself away from risk and prevents alienation from the environment. We must remember that the focus of dynamic equivalence ministry is finding and building upon similarities. Though boldness is not impossible within such a scheme, it is clear that it does much to prevent difference or extraction of the MBB from his or her community.

Jameson and Scalevich's (2000) own comments about how identity directly effects persecution bear out my point. They admit that occasionally Muslim followers of Jesus suffer, but it is little in comparison to the one who changes his or her identity to Christian (2000:38). The believers are able to do so because they "radically reinterpret" the Qur'an based upon "their knowledge of God through Jesus Christ" (2000:36). The Muslim followers of Jesus that they mention do so by teaching that Jesus is the eternal Word of Allah, as found in Surah The Women 4:171.

The DEM is a system, but is not always recognized as such. The same motivation for its theory of communication carries through to translation, theology, and mission. It applies to everything from what words a person should use to address God to what type of clothes he or she wears. Therefore, we fail to appreciate the place of the CQH if we do not understand the system from which it extends. Part of the motivation for application of the CQH is the undergirding of a dynamic identity that allows the MBB to remain within the Muslim community. It aims at using the Islamic holy book to connect with Muslims on a deep level. Essentially, the Qur'an contains the gospel and becomes the MBB's

apologetic to his or her community. The CQH reshapes the meaning of the Qur'an by reading Biblical meaning into it. The hope is that a bridge can be constructed from Islam to Christianity. However, the new believer is supposed to be able to maintain some solidarity with his or her community. It is not enough just to critique the way in which some DEM missionaries use the Qur'an. The system upon which the CQH is built must be recognized and dealt with, because it seeks to relate all its elements and methods to the Bible as God's inspired classic casebook. We must deal with it with sensitivity, recognizing that there are good reasons for the some of the alterations. Finally, we must deal with it knowing that our critique affects the whole of the new believer's life.

In chapter 4 we seek to answer several issues surrounding DEM theory and application. We examine if dynamic communication, dynamic conversion (MBBs), and dynamically equivalent communities adequately express God's truth. Another important investigation is into whether or not the charge of synthesis is justified in reference to the ministry of the DEM to people of Muslim faith. Since the 1970s, important objections to the DEM have arisen. For example, some say it descends from neo-orthodoxy. I evaluate it in anthropological and theological matters, testing it for coherence and Biblical fidelity. This being a missiological thesis, I compare not theory alone, but also methods of ministry.

Chapter 4

Objections to the dynamic equivalence model and the Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic

This chapter is focused on evaluating the theory and application of the DEM and the CQH along anthropological, theological, and Biblical lines. The next chapter examines several methods for encounter with Muslims that employ the CQH. There are a number of ways to classify writers expressing discontentment with the DEM. I choose to look at three differing sets of critics, each covering a different time period and level of dissatisfaction with the DEM. The objections are noted and judged for validity and utility with the hope of securing an adequate opinion regarding the enduring value of the DEM. Then an analysis of the DEM in areas crucial to Evangelical thought and ministry are offered.

4.1. Which Evangelicals of the late twentieth century and early twenty-first century spoke a disagreed, and what is the value of such criticism?

I call the first set of commentators dissenting to the DEM the Anti-insider movement critics. The group includes well-known missionaries, such as Smith, and has published its opinions in book and video form. They are the most recent set, and offer the least in terms of constructing a workable base for ministry to Muslims. The second group is composed of Schlorff and Nicholls. Both Schlorff and Nicholls were early practitioners questioning the foundations of the DEM. They are less critical of the DEM than the Anti-insider movement set, and sought to grapple with key issues that gave rise to the DEM. The third set of dissenting commentators is composed of Hesselgrave and Hiebert. These two offer the deepest understanding of Evangelical mission, as well as being both sympathetic and critically analyzing the DEM as it emerges in the late twentieth century.

4.1.1. Anti-insider movement writers

Perhaps some would object to the label of Anti-insider movement critics. However, a careful reading of *Christlam* (Lingel, Morton, and Nikides 2011, e-formatted book with outlined chapters but no page numbers), edited by Lingel, Morton, and Nikides, reveals that the goal of the writing is to persuade Evangelicals of the danger of the insider movement. They do not do enough in the way of theory or method to instruct how Evangelicals how to go about encountering Muslims and engaging them in ministry. Further, an interview of Morton appears in a video, entitled *Half devil–half child* (2012), that focuses on the insider movement in a particular South Asian nation. The aim of the video is the same as the previously mentioned book. Thus the general tone of the first set of critics is negative, rather than constructive. The writers are aware of the DEM and Kraft's theory, several having attended the Fuller Theological Seminary. Yet they do little to situate their arguments against the insider movement as existing within, or extending out from, Kraft's dynamic approach to truth.

Smith (2011:e-formatted book with outlined chapters but no page numbers) is well known for his apologetic engagement of Muslims in London. Some have expressed distain for his approach. Parshall states, "Jay Smith's provocative postulate is not a new paradigm. Rather, it is a rehash of that which has been tried, tested, and found wanting…" (1998a:39). Parshall fails to appreciate Smith's work on two levels. Firstly, apologetics is a crucial part of Christian life and ministry. To play down Smith's penetrating questioning of the basis of Muslim confidence is a mistake. Secondly, Smith's courage and love is a needed example. Many Christians today either hate Islam and spurn Muslims, or hope to ignore them altogether. A careful consideration of Smith, especially from a practitioner's standpoint, reveals a beautiful combination of love and gentleness towards Muslim people, and deep engagement with the thought of Islam (Smith 2011). Evangelicalism should be thankful for his example and writings, but maintain Parshall's basic admonition that apologetic is doubtful as a viable basis for widespread ministry to Muslims.

Among the contributors to *Christlam* (2011)*,* Smith is one of the more generous towards the insider movement. Despite his overall fairness, he fails to give a holistic evaluation. Common Ground is a secretive association of Evangelicals that promote the DEM and insider movement principles. (Smith 2011:outlined as chapter 6.1) They are

selective in where and how they assemble, and strictly monitor the attendance roster of meetings (Smith 2011: Introduction, sections 5 and 6). His evaluation of a Common Ground meeting he attended in Atlanta is contained in a chapter entitled "An assessment of IM's principle paradigms" (2011:outlined as section 6.1). It shows several ways in which the anti-insider movement critics are incoherent and underdeveloped.

Smith's (2011: outlined as section 6.1) analysis of the Common Ground meeting is well thought out, but he fails to develop his own thought in similar areas to which he criticizes the insider movement advocates. He writes, "My concern is that, unlike the Chronological Method that begins with the Bible, the Seven Signs begin with the Qur'an, and misinterprets Qur'anic passages. This may inadvertently give authority to the Qur'an unless used only as a bridge to then lead the Muslims to the Bible" (Smith 2011:under outline section 6.1, with section heading "Seven signs"). His comments on the methodology of the *7 Signs* are correct, yet he fails to acknowledge and engage the theory producing the approach. Many new practitioners begin employing the Qur'an in just the way Smith advocates. When faced with the pressure of the DEM anthropological dialectic, they follow the theory into progressive reliance on the Qur'an for communication with Muslims. Smith (2011:outlined as section 6.1) supports the use of the Qur'an on one level, but forbids it on another without stating clearly why one is acceptable and the other unacceptable. If practitioners accept the idea of supraculture and the embedded dialectical understanding that God's interactions in the world are shaped by human hermeneutical limitations, then it follows that they will also allow more developmental room for truth in Islam and the Qur'an. Smith's (2011) admittance that the Common Ground meeting caused him to consider joining their side is the proof to this point (final three sections of chapter outlined as 6.1). The appeal that the insider movement methods showcase is the dynamic/dialectical explanation of how there can be truth in non-Christian religion. Smith, and *Christlam* (2011), make many valid points, but often fail to acknowledge and never correct adequately the theory that leads to the insider movement.

Morton (2011b:section outlined as 3.5) makes several helpful points in his chapter entitled "Inappropriate missiology?" Unlike most writers in *Christlam* (2011), he evaluates the insider movement in terms of the model that gives it origin and coherence.

He does so by referencing Kraft's understanding of the relation between form and meaning. As noted above, Kraft holds that culture and its forms are neutral. Morton proposes an alternative view based upon the teaching of Lingenfelter.

> Culture is not about neutrality; rather culture is a prison from which we need to escape. Since man is sinful, he creates sinful structures; these sinful structures are our cultures. There is not much neutrality in culture if it is sinful. It is therefore the goal of discipleship to lead a person out of the bondage of culture into the freedom of knowing Christ (2011a:from the second section of the section entitled, "Is another perspective on culture possible?").

Morton's caricature of Islam is that it is "… a pit, a prison, a noose, and a snare of the devil. Islam is a religion of death, chains, blindness, and pride" (2011b:outlined as section 3.5, from the third section of the section entitled, "Is another perspective on culture possible?"). His ideas on the nature of Islam are important because for him the religion of Islam is inseparable from the culture (2011b:outlined as section 3.5, from the fourth section of the section entitled, "Islamic understanding of Islamic forms"). He is able to see some of the key issues, because he calls attention to Kraft's understanding of the relationship between form and meaning. However, he leaves Evangelicals little to take away from his, self-admittedly sarcastic commentary (2011a:from penultimate section of the chapter outlined as 3.3). Morton does not provide needed explanation as to all the levels that religion, whether Christian or not, touches the soul of humanity. When contrasted with the writings of Hiebert, and especially Hesselgrave, his article is found to be in tremendous want of detail in the area of anthropology. Without constructing a view towards humanity as a complex creation of a personal God, it seems that anyone holding Morton's view would be negative not only toward the religion of Islam, but also its people. He fails to show how the religion of Christ corrects all of the darkness, death, and pride he sees in Islam. He comes short of recognizing the complexity of anthropology, replacing one simplistic view of cultural forms for another. Morton is correct that it is a mistake to empty Islamic forms of their meaning, and replace the shells with Christian content. However, it is difficult to accept his proposals that every part of a Muslim's life, even customs far removed from any significant religious content, is darkness. Humanity's spiritual nature is not so simple.

There is incoherence in Morton's teaching in *Christlam* (2011b: outlined as section 3.3). In his chapter entitled "Theology of religions: would Jesus be caught dead working in Islam?" Morton seeks to build a theology of religion that accounts for continuity and divergence. For him, continuity refers to how ideologies relate to one another. The example he provides for continuity in religion is the relationship between Judaism and Christianity. Divergence accounts for how ideologies differ and move apart. Buddhism, unlike Hinduism, refuses a close connection with other religions. It chooses to define itself in terms of distance with other thought forms (2011a: outlined as section 3.3, section titled "continuity and divergence"). Morton writes that Islam seeks a closer continuity with Christianity than is permissible Biblically. He accuses the Common Ground members of committing a similar offense by taking the Islamic view of continuity with Christianity. Instead, Evangelicals should call for a heartier repentance. By repentance he means not only a turning to Christ, as the insider movement emphasizes, but also a turning from Islam (*Half devil-half child* 2012). His conclusion is that there are "two religions, two books, and two Creators" (2011a: outlined as section 3.3, section entitled "Implications," point number one).

I agree with most of what Morton writes. The problem is that he fails to recognize appropriate levels of complexity in theology of religion, as he does in the issue of how form and meaning relate in defining culture. Few would disagree with his affirming the two-sided aspect of repentance. However, the need in missiology is to work out how one maintains real continuity amidst obvious diversity. Even esteemed Evangelical historian George (2002) concludes that one cannot rush to judgment in such matters. In his book, *Is the Father of Jesus the God of Muhammad?* George (2002) argues that there is continuity. In so far as Islam propounds a divinity that is eternal, a creator but separate from creation, all-powerful, full of glory, etcetera, Evangelicals can answer affirmatively. However, the difficulty arises on the issue of predication. (2002:69). How such a creator can be known and approached portrays the divergence between the two faiths. Morton (2011a) touches on this by pointing out differences in understandings of the nature of Jesus, the Holy Spirit, and more. Yet, he never calls clearly for such categories or constructs a way of accounting for the continuity. He writes, "Inherent in the act of repentance is the acknowledgement that one's previous religion, no matter how much

truth it contains, is a false religion" (outlined as section 3.3, section entitled "Implications," point number one). He does not instruct Evangelicals how to account for "how much truth" Islam contains, but pushes for an insistence upon the falsity of Islam. Morton should labor to show how Evangelicals can love and minister to those we share a fallen human nature with, and move them to repentance and faith.

Smith (2011) and Morton (2011) represent their colleagues well. They seek to maintain a commitment to historic, Biblical Christianity, while reaching out to minister to Muslims. They are well read and experienced writers. However, they and the rest of the Anti-insider movement set fail to present Evangelicalism with a viable alternative to the DEM.

4.1.2. Samuel Schlorff and Bruce Nicholls

Schlorff (2006) and Nicholls (2003) were both early critics of the DEM. Both were dedicated practitioners, as well as writing missiologists. They held that the DEM compromised essential elements of Evangelical faith and mission. In comparison to the Anti-insider movement critics listed above, they posture themselves more sympathetically to the DEM by dealing with many of the same issues as Kraft. In the end, Schlorff and Nicholls were not able to generate a model that dissenting Evangelicals could rally behind. Schlorff has written more material on Evangelical encounter with Muslims than Nicholls, and his work contains more practical material with which to interact. Therefore, he is considered first and given more space.

4.1.2.1. Samuel Schlorff

Schlorff (2006) served for decades with Arab World Ministries. Since the early 1980s he has written to influence Evangelicals to faithfulness in mission, especially in their treatment of hermeneutics and theology of religion. The structure of my examination in chapter 2 receives much from Schlorff's historical classification of Christian methods of ministry to Muslims. Mission-minded Evangelicals owe him a debt. The following is a good summary of the heart of Schlorff's missiology:

> I am suggesting that greater attention needs to be paid to the hermeneutical method implicit to the way we approach the Qur'an and Islamic culture as we

carry out our mission. In particular, we need to avoid synthesizing approaches and focus on analytic methods of interpretation, including the traditional historico-grammatical interpretation (Schlorff 2006:136).

The debt owed to Schlorff is due to his keen eye for central issues of importance to theology and mission. He points out that the way practitioners approach Islam and interpret the Qur'an is directly related to how they understand hermeneutics. Even those who do not agree with Schlorff's proposals acknowledge his understanding and dedication (see Parshall's recommendation of MM in Schlorff 2006).

Though Schlorff (2006) clarifies the central issues for Evangelical theology and mission to grapple with, he occasionally makes incorrect observations. For example, in several places he writes concerning the dangers surrounding "the new hermeneutic" in the DEM, which he defines as a two-way synthesis "… where both the Qur'an and the Bible are opened up to the meanings of one another" (2006:126–127; 1980:151). He states that its adherents prefer historical-critical methodology to the *sensus plenior* (plain meaning). Typically the phrase, "the new hermeneutic" refers to the work of a group of theologians who restructure Biblical hermeneutics following Bultmann, and the DEM is not a good representative of the school.

Schlorff's (2006) analysis of "the new hermeneutic" is problematic because though Kraft is clear that he does not take a hermeneutical position that could be described as that of *sensus plenior* (Kraft 1979a:116–146), it does not follow that he can be described adequately as holding to the historical-critical position. Kraft (1979a) defines his position as an Evangelical in light of Coleman's book, *Issues of theological warfare: evangelicals and liberals* (1972), thereby acknowledging the limitations of higher Biblical criticism and seeking to move beyond it. Schlorff's simple claim that Kraft invokes the historical-critical method fails to appreciate the breadth of Kraft's work. The driving force in the DEM is to incorporate ethno-linguistic notions into interpretation of the Bible. His position bears some similarities to what is known generally as "the new hermeneutic," as well as historical critical methodology. A better explanation of the similarities of the DEM to "the new hermeneutic" is that both are interacting with the same hermeneutical context of their day. Similarly, Tracy's *Blessed rage for order* (1975) influences Gilliland's approach to theological method (1989:11). It

does not follow that Gilliland's theological method is post-liberal, though it is undeniably affected by Tracy's ideas. All of these writers are dealing with the issues of their day.

In order to understand why Schlorff evaluates the DEM as he does we must look to his roots. His background and training include formative time at the Westminster Seminary. He is a representative of what I have termed the first stream of Evangelical missiology, and Kraft calls "closed conservatives" (1979a:39–41). The differences between the first stream, with writers such as Schaeffer and Packer (in Packer 1996), and the DEM advocates of stream two are significant. The central issue for stream one writers is articulating a commitment to the authority of the Christian Scripture amidst the voices of culture, reason, and tradition (Packer 1996:48). Authority is not dealt with formally in CC. Kraft, and stream two, are concerned primarily with integrating anthropology into theology. Thus Kraft's pejorative labeling of stream one is presumptuous, as proved by the blossoming of stream one's hermeneutical position through the writers such as Vanhoozer (1998), Frame (2010), and Clark (2003). Both streams are dealing with the same difficulties, but from differing standpoints. Understood in the light of these two streams of Evangelical thought, it is easier to understand how Schlorff feels uneasy with Kraft's dynamic equivalence, and searches for a way to describe his discontent. Unfortunately, his summary of the hermeneutic behind the CQH as "the new hermeneutic" is not accurate.

In his article from *Missiology* in July 2000, Schlorff offers to correct the DEM with a betrothal model. He expands on this idea in *Missiological models in ministry to Muslims* (2006). In contrast to the translational model, he proposes the betrothal model, which seeks to

> … 'betroth' the young church to Christ, to bring the church into healthy, loving relationship with Him. As I reflected upon the problems associated with the dynamic equivalence model as it has taken shape, it occurred to me that the image of betrothal used by the apostle fits … better than that of dynamic equivalence (2000:317).

The betrothal model is helpful in some regard. First, it is simple and Biblical. In 2 Corinthians 11:2 Paul writes, "For I feel a divine jealousy for you, since I betrothed you to one husband, to present you as a pure virgin to Christ." Within the betrothal model, the lines of authority are clear. The devotion and commitment of the new church belongs

with Christ. In this way, they are to look to Christ's coming and kingdom and live in the present age, with its demands and limitations, as though the coming of the Bridegroom is imminent (2006:158). Another commendable aspect of the betrothal model is its recognition of the valuable work great missiologists, such as Hiebert's notion of critical contextualization (quoted and adapted in Schlorff 2006:156–157). Finally, Schlorff does well by seeking a wide application for his model, including theology of religion, contextual starting points, and church strategies (Schlorff 2006:158–59).

The difficulty with the betrothal model is that it does not offer clarity at the crucial point of anthropology in mission. The primary reason the DEM has garnered such wide acceptance is its explanation of how to bridge the gap between divine and human. It may lack in expressing a clear commitment to the unique authority of Scripture, but it labors to show how the anthropological side of Evangelical mission ought to proceed. Biblical interpretation, conversion, church formation, and so on are to be understood as a dynamic movement from God towards human approximations in each area. The betrothal model assumes little difficulty in such tasks, and lacks in an area crucial to Evangelical mission today.

As in the quotation above, Schlorff advocates that Evangelicals set aside synthetic approaches to interpretation, and return to the traditional analytic one. He sees the needed corrective to dynamic equivalence as a recommitting to a *sensus plenior* approach to Biblical hermeneutics, moving from Scriptural text to application in cross-cultural contexts. He concludes, "… only a hermeneutic of analysis is adequate to the task of communicating the gospel cross-culturally" (2006:152). Schlorff hopes to apply Hiebert's concept of critical contextualization to his betrothal model. He sees critical contextualization as helpful in safeguarding the new churches from the "… pitfalls associated with the uncritical adoption of Muslim forms" on the one hand, and ensuring that missionaries not take an overly active or paternalistic role in the development of the new church on the other hand (Schlorff 2006:156–157).

Though Schlorff is admirable in many ways, his proposal of strictly analytic hermeneutics does not deal with the complexity of the situation involved in interpreting the Bible today. As I write in the chapter 6, Clark (2003:113), following the lead of Dryness (1990), proposes that Evangelicals move beyond a simple linear approach to

interpretation. Life and mission do not always allow for such a simple process of reading the Bible and moving towards obedience. People must have the freedom not only to listen and obey to the Scripture, but also bring their questions to the Scripture, allowing it to authoritatively reshape their questions and renew their lives in a systemic way. This type of proposal does not limit the voice of the Holy Spirit in the lives and thoughts of people, but deepens it. Nor does it scale down the authority of Scripture, but expands it to bring renewal to the whole of the person or church. It does not remove or lessen the input of grammatico-historical investigation into the process of Biblical interpretation. Rather, it widens the scope so that the questions culture would bring to the Scripture work alongside grammatico-historical commentary, both under the Lordship of the Holy Spirit as expressed in the unique authority of Scripture.

Schlorff (2006) advocates a method for encounter with Muslims produced by Zaka called Church without walls. He states that Church without walls is built on the premise that barriers of "… misunderstanding and distortion between Christians and Muslims are so high and massive that the church must take deliberate action to break down those walls and create conditions where genuine communication can take place" (Schlorff 2006:164). The primary method for breaking down the walls is meetings for better understanding. Christians in a given community who are interested in reaching their Muslim neighbors form groups that interact in the community surrounding the local Mosque. They gain permission to meet with groups of Muslims, sometimes in the Mosque, and discuss Christianity and Islam respectfully. From the meetings for better understanding, opportunities are gained to visit Muslims individually or in smaller groups and present the gospel to them (Schlorff 2006:174). Those who are receptive are introduced to discipleship in areas including: doctrine, devotion, ministry, and character (2006:175). The end of the process is either integration into an existing church, or formation of a new Muslim-background believer house church (2006:176).

There is much to be commended in Church without walls. Undoubtedly, a crucial first step in encounter with Muslims is to overcome mistrust and establish basic mutual respect. Zaka's meetings for better understanding (in Schlorff 2006) do much to overcome mistrust. Schlorff spends several pages presenting proof that church without walls is founded upon presuppositional apologetics, and such a base is helpful. Its

straightforward method of dialog and maintaining the integrity of the religious natures of Islam and Christianity also prevents Muslim perception that Evangelicals are attempting a secret mission, or twisting the teaching of Islam as can occur when the CQH is applied.

In the way it approaches Evangelical encounter with Muslims, church without walls is similar to inter-religious dialogue, and carries the same limitations. Underneath the approach, as well as in Schlorff's articulation of its out workings, is an attempt to counter the DEM prohibition of extraction of new converts. As meetings for better understanding progress, the Christian community and its membership is identified and solidified in its own eyes, as well as that of the Muslims around. It is important to see the potential difficulties in applying such a method in Muslim communities that do not look favorably upon a Christian presence in their midst, much less the expansion of the Christian community. Even if the DEM's disdain for the extraction of new believers from their communities is judged unbalanced, it is unlikely that such an open approach as church without walls would flourish in countries where there is no trustworthy legal protection for minorities. The difficulty is exacerbated because many Evangelical mission organizations focus their efforts in countries with the least percentages of Christians. These groups would resist constriction of ministry and work only in communities where meetings for better understanding are feasible. Here we see the heart of the disagreement between many Evangelicals, not only those advocating dynamic equivalence, and church without walls. Building ministry upon meetings for better understanding assumes the presence of an established church in the given community, and moves only at the pace that the communities are willing and able to live and propagate their faith. Not all Christian communities, and especially ones in politically unfavorable lands, are willing to sacrifice the limited degree of freedom they possess. For most Evangelicals, no model for ministry will be considered viable on a large scale if it does not provide a way to aggressively minister the gospel to "all the nations" (Matthew 28:19–20).

A final criticism of Schlorff's betrothal model (2006) comes from Gilliland (2000). In his response to Schlorff's article in *Missiology* quoted above, Gilliland writes, "I was surprised and saddened that the Holy Spirit was not mentioned even once in Schlorff's entire article" (2000:335). It is curious that Schlorff exerted little effort to show the place of the Holy Spirit six years later when he released MM. Though Schlorff

remains a hero in many ways, we must agree with Gilliland's stinging criticism about the betrothal's model's lack of development of an adequate understanding of the Holy Spirit. Chapter 6 shows how the doctrine of the Spirit and Word ought to lead naturally to a healthy development of anthropology in mission.

4.1.2.2. Bruce Nicholls

No examination of stream one would be sufficient without looking at the work of Nicholls. Nicholls has served as Professor of New Testament at the Union Theological Seminary in Pune, India. His writing contains many insightful points and great sensitivity to how mission is carried out in the various places of the world. In many ways, his work asks questions and raises issues that still need to be deal with today. For example, on the need for a deepened understanding of the connection between general and special revelation he says,

> Saving revelation and saving grace are always supernatural and supra-cultural. Effective cross-cultural communication requires a clear theological distinction between general and special revelation, though in the process of conversion and re-creation they can never be separated. Revelation is unitary. The former without the latter is powerless, and the latter without the former lacks the basis of knowledge of God as Creator (Nicholls 2003:67).

He also recognizes the need to move toward a notion of culture that is both corrective and affirming. He writes, "… the gospel rejects those elements which are contrary to the revelation of God, converts those that reflect man made in the image of God, and creates new elements which are distinctive to the gospel" (68). These two quotes display how Nicholls' commentary shows tremendous breadth. Indeed, in terms of the scope of his writing, he is second only to Hesselgrave.

While showing considerable breadth in his writing, Nicholls fails to present sufficient depth for Evangelicals to follow his teaching on towards a new model for ministry. His primary work, *Contextualization: a theology of Gospel and culture* (2003), is only seventy-two pages long, inclusive of endnotes. Nicholls never followed up with a more substantial outworking of his thought and method. In one sense he can be commended for remaining focused upon ministry even at the expense of more

development in writing, but Evangelicals were left without a clear method of applying the changes he called for in his book and presentations.

Nicholls (2003) also employs many concepts and terms from the DEM, attempting to give a voice to their definition and application. He was an early non-DEM advocate for the use of the term contextualization, but urged Evangelicals to supply clarity for their own conception of term contextualization and process for which it stands. His use of supraculture supplies a good example of how his unapplied theory leaves his audience with little ability to utilize his teaching. Nicholls (2003) states, "… there is always a dynamic tension between the supra-cultural universals of the church common to the church world-wide, and the cultural variables particular to each national church" (2003:64). A quote from an earlier section of his book provides a needed balance. Supraculture is "… the phenomena of cultural beliefs and behaviors that have their source outside of human culture" (2003:13). As his thought on this matter progresses he qualifies his usage of the concept as not identical to secular anthropology's notion of a closed system with God locked on the outside. However, he never deepens this understanding or works it out in method. As noble as it is to call for a Christian culture "… which will reflect both the universality of the gospel and the particularity of the human environment" (2003:13), this idea must be fashioned into some type of applicable model for life and thought.

Nicholls (2003) is an early and noteworthy voice in dissent to the DEM. His writings indicate a searching for renewal in understanding of the nature of humanity and how it relates to God. His ideas are vital to consider, but lack on a practical level. Perhaps it is too much to expect someone writing as early as he to be able to advance theory and application simultaneously, but his counterparts on the DEM side were always ready with a quick application of their missiology to ministry. Nicholls could have filled the vacuum with much needed corrective.

4.1.3. Paul Hiebert and David Hesselgrave

Hiebert and Hesselgrave are well known representatives of Evangelical missiology. They combine expertise in anthropology and a willingness to answer the tough questions of their day. Hiebert and Hesselgrave maintain a firm commitment to a high view of

Scriptural inspiration, without losing sight of the fact that missiology is no trite intellectual endeavor or mere application of theology. Instead, they treat missiology as the vanguard of Evangelical thought, and the surest measure of its vitality and faithfulness to the gospel.

4.1.3.1. Paul Hiebert

Hiebert's contributions deal with many issues central to Evangelical concern. His writings are simple and deep. Many of the missiologists he is associated with do not seem to grasp the import of what he wrote, and none were able to mold it into a large-scale workable model. The best example of his work having been underappreciated is his book, *The missiological implications of epistemic shifts: affirming truth in a modern/postmodern world* (1999). Among the writings of Evangelical missiologists, few books engage the philosophy of knowledge from such an informed, yet practical, position. However, Evangelical missiology has not begun to develop consciously upon the critical realist base Hiebert proposes. As I state below in more detail, many seek to create a close proximity between their work and Hiebert's, as if mentioning some of the same concepts that he secures their identity as Evangelicals.

Hiebert (1985) proposes that there are three dimensions to human culture. His description includes the cognitive (knowledge), affective (feelings), and evaluative (values). Importantly, he strives to show how the gospel has a word for and effects change in each dimension of life (1985:31–34). The gospel brings holistic healing to humanity. Thus mission to people of other faiths is built upon deep level communication and "… is possible only when we understand the world views of the people to whom we minister. It also means that people will understand the gospel from the perspective of their own view" (1985:21). In this way, Hiebert deals with the same issues as the DEM, insisting that missionary communication that does not touch the whole of the target audience's cultural makeup and allow for the receptors to develop on their own is not ideal. His description of culture is not as comprehensive as the one Hesselgrave (1991:101–103) provides, but he pushes for the same type of deep level communication in Evangelical encounter with people of other faiths.

Hiebert's most helpful contribution to Evangelical missiology is in his treatment of symbols, or how form and meaning relate. As chapter 3 states, dynamic equivalence anthropology is built upon a basically neutral understanding of culture and its forms (Kraft 1983:83). Hiebert states, "Human behavior and products are not independent parts of a culture. They are closely linked to the ideas, feelings, and values that lie within a people. This association of a specific meaning, emotion, or value, with a certain behavior or cultural product is called a symbol" (1985:37). Hiebert's approach is both holistic towards culture and attentive to the value of individual parts of the culture. This is a well-balanced and needed response to the DEM's stance of neutrality for cultural forms. He develops his view of symbols further, describing them as follows: complex, varied, found in historical and cultural context, requiring a number of different but related meanings, shared in a specific community, and having continuing yet transferable meanings (1985:37). Most important for this thesis is his definition of ritual symbols. In these type symbols "… the link between form and meaning…is so close that the two cannot be differentiated" (1985:39).

Hiebert also teaches that symbols have denotative and connotative, as well as explicit and implicit, meaning (1985:144). Denotative and connotative meaning refers to how symbols communicate not only what the speaker means, but also what he or she does not mean. The nature of communication requires that such explicit meanings be understood in the greater context of the receptors communicative practices. Further, there are implicit meanings to the symbols. That is, they are set in the "philosophical and theological assumptions implicit" within each classification system (1985:144). Hesselgrave provides a similar assessment (1991:72). It is clear that Hiebert could not advocate the DEM's view of neutrality of cultural forms, or support the aims of the CQH to replace meaning from Qur'anic passages with Biblical content.

Critical contextualization is the concept Hiebert develops for how Evangelical missionaries can maintain a correct position in reference to Scriptural authority while allowing theology and practice to develop in the context of the receptors of the message. It is his application of Critical Realism, especially as relates to form and meaning, to mission. His 1984 article in *Missiology* enumerates a path for contextualization that rejects simplicity. True contextualization neither rushes to reject old forms nor

uncritically accepts new ones (1984:287–296). He emphasizes the priesthood of all believers and congregationalism (1984:289). His article from 1987, also entitled "Critical contextualism," takes the cause of critical contextualization even further, leading the new church to "… analyze their old customs in the light of the Biblical teaching" (1987:110). That is, proper contextualization seeks to express Biblical meaning within the new culture. Next, he enumerates upon the process of his model for contextualization and its epistemological base.

> Critical Contextualization does not operate from a mono-cultural perspective. Nor is it premised upon the metacultural and metatheological frameworks that enable people in one culture to understand messages and ritual practices from another culture with a minimum of distortion. It is based upon a Critical Realist epistemology that sees all human knowledge as a combination of objective and subjective elements, and as partial but increasingly closer approximations of truth. It takes both historical and cultural contexts seriously. And it sees the relationship between form and meaning in symbols such as words and rituals, ranging all the way from an equation of the two to simply arbitrary associations between them. Finally, it sees contextualization as on ongoing process in which the church must constantly engage itself, a process that can lead us to a better understanding of what the Lordship of Christ and kingdom of God on earth is about (1987:111).

This understanding of the theological process is his base for mission, an endeavor he expands in his *Missiological implications of epistemic shifts* (1999).

Many DEM missiologists do not seem to know what to do with Hiebert's critical realism. Gilliland gives Hiebert, who was a colleague at Fuller during the early part of his career, prime place in his book, *The Word among us* (1989)*, summarizing the importance of Hiebert's chapter by stating that "It is essential to understand that contextualization is a complex process involving the careful use of cultural forms to convey Christian meanings" (1989:4). He attempts to moderate between Kraft's position on cultural forms where "God can make use of whatever is present within the receiving society" (1989:135), and Hiebert's stance that "… form and meaning are related in complex ways, depending upon the nature of the symbol" (1989:109). Consider the following quote from Gilliland's chapter:

> No culture is completely good or completely bad. Most aspects of a culture will fit into the more neutral category … It takes careful study of the Word and discipline in the Spirit to know what features of the culture can be used to communicate the message and enhance the meaning of worship (1989:25).

He takes Kraft's definition of cultural forms, and tempers it with Hiebert's critical contextualization.

The problem with Gilliland's attempt to synthesize Hiebert and Kraft is that he fails to realize that the two present differing epistemological bases for mission. Osborne (2006) provides a good summary. "Paul Hiebert argues for a 'transcultural theology' and religious system that is in essence a Biblical theology in contextualized form" (2006:417). This commentary is important because it highlights how Hiebert, as well as Kraft, are not presenting mere practical methods for doing ministry. Instead, they set forth approaches firmly based upon differing theological methods. Osborne continues, "While many in the dynamic-equivalence school locate meaning primarily in the reader/receiver, Hiebert proposes a 'critical realism' that situates meaning in the text/sender and seeks to develop a contextualized model that fits the revealed truths" (2006:417). He labels Kraft's DEM inadequate because of the way it selects which Scriptural elements are time-bound and which are supracultural. The DEM's approach assumes that "… any general command be normative and any specific command be culture bound. Yet the general commands (such as 1 Corinthians 14:40) derived their meaning from the cultural circumstances, and most specifics had their origin in general principles" (2006:420). Gilliland recognizes the need for positioning theology close to the Scripture, and so tries to keep Hiebert's critical contextualization as a component of his approach. Yet, he maintains Kraft's basic assertions on the nature of form and meaning for cultural symbols. The two systems cannot be reconciled on a deep level.

In terms of theological method and mission, the content of Hiebert's proposals concerning critical realism are notable contributions to Evangelical missiology in the latter twentieth century. When critical contextualization was not understood clearly as a model based on well-thought out epistemology he never pushed Gilliland and others for a more consistent application (Hiebert 1989:101–120). Even though much of his writing is out of harmony with foundational postulates of the DEM, he does not deal with the deficiency directly. Evangelicals are left to assume that he prefers to comment upon the epistemology behind encounter with people of other faiths, and hopes that DEM advocates will somehow reform their position accordingly. We can be grateful for his significant contributions to the area of form and meaning, as well as his example of a

spirit of unity and patience. However, we must also recognize that theory leads inevitably to practice. The DEM is a holistic system of thought. It will continue to expand until clearly challenged on its fundamentals and structure. Hiebert's articles and books reveal that he does not see himself as the person to initiate such change or growth.

4.1.3.2. David Hesselgrave

Hesselgrave has taught at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School for decades. He has produced practical works, such as *Planting churches cross-culturally* (2000), that have enduring value. *Contextualization* (2000), which he wrote with Rommen, is the best introduction to the subject written by an Evangelical. His book, *Communicating Christ cross-culturally* (1991) is unparalleled in breadth and depth. In it Hesselgrave does much to expand Evangelicalism's theory of cross-cultural communication. He holds that deep level communication must be the Evangelical goal. Such communication should be "… one in which the message has been so effectively communicated that the receptor feels the same type of communicative urge as that experienced by the source" (1991:178).

Without doubt, the heart of Hesselgrave's contribution to Evangelical missiology is his advocating a view of culture based on seven dimensions. In speaking of the seven dimensions, he sees himself as deepening the scope of how human culture is understood beyond the understandings of Barney and Nicholls (see Hesselgrave 1991:101–103). He expands Barney's model, which includes four dimensions arranged according to a hierarchy. The deeper levels of culture are the most important to be dealt with when Evangelicals encounter people of other faiths, but are also the most difficult to discover, analyze, and modify. Hesselgrave's (1991) expansion of the dimensions is meant to provide greater clarity in dealing with the deepest areas of culture (1991:101–103). His seven dimensions include: worldview, cognitive processes, linguistic forms, behavioral patterns, social structures, media influence, and motivational resources. He emphasizes that the dimensions "… interpenetrate and impinge upon one another. They are separable for pragmatic purposes, but of course, combine to form one reality" (1991:164). The dimensions co-exist simultaneously in the lives of people, intermingling and influencing one another. In this way, his expansion of Barney's cultural model provides for more understanding by which to identify with the lives and thoughts of those Evangelicals wish

to communicate with, while not losing the personal aspect of how the dimensions inter-relate within the lives of actual people. This is good missiology.

Hesselgrave acknowledges Kraft's contributions at several points, but seeks to maintain his distance from Kraft's conclusion in key areas. He writes,

> Charles Kraft says that the 'key participant' in the missionary communication is the receptor and that missionary communications should be 'receptor-oriented.' When we realize that in Kraft's understanding the biblical text becomes divine revelation in the existential context of 'impactful communication,' we are instructed by his analysis (1991:175–176).

Unlike most of the Anti-insider movement advocates, he appreciates Kraft's sensitivity to the needs of mission in his day. Hesselgrave understands that the anthropological questions Kraft seeks to answer have theological roots, and that a central point in the discussion is the doctrine of inspiration. He is consistent in his commitment to the inerrancy of the Scripture, while pushing for deep level communication in Evangelical mission. This is a great testimony to his faithfulness and capacity. If his firm stance on inspiration through the 1970s to the1980s had not been accompanied by a simultaneous laboring to introduce anthropological insight into mission, then Evangelical mission could have wholly adopted the DEM or fallen into an irrelevancy from which it would have been difficult to recover.

Though he differs with Kraft on the nature of Biblical inspiration and epistemology, he postures himself similarly to the DEM in two important ways. First, he gives a significant place in his communicative theory for cultural distance. Hesselgrave lists Ralph Winter's 1974 presentation at the Lausanne Conference as influential in the development of his thinking on cultural distance (Hesselgrave:1991). "The difficulty encountered in any particular instance of evangelism (or communication more widely conceived) is directly proportional to the degree of difference between the two cultures involved" (Hesselgrave 1991:169). Hesselgrave incorporates cultural distance into his seven dimensions, claiming that "… the greater the cultural distance in any of the dimensions, the greater the impact or impingement on the message, how it should be encoded (contextualized) and how it will be decoded (interpreted)" (1991:169). He creates a chart so that the cultural distance between the encoder and decoder can be gauged, and communication adjusted accordingly. By pointing out the connection

between Hesselgrave and the DEM on the issue of cultural distance I do not suggest that there remains no difficulty or distance to be breached in cross-cultural communication today. On the contrary, I think that Winter, Kraft, and Hesselgrave are dealing with a great need in their day. Evangelicals need to give more account for the differences between themselves and people of other faiths. However, the writings of these men and others have had a great influence on Evangelical mission, and awareness of cultural distance has drastically improved. It remains important to see that sometimes, as with the CQH, Evangelicals have overcompensated for the cultural distance. Since evaluating cultural distance plays such a central role in Hesselgrave's missiological scheme, it is easy to see how he could have difficulty distinguishing himself from the finer points of Kraft's DEM and communicative theory. Without a suitable understanding of both cultural distance between ministers to people of other faiths and corresponding anthropological similarities of all humanity as the creation of God, it is difficult to build a model or method to answer the DEM.

Hesselgrave's writing resembles the DEM in another important way. Though he acts upon a separate theological base and enumerates a method of cross-cultural communication that differs from Kraft, Hesselgrave remains within the translational model for mission (1991:44). The idea behind translation is a movement from outside to inside, from unknown language or form towards a known. As noted above, the model creates a needed sensitivity towards crafting communication and ministry in ways that can be well received. It also entrenches the idea of cultural distance. Further, it assumes a linear movement from the encoding agent and culture towards the decoding party. Chapter 6 explores the limitations of such interpretation, and moves for a more realized submission to the Spirit and Word by both parties in interpretation of the Bible.

Hesselgrave could do more to enumerate a vigorous approach to ministry to Muslims. The example he and Rommen provide in *Contextualization* (2000) is a mere eight pages. The debate format displays a vast cultural divide between Evangelicals and people of Muslim faith. Its content deals primarily with the most divisive issues between the two (2000:238–235). In *Communicating Christ cross-culturally* (1991), Hesselgrave calls on the ministers to Muslims to first live an appropriate life, establishing themselves as people of goodwill. Evangelicals should not overlook the whole of the person and

116

work of Christ in the Gospels. Instead, they ought to follow the example of the Lord Jesus by seeking to minister to the whole person. Finally, he advocates a rigorous and humble style, befitting the gospel (2000:277–280). These are disappointing sections in otherwise wonderful books. He recognizes several important issues but fails to provide a sufficiently deep level of communication with Muslims that he advocates for Evangelical mission as a whole.

The level of analysis offered by Hiebert and Hesselgrave far exceeds that of the Anti-insider movement critics, and Schlorff and Nicholls. They do not go far enough in providing a method for rigorous engagement in ministry to the people of Islam. However, they do one crucially important work. They strain continually to construct an Evangelical missiology that is anthropologically informed, and Biblically sound. They are unable to realize all for which they set out to accomplish, but they do recognize that the point of departure in the DEM comes at a central issue. Hiebert and Hesselgrave see that the DEM does not maintain the final and unique authority of the Bible for all of thought and life. The Scriptures are God's very own personal Word to humanity.

Kraft's DEM expands the situational aspect of Evangelical theology and mission. Dynamic equivalence allows for a great room to read the Bible in differing contexts and freely relate life and thought to it. However, by positing the Scripture as merely a divine classic casebook in a world where cultural forms carry a generally neutral meaning, there is no way to ensure that the end product is fundamentally Biblical in constitution and growth. Hiebert and Hesselgrave point out consistently to Evangelicals the need to listen carefully to people of other faiths, strive to communicate on a deep level, and foster a mission to the nations that is born, nurtured, and matured in accordance to the Scriptures. Indeed, these two great missiologists are worthy of much respect for their faithfulness to Evangelicalism.

4.2. Objections to the Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic and the dynamic equivalence model

Now I present my own critique of the anthropological dialectic of the DEM and the CQH. Objections could arise from a number of directions. I could attack Kraft's Evangelical credentials, his understanding of the nature of Biblical theology that he takes from Vos,

his definition of true theology, or those elements of liberal theology he believes are beneficial to Evangelical hermeneutics (Kraft 1979a:36–37). I choose not to follow such a course because a reader could object to my opinions as easily as I do to Kraft's choices.

I could attempt to link Kraft's anthropologically driven missiology to some overtly non-Evangelical school or scholarship, thereby exposing a weakness. There are many such candidates. Schlorff accuses the dynamic equivalence school of being influenced by theological motives and interpretive schemes of "the new hermeneutic" (1980:150). However, Kraft's model does not resemble the writings or the interpretive patterns of post-Bultmannian critics. Schlorff's accusation is far-fetched. As far as hermeneutic schools are concerned, better comparisons are between Kraft's receptor-oriented hermeneutics and reader response criticism, or Derrida's deconstructionism. The DEM could be likened to liberation theology's insistence on theology done in context. Investigation could be conducted into the likeness of Kraft's view of revelation in Scripture with the late twentieth-century conceptions of kenoticism. Perhaps the most likely resemblance of Kraft's thought is to Barth (1956b:64). Barth's notions of *historie* and *geschichte* are pronounced similarly to the categories of culture and supra-culture found in CC. The problem is that the DEM does not neatly fit into the flow of philosophy associated with any of these schools. Further, Kraft offers minimal documentation for the writers and traditions with which he interacts in forming his model. My assumption is that Kraft's model is a legitimate attempt to balance objective and subjective elements in Evangelical mission, and not a simple matter of his being influenced by a person or school of thought that he reproduces into the DEM.

The remainder of this chapter examines the problem created by dynamic equivalence in anthropology, theology, and Biblical interpretation. Many issues are raised when judging whether or not dynamic equivalence accomplishes its hermeneutical goal, and if the Evangelical view of Scriptural inspiration is compromised in the process. However, I choose to level a single accusation against the DEM. I believe it endangers the most fundamental of Christian convictions, the Lordship of Christ. In chapter 3 we sample how the CQH undermines the uniqueness of the Bible's authority. In chapters 4 and 5 this accusation is expanded, with the conviction that in the text of the Bible alone humanity has God's personal Word. Only the Bible carries the authority of God, and only

in it is the gospel revealed. To minimize or denigrate the inspiration of Scripture is not merely to say that the text of the Bible contains error. It is to distort the clarity of the words of God and obscure his right to receive obedience and faith from the audience.

4.2.1. The dynamic equivalence model's obscurity in the area of anthropology

As I write above, Woodberry's (1989a:306–307) concept of sufficiently similarity is the missiological restatement of Kraft's (1979a:95) basic anthropology from CC, namely that all cultural forms are "essentially neutral." Gilliland (1989) affirms DEM anthropology on sufficient similarity in a conservative manner by writing that "… contextualization focuses on categories of truth that can be 'read' from the culture and which correspond to biblical revelation" (1989:25). The meaning of correspondence is clarified on the same page where he says, "… most aspects of a culture will fit into the more neutral category" (1989:25). The focus of this section of my thesis is to unpack the ramifications of the dynamic equivalence theory on how form and meaning relate in cultural symbols, and show the intrinsic connection such anthropology has with the CQH.

Hiebert (1989) makes many observations on the value and interpretation of symbols. In his chapter from *The Word among us* (1989), entitled "Form and meaning in the contextualization of the Gospel," he protests against methods and models that assume too strong a distinction between form and meaning. He writes, "The separation between form and meaning is based on a too simple view of culture" (1989:105). The difficulty with such separation stems from a tendency to understand all of culture through linguistics. Hiebert emphasizes that life is more than language. Further, if human thought categories are understood as mere creations of the mind, then cultures become similar to isolated islands. Genuine communication is difficult, and "… people in other cultures will interpret what we say in terms of their own cultural categories" (1989:105). Discerning what level of correspondence resides between message communicated and message understood becomes strained. I cannot locate in any writing where Kraft, Woodberry, or Gilliland ever qualify or moderate the DEM anthropology of essential neutrality of cultural forms in order to deal with the difficulties Hiebert mentions.

DEM writers give considerable effort to establish the primacy of interpretation (deeper-level meaning) over symbols (surface-level meaning) (Kraft 1983:83). This is the hermeneutical equivalent of the essential neutrality of all cultural forms. Osborne (2006) observes the difficulty with maintaining such a position with consistency in Biblical interpretation. "The major difficultly … is deciding exactly what are the cultural or time-bound elements in a passage and what are the supra-cultural principles" (2006:425). I introduce Osborne's point from hermeneutics into the discussion of cultural forms and meaning because it highlights the subjective nature of the dynamic equivalence operation undergirding the CQH. Biblical meaning is funneled arbitrarily through the Qur'an to produce readings that would never occur from the historical or social context. Osborne continues:

> Kraft's categorization model is inadequate, for it would demand that any general command be normative and any specific command be culture bound. Yet the general commands (such as 1 Corinthians 14:40) derived their meanings from cultural circumstances and most specifics had their origins in general principles (2006:425).

Osborne shows that what Hiebert points out in reference to the relationship of form and meaning for cultural symbols is also true about Biblical interpretation. It is not responsible to create a great distance between the form of a symbol and its meaning, or time-bound elements of the Bible and its supra-cultural truth. It is not possible to draw firm lines between cultural and supracultural in Scripture.

It is not Kraft's utilization of reader response interpretation in general I am classifying as the root of the CQH. Instead, as Vanhoozer (1998) points out, "… the difference between a radical reader response and a more conservative one is that the latter still believes that some responses better fit a given text than others" (1998:152). To be fair, DEM missiologists would not say that all interpretations are equal. In that regard they are not radical reader response proponents. The lesson from Vanhoozer's quote is that to the extent that they allow sufficient similarity/essential neutrality anthropology to cause Biblical meaning to be read through the Qur'an they are expanding the scope of possible readings for the Qur'an's past normal cultural, exegetical, and historical perimeters. Such interpretation is radical in its posture, even if sometimes conservative in its affirmations.

Clark's (2003) comments on Fundamentalism are also helpful in classifying the DEM concept of cultural neutrality. Approaching from a philosophical vantage point, Clark writes, "… good principlizing seeks out carefully tested applications of Scripture that move beyond how the text would have been applied in ancient contexts" (2003:94). He describes naïve principlizing as interpretation that assumes all cultural elements can be removed in the hermeneutical process. Clark's characterization of fundamentalism as naïve (2003:94) is reminiscent of Hiebert's statements on the pitfalls of having too simple a view of form and meaning (1985:37–39). Dynamic equivalence makes a similar error in assuming that the meaning of cultural forms can be exchanged or reformed in a similar way. Its anthropology could be categorized as naïve.

Hiebert's (1989) second critique of models that exaggerate distance between form and meaning is that they interpret symbols asocially (1989:106). Woodberry's (1989a:286–288) example of the Malaysian law forbidding non-Muslim use of Islamic terminology is an example of this tendency. Muslims in Malaysia feel that they have ownership of Islamic vocabulary. The solution he seeks is to show the Muslims how "Jesus and the Christians were already using the terms when Muhammad began his teaching" (1989a:286). Woodberry never explains what the corresponding ownership non-Muslim people speaking Malay and Mandarin have with Muslim terminology. Jesus and first century Jews could claim a link through their own Semitic background that twentieth-century Malaysians cannot. Arabic is not widely spoken by residents of Malaysia, but the Muslims of the country do have a religious claim to the words. The asocial cultural view of forms Hiebert mentioned appears in DEM mission at several points. "It does not take seriously enough that symbols are created and controlled by social groups and whole societies … When we try to reinterpret symbols used by the dominant society, however, we are in danger of being misunderstood" (Hiebert 1989:106). I have no objection to a Christian speaking to a Muslim friend and employing some Islamic terminology. It is also no problem for some Islamic terms to be translated into the Bible, where the breadth of context provides firm semantic range for the redefinition of such terms according to the Biblical text. I do agree with Hiebert's objection and believe it improper for the DEM to lay claim of ownership of cultural symbols it could never own apart from an asocial view of cultural forms.

Hiebert's next point is that to separate form and meaning is to ignore history. Words and symbols have "… histories of previously established linkages between form and meaning. Without such continuity, it would be impossible for people to pass on their cultures from one generation to the next." The Malaysian law Woodberry (1989a:286–288) references is an example of the ahistorical tendency of DEM anthropology. Non-Muslim Malaysians would have to cast context from their minds in order to claim sufficient similarity and ownership with Islamic terms to which they have no historical connection. As Bosch (1991:485) states, "… religions are worlds in themselves, with their own axes and structures; they face in different directions and ask fundamentally different questions." He continues by denying legitimacy to a scheme where "… 'elements' of the Christian religion are generalized until they fit the phenomena of other religions and thus produce a kind of reduced copy of Christianity" (1991:485).

Hiebert's ahistorical point is reminiscent of Vanhoozer's (1998) description of fundamentalism as naïve realism. He states, "Fundamentalism is realism. But it is naïve realism, oversimplifying the distance between text and interpreters. The result is an overconfidence in its own conclusion" (1998:426). Kraft seeks explicitly to mold his model within critical realism (1979:28). However, his teaching that all cultural forms are neutral oversimplifies the distance between text and interpreters. The following section on the CQH displays this ahistorical point clearly.

Because the focus of my thesis is the theory behind and the practice of the CQH, Hiebert's (1989) final points in his chapter from *The Word among us* are critical. In many non-Western societies form and meaning are "… intricately related in important symbols, particularly religious symbols. To say a word of curse is indeed to curse. To perform the rain dance is not a way of asking the gods to send rain; it is to create rain … symbols … are seen as performative" (1989:107). He teaches that the link between form and meaning can be loose (as in natural symbols), arbitrary (most discursive language), tight (ritual symbols), or even equated (historical symbols) (1989:111–116). Hiebert's complexity on these issues is refreshing and needed. It reveals considerable lack on the part of the dynamic equivalence school. As seen above, the DEM teaching on cultural symbols is somewhat naïve, as well as tending towards simplistic, asocial, and ahistorical definitions. The lack is felt keenly in the genres of symbols Hiebert labels as intrinsically

ritualistic and/or historical. The Christian Scriptures and the Qur'an are great examples of such complex symbols, the genres of symbols linked closest to meaning.

Chapter 5 showcases methods employing the CQH, analyzing them to determine the extent the DEM principle of neutrality of cultural forms causes Biblical meaning to be read through the words of the Qur'an. However, at this point it is necessary to provide examples of the CQH and make initial comments. Accad, early advocate for the Christian potential of the Qur'an, comments on Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:40–41 and Surah The Women 4:169,

> The Word of God and His Spirit. Aren't these the titles given to Christ by the Bible itself? Aren't these titles enough to prove that Christ was with God from the beginning? ... Isn't this, at the same time, the Christian Trinity in the Qur'an? God (Father), the Word (Son), and the Spirit. I know that some Muslims explain the Spirit of God to be the angel Gabriel, but here we find also the Qur'an quite specific in saying: 'And she who guarded her virginity (Mary), we breathed into her of Our Spirit and appointed her and her son to be a sign … (Surah Prophets 21:93).' How can the angel Gabriel be breathed into the virgin Mary? (1997:333–334).

Accad goes on to claim the Qur'an supports Christ as Creator, who died and was resurrected to life (1997:334). A current and important use of the CQH is the *7 Signs* method from Common Ground. It makes similar assertions to Accad, claiming near equivalent meanings of Qur'an and Bible through the narratives of Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, and Jonah. The culmination of the project is to present Christ as the fulfillment of the "signs" from both the Qur'an and Bible.

Accad (1997) admits that many Muslims reject his interpretation of Qur'anic titles for Christ, such as Word and Spirit (1997:334). Whether or not the community of faith of a given sacred text supports his interpretation is not a central concern. The central concern is the perceived common ground. If sufficient overlap of meaning is perceived between Bible and Qur'an, then the CQH is judged valid. The DEM concept of essential neutrality of cultural forms expands greatly the scope of overlap. It matters not that the majority of Muslims do not see the same overlap. Dynamic equivalence is expanded to such an extent that even the words of the Qur'an are able to carry Biblical meaning.

Bavinck (1960) makes assertions that shed light on obscurity in anthropology produced by the CQH of the DEM.

It is not correct to say that culture is nothing but a system of customs and traditions inherited from forefathers, for it is more than that. Culture, in so far as it is real culture and not just an agglomerate of various elements which are not wholly integrated and not adjusted to one another, is based upon the fundamental attitude of man towards the universe and the invisible powers. This position implies his social relationship as well as his attitude towards nature, his sense of responsibility, his outlook upon life and death, and his whole system of evaluation. All these various cultural elements are nothing but symptoms of the deeper existential attitude of man in the amazing complexity of the world in which he finds himself (1960:21).

Firstly, Bavinck urges that religions should be approached in a holistic way, as a system that should not be split asunder and hollowed out, in order that outside meaning can be infused. Secondly, Bavinck points towards the fallacy of assuming that the parts of culture should be isolated radically for examination, much less employment in the scheme of the CQH. In the same way that the parts of Islamic culture, or any culture, are defined in how they relate to other parts of the system, so individual components of the Qur'an (surah and ayats roughly correspond to Biblical chapters and verses) of the Qur'an must be read within the whole, as well as in appropriate historical contextual framework. When the Qur'an (Surah The Prophets 21:91) states that Allah's spirit came upon Mariam producing the conception of Messiah it does not follow that it intends a dynamically equivalent meaning to that of the evangelist in Matthew 1:19. To advance meaning based on the CQH is to compound the Lordship of Christ testified to by the Scriptures with contrary elements from the Qur'an because ultimately the whole of the Muslim holy book must be dealt with and evaluated in the lives of the receptors.

The primary task of missiology is the communication of Biblical truth to people of other faiths. A key component in such communication is persuasion. Missionary communication is persuading communication. If all symbols are essentially neutral and meaning from the Bible can be read through the words of the Qur'an, then it is natural for the communicator to use all tools and influence available to impact the audience on deep level. The desired result of missionary communication is that the audience would hear and receive the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. Cross-cultural communication to people of Muslim faith according to the dynamic equivalence operation allows for the situation where the message of the Bible (the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ) can be given and received through the words of the Qur'an. Instead of labeling practitioners, like Accad,

too quickly as heretical, we should take the time to understand that they are practicing what the DEM teaches in its evaluation of the relationship between form and meaning. There is error in the CQH, but it should be analyzed according to its source, as well as its outcome. The problem is the simplistic anthropology that does not account for the complexity of defining and employing symbols with the ritual, cultural, and historical depth of the Bible and the Qur'an.

4.2.2. The theological assumptions of the dynamic equivalence model's Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic

In this section I establish that the CQH is well-fitted to Kraft's theological postulations in CC. Kraft's DEM is holistic in that it deals with the issues of anthropology and Bible from a variety of standpoints. To avoid the perception that I am projecting the CQH onto the DEM when it does not belong, I introduce briefly another model employing the CQH, before moving to link the CQH and DEM across the theological spectrum.

Due to his book, *The camel* (2007), and the experiences surrounding his tenure in South Asia, Greeson is one of the more recognizable Evangelical names for ministry to Muslims. He is a leader in one of the largest missionary organizations in the world. Examining his method for how to approach encounter with Muslims is important for any study of Evangelical missiological approaches to Islam. There are basic and advanced outlines to Greeson's camel method. The basic method has three points, derived from Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:45–55 (2007:51–60). The first point is that Isa is holy, and is drawn from The Family of 'Imran 3:45 which states, "O Mary! Allah giveth thee glad tidings of a Word from Him: his name will be Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, held in honour in this world and the Hereafter and of (the company of) those nearest to Allah". In Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:49 it is written, "And (appoint him) a Messenger to the Children of Israel, (with this message): 'I have come to you, with a Sign from you Lord, in that I make for you out of clay, as it were, they figure of a bird, and breathe into it, and it becomes a bird by Allah's leave: and I heal those born blind, and the lepers, and I quicken the dead, Allah's leave… '" from which the second point, that Isa has power of death, is taken. The third point is deduced from Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:55, which states, "Allah said: 'O Jesus! I will take thee and raise thee to Myself and clear thee (of

the falsehoods) of those who blaspheme; I will make those who follow thee superior to those who reject faith, to the Day of Resurrection; then shall ye all return unto me. '"" The lesson from this ayat is that Isa knows the way to heaven. Greeson uses these three points "in an attempt to raise Jesus from 'prophet status' closer to 'Savior' status" (51).

Greeson (2007) is clear that there is truth in the Qur'an that can be used in his quest to lift Jesus towards a higher status. He is careful to state that truth in the Qur'an is incomplete. It's not enough to induce salvation in Christ, but it is sufficient to begin a process towards greater truth. On the theology behind his view, Greeson writes, "Is truth any less true if it is found somewhere other than the Bible? When the Qur'an says that Jesus was born of a virgin, without an earthly father, is it any less true than when the Bible says the same thing?" (2007:48). Initially, Greeson's point is reminiscent of Sam Schlorff's (1980) characterization of three possible ways to employ the Qur'an in encounter with Muslims. The second of the three is to "use Qur'anic data as evidence for historical facts" (1980:144). Such usages are appropriate and unavoidable. It is permissible, but causes trouble if used for a base in lengthy discussions where important life changing decisions are made. The Qur'an, like the Bible, is a unified book that presents an entire approach to God, existence, and human destiny. We cannot pull parts out of it and construct new hybrid teaching, without creating confusion on how the pieces of the new structure cohere. If a Christian worker uses Schlorff's second approach to say that the Qur'an does not teach that the Christian Scriptures have been corrupted, then generally the next act is to attempt reading the Scriptures with the Muslim man or woman. Such employment of the Muslim holy book is a legitimate use of the Qur'an as a beachhead, or bridge. This is not the CQH and is not the method of Greeson.

Greeson's (2007) motivation is to elevate the status of Christ higher than a prophet, towards Savior. In order to do so he seeks to help Muslims "in distinguishing truth from errors" (2007:48). In that way his approach moves beyond simply quoting the Qur'an to verify historical or Biblical points. He quotes Surah Jonah 10:94, which says "If thou wert in doubt as to what We revealed unto thee, then ask those who have been reading the Book from before thee... ". He understands this ayat to indicate that Christians and the Bible are needed to make sense of the Qur'an. If understood in Biblical light, then there is enduring and useable truth in the Qur'an. "There is not enough light in

126

the Qur'an to bring them to salvation, but there are enough flickers of truth to draw out God's Persons of Peace" (2007:71). In another place he says that finding truth in the Qur'an is like searching for counterfeit bills amidst genuine currency (2007:48).

Accad's *Building bridges* (1997), the *7 Signs* method associated with the Common Ground organization, and Kevin Greeson's *The camel* (2007) are well-known works of mainstream Evangelicals who employ, to a greater or lesser extent, the CQH. Accad's influence dates back to the Glen Eyrie Conference of the late 1970s, and his ministry included much of the Middle East. The Common Ground group attracts Evangelicals worldwide, including East Asia and Indonesia. Greeson's influence extends across South Asia, and into North Africa. When I write concerning these missiologists and practitioners employing the CQH in their encounter with Muslims, then I am not speaking about a fringe group on the outer limits of the Evangelical camp. I am calling attention to long-standing, mainstream members who have a history and legacy.

Though he did not work out all of the issues in regard to ministry to Muslims in CC, Kraft did make concrete links between the theory of dynamic equivalence he began to expound in the 1970s and work among Muslims. At NACOME he advocated that Islamic cultural forms, including the Qur'an, have strong cultural similarity with Judeo-Christian ones and can be used in ministry (Kraft 1979b:118). Not only is my linking the CQH to the DEM not arguing against the extremities of an Evangelical fringe group, the link is natural to the model that Kraft began decades ago.

The primary idea in the CQH is that data from the Qur'an dynamically equivocates with the Bible. In that way the CQH fits with the DEM stance on the essential neutrality/sufficient similarity of all cultural forms. A ready example of the link is Greeson (2007) claiming that Christian Scripture is needed to call attention to the "flickers of truth" (2007:71) in the Qur'an. I have been present on several occasions when *The camel* (Greeson:2007) outline, which focuses upon the Qur'anic testimony in Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:45–55, has been presented to Muslims. Once, during the section where it emphasizes that Jesus has power over death, an astute Muslim Imam commented, "You should see that this same surah teaches that Jesus was made from the dirt. He is not more than a prophet." His point is valid and threatening to the goal of establishing the Biblical gospel. Greeson and others are aware of such points in the

Qur'an. However, viewing truth as fundamentally dynamic allows the communicator to pick up on parts deemed sufficiently similar to Biblical ones, without accepting the whole.

In Kraft's model, a fundamental part of the dynamic equivalence process is actualized truth.

> Revelation … is like certain strong glues that require the mixture of two substances at the time when they are used … The one container holds the base and the other a kind of 'activator.' Neither of these substances will work by itself. When they are mixed, though, they powerfully bond the substances to which they are applied. In the process of revelation, the information component is the base, while the Holy Spirit, usually in partnership with a human being, is the 'activator.' Without both components, revelation is potential, never actualized (1979a:216).

Notice the definitions of the components in the process of actualized revelation: latent, potential base, and personal activators. Kraft goes on to indicate that the informational base for revelation can be either general or special, and the difference between the two is according to "stimulus value" (1979b:219). When written in Christian Scripture, revelation is information concerning revelational events and their interpretation (1979a:220–222). Scriptural data/information becomes revelation when it is fertilized or actualized, an event he labels 'repersonalization' (1979a:221). In the DEM, revelation occurs when the revelational base encounters a Spirit-led stimulus.

Greeson's (2007) notion of "flickers of truth" in the Qur'an (2007:71) is not an exact restatement of Kraft's process of actualization, but does carry important resemblance. A Christian worker using *The camel* (Greeson:2007) outline helps a Muslim friend to separate truth and error in the Qur'an, leading them to see Jesus as more than a prophet (2007:48). The similarity occurs when a personal agent (Christian) encounters a Muslim friend and uses Biblical truth to bring light to the potential meaning of the Muslim holy book. In that way the event is very similar to actualization. The CQH fits with Kraft's doctrine of revelation, and the "glimpses of God's absolute Truth (with a capital T) embedded in the inspired casebook" (Kraft 1979a:301).

According to Kraft (1979a), general revelation can also serve as a base for actualization. The difference between general and special revelation is in stimulus value, as well as how the information is used (1979a:219). He writes, "… as important as the

Scriptures are to us, it seems evident that God has worked throughout history … without the receptors being aware of the special revelational information contained in the Book" (1979a:220). He goes on to speak of an odd category of "extra-Scriptural special information" (1979a:220). The connection between Kraft's' teachings on special/general revelational data and the CQH becomes clear when we recall the above quote from the NACOME conference at Glen Eyrie. He contends for a dynamic equivalence between Arabic/Qur'anic and Hebrew/Old Testament backgrounds. When Kraft speaks of using "… indigenous proverbs as stepping stones" (1979a:218) it is inside his dynamic scheme of actualization, rather than merely pointing out a place where a particular culture bares similarity to Bible teaching. In the DEM, Spirit-led stimulus activates latent, informational base. In the CQH, Spirit-led/Biblically informed persons bring light to the Qur'an. In that sense, Biblical meaning actualizes the Qur'an. Further, the actualization process, sometimes called "truth with impact," is the way in which the Scriptures are understood to be alive and active, as Hebrews 4:12 states (Kraft 1979a:399).

In the DEM, the Bible is not only an inspired classic casebook and a yardstick to measure contemporary revelations against, but also a tether. "As the confirmed inspired record of the way God works, the Bible provides the 'set radius' within which contemporary revelational encounters may occur. Events that occur outside that range are by definition not revelational" (Kraft 1979a:399). If the basics of the Biblical person and work of Christ may be seen in fragmented truths from the Qur'an through the concept of essential neutrality of cultural forms, then it is difficult to see how anyone could deny the revelational potential of such Qur'anic data. If it were deemed outside the Biblical tether, then the gospel would be outside the radius the Bible establishes.

Abdul-Haqq was an evangelist with the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association. In his book, *Sharing your faith with a Muslim* (1980), he employs the CQH and displays how the idea of Bible as a tether buttresses the CQH. "Muslim commentators have endeavored to minimize the full impact of the plain declaration of the Koran that Jesus Christ was the Word of God Incarnate" (1980:67). He asserts that the title is a clear reference to Christ sharing the same essence as God. In light of the Surah The Women 4:171 declaration of Jesus as "a Spirit from Him," Abdul-Haqq says, "It should be plain for any reasonable person to see that the Word of God must be of the same nature as God.

But Muslim commentators have sought to avoid this conclusion in regard to Jesus Christ" (1980:68). By reading Biblical meaning into the words of the Qur'an, Abdul-Haqq shows how dynamic equivalence in Evangelical encounter with Muslims has the potential to raise the Qur'an to a quasi-inspired status. The Qur'an cannot be outside the Biblical tether because the gospel is communicated through it, actualizing its latent data by Spirit-led stimulus. The net effect of the CQH is a neo-orthodox reading of the Qur'an. Barth said that the Bible could become the Word when used in the preaching of the Church (Barth 1956a:93). Similarly, in thoroughgoing usage of the CQH the text of the Qur'an is elevated and contains the gospel. The words of the Qur'an, understood in light of the New Testament witness to Christ, are within the set radius of the Bible. I am not saying that all who quote the Qur'an during encounter with Muslims intend to ascribe inspirational status to the Qur'an. I am saying that the Qur'an acquires a quasi-inspired status to the extent that the CQH is used to communicate Biblical meaning through Qur'anic words.

The problem with the approach of Greeson/Kraft to truth in the Qur'an is that the Muslim holy book is used to convey the message of the gospel. As chapter 5 shows, some approaches communicate that the Lord Jesus Christ was fully God, became incarnate, died a substitutionary death on the cross, rose from the dead, and ascended into heaven, but rarely quote from the Bible. Teaching that the Qur'an contains elements of truth does not convey adequately the significance of the Qur'an in the CQH. In this view the Qur'an is correct accidentally, but not inspired. However, it is difficult to deny the Qur'an some level of revelational status, especially if properly activated according to Kraft's information plus stimulus formula (Kraft 1979a:183). Such a positive view of the potential of religion outside of Biblical origin is reminiscent of the fulfillment model, and reflects Kraft's statement that the religious quests of human societies many be seen as attempts to respond to culturally embedded communication from God. Such communication is rightly called general revelation (1979a:218).

The basic teaching of the church and the Bible is that Jesus Christ is Lord. The DEM views the Bible as an ocean and truth in the Bible as icebergs. Dynamic equivalence interpretation covers not only how the Bible is interpreted, but also how the Qur'an is understood. The result is a quasi-inspired status for the Qur'an, due to its being

utilized by the CQH to proclaim the gospel. It is not unfair to say that the CQH compromises the Lordship of Christ by eroding the unique inspirational status of the Bible, because supracultural truth that leads to the atonement in Christ can be found in the Qur'an. The Scripture is God's personal word to humanity. Without a clear and personal word that the church is able to interpret and follow in the varying contexts of the world, obedience to the Lordship of Christ becomes difficult to understand in practical terms.

It is unlikely that practitioners who use the CQH would claim that the Qur'an advances the Lordship of Christ. Only the Bible does that. In that way, the "flickers of truth" analogy (Greeson 2007:71), or "glimpses" of truth (Kraft 1979a:301), for the Qur'an is not satisfactory. In his *Mahomet and Islam*, William Muir **(**1887**)** tells a story that could be helpful in understanding the appropriate value of the Qur'an in Christian encounter with Muslims. After claiming an important victory at the Battle of Kheibar, Muhammad is offered a banquet of goat meat by a local Jewish woman, presumably to gain favor with her conqueror. Muhammad takes a bite of the meat before realizing that it is poisoned. Gripped with pains from slight contact with the poison, he is unable to prevent his trusted friend, Bishr, from consuming enough to cause death (Muir 1887:169–170). I suggest this story as an explanation for the value of the Qur'an in conveying the Lordship of Christ. There are places where the historic content of the Bible and the Qur'an agree. For example, both of the texts claim that Mary was a virgin at the time of Jesus' birth. However, it is a mistake to assume that gospel content can find a suitable home in the Qur'an, or that the Qur'an can lead the thoughtful and careful reader to acceptance of Christ as Lord and Savior. The meat Muhammad ate contained several nutritious ingredients. It was a good source of energy and protein for the body. It contained iron and other minerals difficult to find in a dry environment, such as that of Arabia. However, the warrior-prophet who fought countless battles and sustained numerous injuries went to his grave adamant that the worst injury he ever sustained was from the lingering effects of Zeinab's poisoned meat offering (Muir 1887:170). Had he not regurgitated it quickly he would have died. I do not think that a Christian employment of the Qur'an is a good strategy. Even if the CQH could be justified as a method of gospel proclamation, then it could not be shown as a method that best brings Muslims to

a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ as Lord. To find Christ as Lord one must look to the Scriptures. As Frame puts it, "No Scripture, no Lord. No Scripture, no Christ" (2010:212).

Examining the CQH and the resulting value of the Qur'an is important in highlighting again my assertion that the DEM is moved along by an anthropological dialectic. In Smalley and Kraft's theory, the place of the divine/supra-culture is seemingly very high. In practice the distance between culture and supraculture expands to allow for increasing diversity of context and extension of the dynamic facet of theology and mission until the line of uniqueness of Scriptural authority is eroded.

Coupled with the explicit examples above from texts employing the CQH, there are implicit examples of the erosion. Much can be learned in contrasting Parshall's book, *Muslim evangelism* (2003)*,* and his interaction with Massey around the turn of the twenty-first century (2000a)*.* I choose Parshall as an illustration for several reasons. First, he credits Kraft as a prime influence in the development of his contextualization efforts (2003:16). Second, he has sought continually to execute adaptions in missionary endeavor without losing sight of a high view of the Scripture. When I comment on him, then I am interacting with the thoughts of a proven Evangelical missionary mind. Finally, I have had the pleasure of sitting with him on several occasions. I testify that he is a wonderful blend of keen, inquisitive intellect, and matured warm-hearted love. Evangelicals have looked up to him for decades for good reason.

Parshall follows Kraft's ideas on form and meaning almost verbatim, yet avoids some of the pull of the anthropological dialectic through a firm commitment to the authority of Scripture. In his well-known book, *Muslim evangelism* (2003)*,* the chapter on form and meaning centers around Kraft's dynamic equivalence theory, and includes a quote from CC on Christianness being located primarily "… in the functions served and the meanings conveyed by the cultural terms employed, rather than in the forms themselves" (2003:78). Having dynamic equivalence as his epistemic base, it would seem natural for Parshall to emphasize exclusively developing methods to link Biblical meaning with Islamic forms. Instead, when commenting on the topic of theological bridges to salvation he includes, "The essential element is that the new believer comes to a fully orbed faith in and acceptance of God as revealed in the Old and the New

Testaments" (2003:156). Thus a strong commitment to the inspiration of Scripture proves able to stay the weight of the anthropological dialectic in *Muslim evangelism*.

Parshall's commitment to the inerrancy of Scripture is unable to prevent the anthropological dialectic of the DEM from reformulating and pulling Evangelical mission into a focus that produces the CQH. It is important to recall how after Parshall's article in *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* article entitled, "Danger! new directions in contextualization," (1998) he backs down his protest. The first issue of *International Journal of Frontier Missions* from 2000 on Muslim contextualization is Massey's connecting the dots between his contextualization and the DEM, thereby unarming the thrust of Parshall's protest. Massey's first article focuses on the transcendence of God in his workings among humanity. His catch phrase is "God's ways are not like our ways" (2000b:6), restating the cultural/supracultural concept of Kraft. When uniqueness of Scriptural authority and DEM essential neutrality of cultural forms collide Kraft's anthropology wins out, and Parshall backs down (Massey 2000a:3–4).

Jameson and Scalevich (2000) take the case further, and move to solidify the focus on essential neutrality/sufficient similarity. For them, the DEM means not merely using functional equivalents in translation efforts, but also a reworking of how sacred texts, Bible and Qur'an, are read in communities. The emphasis is placed upon the link between the first century Jewish audience of much of the New Testament, and contemporary Muslim communities. "We observe a boldness to proclaim the gospel, beginning with the testimony of the writings held to be authoritative by the unbelieving community, and progressing to a fuller proclamation of the power and work of Christ" (2000:36). Following the anthropological dialectic, the link they mention is sufficient to view the sacred texts of Muslim communities as functional equivalents to the text of the Bible.

The weight of the anthropological dialectic forces even the sacred texts of other faiths into the mold of dynamic equivalence. Jameson and Scalevich (2000) report that the new communities they are forming in their ministry "… are boldly proclaiming the gospel by beginning with a radical reinterpretation of the Qur'an as it bears witness to Christ, and then moving to a fuller testimony of the person and work of Christ" (2000:38). Radical is an apt word to describe the CQH they employ. Surah The Table

Spread 5:68 commands believers in Islam "… to stand fast by the law, the Gospel, and all the Revelation that has come to you from your Lord." Passages like this are read as if there is no community in which they are produced, and as if the Qur'an and the Bible have identical reports of the lives of patriarchs like Abraham. The Qur'an is clear that Abraham/Ibrahim was a Muslim, as found in Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:67. Those following the DEM teaching of Jameson and Scalevich ignore such knowledge, content with sufficient similarity of cultural forms. They mention the case of a particular Muslim background believer named Rashid. "Many dozens of verses from the Qur'an were interpreted in a new light to Rashid. Looking at the Qur'an through the lens of the New Testament was a new experience" (2000:37). Notice the progression from functional equivalents in translation, to functional exchange of meaning in sacred texts (the CQH), and the reinterpretation of texts by outside commenters. Step by step they move theology away from any fixed referent in the Bible's unique authority. They label their own approach as radical. Initially, Parshall's commitment to the inspiration of Scripture caused him to object to the missiology of Massey and the IJFM group, but when confronted with the connection between such radical ministry and the DEM his protest is quieted, as witnessed by his quote in Massey's (2000a:3) editorial.

4.2.3. The dynamic equivalence model's biblical infidelity

The DEM doctrine on revelation is difficult to justify from a Biblical perspective. In this section I examine some of the key passages quoted by DEM advocates, and test the DEM for Biblical fidelity.

Concerning methodology for encounter with Muslims, Acts 17:16–34 may be the passage quoted most often by promoters of dynamic equivalence. Chapman (1989a) postures himself conservatively in a manner similar to Parshall in his book *Muslim evangelism*. His appraisal of Acts 17:22–31 includes the need for making a challenge to Islam, but concludes by urging that "… at every point there are extraordinary close parallels between Paul's words and the teaching of the Qur'an" (1989a:113–114). He lists seven basic areas of agreement between Christianity and Islam. Ministry to Muslims is built upon working in these areas of commonality and include: God creates, God is one, God rules, God reveals, God loves, God forgives, and God judges (1989a:122–124).

Concepts of challenge are included in Chapman's proposals, but his approach is founded on reliable truth in Islam and the Qur'an. The extraordinarily close parallels he sees between Bible and Qur'an veers towards viewing the Muslim holy book as some type of natural/general revelation of the Biblical God.

It is difficult to reconcile exactly what DEM writers mean when they speak of common ground. Parshall (2003) writes, "… the common ground of the Qur'an and the Old Testament, in regard to the prophets, should be thoroughly explored" (2003:151). He sees the contemporary context of Muslims as parallel to that of Old Testament Israel. Other DEM writers, such as John Travis and Andrew Workman (2000:53–60) and Jonathon Culver (2000:61–70), promote understanding Muslims in categories like that of first century Jews. The difficulty with such positions is that they imply that the Qur'an contains special revelation, for God spoke through the Old Testament prophets and to the Jews of the first century directly. Similarly, Accad (1997) states,

> Paul described God to his Athenian listeners in general terms that they were familiar with, using a reference to their philosophers and poets as a bridge to introduce them to a few quotations from the Old Testament about God. Then he followed with his declaration that Jesus Christ was the Savior of everyone in the world … It is worth noting that the Spirit of God, who inspired the writer of the book of Acts, did not hesitate to include a statement from one of the Greek poets in the content of the Bible (1997:22).

Accad sees the Greek context of first century Athens as parallel with contemporary Muslim culture. His position renders the common ground of the Qur'an a type of natural revelation, for natural revelation is the subject of Paul's Acts 17 address. It is unlikely that any of these commentators want to assign to the Qur'an enduring inspirational status or place it on equal terms with the Bible. Their motivation is in promoting the receptor-oriented hermeneutic of the DEM. In general, DEM writers seem unaware or unable to classify clearly the common ground of the Qur'an as either special or general type of revelation. Terms of differentiation in revelation, like special and general, have a lessened importance in the dynamic equivalence scheme. Though such terms are over-applied at times in Evangelical thought, it is unfortunate that DEM missiology has not set forth the implications of their teaching at such a crucial point. Authority in Christian life and thought is related intimately to the nature of the prophetic witness that confronts

humanity. The primary goal for DEM practitioners is to highlight close parallels and locate areas of common belief between the Muslims and Christians.

Bruce (1988) provides a helpful summary, based upon Acts, of Paul's approach to gospel proclamation and the place of natural revelation in the apostle's ministry. In Acts, Paul's primary audience is Jewish, and only twice did he address directly a Gentile dominate group. Acts 14:14–18 is one and 17:22–31 is the second. In addressing Gentile audiences, Paul would not "… insist on the fulfillment of Old Testament prophesy, as he did in addressing synagogue congregations; instead an appeal to the natural revelation of God the Creator is put in the forefront. Yet this appeal is couched in language drawn largely from the Old Testament" (1988:276). The CQH picks up on this tendency of Paul to assume natural revelatory awareness for audiences that have little or no Biblical background. Only it assumes the Qur'an is a location of a level of true divine knowledge. "It is in this light," Accad (1997) states, "… that the Christian can skillfully share truth from the Qur'an with his Muslim friend. If he does so, both will be surprised and edified by what it says about Christ as the Word of God who took a body like ours, though without sin, and became the son of Mary and Savior of the world" (1997:23). Though the Qur'an denies explicitly the deity and crucifixion of Christ, DEM practitioners employing the CQH insist that the basics of the gospel are found in the areas of common ground. If the Qur'an is a location of an indefinite level of natural revelation that parallels important sections of Biblical special revelation, then corresponding justification arises for the Qur'an as a locus of true knowledge of God. As knowledge of God in nature is clouded, suppressed, and misunderstood, so the truth in the Qur'an is subject to much greater limits than what is termed special revelation in the Bible and Christ. Natural revelation cannot be rejected, even though it is less definite than special revelation. Neither should the Muslim be required to abandon his or her traditional holy book.

Paul's speech in Acts 17:22–31 gives a higher priority to repentance than the positions of Chapman, Parshall, and Accad permit. Repentance is starting point of Paul's address, as seen in Acts 17:23. "What therefore you worship as unknown, this I proclaim to you" (ESV). His initial revulsion must not be excused by the previous mention of the highly religious nature of the people of Athens. To do so would be to err by hearing the narrative account of extensive idolatry with twentieth century Western ears that consider

such things as works of art to be admired. (Bruce 1988:329). Neither a Jewish audience of Paul's time nor a contemporary Muslim audience could read the text in such a way. Kistemaker (1990) insists that the apostle refrains from labeling an idol "God," describing God in neuter rather than masculine terms (1988:38). His platform for addressing them was their ignorance, not their knowledge. Paul's first note rings with the priority of repentance in his message. The CQH exposition of Acts 17:22–31 provides little clarity for deep holistic repentance.

It is important to note that in Paul's mind repentance is not systematic, but must be systemic. The crucial thing is not a point-by-point repudiation of each aspect of the former life, but a fundamental reorientation towards the true God of the Bible through repentance and faith. Some DEM commentators rely upon this tendency of Paul to support their understanding of repentance and faith in gospel proclamation to people of other faiths. Fitting well into my classification of the DEM's anthropological dialectic, Brown and others support repentance in one right, because they insist on confessing Christ as Lord. "What is required is simply to put one's faith personally in Jesus as the Christ, the Messiah, meaning one's Lord and Savior. Saving faith, in both its propositional and relational aspects, is simply saying 'Yes' to Jesus" (Brown 2000:41). Facts that are Biblical yet implicit in Brown's receptor-oriented notion of repentance include the divinity of Christ and substitutionary atonement. In confessing Christ as Lord and Savior, these implicit aspects are grown into after faith is initiated rather than constituting part of it. He does not explain how the audience can accept Christ as Lord, but not hold to his divinity.

Brown's teaching on accepting the Lordship of Christ is problematic because receptor-oriented-interpretation means that significant teaching from the Qur'an remains as part of the foundation of faith. A minimalist approach to content in repentance among a Muslim audience makes it difficult to see how the shift from the Messiah of the Qur'an who is merely prophet to the Savior to whom every knee shall bow (Philippians 2:10 ESV) occurs. The foundation of repentance is unclear. Further, true knowledge of God, whether natural or special, ought not to be repented of in the life of a Christian. Receptor-oriented interpretation of the Qur'an means that it contains truth that must endure.

The Acts 17 account of Paul's ministry in Athens does not allow for the parallels to which Chapman and other DEM writers attest. Instead, Paul proceeds in ways similar to his previous ministry to Gentiles (Acts 14:14–18). Upon spending time in Athens he is not moved by the potential for common ground between the Biblical God and Greek philosophy, but appalled by the idolatry of the city. His response is to keep to custom in his preaching. He goes to meet and reason with two groups: the Jews and devout persons of the synagogue, and the Gentiles of the market. When the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers enter into dialogue with Paul, they offer several descriptions of the content of his message in the market. They believe apostle's message to contain a distinctly foreign quality, and could intend the description "foreign divinities" to be pejorative. Acts 17:19–20 says that the men "… took him and brought him to the Aeropagus, saying, 'May we know what this new teaching is that your presenting? For you bring some strange things to our ears. We wish to know what these things mean'" (ESV). In addition to foreign, they label Paul's discourse as strange and new. The two terms for foreign and strange in verses 18 and 20 make it clear that Paul's teaching is new. His message is out of character with the Greek audience's understanding of the ordering of the world. At any rate, it would be irresponsible to assume that they perceived in the apostle's message the extraordinary close parallels Chapman and others use to justify common ground between Qur'anic and Biblical teaching. Further, it would irresponsible to claim that the message of Paul at the Aeropagus is unrelated qualitatively to his reasoning in the synagogue and market. The summary statement given in Acts 17:18 by the philosophers is that Paul preaches "Jesus and the resurrection" (ESV). The direction of his message is the same, as seen in verse 31.

The parallel of the passage is not common ground with Greek philosophy, or correspondingly with the Qur'an, but with the knowledge of God that Romans 1:19 teaches is perceived by all humanity. Such knowledge of God "… was accessible to all in his works of creation, but the capacity or desire to acquire it had been impaired by idolatry" (Bruce 1988:334). The tone of Acts 17 is different than Romans, aimed at persuasion of an unbelieving audience rather than the edification and instruction of congregations of believers. However, the basic doctrine is the same. Paul's address grabs hold of an empty altar, a symbol of ignorance and lack in the religious life of the

Athenians. As Kistemaker (1990) notes, the apostle refrains from identifying the altar to an unknown god with the God of the Old Testament (1990:38). He sees the altar as self-admittance by the Greeks of the limits of their thought to account for the whole of creation and Creator. It implies that the audience acknowledge how they are suppressing the knowledge of the true God through idolatry. If they felt secure that their idolatrous system accounted for the whole of creation, then there would be no need for placating an unknown deity. Paul makes use of limitation and ignorance expressed in the Athenian altar to an unknown god. His method opposes the notion of common ground proposed by DEM advocates. The Qur'an presents itself as special revelation, the dictated words of Allah. It cannot assume any type of position like the altar of Acts 17:23, because the assumption of Qur'an is that it is the conclusive word of Allah about the divine nature and creation.

Extra-biblical references in Acts 17 assume the weakness of the Greek tradition and religion rather than the strength. Bruce (1988) writes:

> Did Paul identify the Zeus of Greek Philosophy *simpliciter* with the God of biblical revelation, whom in his letters he repeatedly calls 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ'? Quite certainly not. Is he then simply detaching from their original contexts sentiments, which, so far as there actual phraseology goes, lend themselves to incorporation into Judeo-Christian context? Again, no. (1988:339).

The lesson from extra-Biblical references is that the knowledge of the true God cannot be suppressed completely. Titus 1:12–13 employs extra-Biblical material similarly to Acts 17. It states, "One of the Cretans, a prophet of their own, said, 'Cretans are always liars, evil brutes, lazy gluttons.' This testimony is true." (ESV). The effect of this quotation is to point out how a tradition that endangered the young Cretan church with false teaching self-admits its own propensity to falsity. Further, this verse comes in a passage on the qualifications and duties of an elder, who must be capable of instruction and correction (verse 9). Verses 10–11 command that some doctrine must be rejected and opposed. As in the Acts 17 quotation from extra-Biblical literature, the Titus 1:12–13 passage focuses on the weakness in extra-Biblical tradition, rather than supposed common ground.

Paul's basic position in drawing out the weakness in non-Christian tradition through quotations of extra-Biblical sources, his teaching on humanity's understanding of God through creation in Romans 1:18:22, and the place he gives for repentance in his

preaching must apply to how Evangelicals encounter people of Muslim faith today. The teaching of the Qur'an has been a part of the lives of Muslims since the earliest ages and cannot be avoided altogether in Evangelical ministry. In chapter 6 I look at ways the Islamic holy book can be with interacted with in Evangelical encounter with Muslim faith without assuming the common ground approach of the CQH. It is the Bible that brings the hearer into a relationship with the Absolute Personal Creator God. It is the Spirit and the Word that guard the faith and life of the church as it grows in a Muslim context. It is the Bible that serves as the normative factor at each stage of ministry to people of Muslim faith. Though the Qur'an carries a firm insistence on monotheism, it remains a part of the extra-Biblical literary tradition and should be handled accordingly.

People of Muslim faith are creatures of God and are accountable to Him. The ways they suppress the truth of the true God does not abdicate their status as creatures of God. The Epicureans and Stoics of Acts 17 were not as avid on the practice of idolatry as the majority of Athenians, but Paul addressed them as idolaters because they maintained basic components of the worldview of idolatry. Concerning their position Frame (2007) writes that Paul:

> … concluded by demanding their repentance for the sin of idolatry. Actually, neither the Epicureans nor the Stoics had much use for the traditional Greek gods. But Paul evidently believed that Stoic materialistic pantheism and Epicurean atomism were no better than the worship of Zeus and Apollo. The world is not governed by impersonal fate (Stoicism) or by impersonal (occasionally random) movements of atoms (Epicurus), but by a personal God who has 'fixed a day on which he will judge the world in righteousness by a man whom he has appointed; and of this he has given assurance to all by raising him from the dead' (verse 31) (2007:2).

Muslims are not idolaters, but what they hold as ultimate reality is less than the truth of the Biblical God. In this sense, viewing the Qur'an as including extraordinarily close parallels to the Bible that serve as common ground of truth is unhelpful. It works against the repentance that leads to faith.

Interpreting the Qur'an as common ground on which the gospel can be proclaimed is inconsistent with the wider ministry, testimony, and teaching of Paul. 1 Thessalonians 1: 9–10 is a good summary of the apostle's approach to encounter with people of other faiths. Paul reminds the Thessalonians how they "… turned to God from

idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, Jesus, who delivers us from the wrath to come" (ESV). Though his basic message is consistent, he did have different emphases for different audiences. To Jews and God-fearing Gentiles, "… who already knew that God is one, and that he is the living and true god, the gospel proclaimed that this God had sent his Son as Messiah and Savior; but pagans had first to be taught what Jews already confessed regarding the unity and character of God" (Bruce 1988:277). Acts 17:22–31 is understood best with these categories in mind. Paul's words to the Athenians serve to bring them to repentance for their idolatry and prepare them to hear more about Jesus as Messiah and Savior. It does not require that they become God-fearers, but that they accept that the Creator and Master of the world has revealed Himself according to the greater teaching of the Old Testament as fulfilled in the resurrected Lord Jesus Christ. The apostle's message is just as much a stumbling block for contemporary Muslims as first century Greeks.

The common ground notion DEM writers perceive in Acts 17 does not account for how Muslim audiences are to repent. As stated above, systemic repentance is the Biblical requirement. Systematic repudiation of every Islamic notion is neither possible nor Biblical, but systemic repentance applies to the whole of life. A person born in a Muslim family who hears the gospel must accept Christ as Lord of all and believe that he was resurrected from the dead (Romans 10:9–10). Whatever calling Muslims "sons of Ishmael" may mean for DEM writers (Parshall 1998a:42), it should not mean that the monotheism of Islam is sufficient as Biblical faith or somehow equivalent to natural revelation. Moltmann (1985) notes that the Christian faith should not be examined or lived as if it were simple monotheism or Unitarianism, as is supposed commonly. Instead, the Biblical faith is Trinitarian (1985:2). Descriptions of the faiths of Muslim, Christian, and Jewish people as Monotheistic are helpful in philosophical, political, and religious discussion. In order for a Jew or a Muslim to become a true follower of Jesus Christ it is necessary for he or she to confess Christ as Lord. The new believers' understanding of his Lordship will not be initiated with an exhaustive understanding of the Biblical teaching on the person of Christ, but cannot be outside of central perimeters. In addition to the Romans 10:9–10 insistence that Jesus Christ is resurrected Lord, I John 5:4–5 states, "For everyone who has been born of God overcomes the world … Who is it that overcomes

the world except the one who believes that Jesus is the Son of God" (ESV). A hearer of the gospel message may not have a systematic comprehension of Jesus as the Son of God, but he or she must repent to God in terms compatible with it. In every case it is only the Biblical notion of Jesus as resurrected, Lord, and Son of God that provides the truth that faith and repentance are to be founded on. No one coming to the true God in faith will understand the depths of the nature of God, but he or she must believe that the gospel is the truth about God. Repentance plays a more central role in Paul's ministry and teaching than it does in the CQH.

Kraft's teachings on the nature of revelation and his process of actualization must also be tested for Biblical foundation and strength. On the components of revelation Kraft (1979a) defines the Scripture as data (1979a:243), unfertilized (1979a:221), an inspired classic casebook (198), similar to an ocean in which supracultural truth floats as an iceberg (1979a:131), potential (1979a:216), impersonal (1979a:221), unactualized (1979a:216). He labors to distinguish Scripture itself from any comparison to revelation. His intention is to make theological/anthropological summaries for the components and process of revelation. The difficulty with Kraft's assessment of the nature of the Bible is that the Bible never addresses itself in such categories. In fact, the description of the Scripture for itself is dissimilar from the claims of CC. In his section on the Bible as inspired classic casebook, he does not offer a single Biblical reference as a self-description in justification of his model (1979a:198–202). Importantly, he notes that Bernard Ramm, who wrote the foreword for CC and deeply influenced the development of its content, does not go so far as to label Scripture as merely potential (1970:221).

Hebrews 4:12 and 2 Timothy 3:15–16 are passages displaying how Scripture portrays its own nature and work. The former states, "… the word of God is alive and active. Sharper than any double-edged sword, it penetrates even to diving soul and spirit, joints and marrow; it judges the thoughts and attitudes of the heart" (NIV). On this passage, Kraft comments, that the Scripture "… does not merely present information as a textbook might but, in casebook fashion, records the kind of 'alive and active' (Hebrews 4:12) events that it seeks to stimulate" (1979a:399). The Bible as inspired classic casebook is Kraft's understanding of the meaning of this passage. However, the verse in question describes the word itself as alive and active. There is no reference to mere

events behind or potential effects of the word. It also assigns to the word the active verbal aspect of judging the thoughts and motives of humanity. Kraft is correct in emphasizing the continuation of the process of God's activity among humanity and the importance of the Scripture to that process. His mistake is putting too much distance between the Holy Spirit's work and the text of the Bible. Hebrews 4:12–13 indicates that the word, itself, is living and quickens humanity's spiritual deadness, in order that the Son of God may be recognized and confession to Him maintained properly. The work of the Holy Spirit, the "him" of verse 13, is synonymous with the work of the word. "Verse 12 speaks of the word of God discerning the most hidden aspects of our being. That clearly is something that only God can do" (Frame 2010:67). Further, it is apparent that "the word of God" spoken of includes the written text of the Bible because the present tense is applied to the words of David spoken long ago in Hebrews 4:7. This conception of revelation/inspiration is given again in Hebrews 10:5–15, where the prophet's statement recorded in Jeremiah 31:33 is equated with is what "… the Holy Spirit also testifies to us about this" (NIV). At any rate, it is irresponsible to claim that Hebrews 4:12 assigns to the Scripture a latent or potential aspect. Such an idea is antithetical to the passage.

The second primary passage I examine to determine the Bible's doctrine for its own nature and work is 2 Timothy 3:15–16. Paul writes that the Scriptures "… are able to make you wise for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness" (NIV). Kraft's (1979a) focus when explaining this passage is upon the human element in the inspirational process. "The Bible is not only God's word, it is a human word as well" (1979a:202–203). He concludes that it is a record of divine-human interaction (1979a:213). However, Erickson (1989) writes, "… the words-versus-thoughts issue is an artificial issue. The two cannot really be separated. A particular thought or concept cannot be represented by every single word which happens to be available in the given language" (1979a:215). In other words, Kraft's emphasis on the human element in the inspiration of the Scripture creates an either/or situation between words and thoughts. Though it is true that the process and product of inspiration of Scripture includes a human element, Kraft's theology of inspiration does not account for the way the text identifies the written documents themselves as God-breathed. Frame (2010) underscores this point.

"God's intention is to give us words, personal words, not just thoughts or ideas … at no point in this redemptive history is God content to give thoughts or ideas to his spokesmen, without giving them words in which to express those thoughts" (2010:143). Frame's claim is that the Scripture upholds the importance of divine verbal inspiration of the Biblical text. Kraft (1979a) affirms his own brand of verbal inspiration (1979a:205), but never detours from his focus on process over information (1979a:396). Without the emphasis on thoughts/process over words/text, there would be little room for the CQH to develop.

The focus of Paul in the latter portion of 2 Timothy is to reinforce to his disciple and the wider audience that their faith would be secure in the wake of his nearing death. "Memories fade over time, and generations will arise who do not have personal memories of Paul" (Frame 2010:125). Though Paul is "… already being poured out like a drink offering" (NIV 2 Timothy 4:6), the church could have supreme confidence in the continuing leading of God in their lives because of the written word of God (3:16). His confidence stems from his belief in the fundamental connection of the Holy Spirit and the word of God. The notion of "God-breathed" includes the idea of the unity of work between the Spirit and the Scriptures. Frame continues:

> In Genesis 1:2, God's Spirit hovers over the waters as God prepares to create all things by this word. Psalm 33:6 couples God's 'word' and 'breath' as sources of creation. God's breath is his Spirit. (cf Isa. 34:16; 59:21) … in John 16:13, Jesus says that the Spirit will 'speak' to bring the disciples into all truth … Scripture also connects the written Word of God to the Spirit. Second Timothy 3:16 tells us that Scripture is *theopneustos*, 'God-breathed,' again invoking God's Spirit-breath as the source of the Word (Frame 2010:64–65).

Vanhoozer (1998) takes the importance of the connection between Spirit and Word even further, holding that the connection is the essential principle of Protestantism. He looks to Ramm's description of fundamentalism as an abbreviated Protestant principle, because it "… attends to the Word and relegates the Spirit to the theological and hermeneutical margins" (1998:426). His contention is that the basic and unabridged Protestant position is one of assuming that "God, speaking in and through Scripture, interprets Scripture … the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of understanding – the Spirit of the letter correctly understood – not a rival author" (1998:426). Vanhoozer stands against any hermeneutic fostering a dualism of Word and Spirit. He writes, "The Spirit is neither a

supplement nor a second source to the Word in Scripture" (1998:426). I believe that Kraft over-emphasizes the notion of dynamic equivalence, creating a danger of imbalance on the other side of the spectrum from fundamentalism. He does so by not holding to a sufficient and unique unity between the Holy Spirit and the Scriptures. Dynamic equivalence does not hold to a sufficient unity because the process of actualization requires two components as clearly distinguished as separate cans that form epoxy glue. Kraft's model broadens the range of special revelation (1979a:220), and his anthropological concept of essential neutrality allows for the possibility of non-Christian religious quests functioning as legitimate sources of general revelation (1979a:218). In that way the Spirit's speaking in the Scripture is not unique. The DEM becomes another abridged Protestant principle by distinguishing between the text of Scripture and actual revelation. Kraft's model attends to the Spirit and relegates the Word to re-personalizing margins.

Reflection on the Lord Jesus' teaching on the nature of the word of God brings the issue into sharper focus. John 6:63 states, "The Spirit gives life; the flesh counts for nothing. The words I have spoken to you – they are full of the Spirit and Life" (NIV). Commenting on John 6:63, Kostenberger (2004) writes, "Both OT and NT view God's word as fully efficacious. Here it is stated that it is *Jesus'* words (*rhemata)* that are spirit and life" (2004:219). By italicizing "Jesus'" in the quotation, he highlights the two basic points I make about the text of Scripture. First, the Bible, understood as God's word, carries necessarily the efficacious power of the Holy Spirit. Kraft's dynamic equivalence assumes a latency that fits neither with the teachings of the apostles, as seen in 2 Timothy 3:16 and Hebrews 4:12, nor with the words of Jesus. Approaching the Scripture as if there are times where a great distance remains between it and the Holy Spirit, as actualization/repersonalization requires, forces a distance between text and Spirit during the human hermeneutical event that the Scriptures do not recognize. The assumption of the Bible is that the Holy Spirit is present at the reading. Following the same idea as Kostenberger, Vanhoozer (1998) says that Biblical efficacy properly understood includes the Spirit's superintendence of both perlocutionary effect and illocutionary force of the word (1998:427). He states, "On the level of meaning, then, the Spirit renders the Word efficacious, by impressing upon us the full force of its communicative action, its

illocution … the Spirit enables understanding" (1998:427). The Lordship of Christ is realized when the Spirit brings understanding to humanity through the reading of Scripture; when humanity listens to the Scripture and hears the words of God. Vanhoozer does not imply that interpretation is simplistic, having no difficulties. Indeed, interpretation can be distorted by prejudices and ideologies. However, such distortion earns recompense from God (Hebrews 4:12) precisely because interpretation occurs when "… the message has been grasped, however dimly, and then let go" (Vanhoozer 1998:427). His point is that an *a priori* assumption that the Spirit and the Word operate with significant distance, as in the actualization process of the DEM and the CQH require, runs contrary to the assumptions of the Scripture.

Kostenberger (2004) also points out that zeal in studying Scripture alone is misguided. Harkening to the Word means "… an understanding of Scripture's true (Christological) orientation and purpose. Not merely are individual sayings of Scripture fulfilled in Jesus; Scripture in its entirety is oriented towards him" (2004:193). Scripture must be listened to and obeyed because it is Christ's word. In that sense, its power and authority are derived. However, to hold to Kostenberger's characterization of Scriptural authority as derived apart from an intrinsic connection between Spirit and Word is mistaken.

Chapter 5 follows this chapter by examining five field models used by Evangelicals for encounter with Muslims that employ the CQH. To the extent that these models read Biblical meaning into the words of the Qur'an they substitute the Qur'an in place of the Bible as the Spirit's unique word for gospel proclamation.

Chapter 5

The Christian Qur'anic hermeneutic in recent Evangelical mission

Chapter 4 concludes with the assertion that the CQH requires an unbiblical distinction between the Spirit and the Word. Such a distinction compromises the Lordship of Christ through a blurring of Scripture's unique authority. This chapter considers the application of the CQH of the DEM to Evangelical ministry methods. My investigation helps to call attention to the prominence of the CQH in Evangelical encounter with Muslims, as well as provide depth of analysis for determining how deeply the CQH influences each method. Five ministry methods are considered, as well as potential objections to my conclusions.

5.1. Objectives and parameters for analysis

Whereas chapters 3 and 4 are concerned primarily with the theory of the DEM and the CQH, the following examinations of the methods display how the compromise occurs. I also seek to determine the corresponding effect upon the ministry methods and models.

5.1.1. Objectives in analyzing the five methods

I provide a qualitative examination for each of the five methods. All the methods employ the CQH to a greater or lesser extent.

5.1.2. Parameters for analysis of the five methods

A brief summary is given for each method, which includes exploring its style, methodology, and purpose. Style includes its basic structure, that is, conversational/relational versus a content driven approach. Methodology refers to whether the method is especially complicated and difficult for audiences, or if it maintains a simple approach for encounter. Purpose is the goal of the method and helps to determine the desired outcome of the method for encounter.

After the brief summary, each method is examined to determine what place the Qur'an occupies in its presentation. Some methods work to maintain a closer connection

with the text of the Bible than others, relying less on the Qur'an. Others set forth the appearance of the Muslim holy book becoming a functional equivalent to the Christian Scripture, working deep within the CQH of the DEM.

The next point of inquiry is the role the Bible plays in each method. I seek to determine if the goal of the presentation is the establishment of Biblical authority, or a reinterpretation of the Qur'an's authority through the CQH. My investigation hopes to learn whether each method views the Qur'an as sufficiently similar to the Bible, or if it introduces a new and outside authority. Having concluded this line of questioning, I identify the intended product of each method, where the line of authority lies, and the apparent understanding of the gospel.

The final point of examination is how deeply each method penetrates and interacts with the mind and heart of Muslims. Most of the methods are the result of ministry in parts of the world filled with a vast array of religious alternatives and ideologies. Any method that approaches the faith of Muslim people as if it is monolithic has little enduring value. Nevertheless, as Islam exists in areas of immense diversity, culture, and socio-economic conditions it insists tenaciously that the finality of the Prophet and the Qur'an should be the common link among all people. As Esack (1997:55), a South African Muslim seeking to reconcile the Qur'an and pluralism states, the correct understanding of revelation is that succeeding generations and prophets reshape and reconstitute the message of the previous prophet. Many adaptations can and are made in the house of Islam as it finds itself throughout the world. However, Esack (1997:57) maintains that the foundation of faith for all Muslims is the finality of Prophet and Qur'an, because the most basic type of reshaping or abrogation he mentions is Qur'anic abrogation of other Scriptures. I examine each method in the light of the author himself, and his attempt at encounter with Muslims in such a context of finality.

5.2. Analysis of Fuad Accad's *Building bridges*

Accad was born in Lebanon and devoted his life to ministry to Muslims there, and other parts of the Middle East. He was an early proponent for the CQH, bringing his method of the Seven Christian-Muslim principles to NACOME (McCurry 1979). Evangelicals began considering the CQH at Glen Eyrie, but Accad was already an experienced

practitioner. Accad is important also because, though not culturally a Muslim at birth, he was a native Middle Easterner. In that way his approach brings a non-Western perspective to my examination.

5.2.1. Summary of *Building bridges*

Building bridges (Accad1997) has seven basic points comprising its approach to encounter with Muslims. The first principle is that "God has a purpose for our lives" (1997:77). He summarizes, "The Creator loves us and wants to enrich us by having a close relationship with us" (1997:78). Accad advocates a notion of dynamic equivalence between the Qur'anic and Biblical doctrines of humanity's creation and the entrance of sin. For example, he holds the Islamic title for humanity, *khalifah*, in Surah The Heifer 2:30–39 as roughly equivalent to the Biblical teaching on the image of God in Genesis 1:26–31 (1997:79). Accad deems the Qur'anic and Biblical teachings also to be sufficiently similar on how the Creator cares for sinful humanity and desires to have close fellowship with them (1997:80–81). I do not deny any notion of resemblance between the two books. Instead, my objection is to his employment of the CQH and his unqualified identification of foundational teachings between Bible and Qur'an.

The second principle of *Building bridges* is that sin separates humanity from God (Accad 1997:83). Accad quotes Surah The Heifer 2:81 that states: "Nay, those who seek gain in Evil, and are girt round by their sins- they are companions of the Fire: therein shall they abide (for ever)." He recognizes similarity between the ayat and Romans 6:23, quoting it as follows: "The wages of sin is death …" (1997:84). The lack of clarity with the CQH is seen clearly because he neglects to finish the Biblical sentence from Romans 6:23, which declares that "… the free gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ *our Lord"* (emphasis mine; ESV). No Muslim could accept the teaching of Paul that Christ is Lord, and segregating his concept of sin from his faith in the person of Christ at that point in the outline of Romans is irresponsible. His adamancy in dynamically equivocating between Bible and Qur'an on the topic of sin is ironic, because Woodberry concludes a lengthy study on the same issue by stating that the New Testament provides details lacking in the Qur'an (1989b:155–157). Likening the two sources is not as simple as Accad (1997) claims.

Principle three states: "We can't save ourselves" (Accad 1997:91). Support for the principle includes a quotation of Surah The Believers 23:109, which says, "A part of My servants there was, who used to pray: 'Our Lord! We believe; then do Thou forgive us, and have mercy upon us: for Thou art the Best of those who show mercy.'" Accad summarizes by stating that true believers are the ones understanding that "… they must throw themselves on the mercy of God because their own deeds are not enough" (1997:95). I think it sufficient to comment that such a Qur'anic reference does not justify Accad's holding to strong resemblance between the Qur'an's doctrine of forgiveness and the Biblical teaching on justification by grace.

The fourth basic point from *Building bridges* is that "the Cross is the bridge to life," or that God has provided a solution to our dilemma (Accad 1997:97). In this principle Accad attempts to communicate the idea of substitutionary atonement or ransomed redemption. It is one of the strongest sections of the book. Wisely, he emphasizes the use of stories to communicate difficult or new concepts. For example, he tells the story of a judge emotionally burdened by the responsibility to declare a captured thief he loves as guilty. The judge resolves the difficulty by repaying the money that the guilty man had stolen (1997:99).

Principle five makes the case that "God's provision is a person" (Accad 1997:110). His emphasis is that God's solution for sin "… is not just the Cross but a divine Person, Jesus Christ, who was anointed and aided by the Holy Spirit" (1997:110). This quote is important because Accad sees it as the common denominator between Biblical and Qur'anic content concerning Christ as the Word of God, and how Christ relates to the Holy Spirit. In this section, he deals with difficulties in communicating the Christian gospel to people of Muslim faith. On the topic of how to present the divinity of Christ to Muslims, he suggests that the practitioner should focus on examples from the Qur'an that give a high status to Christ (1997:112–113). Concerning the specific topic of Christ as the Son of God, Accad recommends advocating for a spiritual understanding of Christ, rather than a physical or symbolic sonship (1997:115–116). He writes,

> Jesus is God's Word from God and that He is also a Spirit from God. God is Spirit, and one who comes from – is 'born of' – His Spirit is indeed Spirit … The following passages from the Bible and the Qur'an indicate that God indeed had a Son, and the underscore the relationship between them (Accad 1997:116).

Among the Biblical verses he quotes is Romans 1:3–4 which states, "… concerning his Son, who was descended from David according to the flesh, and was declared to be the Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord" (ESV). He provides several examples from the Qur'an that he believes concur that God had a Son who was unique among the prophets because of the miraculous work he performed, the way the Holy Spirit was in His life, and the events surrounding the end of His earthly life (Accad 1997:117–120).

The sixth principle is called "Making Him ours," and is summarized in the following declaration: "We must invite Christ, our substitute, to live in our hearts and be the master of our lives" (Accad 1997:124). After quoting from Bible and Qur'an, Accad declares the two sources agree that God guides the repentant to receiving by faith Christ as Savior, Redeemer, and Mediator (1997:125). He interjects Biblical meaning into Qur'anic data further in the latter section of his explanation of the six principles. He lists a quotation from Romans 10:10, which states, "For with the heart one believes and is justified, and with the mouth one confesses and is saved" (ESV). Next, he references Surah The Pleading 58:22, which says, "For such He has written Faith in their hearts, and strengthened them with a spirit from Himself." Accad concludes,

> God is the only one who gives faith. If He doesn't we will never have it. The Qur'an does not even mention good works here. When a man receives Christ in faith, God puts the Holy Spirit in him. That is the meaning of 'He has confirmed them with a Spirit from Himself (1997:127).

In his reasoning, the meaning from Romans 10:10 is critical to unlocking the proper understanding of Surah The Pleading 58:22.

Accad's (1997) seventh principle concerns "What to expect when we accept God's gift" (1997:130). His summary for the final principle of his method reads: "When we accept Christ, we receive forgiveness for our sins, a personal relationship with God, peace in our hearts, and a complete change in our lives (1997:130). He gives a section on having assurance of forgiveness of sins, and uses on Biblical references. Accad's reading of Biblical faith into the Qur'an denies the traditional Islamic notion of the human predicament and responsibility. As Akhtar (1991) writes, "… apart from martyrs for the cause of Islam … all other men must wait their turn as their deeds are weighed and

assessed in the balance" (1991:6). I have heard similar statements from hundreds of Muslims when I encounter them in ministry. Differences of degree for punishment of sin and forgiveness from Allah are common in Islam, but Akhtar's basic summary I have found accurate. Reading Biblical faith in Christ alone into the Qur'an stretches the range of meaning for the Qur'an far beyond its immediate teaching or interpretation by Muslims.

In true Evangelical fashion, Accad (1997) suggests practitioners of his method to call for a prayer for salvation, of which he provides a sample (1997:132–133). The suggested prayer completed, he states that the time has come for the audience to use less Qur'anic material and spend more time with the Christian Scriptures. Accad writes how the Qur'an "… has served its purpose as a bridge to the truth" (1997:133). The final section on principle seven concerns how one is to strengthen his or her relationship with God. It is puzzling that this section, comprising half the chapter, would contain only references from the Qur'an (1997:134–137).

The style of *Building bridges* (1997) is largely relational and conversational. Accad writes that the "… principles are not to be used like a tract, but learned and personalized before sharing with a Muslim friend" (1997:71). Further, he intends that the principles be shared over time as friendship develops and deepens (1997:72). Though there are seven principles, which could take months to complete, Accad's method is simple. A gentle and friendly tone is complemented by use of varying communicative techniques, including stories, varying quotations, mention of material familiar to the audience, and provocative new ideas. In my opinion, *Building bridges* (1997) has the best balance between relational and content aspects of any of the methods I review, as well as a winsome style for encounter with Muslims. Accad is to be commended in that regard.

The simplicity of Accad's (1997) method extends from his goal, which is to expose Muslims to the Word of God (1997:74). However, he qualifies the purpose of his book by insisting its aim is not to stress that the Bible is the Word of God and the Qur'an is not (1997:75). He believes that faith in the efficacy of the Bible as God's Word means allowing it time to work in the hearts and minds of Muslims. Accad asserts, "… eventually it will all become clear" (1997:75), and claims that over eighty percent of Muslims who complete the study "… come to put their trust in Christ – when the

Christian who shares the principles does so in a way that is personally and culturally sensitive" (1997:71).

5.2.2. The role of the Qur'an in *Building bridges*

Accad (1997) states that the role of the Qur'an in *Building bridges* is to expose Muslims friends to the Word of God (1997:74). He expands this notion, making truth in the Qur'an analogous to the frame of a burned building (1997:102). The existing religious framework is not set aside, but preserved in some regard. In his words, "… the frame of truth is still there, but so much of it has been destroyed. You have to build it back up stone by stone by planting these seeds thoughts of truth in his mind" (1997:102). Portions of the Qur'an deemed dynamically equivalent with the Scripture are preserved as components of the gospel.

In order to find success in communicating his fourth principle concerning the Crucifixion, Accad (1997) encourages use of stories. He testifies that following satisfactory narrative presentation, "… the Cross will begin to be far more logical, necessary, and appealing as a concept. The following verses from the Bible and the Qur'an further document that God should be trusted to provide man's ransom from his sin" (1997:99). The first sentence of this quote is quite helpful, pointing out ways that many Western practitioners might not consider to drive home difficult ideas as they encounter Muslims. The second part of the quote shows again the CQH, how the Biblical notion of atonement is read into the words of the Qur'an. The important consideration here is the difference between using narrative to reshape the concept of ransom away from traditional notions in the Qur'an, and using Biblical content to reshape the meaning of Qur'anic passages away from how they would be understood otherwise. The CQH is prominent in his quotation and commentary on Surah The Heifer 2:38, which states "there comes to you guidance from Me, whosoever follows My guidance, on them shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve," and Surah The Women 4:110, where is written "If anyone does evil or wrongs his own soul, but afterwards seeks Allah's forgiveness, he will find Allah Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful." Accad (1997) concludes from the two Qur'anic references that Adam and Eve had sufficient guidance offered to them from God when they sinned. "The Lord Himself was their salvation. They couldn't depend on

their own works … People often believe that their good deeds must outweigh their bad deeds to win God's favor and to go to heaven. This verse says that they must repent and ask for God's forgiveness of their bad deeds" (1997:103). I agree that the Muslim holy book contains a theme of forgiveness of sin. However, it is presumptuous to teach Muslim friends that the meaning of these ayats is equivalent to the Protestant Biblical doctrine of salvation by faith alone.

Accad goes so far as to claim that Islam contains a strong notion of original sin, referencing Surah The Heifer 2:36 and Surah The Heights 7:22–23. Accad summarizes the references, claiming the meaning to be that "… we are sinners and that if God does not forgive us and save us, we are lost." Again, I am not denying that transgression, a type of forgiveness, and condemnation are not to be found in the Qur'an. I am denying that such quick wholesale equivalence can be established by pointing out shared topics that Bible and Qur'an deal with. Further, I feel that Accad is worthy of commendation in that he is consistent to his interpretive base, the CQH. If there is dynamic equivalence between Islamic and Biblical culture and background, as Kraft claims (1974:137–144), then it is natural to begin making links between the two in the source materials.

At this point I hope to make an important qualification in my argument against Evangelical employment of the CQH for encounter with Muslims. I do not mean to indicate that methods that contain the CQH are harmful altogether or accomplish nothing positive. As my examinations in this chapter unfold, I show that often there are helpful and usable elements in the methods. Difficulty arises in the methods to the extent that the CQH is present, and in the degree to which central and enduring truths are interpreted through it. As referenced above, *Building bridges* (Accad 1997) uses the CQH at points central to the Christian faith: such as the Crucifixion (1997:97–99), the person of Christ (1997:116–120), and the nature of appropriate Biblical faith (1997:124–127). If deep overlap exists at points central to Christian doctrine and life, then it would be difficult for the audience to depart from some level of dependence upon the Qur'an.

5.2.3. The role of the Bible in *Building bridges*

Though Accad's (1997) general purpose is to expose Muslims to the word of God (1997:74), each of his seven principles are implemented with an understanding that that

there is little need to "… stress that only the Bible is the Word of God and that the Qur'an is not" (1997:75). He builds his method consciously on the concept of dynamic equivalence between Bible and Qur'an. The meaning of the Christian Scriptures read through the words of the Qur'an reveals essential agreement in the details of the Lord Christ's death, burial, and resurrection (1997:119), and the doctrine of Christ as Son of God (1997:115–116). The role of the Bible is to provide the basis for understanding the real meaning of the Qur'an. The Scriptures contain needed context for revealing the truth of the Qur'an.

Concerning the native view of Islam for Muhammad's place in prophetic history, MacDonald (1911), whose approach is built upon common truth between Christianity and Islam, writes,

> Muhammad saw himself setting up a philosophy of the history of revelation, with the Islamic view as the reality of what occurred in the history of the Jewish prophets, or the Messiah, and through the New Testament. The view holds that time and time again men fell from the pristine, Islamic faith. Each time God sent prophets to call them back. The final and greatest such prophet is Muhammad (1911:216).

The writers of the imperial period, such as Tisdall (1904:33) and Muir (1896:69) often sought to lead Muslims to consider the claims of the Bible by referencing Qur'anic passages that refer to continuity with the Scripture. Unlike Accad and others using the CQH, they did not rewrite the notion of continuity in the minds of Muslims by reading Biblical meaning into the Qur'an. Though they consistently claim that the Qur'an calls for a reading of the Old and New Testaments, Tisdall, Muir, and others do not invert the Muslim view of the history of revelation and manufacture a new context in which to read the Qur'an, one where its meaning for critical passages is derived from the Bible. Despite the presence of the imperialistic mind I write about in chapter 2, the imperial period methods maintain that the Bible alone contains an enduring truth basis for encounter with Muslim people.

5.2.4. Depth of interaction with the Muslim mind

Building bridges seeks to deal with issues and themes relevant to Muslims worldwide. Topics such as God's purpose for humanity and sin are interesting and easy to follow.

Themes unique to the gospel, such as the crucifixion, are presented in an appealing manner and wittingly avoid unnecessary conflict. Coupled with a friendly tone, these qualities work together to prevent Accad's (1997) method from being seemingly overly general or monolithic.

Accad's (1997) outline focuses on influencing the Muslim audience to adopt his Christian reading of the Qur'an. In that way he interacts deeply with the mind of Muslims, perhaps without his intentions being apparent immediately. The position of the Qur'an as final in the abrogation process (Esack 1997:57) over the Bible is contorted. It should be admitted that such inversion is not unique to *Building bridges*, but the common denominator in the CQH.

5.3. Analysis of *The Qur'an's testimony*

The Qur'an's testimony (QT:1997) is a booklet about one hundred ten pages in length, and written by a Westerner for use in encounter with a large South Asian Muslim people group. Though publishing and distribution began in 1997, it is still circulated today. The author (I know the author personally, and for security purposes do not cite his name directly) does not print his name in the booklet, but is one of the more respected voices in Muslim contextualization discussions among Evangelicals. I have spoken with him on numerous occasions.

5.3.1. Summary of *The Qur'an's testimony*

QT (1997) is organized as a workbook comprised of eight lessons. For each lesson, readers are to comment on the meaning of referenced Qur'anic passages. Often Biblical passages are included for commentary. In each section the reader is asked to state his or her own ideas for the referenced material (1997:1). Some lessons focus on essential agreement between Qur'an and Bible on particular topics. Others imply a difference in position between the two books.

The style of QT (1997) is highly literate and content driven. It assumes that the reader is able to not only read the given passages, but also compare and contrast the meanings at a fairly high level. Such a style limits the number of its audience and potential for wide application. However, every practitioner must have both a starting

156

point and a target. Beginning with literate people in encounter is not a dead end, for it gives needed perimeters for ministry and relationship initiation. Effective ministry to a literate cross section of a given people group could be helpful because of the importance of Biblical teaching to the intended result of encounter with Muslims, a new community of believers in Christ as resurrected Lord.

The methodology of QT (1997) is similar to its style. It does not have the simple and applicable approach of *Building bridges* (1997), and would not do well with a larger audience. If attention is given to meeting, engaging, and producing leaders/facilitators of new communities with the initial literate contact, then the limitations of its style and methodology are greatly lessened. I believe QT's (1997) usefulness is proportionate to its place within a greater strategy for encounter with Muslims.

The purpose of QT (1997) is "… to take readers into the Qur'an to see for themselves what it says" for each subject (1997:1). The author concludes his book by expressing his hope that the reader would read the Qur'an in its entirety, comparing it to the Bible at crucial points (1997:107). The importance of the CQH for the author of QT (1997) during encounter with Muslims is highlighted in the references above.

The topics covered in QT (1997) include the Qur'an's witness concerning: other Scriptures (holy books), Prophets and sin, the Prophet Muhammad and his work, Jesus Christ, the disciples of Jesus, the sovereignty of God, fighting and warfare, and various subjects. In the first section on Scripture outside the Qur'an, effort is exerted to show how the Muslim holy book advocates that the Injeel, like the Torah, was revealed by Allah and is unchangeable. The end of the chapter focuses on the Qur'an's role of confirming the Bible. Drawing off references from Surah The Heifer 2:53 and Surah The Prophets 21:48, the Arabic descriptive title for the Torah as *furkan* is transliterated. "The word *furkan* in Arabic means separation or proof. As used in the Qur'an, it probably means the discriminations between true and false" (1997:18). In other words, a portion of the root of the message of the Qur'an is found in the Torah and Injeel.

The second lesson in QT (1997) covers the Qur'ans testimony concerning Prophets and Sin. In this section he covers the lives, ministries, and significance of Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jonah, David, Solomon, Muhammad, and Jesus. Portions for each prophet include references from the Qur'an and the Bible, with the exception

being no Biblical reference for Muhammad. He carefully points out that the Qur'an never mentions need of repentance for *Isa Masi* (1997:30–31). Concerning prophets other than *Isa Masi,* the chapter exhorts, "The fact that the prophets were men who underwent the same temptations and testing as we does not diminish their importance to us, nor the respect they deserve … because they endured … they provide us with a tremendous example" (1997:33–34). The conclusion is that the audience should learn to live their "… lives in such a close relationship to Allah that any sin we commit is quickly recognized for what it is and repented of" (1997:34). It is important to see that no qualification is given for the prophetic office of Muhammad within the flow of Biblical history. He is absorbed into the line of revelational history, despite post-dating the Lord Jesus Christ.

The office and work of Muhammad as prophet is covered in the third section. QT (1997) emphasizes that Muhammad fulfills the offices of *Rasul* (1997:35) and warner (1997:37). Quoting Surah Fussilat 41:43, which states, "Nothing is said to thee that was not said to the messengers before thee: that thy lord has at His Command (all) Forgiveness as well as a most grievous Penalty." The author highlights that Muhammad came in the Islamic tradition not as anything new or unique (1997:38). Yet, instead of interpreting this alongside the Islamic notion of finality in the prophetic office of Muhammad within prophetic history (Esack 1997:55–57, MacDonald 1911:216), he assigns a dynamic equivalence between the two religious sources at these points. In the case of Muhammad, he implies that the Qur'an assigns a sufficiently similar meaning for the Islamic office of Rasul and the Biblical office of prophet. Insisting that the Muslim prophet is human, limited, even sinful, is merely a perfunctory move towards leveling the effect of including Muhammad in legitimate revelational history. In the Muslim mind the issue is a minor one. As Esack (1997:57) insists, the primary concern is finality. Within the idea of being the final prophet is that the Muhammadian/Qur'anic view of revelational history is the correct and binding one. It is not of insurmountable significance that Muhammad himself is not the way, or if Muslims are required by their holy book to consider the Christian Scriptures. The net result remains the same because the Qur'anic understanding of human history and destiny is the determinate word.

The fourth lesson in QT (1997) is on Jesus Christ; the titles given to him, his birth, his life, and the honor paid to him in the Qur'an (1997:46). Dynamically equivalent

links for the meanings of key titles found in the Qur'an and Bible that are assumed include: Messiah, Savior, even the Spirit of Allah (1997:46–49). For example, QT (1997) claims that Surah The Women 4:171 is mirrored by John 1:1, both passages holding up Jesus as the Word of God. On the same DEM basis, the work and miracles of Jesus Christ are summarized as bringing or being mercy from Allah to humanity (1997:50–55). Surah Mary 19:21, where *Isa* Masi is called a mercy from Allah, is dynamically equated with the Biblical injunction from John 1:17 that "… the law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ" (ESV). The author sees agreement between the Bible and Qur'an that Jesus Christ is holy and worthy of honor (1997:57–58). Perhaps the greatest license is taken at this point, where the Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:42 title for *Isa Masi* as one of the exalted is portrayed as dynamically equivalent to the exaltation the apostle Paul mentions in Philippians 2:9–11.

By pointing out such dynamic equivalence I do not mean to insinuate that the Qur'an does not assign a holy and miraculous character to *Isa Masi*. On the contrary, almost any Muslim, when questioned about him, will confess quickly a high regard for him. However, the meaning of holy to describe the person of Jesus Christ in Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:36 is not similar to the meaning Peter assigns to the Lord in John 6:69, which reads, "Lord, to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life, and we have believed, and have come to know, that you are the Holy One of God" (ESV).

Lessons five, six, and seven pertain to the Qur'anic testimony about the disciples of Christ, its witness concerning the sovereignty of God, and the Islamic notion of jihad. As a whole, these sections are not as close to my central topic, the CQH in current Evangelical methods for encounter with Muslims. One interesting observation should be made, particularly on the subject of the Sovereignty of God. In lessons concerning the proximity of Biblical truth and the person of Christ to the testimony of the Qur'an QT (1997) postures itself to maximize interpretive data towards similarity. However, on the issue of the sovereignty of God QT (1997) orients itself towards dissimilarity. The Qur'anic assertion, found in Surah The Prostration 32:13, that God "… causes some men to come to faith, and some to turn away in disbelief" (1997:72) is deemed unacceptable. Contrary to that view, QT (1997) depicts the Biblical God as desiring repentance for all

humanity, based upon Romans 5:8, I John 4:7–12, Ezekiel 33:11, and Matthew 3:1–2 (1997:79). The author (QT 1997) writes,

> Allah loves all men, even the disobedient sinner. It is therefore Allah's will that all men should turn to Him in humble repentance and faith. However, while that is Allah's desire, He does not force men to do so. He respects their freewill and allows them to make the decision themselves whether to turn to Allah or continue in disobedience (1997:79–80).

My aim in including this quotation is not to advocate one view of the sovereignty of God over another. Instead, I point out how QT (1997) ignores a potential point for dynamic equivalence between Biblical and Qur'anic passages on the issue. Romans 9:15–16 states, "For he says to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion. So then it depends not on human will or exertion, but on God, who has mercy" (ESV). Similarly, Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:129 includes, "He forgives whom He will, and punishes whom He will." Incoherence is present in the QT interpretation of the Qur'an.

After several quotations on Jihad from the Qur'an, the author (QT 1997) makes important assertions about how the Qur'an and Bible should be interpreted together on the issue. "With the coming of Jesus the Messiah and Allah's sending of His Holy Spirit into men's hearts the religious focus shifted from the external to the internal" (1997:89). At this point the CQH is readily apparent. Next, he links together Biblical and Qur'anic "ways to deal with evil doers" (1997:93). Then, he asks the readers,

> What do you think might be the reason why we do not find the command to love our enemies in the Qur'an or the Torah, but only in the Injeel Shorif? Consider who sent the Holy Spirit into his disciples' lives? John 16:5–15. Consider also the title for Jesus in the Qur'an – the Spirit of Allah (1997:95).

In the overall movement of his commentary on Jihad, there seems to be an unspoken push to sever gradually the Muslim away from injudicious acceptance of the Qur'an. However, the bedrock of his position, a CQH view of Christ in the Qur'an, is present at the same time as the push. It is difficult to predict which supposition the Muslim reader will allow to have first place. It could be reading Biblical meaning into the Qur'anic words concerning Christ, or the casual aversion for the Qur'anic notion of jihad.

The final lesson deals with various issues in relating the Qur'an and Bible. Most importantly, he asserts that Surah Mary 19:15, 33 teaches that the core of the gospel is to

be found in the Qur'an. The quotation "… would seem to support the fact that Jesus did, in fact, die and was raised to life. The verses are admittedly not to clear. However, considering that clear teaching of the Injeel on this point, it would seem the most likely interpretation" (QT 1997:104). This is the clearest statement in the book of the CQH, and is opposed diametrically to the view of revelation history of Esack (1997:57).

5.3.2. The role of the Qur'an in *The Qur'an's testimony*

QT (1997:14–16) teaches that the Qur'an relates to the *Injeel*, and subsequently the entire Bible, in the same way that the *Injeel* relates to the *Taurat.* Its purpose is one of confirmation. I could argue that confirmation is only one part of the function of the New Testament towards the Old Testament, for it also completes and helps interpret the Old Testament. The best way to ascertain of the role of the Qur'an in QT (1997) may be to examine the limitations the booklet itself points out. When building the case for the freewill of humanity made in God's image (1997:78–79) the focus is exclusively on the Bible. In other words, the Qur'an confirms the message of the Bible in areas related to Christ, but not in moral/ethical situations. It could be that QT (1997) means to imply a progressive shift away from dependence on the Qur'an in favor of the Bible. The difficulty with such a move is that foundational teaching, namely the gospel, is found in the Muslim book.

5.3.3. The role of the Bible in *The Qur'an's testimony*

QT (1997) is consistent in its insistence that the purpose of the Bible is to aid in proper reading of the Qur'an. The insistence can be seen in its carrying over the Biblical notion of Christ as Savior from the Bible to the Qur'an (1997:47), the dynamic equivalence of teaching on Christ as the Word of God in John 1:1,14 and Surah The Women 4:171 (1997:48), and an essential equivocation of the miracles from the Old Testament to those in the Qur'an (1997:54). The role of the Bible in QT (1997) is to give the true context in which to read the Qur'an. Lessons on sovereignty and jihad seem to indicate an authorial belief that the Bible may not agree with the Qur'an in every situation.

5.3.4. Depth of interaction with the Muslim mind

Despite being a Westerner, the author of QT (1997) does take a more holistic approach than Accad in *Building bridges.* He allows the Qur'an to speak over more issues than merely those surrounding a gospel presentation. His discussion of *jihad* shows that he allows more room for Islamic notions to introduce issues upon which lessons are based. He does not deal adequately with the issue of finality in historical revelation or abrogation, the central issue of concern when bringing together Bible and Qur'an.

5.4. Analysis of *The camel*

Greeson (2007), and his method for approaching Evangelical encounter with Muslims, is well known in the Evangelical world. He was not the earliest Evangelical to adopt using the Qur'an to reach out to Muslims, but is one of the most widely recognized practitioners of such attempts. Many workers influenced by the DEM and ministering among Muslims are secretive about their work, and reluctant to speak openly about what they do and how they operate. I know Greeson personally, having worked alongside him. He is an example of boldness and is an incessant worker. He is tireless in seeking to reach Muslims, and promotes constantly how other Christian and Evangelical workers should do the same. Greeson is ready always to offer assistance, experienced advice, and instruction to those willing to listen. *The camel* (Greeson 2007) has uncovered parts of how DEM/CQH influenced Evangelical workers operate that were not as well known before. It is written by Greeson, an American, but inspired, informed, and solidified with maximum input by Asians and former Muslims. His book and method are used in Africa, throughout South and Eastern Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America.

The style of *The camel* (Greeson 2007) is as helpful and flexible as any I examine here. The basic outline offered makes three simple assertions from the Qur'an designed to draw out those who are interested. It has a definite course on which to begin discussion with a Muslim friend, yet is not so complex that there remains little room for questions, personal additions, or adaptation. The methodology of Greeson's book is praiseworthy because in addition to the simple outline already mentioned, he provides an advanced outline for Muslim friends who are willing and able to go to a deeper level. He does a good job of introducing depth without creating a method that requires a worker to spend great amounts of time studying the Qur'an.

Greeson's method and work are both aimed at church planting movements, a term coined by Garrison (2004). He quotes Garrison's definition of a church planting movement as "… a rapid and exponential increase of indigenous churches planting churches within a given people group or population segment" (2007:9). *The camel* (Greeson 2007) connects the goal of producing a church planting movement with the process of locating a person of peace. Taken from Luke 10:1–20, the idea behind Greeson's use of person of peace is a man or woman on whom God's Spirit has already begun working. The person of peace will accept the message of the Gospel and assist in or facilitate the spread of the gospel according to the principles of a church planting movement (2007:35–40). The method Greeson lays out in his book constitutes his path to making a connection to the person of peace and drawing him or her towards faith in Christ.

5.4.1. Summary of *The camel*

The camel (Greeson 2007) method outline (basic version) centers on Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:42–55. It makes the following points concerning the Qur'anic passage: *Isa* is holy, *Isa* has power even over death, and *Isa* knows the way to heaven (2007:51). Greeson is adamant that the purpose of the outline is not "to lead a Muslim to Christ," but to use "Surah Al-Imran 3:42–55 in the Koran in an attempt to raise Jesus from 'Prophet' status closer to 'Savior' status" (2007:51). The motivation of employing the Qur'an in encounter with Muslims is to avoid the defensive posture Muslims take when approached with the Bible. Greeson advocates beginning with the Qur'an because: ministry should begin where the audience is at in their minds, using the Qur'an enables the MBB to relate to his family and friends and minimizes persecution, workers can use the Qur'an to lift the position of Jesus close to the Savior status, and because using the Qur'an allows one to go deep into Muslim communities (2007:48).

The first point says that *Isa* is holy (Greeson 2007:51), and is drawn from the latter part of Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:45–46, where it is written that *Isa* is "… a Word from Him … held in honour in this world and the Hereafter and of (the company of) those nearest to Allah … and he shall be (of the company of) the righteous." Greeson admits that he finds many points of "spiritual truth" in this ayat, including that *Isa* is the

Word of God, holy, and righteous (2007:62–65). In the advanced outline he advises asking the Muslims audience to think about and explain Allah's act of putting His Spirit inside of Mary. "Does this mean that Allah was inside of Maryam? This question helps Muslims understand that *Isa* and Allah are one" (1997:63). Other important questions posed include: "Do you know of any other prophet who did not have a father? and "Have you ever thought about the reason why Allah decided *Isa* was to be born without a father?" (1997:64). His employment of the CQH relative to the person of Christ is apparent, though less technical than the methods of Accad (1997) or QT (1997). Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:45–47 is taken to mean that *Isa* has "the same quality of holiness that Allah has" (Greeson 2007:58).

The second point in *The camel* (2007) outline says that *Isa* has power over death. Greeson's point is to show Muslims how *Isa*'s power acts to bring comfort to the world, and that his authority extends to cover humanity's greatest enemy, death. He offers the practitioner two questions to pose to Muslims. First, ask the Muslim friend, "Do you think that one of people's greatest fears is death?" (2007:59). Once the audience admits the great worry death brings to people the second question is offered. "Do you know of any other prophet who was given the power of death?" (2007:59). The second question brings the central point, that *Isa* has power over death, into focus.

In the advanced level section for the second point in *The camel* (2007) outline, Greeson expands the scope of his argument by means of the CQH. He points out the statement in Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:49, where *Isa* states, "I have come to you, with a Sign from you Lord, in that I make for you out of clay, as it were, the figure of a bird, and breathe into it, and it becomes a bird by Allah's leave … and I quicken the dead …" Greeson declares,

> Don't let the first miracle list in this ayat … slip by without making a quick comment. Even though we do not accept this story, we do like the Apostle Paul by using one of their stories to draw out a point. Direct them to see the likeness and unity of *Isa* and Allah … *Isa* had the same power to create life. He blew his "Ruh" (Spirit) into the clay and it came to life. This reaffirms that *Isa* is the Ruhuallah of Allah (2007:67).

Though Greeson recognizes the apocryphal origin of the reference to *Isa's* giving life to the bird in this ayat, he continues in his use of the CQH to underscore the notion of

dynamic equivalence between the Biblical teaching of the relationship of Christ and the Holy Spirit, and the "Ruhallah" notion of the Qur'an. He confesses, "this passage in the Koran floods my soul with hope" (2007:68).

The final point in *The camel* (Greeson 2007) outline teaches that *Isa* knows the way to heaven. Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:55 recalls Allah saying to *Isa,* "I will take thee and raise thee to Myself and clear thee (of the falsehoods) of those who blaspheme; I will make those who follow thee superior to those who reject faith, to the Day of Resurrection." Since *Isa* receives such a place by Allah, Greeson (2007) proclaims, then he is the prophet best suited to assist humanity to get to heaven (2007:65). He implies that this ayat supports Allah's causing *Isa* to die and be raised to life again (2007:69).

The third point is concluded with the following quotation: "… 'according to the ayats you've just read, is it true that *Isa* came down from heaven, lived a holy life, had power over death, then left the earth and went to be with Allah, and is in heaven today?' Maybe there is hope for us to get to heaven after all" (Greeson 2007:70).

5.4.2. The role of the Qur'an in *The camel*

Greeson asserts that the Qur'an does not support full Biblical teaching about the person of Christ, but holds that it does allow for a higher status than mere prophet. Therefore, not enough can be found in the surah and ayats mentioned to induce salvation, but there is sufficient knowledge present to build bridges and lift Christ from a mere prophetic status towards that of Savior (2007:51).

In chapter 4 I reference Greeson's statement on the nature of truth in the Qur'an. According to him, truth is no less true simply because it is found in the Qur'an, and the Muslim holy book is equal in truth to the Bible when it affirms that *Isa* was born of a virgin (2007:48). Truth in the Qur'an is mixed with error similar to counterfeit currency mixed with legitimate bills. "Muslims need help in distinguishing truth surrounding by errors" (2007:48). He also states that "… the Qur'an falls short of presenting the full gospel message … Allah's truth and roadmap to heaven is perfectly revealed in the 'Scriptures that came before the Koran'" (2007:75). Greeson's doctrine resembles the broken clock analogy of truth more than the careful reworking of history of revelation I pointed out in QT (1997). Kevin Greeson is thoughtful in his approach to encounter, but

driven by the pragmatic desire to locate a person of peace and move towards church planting movements. I believe that pragmatism, coupled with a drive to see Muslims accept the gospel and plant churches, prevents him from more through going application of the CQH.

5.4.3. The role of the Bible in *The camel*

A helpful section of *The camel* (Greeson 2007) makes use of the Islamic customs and teachings about Korbani sacrifice associated with Eid Al-Adha. During this festival Muslims sacrifice cattle, camels, and other animals to commemorate the sacrifice of Abraham's son. Just before slaughter, many traditions dictate that names are called of the family providing the sacrificial animals, sometimes even with a hand placed upon the head of the animal by a family member. Muslims see little meaning in the acts beyond commemoration, but some, including Greeson, use the custom to introduce the notion of blood atonement. I believe this illustration can be helpful, and do not intend to criticize it. However, Greeson (2007) makes an important statement in commenting on his use of this sacrifice. He says that his Biblical explanation reveals "… the true meaning behind the acts of korbani" (2007:107). The role of the Bible in *The camel* (2007) is to provide a test for the Qur'an to determine what truth is. This is not the same as Schlorff's (1980) second level hermeneutic for the Qur'an, which uses Qur'anic date to evidence historical facts (1980:144). Greeson (2007) describes his approach in similar ways, but his use of the Qur'an to communicate essential elements of the gospel (2007:65–69) is clearly within the scope of the CQH.

5.4.4. Depth of interaction with the Muslim mind

Greeson devotes a short section of *The camel* to what he calls "the big question" (2007:73–74). The focus is how to deal with the delicate issue of prophethood and Muhammad in the light of final judgment being reserved for the dictates of the Christian Scripture. Greeson should be commended for discussing explicitly what QT (1997) and *Building bridges* (1997) never deals with thoroughly and explicitly. His answer to "the big question" is to point out the limitations the Qur'an itself places on its prophet. In Surah Winding Sand-tracts 46:9, Allah speaks to Muhammad, saying "Say: 'I am no

bringer of newfangled doctrine among the Messengers, nor do I know what will be done with me or with you. I follow but that which is revealed to me by inspiration; I am but a Warner open and clear.'" Greeson (2007) points out that Muhammad is not given a distinguishing title or described as the greatest of the prophets. His lack of knowledge in human destiny is emphasized (2007:73). He also contrasts Muhammad's uncertain claims for his people with the assurance promised by the Lord Jesus Christ in John 6:47: "Truly, truly, I say to you, whoever believes has eternal life" (ESV). By emphasizing the limitations assigned to Muhammad in the Qur'an and introducing some contrast with the assurances given in the Bible, he increases the authority of the Bible beyond that of the Qur'an.

As Esack (1997:57) points out, the foremost issue in the mind of Muslims does not concern power, office, or position. Instead, the foremost concern in the Islamic mind is finality. Given the presentation outlined by *The camel* (2007), it could be that Muslim hearers take Greeson's meaning to be that Muhammad is a true prophet, but Jesus is savior. The assumption of most advocates of the CQH is that allegiance to Muhammad and Qur'an gradually decrease after conversion, and a corresponding increase in submission to Jesus and Bible will occur. However, the situation presented above does not develop in a cultural vacuum. Most Muslim contexts limit or may be provoked by these alterations to religious authority in the Muslim community. Having clarity on the lines of authority in relation to Muhammad and Qur'an are critical to the life of an MBB, because familial, economic, and social relationships are put out of balance by a disturbance in the convert's new identity. If alterations are introduced to a significant or foundational area, then the whole of life and thought are changed. This insight is critical when dealing with issues such as the status of the Islamic Prophet, and the finality of the Qur'an. As we see with the examination of the next Evangelical method, WHLQ (2008), the MBB must have certainty in personal and group identities. Such clarity of personal identity begins with having a clear understanding of the value and authority of the Bible and the Qur'an. *The camel* (Greeson 2007) does more to provide assurance in these areas than some other methods, but, hindered by gospel content rooted in the Qur'an, cannot pass a definitive judgment for or against the enduring value of the Muslim holy book.

5.5. Analysis of *The way to heaven through the light of the Qur'an*

My examination shows how WHLQ (2008) to be the most thoroughgoing method in application of the CQH. Therefore, my critique of WHLQ (2008) is severe. It is helpful to note that I have known the author personally, spent time in ministry with him, had him as a guest in my home, have been a guest in his home, and have observed his life for over a decade. I consider Rev Baroi to be worthy of immense respect. He has as much integrity and honesty as anyone I have known in my ministry. He is an example of boldness in encounter with Muslim people. For years on Christmas day he attempted to visit the Prime Minister of his Muslim country, hoping to give a Bible as a gift. After several years of denial, he was awarded a short time with the head of state, and testified about the Lord Jesus Christ. It is my hope that my disagreements with the approach to interpreting the Qur'an found in WHLQ (2008) do not overshadow my deep regard for its author as a person, friend, and follower of the Lord Christ. He and I have discussed these issues many times. Evaluating Baroi's method is crucial to my thesis because he is a mentor to Christian workers in India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Thailand, Malaysia, North Africa, and the Middle East. From my personal relationship with both authors I can say that much of the content of the fifth Appendix in Greeson's (2007) *The camel*, entitled "Notes from the best church planters" (2007:139–143), originates from his experience with Baroi.

5.5.1. Summary of *The way to heaven through the light of the Qur'an*

The style of WHLQ (2008) is very much content driven. It is organized more as a loose presentation or reference book for practitioners hoping to learn about effective experience in encounter with Muslims than a step-by-step presentation of the gospel. Baroi has trained thousands of people in his method. Because he emphasizes modeling and experiential learning, his attempts at training workers are successful. He attracts literate and highly motivated witnesses to learn his method. The style of WHLQ (2008) is not as helpful for the outside observer as it is for the trainee inside Baroi's network. The methodology for his book fits its target. Having a style befitting training Evangelical workers for encounter with Muslims, it delves deeply into the Qur'an, seeking to reform the connection between Bible and Qur'an. The stated purpose of WHLQ (2008) is to

present the light of the Qur'an to the world (2008:5). My examination shows that the light Baroi speaks of is the Qur'an's testimony to the gospel and faith in Jesus as Savior.

WHLQ (2008) has sixteen short chapters. I summarize its content based upon five of the most important sections, and supplement from other chapters. The first important section is about the purpose of the Qur'an. In a manner similar to QT (1997), Baroi (2008) lifts the importance of Surah The Table Spread 5:48, which describes the Qur'an's purpose as confirming or guarding over the Christian Scriptures (2008:13). Its purpose is to cast a vote in favor of or offer support for the message of the Bible. Further, Allah gave the Qur'an especially for the people of Arabia (2008:15).

The second important section, on the fear of Allah, is based upon Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:198, which states that "… for those who fear their Lord, are Gardens, with rivers flowing beneath; therein are they to dwell (for ever) – a gift from the Presence of Allah; and that which is in the Presence of Allah is the best (bliss) for the righteous." Baroi (2008) claims this ayat to be dynamically equivalent to Mark 12:30–31, then explains his claim with the following quote:

> the Jews follow the *Taurat, Zabur* (Psalms) and books of the Prophets; while Christians follow the *Taurat, Zabur*, the books of the Prophets, and the *Injeel*, which is called the Bible. Muslims claim that they follow the Qur'an. The fact is that the basic guidelines of all these separate paths are fundamentally the same (2008:19–20).

By this statement Baroi is not saying that the different religions affirm all the same teachings, but that there is a common direction to the differing paths. His conclusion for the section is that humanity should follow from the heart whichever of the paths he or she finds herself on (2008:21).

The third section I summarize concerns the teaching that all humanity is sinful. In Surah Bees 16:119 it is written that "… to those who do wrong in ignorance, but who thereafter repent and make amends – the Lord, after all this, is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful." Baroi comments that the Qur'an's testimony is that it is impossible for sinful humanity to enter heaven. Allah's standard is too high. "Only one sin can disqualify us from Paradise" (Baroi 2008:22). Based upon Surah The Originator 35: 18, Baroi argues that intercession in the Qur'an is limited to those who are without sin, thereby excluding all except *Isa* (2008:27). He continues to contend that Adam himself was a sinner, based

on Surah The Prophets 20:115) (2008:29). Drawing off Surah The Table Spread 5:30, Baroi asserts that Adam's corrupted nature was passed on to his offspring (29). "To become a sinner, it is not necessary to commit many sins; only one sin is enough for that. But if we desire to be with Allah in heaven, we must be 100% holy" (2008:30).

Woodberry (1989b) labors to establish a base for the DEM in the area of human sinfulness, but stops short describing the doctrine in the Qur'an and Christian Scripture as fundamentally equivalent (1989b:157). His chapter indicates that some basic notions of sin and its results are similar between the Bible and the Qur'an, but fundamental teachings, like the nature of humanity and the application of the law, are not equivalent. I do not take issue with Baroi (2008:21) for advocating a notion of human sinfulness in the Qur'an, or for seeking to expand its scope. I do think that it is a mistake to propose a simple similarity between Biblical and Qur'anic anthropology. Taking such a position requires introducing a foreign context onto the words of the Qur'an, and ignoring the traditional ways Muslims interpret their own holy book.

The fourth important section is about the gospel. WHLQ (2008) reports that the good news is present in the Qur'an based upon several affirmations. First, *Isa* is without father and conceived by the Holy Spirit (The Family of 'Imran: 3:45) (30). Second, *Isa* is righteous, understood as "… in a right relationship with Allah" (31). Third, *Isa's* name was given to him by Allah (The Family of 'Imran 3:45) and is equivalent to the Hebrew name, meaning savior. Combined with the name *Masi*, which he equates with Messiah or Christ meaning anointed, Baroi (2008) concludes "… the glad tidings (good news) that we read about in the Qur'an is that the 'chosen Savior' has come into the world to free mankind from sin" (2008:32). Fourth, WHLQ (2008) says that Allah gives to *Isa* clear miraculous signs and power from the Holy Spirit (Surah The Heifer 2:253), whereby he was able to resist sin. Had Adam not lacked such empowerment he could have resisted sin in his time (2008:33). The fifth affirmation from the Qur'an summarizes all others. Looking to Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:49, Baroi (2008) says that all Allah has in terms of power and authority is with *Isa* (2008:34). His final affirmation is that the Qur'an implies that *Isa*, after dying in substitution for humanity's sin, rose from the grave (Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:55) (2008:36). His conclusion is quite natural: "… we have no other choice but to conclude that Isa is in fact Allah" (2008:34). It is of utmost

importance to notice that each of these affirmations, often referred to in Christian Theology as *kerygma*, is deduced from the Qur'an directly, without a single direct reference to the Christian Scripture (2008:30–34).

A look at the debates between Deedat and Gilchrist could prove helpful at this point. Gilchrist (1985), in his booklet *Christ in Islam and Christianity*, records a summary of Deedat's objection to the CQH. Expounding on the lack of extensive definition of the Biblical term Messiah and its occasional inclusion in the Qur'an, Deedat retorts that reading meaning from the Christian Scriptures through the Qur'an would be similar to transmuting "… baser metals into shining gold" (see reference in Gilchrist 1985:15). Commenting on Deedat's own tactics, Gilchrist writes, "The whole problem with Deedat is that, being a Muslim he approaches the Bible with the presumption that Jesus is not the eternal Son of God and could never have claimed to be such" (1985:27). He continues, "The great mistake with Deedat when he reads the Bible is that he does not objectively seek to discover what it says, but approaches it with presuppositions about what it should say" (1985:29). Most Christians would agree with Gilchrist's assessment of Deedat's "Muslim Biblical hermeneutic." However, most Muslims that Evangelicals encounter would not have Gilchrist's skill to sort out why and how Baroi's hermeneutic for the Qur'an is mistaken. I do not mean to say that Muslim people are unintelligent or unskilled, but that most of the people Evangelicals minister to are not polished debaters and academics, like Deedat and Gilchrist. Further, I do not believe that Baroi has any ill motive in his strong use of the CQH. I do think that his preaching the gospel from only Qur'anic references breaks down the uniqueness of Scripture's authority, as well as inferring from the Qur'an many notions, such as the deity of Christ, that it could never condone.

5.5.2. The role of the Qur'an in *The way to heaven through the light of the Qur'an*

Baroi (2008) states clearly his view of the place of the Qur'an. Relying upon Surah The Prophets 20:2–3, he says,

> the Qur'an is an instructional book, given to a people had not previously received any book, it was an important source of directions for how they should live and

what they should do. The Qur'an can therefore be understood as a law book or a code of life. Because the Qur'an also says that it is a collector from the previous Holy Books, it may also be thought of as a guidebook or study guide. As such, it has elements that we find as condensed versions of the main textbook. The Qur'an makes no attempt to give full details into the lives of the previous prophets, but refers back to the 'before books.' The Qur'an is the guidebook and the 'previous Books' are the textbook from which the Qur'an has been a collector (Baroi 2008:17).

The Qur'an is an abbreviation or guidebook for the Bible, indicating that it contains in part what the Bible is in full. The title of the book is an apt summary of its teaching. Whosoever listens to and follows the truth message of the Qur'an is on the path to heaven.

The camel (Greeson 2007:48) teaches that the Qur'an is like a handful of genuine currency mixed with false, and the Bible is the guide to know what parts can be trusted. Accad's (1997) *Building bridges* goes farther, assigning to the Qur'an the duty of exposing Muslims friends to the Word of God (2008:74). QT (1997) goes further still, holding that the Muslim holy book functions to confirm key components of Bible and gospel. However, it calls attention to issues, like *jihad*, where the Qur'an does not agree with the Bible. WHLQ (2008:30–34) makes no such qualification, and sets forth the gospel in its entirety from the Qur'an.

Baroi (2008) constructs his method for encounter with Muslims in a fashion received easily by his audience. By quoting Biblical references at a minimum in his book as a whole and not at all in the section communicating the gospel (2008:30–34), he avoids subjects and sources that could be difficult for Muslim people to entertain. By drawing the gospel from the Qur'an Baroi creates an enduring place for the Qur'an. It is likely that the audience would continue to hold much of their allegiance to the Muslim holy book after moving towards faith in Christ Jesus. Minimally, the Qur'an's authority would abide, even if truncated and subjugated to the authority of the Bible. It would remain in the witness of the new church. Each time they initiate encounter with Muslims they would work to expose their friends to the light of the Qur'an.

5.5.3. The role of the Bible in *The way to heaven through the light of the Qur'an*

172

It is difficult to discern the exact role of the Bible in WHLQ (2008), because the focus is on unveiling a new understanding of the Qur'an to Muslims. The long quote referenced above from the section on the Qur'an's role is helpful. The Qur'an is a guidebook with partial truths, and the Christian Scriptures are a textbook bringing full disclosure. I believe this to be a misunderstanding of the Islamic doctrine of abrogation, and to form the foundation of much of the CQH. It is the inversion of Esack's (1997:55–57) understanding of Islamic abrogation, where the Qur'an has the final voice on knowledge of God.

5.5.4. Depth of interaction with the Muslim mind

Baroi's WHLQ (2008) aims at deeper interaction with the mind of Muslims than the other methods I have examined thus far. His aim is to give a secure identity to Muslims who desire to learn about and possibly follow Christ in faith. Therefore, he provides a through-going application of the CQH of the DEM. If portions of the Qur'an are dynamically equivalent to corresponding sections in the Bible, then a central place for the Bible is not necessary in Evangelical encounter with Muslims. If the Qur'an does teach that Jesus Christ died as humanity's Savior from sin and rose from the dead, then need for the Bible is lessened. Further, in an unstable or potentially dangerous situation the Bible can become an unnecessary danger. Though I cannot agree with the strongly pronounced CQH in WHLQ (2008), I do respect Baroi's consistency in thinking and his deep consideration to the place of the Qur'an in the mind of Muslims. He is correct that anyone wishing to follow Christ in a Muslim country must have a clear conception of his or her identity in Christ, and how that identity relates to the Muslim holy book.

5.6. Analysis of *7 Signs*

7 Signs is the unofficial method of the Common Ground Association for Evangelical encounter with Muslims. Unfortunately for academic endeavors, it is held in as much secrecy as the association and its membership. A colleague provided me with a copy of the *7 Signs* for review and commentary in this thesis. He has attended some of their meetings and is a cautious supporter, though not a full member. The identity of the author of the method is not provided, but its wide circulation within Common Ground is attested

to by Smith's (2011) article from *Christlam*. During his time at a Common Ground meeting in Atlanta, Smith documents that most of the members in attendance were white, middle-aged, and American. Common Ground is difficult to describe because in addition to strict secrecy in meetings and membership there is "… a multiplicity of IM (insider movement) opinions and practices" (Smith 2011). Being a widely circulated and employed document and method for encounter, *7 Signs* can be treated as a fair indication of the thought and missiology of the Common Ground membership. Smith records the Common Ground leadership's endorsement of *7 Signs*. Their response to his questions includes: Speaking on a very general level, the message of the Qur'an is that God has revealed to people various 'signs' which help people to partially understand His eternal provision and humanity's lack of gratitude and submission. This fallen state is to be corrected by God, through the greatest of all Qur'anic signs – *Isa* (note 518). Notice that Qur'anic signs are understood to bring partial understanding on how humanity's condition can be remedied, especially through Jesus Christ.

5.6.1. Summary of *7 Signs*

There is a significant amount of variation in the way the *7 Signs* method is employed. Some practitioners present eight or nine signs, even including the prophet Muhammad as a sign. I limit my commentary to the *7 Signs* most commonly employed and recognized by Common Ground leadership in their correspondence with Smith (2011:note 518). Each sign reads Biblical notions of grace into the Qur'anic records of the prophets, the last and most significant being Jesus Christ. The particular copy I am reviewing subdivides the signs into three sections: the first two signs (Adam and Noah), the second two (Abraham and Moses), and the final three (David, Jonah, and Jesus). The first two are used by God to reveal what God will do for humanity's problem. The second two deal with how God will help. The final three display through whom He will save. (*7 Signs*).

The first sign concerns the Qur'anic prophet Adam, and extends from several Qur'anic passages. Surah The Heifer 2:34–36 is quoted to show how Adam sinned and was warned of judgment for his iniquity. The presence and place of Satan is seen as an important corresponding link between the Biblical and Qur'anic versions. In any case, dynamic equivalence between the two sources is assumed. Surah Ta Ha 20:115–135

speaks of the tree in the garden, interpreting its present and the resulting path that God provides for Adam as sufficiently similar to the Biblical account of Genesis 3. Surah The Heights 7:26 reads, "O ye children of Adam! We have bestowed raiment upon you to cover your shame, as well as to be an adornment to you. But the raiment of righteousness – that is the best. Such are among the Signs of Allah, that they receive admonition." The first sign is the garment of righteousness, drawing meaning from Genesis 3:21 into the words of the ayat above. Both passages are understood to mean that God rejects human attempts at solving the sin problem, with the Qur'anic "vesture" deemed equivalent to the Biblical "garments of skin" (ESV).

The second sign involves the Prophet Noah and the Ark he constructed. Combining Surah The Prophets 21:76–77 and Surah Ya Sin 36:41, the *7 Signs* teaches that the meaning of the Qur'anic narrative concerning Noah corresponds in meaning with the Biblical account. In Surah Ya Sin 36:41, God recounts how He "bore" away the family of the prophet. Not only did the divine work preserve humanity from destruction, it also is an indication of the plan of God to redeem His creation through a bearing away of the burden of sin. Noah was a person of faith, and people who follow God as he did would become new spiritually.

The third sign supposes dynamic equivalence between Biblical and Qur'anic accounts of Abraham, especially the sacrifice of his son. The sign of the garment of righteousness (Adam) and the sign of the Ark (Noah) are signs that promise God will redeem humanity from the power and penalty of sin. The sign involved in the Prophet Abraham is ransom, and details how God will go about accomplishing this redemption. Surah Those Ranged in Ranks 37:107 tells how Allah ransomed the son of Abraham with a momentous sacrifice. *7 Signs* method teaches that the Qur'anic word "ransom" is indicative of how God will deliver people from sin.

The fourth sign, represented by the Prophet Moses, indicates that the sacrifice or ransom would take place through the shedding of blood. Dynamic equivalence is assumed between the Qur'anic account in Surah The Heights 7:103–160 and Exodus 11:1–12:36. *7 Signs* insists that the spiritual significance of blood of the sacrificial lamb is God's promise to deliver humanity from sin. This close parallel in interpretation is maintained despite the disparities apparent in comparing the two texts, and in opposition

to near unanimous Muslim rejection of such an opinion. The Biblical order of the plagues in the Exodus passage proceeds as follows: turning water to blood, frogs, gnats, flies, death of livestock, boils, hail, locusts, darkness, and death of firstborn. The Qur'anic order is famine, flood locusts, vermin, frogs, and blood. Even if the order in the Islamic version is unimportant, the specific plagues levied on the Egyptians do not correspond to the Biblical list. I have witnessed the annual Eid ul-Adha, often referred to as Korbani (sacrifice Eid); many times over the decade my family has lived in a South Asian Muslim country. No Muslim I have met or commentator I have read understands the sacrifices as indicative of ransom stated in the 7 *Signs* method. To the contrary, Muslims identify the sacrifices of Eid ul-Adha as a commemoration of Abraham's submission to God and value the festival as a simple identification with the faith of Islam's founding prophet. I do not disagree with attempting to communicate the Biblical notion of sacrificial atonement and using the illustration of Korbani Eid to aid in communication. It is irresponsible to ignore the clear discrepancies between the Biblical and Qur'anic passages on the point, as well as the near unanimous opinion of Muslims on the issue of the nature of sacrifice.

The fifth sign concerns the Prophet David, and includes dynamically equivocating the Qur'anic notion of grace in Surah Saba 34:10 with the Biblical one. The grace given to David is typified in having received the Psalms (Surah The Women 4:163), but expanded until the meaning of grace in Surah Saba 34:10 connects with the Biblical Davidic Covenant of 2 Samuel 7:8–17. The connection means that the special grace given to David makes him a sign of the coming Messiah. This reworking of the Davidic covenant is carried over, attaching itself to the genealogy of Matthew 1. As the first of the final three signs, David serves to indicate through whom divine salvation would be imparted.

Jonah is the sixth sign of the method. Surah Those Ranged in Ranks 37:139–148 states, "So also was Jonah among those sent (by Us). When he ran away … Then the big fish did swallow him, and he had done acts worthy of blame … But We cast him forth on the naked shore …" An important link is established between this surah and Matthew 12:40–42, the teaching on the resurrection of Jesus as the sign of Jonah. The CQH is

present in the sixth sign in that it promotes Jesus as greater than Jonah and other prophets, and that Jesus died, was buried, and rose again.

The focal point of the *7 Signs* method is the final sign, Jesus. The approach is typical of methods employing the CQH, focusing on similar passages and wordings between Bible and Qur'an. Surah The Heifer 2:87, 253 mentions Isa as strengthened by the Holy Spirit, Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:45–55 describes him as the word of God, and Surah The Women 4:171 characterizes him as a spirit from Allah. The function of Jesus is to fulfill the other signs. All the Qur'anic references in *7 Signs* serve to point to Jesus. The method concludes with an important qualification to readers. Following Isa Masi does not require that a person becomes a Christian. A person born from a Muslim family can follow Isa and remain a Muslim, because Surah The Family of 'Imran 3:52 and Surah The Table Spread 5:111 indicate that the original followers of Isa were called Muslims.

5.6.2. The role of the Qur'an in *7 Signs*

The understanding of truth in the Qur'an embedded in the *7 Signs* method seeks out connections between Biblical teaching and major characters and themes from the Qur'an. Truth in the Qur'an is unlocked as it is correlated with the Bible. Perhaps Baroi's (2008) description of truth in the Muslim holy book as light is best. However, light must be taken as grace in the sense of divine assistance leading away from the Qur'an itself towards the Bible. In that sense the Qur'an is taken to be a sort of forerunner to Christ. Smith (2011) summarizes his view of the role of the Qur'an in methods employing the CQH, describing how truth in the Qur'an brings partial understanding of God's provision for humanity in Jesus Christ. Its light prepares the way for the higher revelation of Christ to be found in the Christian Scriptures. Such is the basic operation of the CQH and is available readily in the methodology of the *7 Signs*.

5.6.3. The role of the Bible in *7 Signs*

The role of the Bible in *7 Signs* is to provide knowledge of Isa Masi, who fulfills the signs in the Qur'an. The full significance of each of the seven parts is brought to light through the Biblical record of Him. It is reminiscent of Kraft's notion of latent

revelational material in the Bible (1979a:219). For example, God caused Jonah to be expelled from the fish and thrown onto the land in order to point to Jesus. Apart from exposure to the Biblical teaching of Jesus concerning His resurrection being the sign of Jonah, a Muslim would not have needed context for understanding the true significance of Jonah. The Bible sheds light on many of the deeper truths of the Muslim holy book that are inaccessible otherwise. For this reason each section of teaching on a given sign is concluded with descriptions of its physical and spiritual importance. Glimpses of the spiritual significance of the signs are gleaned from the Qur'an, but the driving force for full meaning relies on Biblical knowledge.

5.6.4. Depth of interaction with the Muslim mind

7 Signs deals with the primary issue of the Muslim Mind, finality of the Muslim prophet and book, in sufficient breadth. It faces the importance of the Qur'an in the Muslim mind head on, moving beyond initial discussions of what the Qur'an says about Isa. It includes significant sections on prophets often ignored, such as Noah and Jonah, building a support system from the wide history referenced in the Qur'an. If a Muslim objects to the interpretation of the Qur'an's material found in the method, then he or she must engage with a substantial amount of the Qur'an in order to offer a counterargument.

I believe a comparison between *7 Signs* and Baroi's WHLQ (2008) could be helpful at this point. The method of the Common Ground Association of Evangelicals for encountering Muslims does not engage the Qur'an on the same depth as Baroi's WHLQ (2008). The entire thrust of *7 Signs* is in establishing linkage between the Qur'anic signs and New Testament content. As he states in his introduction, the intention of Baroi (2008) is to develop "… an understanding of the meaning of the Qur'an in an effort to present its light to the world" (2008:5). He proves faithful to that purpose in his interaction with the Qur'an concerning the creation of humanity (2008:6), delving into specifics on how the Qur'an claims to relate to the Bible (2008:9), the fear of Allah (2008:19–20), humanity's sinfulness (2008:21), salvations origin in Allah (2008:29), and the good news from the Qur'an (2008:30–32). Rather than assuming that an outsider's interpretation of the Muslim holy book is acceptable to the Muslims he encounters, Baroi (2008) answers important initial questions and builds a body of understanding within the

Qur'an's own material for his latter assertions concerning Jesus in the Qur'an. My objections to Baroi's thoroughgoing CQH notwithstanding, WHLQ (2008) labors to build sufficient trust and commonality in important presuppositions in ways that *7 Signs* does not. The breath of presentation from the Qur'an is sufficient, but more could be done in terms of depth to ensure that the speaker and audience establish sufficient commonality.

5.7. Analytical results

My examination displays that the CQH is present in current methods for Evangelicals encountering Muslims in mission. In some methods it is extensive and far-reaching, as with Baroi's (2008) WHLQ and QT (1997). With other approaches it is somewhat moderated, as is the case in *The camel* (Greeson 2007). Two thoughts are important to consider in my concluding remarks. Firstly, the best description of the Scripture's role is not that of a tether, as Kraft purports (1979a:399). Rarely is the Bible as a whole positioned to tether potential connections with the Qur'an to its own superior authority. Instead, gospel content is extracted from the Scripture and injected into the corpus of the Qur'an. The difference is clear because the methods reviewed, like *7 Signs* and WHLQ (2008), do not lead towards a new identity rooted in the authority of the Scripture as the unique Word of God, but work to correlate truth between the two sources. Secondly, my charge is that the uniqueness of Scripture's authority is compromised only to the extent that the CQH is used in a given approach to encounter. My final comments are structured towards succinct statements on the degree of reliance upon the CQH of the DEM for each method examined.

5.7.1. Extent of employment of the CQH

As referenced above, *Building bridges* (1997) lays out principles for encounter when Evangelicals meet Muslims and assumes strong similarities of meanings on common issues such as God's purpose for humanity, sin, the process of salvation, and the person and work of Christ. I believe the most critical identification between Biblical and Qur'anic truth is near the end of the book. Accad (1997:127), while setting out his sixth principle on "Making Him ours," dynamically equates the meanings of Surah The Pleading 58:22 and Romans 10:10, indicating that entrance to the kingdom of God and

179

saving faith can be congruent with the Qur'an. Content from Paul's epistle serves to activate the words of the Qur'an. For constructing his position upon unity with the Qur'an at points so central and foundational to Christian life, I say that his method is dependent upon the CQH in a significant manner. Not every practitioner that employs the outline of *Building bridges* (1997) will be as insistent as Accad himself on making strong dynamic attachment between Christian Scripture and the Qur'an. Practitioners using Accad's (1997) material would be compromising Scriptural authority only to the degree that serious and lasting equivalence is taught.

When deciphering the degree of dependence upon the CQH, QT (1997) is more difficult to evaluate than *Building bridges* (1997). It is helpful to recall the discussion of *furkan* in QT (1997:18) to indicate that the development of the Qur'an includes significant reliance upon the Old and New Testaments. The Arabic term's inclusion could explain how the author feels the right to affirm dynamic equivalence between Bible and Qur'an on some fronts (teachings on Christ, prophets, and sin) while describing other doctrines of the Qur'an (sovereignty of Allah, fighting and warfare) in a manner that evidences objection. In this way, QT (1997) has a place for distinguishing between Biblical and Qur'anic authority and truth, and is less dependent on the CQH than some other methods. However, it does initiate encounter with the CQH because the *kerygma* of the gospel is reliant upon being activated in the Qur'an. It would be difficult for those who follow the way of QT (1997) while living in a hostile setting to ever separate themselves from reading New Testament meaning into Qur'anic portions concerning Christ, because doing so could provide a base level of justification and identity against persecution.

The camel (Greeson 2007) is the least reliant upon the Qur'an of the methods I review. Two factors moderate its employment of the CQH. Firstly, it has a pragmatic goal and structure. Greeson (2007) intends to use the Qur'an as a brief starting point. He attempts neither to attach superfluous references to his outline, nor focus on issues other than those deemed essential. Gospel content is communicated by means of the Qur'an, but in a way that is transitory primarily. Secondly, Greeson (2007) avoids moving back and forth between Bible and Qur'an, as Accad (1997) does. He begins with the Qur'an in order to begin conversing about Christ, make some foundational points, and proceeds

towards the Bible. The style of *The camel* (2007) is pragmatic. At times such a description would be considered pejorative. In the case of method and CQH, it lessens reliance on the Qur'an because effort is exerted to move beyond the starting point towards the Bible.

One reason behind the influence of Baroi and his WHLQ (2007) is his ability to isolate, simplify, and apply difficult concepts and themes. Most people, Muslim or otherwise, do not know the term epistemology, nor would they be comfortable discussing the finality of Islamic revelation theory. Without directly stating it as his purpose, Baroi (2007) draws his audience into the discussion of the nature of Muslim history of revelation. He applies the CQH to the issue with depth and consistency, urging his readership to look at the Qur'an as a guidebook (2007:17) for the Bible. If his goal is achieved, then the finality of the Muslim holy book in revelational history is altered so that it is subservient ultimately to the authority of Biblical interpretation, though not dismissed from legitimate prophetic history altogether. Knowing Baroi personally and having great respect for his character, I say with confidence that there is no deliberate attempt to mislead. Instead, WHLQ (2007) is his sincere attempt at encountering Muslims with sensitivity and leading them towards faith in Jesus Christ as Lord. Nevertheless, his employment of the CQH is significant and worrisome. Years of experience in encounter with Muslim people tell me that most Muslims can sense the inversion of authority taking place, though they cannot always verbalize the specific changes as they occur. His profound reliance on the CQH and widespread referencing of the Qur'anic text makes it difficult for the Muslim to object to his arguments.

The *7 Signs* method is to be commended as one of the two methods I review, along with WHLQ (2007), which take Islam's view of finality and revelational history seriously. It reinterprets systematically traditional Islamic notions of abrogation of the Biblical text by redefining major prophetic figures along lines that concur with the Biblical record. Not only is the gospel and Christ reinterpreted in alignment with the Qur'anic record, but also narratives of creation and fall, exodus, Davidic Kingdom, and the prophets of the Old Testament. It lacks Baroi's depth of employment of the DEM, but makes a sweeping restatement of prophetic history. As I state above, I have seen some versions of the 7 *Signs* method that include Muhammad as an eight sign, presumably one

operating with a retroactive message. As with all the methods reviewed, the actual degree of compromise of Scripture's unique authority cannot be measured by reading the method, but by examining the ways it is used in the field. Compromise exists only to the extent the CQH is employed.

5.7.2. Difficulties in passing judgment

Analysis in this chapter centers on a sampling of methods employing the CQH in Evangelical encounter with Muslims. My sampling represents a cross-section of the Evangelical approach, ordered on geographical (Middle East, North Africa, and Asia) and ethnic lines (Westerners and non-Westerners). Other methods could be reviewed. My examination is by no means exhaustive, but is sufficient to substantiate my claim to the widespread employment of the CQH among Evangelicals.

Two issues make passing general judgments of DEM methods and models difficult. Firstly, since NACOME, DEM proponents have labeled non-extraction a law (Conn 1979), making it an axiom of their model. Non-extraction has become not only a way to minimize unnecessary persecution of believers in Muslim contexts, but also the bedrock of how dynamic equivalence is worked out for individual identity and fellowship in the local body. Non-extraction removes some unneeded restraints that were previously placed upon believers from a Muslim family. For example, it may not always be expedient for a convert to change his or her name upon repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. However, increasing similarity between MBBs and their former socio-religious context creates a corresponding rise in responsibility for researchers or practitioners who present data for ministry results. It is difficult to verify, interact with, or critique reports from ministries founded upon thorough going non-extractionism as found in DEM mission, because the goal of the axiom is fostering resemblance between MBBs and their social and religious contexts.

The second issue is secrecy. I recognize that many Muslim contexts are hostile towards changes of faith and religion. I do not call for complete openness. Secrecy does add to the need for diligence in reporting and analysis in missiological discussion, because the nature of non-extraction in hostile environments requires that data from the reporter be unquestioned. For example, Parshall (1998b:406) and Massey (2000b) discuss

pseudo-named areas, like Islampur, in a Muslim country. Numbers of converts and qualifications are reported, questions are asked and answered, and firm missiological conclusions are established from the case study. Studies like this one can be helpful. The difficulty is that the reporter controls the data. What he or she reports as a healthy indigenous church is unverifiable to readers of a missiological journal or paper.

I emphasis the trend in Evangelical mission since NACOME for viewing non-extractionism as axiomatic and the high priority given to secrecy in order to call attention to the centrality of the CQH connection with the DEM. The methods I examine are a part of DEM mission and value highly non-extraction and secrecy. Advocates for *7 Signs* or another method could object to my critiques, retorting that I do not have sufficient knowledge of how differing locations and contexts affect the method as it is presented in differing contexts. However, they cannot differentiate their methods from the CQH or the DEM, or avoid the DEM/CQH orientation towards continuing similarity for MBB and birth culture. A person born and reared in a Muslim context who is exposed to the gospel through the CQH of the DEM has little reason to grow away from maintaining some dependence upon the Qur'an. The Muslim holy book is a part of both their birth as a believer in Jesus, and their continued witness. As I state above, such dependence is present only to the degree of employment of the CQH when Evangelicals encounter Muslims.

5.8. Potential objections to my conclusions

In response to my critiques, DEM advocates and practitioners could raise two issues. Firstly, they could object that if there is some degree of truth in the text of the Qur'an then reliance upon its truth, however limited, must be deemed legitimate. Secondly, writers of the DEM emphasize that salvation is a continuing process, rather than a once for all event in an individual's life. They assume that time will allow for MBB's to mature and gradually decrease dependence upon the Qur'an.

5.8.1. The enduring value of the Qur'an

The CQH assumes that there is a level of truth in the Qur'an that can be dynamically equivocated with the Bible, even if partial and problematic. Another assumption in the

DEM hermeneutic for the Qur'an is that the only two options available to base ministry upon are extractionism and non-extractionism, with the result of extractionism being a hands-off approach to the Qur'an and the natural outcome of the non-extractionism being the CQH. Having an explicit and Biblical view of anthropology affords Evangelicals a third option.

The Islamic stance on anthropology is different from that of the Bible, which assumes humanity is created for the purpose of seeking after God (Acts 17:27). Islamic anthropology holds that there is more distance between creation and Creator than is the case in Biblical Christianity, as we see in Akhtar's (1991) chapter entitled "The silence of God." Christian anthropology aims at a life of seeking after God. Akhtar's chapter on Islamic anthropology shows that for the Muslim, life is more about living under the commands and will of Allah. Chapter 6 explores Islamic anthropology as a starting point for Evangelical encounter with Muslims.

5.8.2. Salvation – one-time event or process?

Kraft (1979a) asserts that God reveals Himself in human culture by means of what he calls a "starting point plus process" method of interaction (1979a:239). The DEM application of "starting point plus process" is a focus on the work of God in salvation as a process (Kraft 1979a:239–245). Baroi's (2008:17) depiction of the Qur'an as a guidebook for the actual text, the Christian Scriptures, is a missiological restatement of Kraft's theological assertion listed above. The Qur'an is set forward as a bridge or starting point, not to be assigned permanent status in the MBB life. If salvation is viewed as primarily a process according to Kraft's dynamic equivalence scheme, then practitioners are correct to conclude that converts via the CQH would grow out of dependence upon the Qur'an into a full embrace of the Bible as uniquely authoritative.

I agree with Kraft that the Bible teaches salvation as not merely positional (Kraft 1979a:240), but also directional. Life as a believer in the Lord Jesus should be a continuing reforming of mind and heart by the Spirit of God. Romans 8:30 and 2 Corinthians 1:10 make a strong case that the loving deliverance of God saves humanity at every point in life, from before the expression of faith until the completion of divine work. However, the "starting point plus process" model, relative to the CQH, neglects the

184

centrality of the Bible's place in each point of the life of believers, because some methods for encounter do not reference the Bible during gospel presentation. WHLQ (2008) is an example. Even methods that do quote the Scripture while giving the gospel, such as *7 Signs*, make establishing the redemption of Qur'anic testimony in favor of the gospel content a focal point. Structuring Evangelical encounter with Muslims according to the CQH moves to unite the authorities of the two books into one for matters relating to the gospel.

1 Peter 1:23–25 says that "… you have been born again, not of perishable seed but of imperishable, through the living and abiding word of God … the word of the Lord remains forever." The Spirit's work, in tandem with the word, brings life. Once, during a discussion of these issues, a DEM/CQH practitioner retorted to me that the final verse of 1 Peter 1 dictates that gospel, not the Bible, is the word referenced in the passage. His comment is appropriate because 1 Peter 1:25 states, "… this word is the good news that was preached to you" (ESV).

A careful look at the whole of the apostle's writing in these chapters reveals that it is mistaken to make a sharp distinction between the word as both gospel and Scripture. In 1 Peter 1:25 the gospel (*euangelian*) is called the word (*rhema*) of the Lord. This verse is connected invariably with the preceding reference from 1:23 concerning the word (*logos*), which also lives and abides forever. The following discourse in 2:2 implies that the word is true milk, whereby the infant believer is to be nourished and to grow. Simply put, the word that brings life is the same word that produces growth. When connected with similarly constructed passages, such as 1 Corinthians 3:2 and Hebrews 5:12–13 (Aland et al 1998:788), the scope of the word's function expands to become essential to the growth of the Christian at each developmental point. Further, the word (*logos*) referenced in 1 Peter 2:8 that the builders reject due to unbelief is linked inseparably with the Scripture (*graphe*) in 2:6–8. The word as gospel and the word as Scripture can be spoken of and analyzed distinctly. However, it is unnatural to approach encounter with Muslims as if allegiance to one could exist without a corresponding commitment to the other. The CQH assumes a radical distinction between gospel and Scripture because the gospel is communicated apart from the Bible. The word of the gospel is extracted from

the Scripture and grafted into the Muslim holy book, with the assumption that the resulting life will grow inevitably away from its birth matrix.

I have a final comment on 1 Peter 1–2 in connection with the CQH and the methods examined in this chapter. At two separate times the apostle declares that the word lives and abides forever. When the gospel is preached from the Qur'an a disturbing situation arises. The gospel word, which lives and abides forever for the believer, is shown to arise from the pages of Muhammad's prophetic work. As I state above, when coupled with the missiological premise of extreme non-extractionism and an environment hostile to changes of religion and culture, the CQH makes it difficult for MBBs to shift allegiance to the Scriptures alone. Indeed, exhaustive treatment of the theological dilemma created by the CQH is beyond the range of my thesis. I have labored to present how the CQH has arisen in Evangelical encounter with Muslims, why it remains appealing to young ministers, set it in theological and missiological perspective, and present mainstream examples of its employment. My hope in chapter 6 is to present a simple, viable, and historically/Biblically congruent approach to the Qur'an for Evangelicals encountering Muslims.

5.8.3. Concluding commentary on the DEM approach to encountering people of Muslim faith

In 1 Corinthians 15:3–4 the gospel is presented "according to the Scriptures." The mission of the CQH is to communicate Biblical meaning through the words of the Qur'an. The unique position of the Scriptures is that it alone contains the truth of the gospel. In other words, the gospel is "according to the Scriptures" alone. A compromise of this unique position and authority is created to the extent that the CQH is employed to communicate Biblical content. In chapter 6 I look to the Scriptures to revisit a simple way for Evangelicals to approach encounter with Muslims. My view is influenced by, but not identical to, the elenctics of Bavinck (1960).

Chapter 6

Towards a pre-evangelistic approach to the Qur'an in Evangelical encounter with Muslims

Chapter 2 of my thesis examines Protestant/Evangelical forerunners in order to set the historical perspective of mission to Muslims for the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Chapter 3 describes the development, writings, and history of the DEM, whose advocates are the most prolific missiologists of current Evangelical ministry to Muslims. It traces the conferences and developments of journals and other academic writings, recounting how Evangelicals have sought refinement and renewal in their work among Muslims. As a solution to frustration and perceived meager results, Kraft proposes dynamic equivalence as a hope for reshaping the process of mission.

The fourth chapter recounts how Kraft's anthropological proposal had a ready and motivated audience. Following the lead of sensitive workers and academics, like Accad and Cragg, many Evangelicals began using a hermeneutic that reads Biblical meaning through the Qur'an. In that chapter I test the DEM and CQH for theological motives and missiological results. Chapter 5 is crucial to my thesis because it displays five mainstream methods for Evangelical encounter with Muslims that use the CQH to a greater or lesser extent. It shows that my topic is not peripheral or exaggerated.

The current chapter draws out Biblical lines for Evangelical usage of the Qur'an and for encounter with Muslims. I set out to answer the question I propose in chapter 1: is there any hope for a new approach that preserves the depth of cultural and theological engagement found in using the Qur'an in encounter with Muslims, while maintaining the uniqueness of Biblical authority?

6.1. Qur'anic pre-evangelism

I believe there is a Biblical way to deal with the Qur'an and begin with the thoughts and issues in the lives of Muslims without deployment of the CQH. Said more succinctly, there is a Biblical motive that allows Evangelicals to interact with the Qur'an (an indirect method) without compromising the unique authority of Scripture. As I show, my proposal

is not new. Indeed, at times some of the methods I review take such an approach. My proposal is to draw out the Biblical pattern of correction for encounter, called elenctics, define it as pre-evangelism, and make it explicit in the mind of Evangelicals. The result will be less need to choose either the direct method, which bypasses initially the minds of Muslims as the primary starting point for encounter, or the CQH.

I call such a Biblical pattern Qur'anic pre-evangelism because it enables theologically safe discussion without compounding or confusing sources. It seeks to deal with the Qur'an holistically, while maintaining a commitment to the unique authority of Christian Scripture. My presentation includes several examples of how an elenctics and pre-evangelism are used in encounter, but is not an endorsement of a particular method. Rather, I seek to give guidelines for a general approach. Pre-evangelism can be performed in differing ways and be adapted to varying contexts.

6.1.1. Qur'anic pre-evangelism and the indirect method for encounter

I use pre-evangelism as part of the indirect method for encounter with Muslims, and qualify its description with several clarifications. Bavinck describes encounter as occurring "… when two people permit the light of God's Word to shine over their life. In such moments all consciousness of class and rank, of race and color disappear, and only two people remain standing before God" (1960:128). His definition establishes the overall direction in which encounter between Christians and Muslims should move.

Generally, I hold that the indirect method for encounter is preferable to the direct method. A direct approach moves quicker to gospel presentation than does an indirect style. There are times when an immediate proclamation is the best course of action, where circumstances have prepared listeners to hear the gospel and receive. There are other situations where the gospel must be given to a person or group because time or distance prevents another opportunity. In such cases the direct method is best.

Bavinck states that the indirect method is defined typically as gospel proclamation and calling for repentance as the last step in a long line of deep and probing questions (1960:125–126). He tempers the polarization between direct and indirect methods by making two helpful assertions. Firstly, he exhorts ministers to know their non-Christian audience. Similar to the Philippian jailor of Acts 16, some people are ready for a quick

call to repentance. However, often times the audience is not prepared to hear with clarity an immediate presentation of the gospel. Bavinck advocates that ministers cultivate the ability to understand the inner self of the people they encounter. In the Gospels, Jesus sees a person with a glance, measuring the whole of his or her joys, disappointments, and deepest needs (1960:125–126). Though Christians today do not have at their disposal the depth of discernment the Lord Jesus possessed, we can seek to know and appreciate Muslim friends, delving into their lives in search of how the gospel can address their minds and hearts.

Bavinck (1960:126–127) also calls for "meetings filled with love". Such meetings are marked by a desire to see all of the non-Christian's life, even mistaken or frustrating elements, as part of their flight from God, rather than mere pride or error on a personal or cultural level. Further, a Christian in encounter with a non-Christian friend must see that "… apart from God's grace, this same flight from God is also the deepest motive of my own life" (1960:127). We must see our own flight in their struggles and sin. Such humility is crucial for Evangelicals as they "… permit the light of God's Word to shine over their life" (1960:128).

6.1.2. Limits for Qur'anic pre-evangelism in encounter

Among Evangelicals, pre-evangelism is defined inconsistently. Sproul (2007) lists pre-evangelism within the realm of apologetics, functioning to give reasoning for faith to the mind of non-Christians. He mentions also an offensive component to apologetics, presumably similar to pre-evangelism, which works towards a fully orbed Christian philosophy. Geisler (1996), in an article similar to Sproul's (2007), identifies the goal of apologetics as pre-evangelism. Frame (2000:outlined as the fourth section of the section entitled "The value of apologetics") summaries the traditional position succinctly, including proof (for Christian edification), defensive (against non-Christian accusation), and offensive (persuading non-Christians towards Christianity). However, he does not develop the offensive area.

Tim Keller's (1996–1997) teaching on the three parts of apologetics is helpful on several levels. He writes:

A mature and vital Christian has both a rational basis for the faith and a personal experience of faith. Anyone with only a rational basis will need the personal experience to be a real Christian. But anyone who has a personal experience must also have a rational basis in order to persevere as a Christian. Increasingly (in our post-modern culture), people come to Christianity out of emotional need. But if they don't see that Christianity is rationally and objectively true, it will be hard for them to maintain their Christian walk through times of difficulty, when obeying Christ may not be emotionally satisfying. Thus apologetics is important for the non-Christian (to show the way into the faith), and the new Christian (to ground in the faith), and to the mature Christian (to equip for spreading the faith).

From Keller's (1996–1997) quotation we see that pre-evangelism is not merely defensive. Instead, it is offensive assertion of the validity of Christianity for all humanity (Christian and non-Christian) and all of life (rational and experiential). It is not a reassertion of the imperial period's attempt to bring Islam crashing to the ground. As it pertains to my thesis, pre-evangelism has to do with helping Muslims to see, rationally and experientially, areas of incoherence, dissatisfaction, or lack in the Qur'an.

6.1.3. Islamic anthropology as a point of contact for pre-evangelism

Keller's (1996–1997) discussion of apologetics reorients the science towards the goal of pre-evangelism. He says, "Apologetics is pre-evangelism. Offensively, it disrupts the world-view of the non-Christian. Defensively, it shows the coherence and attractiveness of the Christian world-view … this prepares for a presentation of the way of salvation." Pre-evangelism, at its best, calls attention to incoherence or unfavorable aspects of non-Christian religion. It prepares the way for the gospel by showing how such aspects affect the lives of people. Qur'anic pre-evangelism begins with the ways the Qur'an and Islam influence the lives of Muslims, and draws the people towards repentance to the true God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. It maintains a conviction that truth and life are to be found in the gospel and the Christian Scriptures alone.

Having the above understanding of pre-evangelism, I proceed to identify a point of contact, or starting point for encounter with Muslims. Chapters 3 to 5 make it clear that I do not consider the Qur'an as a partial source of truth or a legitimate starting point. Bavinck sees the prayer from Psalm 9:20, that adversaries would "… know themselves to be but men" (ESV), as indicative of the place all encounter must begin (Bavinck 1960:123). He uses this as his basis and reformulates it into a question upon which to

base encounter, and impress upon non-Christians. They should be made to see what their lives, thoughts, and religions have made of God (1960:126). He offers ample proof of his position, but there is special difficulty in relating his approach to Muslims. Cragg (1993) points out the extreme and often unreasoned confidence in which Muslims hold their ideas about God (1993:161). Drawing on multiple instances where Islamic insiders admit a lack of development in the area of anthropology, he offers a counterproposal for a contact point with Muslims. Because Cragg offers a starting point for encounter with Muslims from their own writings, I examine Akhtar's work before turning to Cragg's important article on encounter between Christians and Muslims.

6.1.3.1. As seen in Akhtar's *A faith for all seasons*

Akhtar's (1991) *A faith for all seasons* sets forth the Islamic stance on anthropology, one quite different from that of the Bible. He deduces Islamic anthropology from a portion of Surah The Table Spread 5:101, where the following warning is given, "… if ye ask about things when the Qur'an is being revealed, they will be made plain to you." Akhtar comments on how the Qur'an allowed for questioning Allah during the time of Muhammad's ministry, while the Qur'an was being given. "The discouraging hint is added immediately that a previous generation accepted the invitation and had then been vexed by the answer from heaven. So it is perhaps best, one thinks, not to ask questions that may return an unpleasant answer" (1991:77). This quotation summarizes adequately his chapter, entitled, "The Silence of Allah." Islamic anthropology holds that a greater distance exists between Creation and Creator than is the case in Biblical Christianity. It teaches that humanity is "… on our own … left with guidance and an inclusive Sharia, a blueprint for private piety and public order" (Cragg 1993:161). There is little reason for seeking intimacy with God as set forth in the Bible, or answers relative to one's life outside the specifics of the Qur'an. In fact, Akhtar warns that the Muslim holy book hints that such behavior could be considered disbelief to God, and carry negative results (Akhtar 1991:77). The Lord Jesus Christ said: "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that comes from the mouth of God" (Matthew 4:4 ESV). His statement is helpful in deducing a Biblical anthropology for comparison with Akhtar's (1991) Qur'anic version. Biblical anthropology holds that human spiritual makeup is ordered

such that it awaits and fits with the "intense spiritual 'aliveness' of the Bible" (Parshall 2002:77). Humanity is constructed in order to receive and be nourished by God's word in a way reminiscent to how the physical growth and metabolism of the body is dependent upon food. Islamic anthropology differs in that humanity is created and equipped by God, then left with a greater distance between humanity and its Creator than in the case of Biblical Christianity.

6.1.3.2. As called for by Kenneth Cragg

It is interesting, even ironic, that in the wake of the DEM and the CQH I find a solution for refocusing Evangelical encounter with Muslims from the author of *Sandals at the Mosque* (1959). In an article overlooked largely by Evangelicals, Cragg, now an aged and reflective scholar and practitioner, questions how ministry to Muslims should be approached. His first admonition is to remember how impressed Islam is with its own virility (1993:161). Heart-searching and reflection are not congenital to the Muslim mind. "Islam is seen as the one religion divinely suited to human nature, and human nature is divinely suited to Islam. This is the double sense of the word 'fitrah' in Surah 30:30" (1993:161). In this surah the Qur'an states

> So set thou thy face steadily and truly to the Faith: (establish) Allah's handiwork according to the pattern on which He has made mankind: no change (let there be) in the work (wrought) by Allah: that is the standard Religion: but most among mankind understand not. (Surah The Romans 30:30).

Islamic self-assurance holds on to Qur'anic sufficiency despite what Cragg calls "… crucial issues for thoughtful, believing scholarship" (1993:161). Further, because Islam fails to give unique and unilateral answers, "our best way into any study of continuing Christian ministry in this field will be first to explore what the bewildered and alerted say" (1993:161).

Cragg (1993) couples an awareness of Muslim self-sufficiency with Akhtar's (1991) Islamic anthropology to call for a helpful approach for Evangelicals in encounter with Muslims. He claims that *A faith for all seasons* "… concedes that Muslims must respond to modernity and be alert to 'the riddle of man' and the 'silence of God.'" Cragg (1993) believes that Akhtar's sensitivity to the lack in Islamic anthropology has led him to see the need for what he calls a "Christ dimension" in God. Referring to 2 Corinthians

5:19, he writes, "The New Testament witnesses to what that dimension is …" (1993:162). The following quote is as poignant and beautiful a statement of missiology as I have read in the English language:

> It is precisely this divine capacity to have the Christ which allows us to speak of the 'Christ in God.' The creedal language concerning 'the only begotten of the father' has exactly this sense: the eternal nature of God, which enterprises and brings about all that we have historically and in the passion of Jesus. This is understood as disclosing, in initiative and action, what is therefore index to the divine being. It is as if we are saying that God is, thereby, 'credentialized' as truly divine in that he has truly come to grips with the wrongness of the human world in terms congruent with his own being and our earthly need. On both counts God is known to be 'most great.' We Christians see in the insignia of redeeming love the very criterion God gives us both for our theology and our ministry to others. Credential, character, and criterion are one and the same. They answer blessedly to what we know most radically about the humanity we share, if sin is to be known for what it is and be savingly forgiven (Cragg 1993:163).

For all its complexity, Cragg's solution is simple. Anthropology is contingent upon theology, and ultimately upon Christology. Akhtar (1991:77) and Mahfuz (see Cragg 1993:162) admit to a broken anthropology in Islam and Cragg's remedy is the gospel from the Scriptures (1993:163). It must be shown that Muslim confidence in Islam and Qur'an as "… the one religion divinely suited to human nature" (1993:161) is misplaced, and that the Christian gospel according to the Scriptures gives light on true anthropology, human sinfulness, and redemption.

6.2. The elenctical approach for encounter with Muslims

Missiological terms like pre-evangelism and direct/indirect method are helpful in formulating an approach to encounter. However, a Christian minister should be confident that his or her models and methods are Biblically derived and oriented. In this section I look at Bavinck's (1960) development of the nature and task of elenctics (1960:232), then broaden the scope of elenctics by examining its place in the Scripture. The section concludes with a working definition and goal for elenctics.

6.2.1. Bavinck and elenctics

Bavinck (1960) identifies the origin of the Biblical term for "elenctics" with the Attic Greek *elengchos*, which signifies the conviction of guilt (1960:221). He points out several glosses in the New Testament. In Jude 14 to 15, the Lord will convict the ungodly. Revelation 3:19 states, "As many as I love, I rebuke (*elengcho*) and chasten" (Bavinck 1960:221). Bavinck includes that rebuke (*elengche)* is commanded for leaders who sin, according to 1 Timothy 5:20. A disciplinary process (*elengxon*) is installed by the Lord in Matthew 18:15 for erring church members (1960:221).

The most important Biblical passage for elenctics is John 16:8, which states that the Holy Spirit would "… convict the world concerning sin and righteousness and judgment: concerning sin, because they do not believe in me; concerning righteousness, because I go to the Father; concerning judgment, because the ruler of this world is judged" (ESV). Bavinck (1960) writes:

> the Holy Spirit is actually the only conceivable subject of this verb, because the conviction of sin exceeds all human ability. Only the Holy Spirit can do this, even though he can and will use us as instruments in his hand. Taken in this sense, elenctics is the science which is concerned with the conviction of sin. In a special sense then it is the science which unmasks to heathendom all false religions as sin against God, and it calls heathendom to a knowledge of the only true God. To be able to do this well and truthfully it is necessary to have a responsible knowledge of false religions, but one must also be able to lay bare the deepest motifs which are therein expressed. This can actually occur only if one recognizes and unmasks these same undercurrents within himself. Elenctics is possible only on the basis of a veritable self-knowledge which is kindled in our hearts by the Holy Spirit (1960:222).

In the first portion of this quotation, Bavinck (1960) describes the process of elenctics, emphasizing the work of the Holy Spirit in bringing non-Christians under the conviction of sin. In particular, the Holy Spirit convicts of sinful beliefs about God. For the Christian minister, elenctics means relying upon the Holy Spirit to produce repentance and faith in the minds and hearts of Muslims. Ministry to Muslims in such a scheme involves discovering how the Spirit works in the lives of listeners during encounter, as well as conveying the Spirit's words, the Scriptures, to Muslim friends.

The second portion of Bavinck's quotation concerns the Christian responsibilities in the process of elenctics. Our task is to help listeners understand themselves; how they have made wrong assumptions about God. Specifically, John 16:8 states that Muslims

believe incorrectly about Jesus by rejecting His place with God the Father. Further, they have a less than Biblical view of righteousness, not accepting the divine standard the Lord Jesus presented. This line of thinking connects with Bavinck's primary point of questioning during encounter, "What have you done with God?" (1960:223).

At this point it is helpful to show how repentance in elenctics relates to the broader theological concept of *possessio* in Bavinck's (1960) thought. *Possessio* refers to the assertion of Christ's Lordship over humanity and Creation. "Christ takes the life of a people in his hands, he renews and re-establishes the distorted and deteriorated; he fills each thing, each word, and each practice with a new meaning and gives it a new direction" (1960:179). Elenctics is the approach that seeks to bring repentance to fallen humanity, re-establishing the recognition of Christ as Lord over all of human life. It extends out of the general theological concept of *possessio*, which "… is neither 'adaptation,' nor accommodation; it is in essence the legitimate taking possession of something by him to whom all power is given in heaven and on earth" (1960:179). Whereas Mahfuz confesses that Allah has "… decided to leave us to our own devices" (see Cragg 1993:162), elenctics, as an extension of *possessio,* sees repentance to God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as the fulcrum of God's work in humanity today. Therefore, Bavinck's identifying the Spirit's work in John 16:8 as the basis of Christian ministry is indispensable. Because God is love (1 John 4:8), Evangelical encounter with Muslims should be characterized by gentility and compassion. Because God is light (I John 1:5), the same ministry must be performed in humility and honest admonishment. As sinful people, neither love nor light originates with us, but is derived in truth from the Lord Christ, who has authority over all things.

As I state above, Muslim self-assurance and confidence in the Qur'an and in their traditions, which often oppose directly the deity of Christ, make giving and receiving correction difficult (Cragg 1993:161). If Muslims are reluctant to entertain alternative thoughts in their theology, then I propose seeking a point of contact in Islamic anthropology. Instead of seeking an elenctical line of contact with them concerning what they have "done with God" (Bavinck 1960:223), Evangelicals encountering Muslims can help them to see the effects their faith has upon humanity. As Akhtar (1991:77) and Mahfuz (see Cragg 1993:162) admit, Islam maintains so much distance between Creator

and Creation that humanity becomes "a riddle." Bavinck's question can then be modified to point Muslims towards pondering what their faith has "done with humanity." In the latter sections of this chapter I give several examples of how such a line of elenctics occurs.

6.2.2. Elenctics further defined in Scripture

Elenctics has a central place in Bavinck's development of missiology. However, if it is to be a viable course for Evangelicals as they encounter Muslims, then it must have a simple and Biblical foundation. Believing that elenctics is rooted in Scripture and applicable to Evangelical ministry among Muslims, I look to several key passages and figures from the Bible for support.

6.2.2.1. The apostle Paul's teaching in the Pastoral Epistles & in John's Gospel

In Titus 1:9 Paul writes, concerning leaders in the church, "He must hold firm to the trustworthy word as taught, so that he may be able to give instruction in sound doctrine and also rebuke those who contradict it" (ESV). In the same way that the preceding verse instructs the overseer to be careful to maintain good works, Titus 1:9 commands that he be skilled in the use of the word. Employments of Scripture and gospel advocated here are both offensive and defensive. Defensive use of the word includes edifying believers by building their confidence and knowledge of the word's applicability and reliability in life. An offensive use of the word is aimed at leading unbelievers towards repentance to God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Inherent in basic Islamic doctrine and Qur'an is the denial of the Lordship of Jesus Christ and Trinitarian doctrine. Elenctics, as Bavinck (1960) conceives it, extends from the use of the Scripture and gospel to "rebuke" (*elengchein*) false religions by bringing the conviction and unmasking of sin (1960:226). It is important that gentility and patience mark Evangelical elenctical encounter with Muslims, because the Holy Spirit performs the decisive work involved. We are the ministers of reconciliation and witnesses, without instrumental powers of persuasion in ourselves.

A natural connection exists between Paul's discourse about elenctics in Titus 1:9, and 1 Peter 3:15, which states that Christians should be prepared to "… make a defense to anyone who asks you for a reason for the hope that is in you" (ESV). Despite the presence of the word "defense," I include Peter's exhortation in the offensive category of elenctics, because giving reason for one's hope in Christ extends well beyond offering mere rational justification for Christian doctrine. Believers who have received salvation in Christ should be eager to testify to the enlivening effects of the Spirit and Word in their lives resulting from faith in the gospel. Therefore, elenctics is not only seeking to lead unbelievers to repentance to God, but also to faith in the Lord Jesus Christ (Acts 20:21).

2 Timothy 2:24–25a adds to the perimeters of elenctics by focusing on the minister involved in leading unbelievers to repentance and faith. Paul writes, "… the Lord's servant must not be quarrelsome, but kind to everyone, able to teach, patiently enduring evil, correcting opponents with gentleness" (ESV). Evangelical encounter with Muslims should not operate as a debate or fight. Further, if the minister is encouraged to endure evil circumstances with patience, it follows that patience and forbearance be extended to Muslims as they consider the testimony offered to them in encounter. The tone of correction the Scripture calls for, in elenctics, is gentility, like that of a surgeon able to use a sharp instrument to heal.

The apostle Paul continues in 2 Timothy 2:25b–26, "God may perhaps grant them repentance leading to a knowledge of the truth, and they may come to their senses and escape from the snare of the devil, after being captured by him to do his will" (ESV). Evangelicals encountering Muslims must recognize that only God can bring repentance and faith. Islam is a complex and integrated system that ensnares adherents in opposition to the Lord Jesus Christ. Only the work of the Spirit and Word can bring needed change. The progression outlined in this passage is as follows: gentle and patient correction, repentance, knowledge of the truth, and a coming to one's senses. First comes Spirit-led/Scripturally-based correction, followed by an awareness of sinful thoughts, actions and nature. The final component in conversion is an agreement with the Spirit/Word testimony, aptly termed a coming to one's senses. Paul's teaching here on the specifics of

how repentance is stirred in human lives is crucial for elenctics, and links well with John 16:7–11, to which I return again.

The Lord begins the passage with a statement difficult for the disciples to receive. "It is to your advantage that I go away" (John 16:7 ESV). The convicting work of the Holy Spirit may be difficult, but is good and needed for Muslims. Without the work of the Spirit and Word, Muslims, as well as all who have not expressed true repentance and faith, would be trapped in the sin, (un) righteousness, and the judgment of the world that the Lord describes consequentially. Apart from the Spirit and Word humanity rests under the wrath of God (Ephesians 2:3).

John 16:9–10 elaborates on the elenctical work of the Spirit and Word. The Lord Jesus states that the Spirit brings conviction to the world regarding sin, "… because they do not believe in me; concerning righteousness, because I go to the Father; concerning judgment, because the ruler of this world is judged" (ESV). The work of the Spirit here connects with the previously mentioned passage of Paul, 2 Timothy 2:26. "The world masquerades as righteous and suppresses any evidence to the contrary, and such behavior requires the Spirit to expose its guilt" (Kostenberger 2004:471). The specific guilt the Spirit and Word work to call attention to concerns unbelief in the person and work of the Lord Jesus. My offering elenctics to Evangelicals does not equal calling for a systematic repudiation of all things touching Muslim culture and practice. That is not the conviction the Lord Jesus describes in John 16. For example, the Bible does not dictate which types of foods a believer should eat. It does call for Christians to live in freedom, and use freedom to express love, acceptance, and edification (1 Corinthians 8). Systematic repentance is not the goal for elenctics. Instead, systemic repentance is the Biblical requirement. Forsaking every part of one's former life at the time of conversion is difficult to perceive and unrealistic to accomplish. John 16 deals with how the Spirit works to bring a systemic reorienting of life towards Christ as Lord. Every door of one's life must be open to the Lordship of Christ, and the work of the Spirit and Word following repentance and faith is to produce a greater desire to know and obey the Lord in all areas of life. Nevertheless, the greater passage of John 14–17 is clear in identifying Christ as Lord/Savior, humanity as sinner in need of salvation, and the Holy Spirit as the divine agent accomplishing redemption and sanctification.

The Lord also says that the Holy Spirit will convict the world concerning righteousness (John 16:9–10). Righteousness can be understood two ways. First, the reference could be to the relative (un) righteousness of the world through sins committed. The Holy Spirit convicts people of the ways that they "… fall short of God's glory" (Romans 3:23 ESV). A second and stronger interpretation for righteousness understands the Lord Jesus' own righteousness as a basis for judgment against the world. Both readings are possible, but the second illumines better the Lord's declaration that he is going to the Father. The world is guilty of suppressing true righteousness, that of the Triune God as seen in the Son. Islamic doctrine and the Qur'an deny both the Sonship of Jesus and the Fatherhood of God. In that way, Muslims reject the highest good, "… the clear biblical teaching that God is only to be experienced through his Son, Jesus Christ. Over this issue Islam and Christianity come into irreconcilable conflict" (Parshall 2002:27). Elenctics is the ministry of the Holy Spirit to bring Muslims to confess the truth of God as Father, Son, and Spirit. Evangelical encounter with Muslims, particularly when dealing with the Qur'an, should be structured in line with the elenctical ministry of the Spirit.

The Gospel of John concludes, in 16:10, that the world is convicted concerning judgment, "… because the ruler of this world is judged" (ESV). Rejection of true righteousness is rejection of the Triune God, and such resistance means taking the side of the ruler of this world, the devil. The judgment mentioned is not potential but actual, as the perfect tense of the verb indicates (Kostenberger 2004:472). "If the celestial ringleader of all evil is condemned, this also includes those who do his biding" (2004:472). Importantly, Kostenberger points out, "… this is the only place in Scripture where the Spirit is said to perform a work in the world" (2004:471). The work of the Spirit is to bring people into an awareness of his or her sinful status as a creature of the Triune Creator God. As far as direct Scriptural commentary is concerned, such conviction is the only explicit work of God the Spirit among the people of the world. An elenctical approach to Evangelical encounter with Muslims works to make explicit an alignment between the work of the Holy Spirit and methodology.

6.2.2.2. The apostle Paul's position in the book of Acts

Paul's encounter with the Greeks recorded in Acts 17:16–34 is at the center of the discussion for how Evangelicals should minister to Muslims. I see two important points for Evangelical encounter with Muslims that should be drawn from Acts 17:16–34. Though acknowledging the thought and commitments of the Athenians, Paul's outline follows the same basic goal expressed to the Ephesian Elders in Acts 20:21, "… of repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ" (ESV). All the complexity of Paul's discussion in Acts 17 is brought to a focal point in verses 30–31, which state that God overlooks the previous times of ignorance, "… but now he commands all people everywhere to repent, because he has fixed a day on which he will judge the world in righteousness by a man whom he has appointed; and of this he has given assurance to all by raising him from the dead" (ESV). God commands all people in all places, including Muslims, to come to Him in repentance and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. Doubtless, the learned apostle knew the beliefs of the Greeks concerning the final destiny of humanity. He knew the Biblical doctrine of resurrection would bring his audience to a point of crisis, as it would also for Jews in Jerusalem (Acts 23:6). Chapman (1989a) agrees that the apostle concludes his sermon with a call for repentance (1989a:125), but calls for a method for encounter that seeks "… to recognize all the common ground we can find between the two faiths, working within that area where the two circles overlap" (Chapman 1989b:127). Whereas Chapman offers a form of dialogue with Muslims on the Qur'an that points out areas where Bible and Qur'an have some level of disagreement (1989b:131), Greeson (2007) insists that attention be given to "the verses of the Koran that deal with truths about Jesus" (2007:48). My contention is that repentance is linked inseparably with faith in Paul's preaching in Acts (Bruce 1988:390), and the same link must remain essential in Evangelical ministry to Muslims. I do not claim that repentance has no place in Chapman or Greeson, but that the place repentance has in Evangelical encounter with Muslims should be made explicit. The dilemma created by faith and repentance in the Lord Jesus Christ ought not to be made more abrasive, nor its demand expanded with non-essential cultural requirements. Nevertheless, faithful proclamation during encounter with Muslims leads inevitably to a crisis of faith and a new allegiance to Christ as Lord. Further, there must also follow a redefining of all socio-cultural relationships under the new identity in Christ. As I state above, it is not possible for

individuals to reconcile the depth of such a change prior to repentance and faith. The example of Paul in presenting the resurrection to Greeks and Jews displays that he sought to establish Christ as Lord across the breadth of his audience's lives.

Acts 17:16–34 also supports my connection between anthropology and theology as a basis for elenctics. Immediately prior to concluding his discourse on repentance in the resurrected Lord Jesus, the apostle gives detailed instruction on the nature and purpose of creation and humanity. Keeping in mind the writings of Akhtar (1991:77) and Mahfuz (see Cragg 1993:162) that conclude that humanity is a riddle, consider the following verses from the book of Acts that record Paul's discourse with the Greeks on Mar's Hill. "The God who made the world and everything in it … made from one man every nation of mankind to live on all the face of the earth … that they should seek God, and perhaps feel their way toward him and find him" (Acts 17:24–27a ESV). Humanity has direction, value, and blessing as the Creation of God. The purpose of humanity is to seek after God. The next section of Paul's sermon has rich import for anthropology. "Yet he is actually not far from each one of us, for 'In him we live and move and have our being'; as even some of your our poets have said, 'For we are indeed his offspring'" (Acts 17:24b–28 ESV). My intent here is not to expound the finest details of Paul's anthropology as much as to point out the natural and Biblical connection between humanity's place as creation of God and the gospel in the context of ministry to non-Christians. As the Creation of God, we are not far from Him. Our constitution is such that we are equipped, though distracted and impaired by sin, to receive the Word of the Creator. Akhtar (1991:77) and Mahfuz (see Cragg 1993:162), insiders of Islam, admit and dislike the "riddle" effect of distance between God and humanity in the Qur'an. The apostle's presentation in Acts 17:16–34 is simple and direct, indicating the value, purpose, and potential of every person bearing God's image. However, Paul's purpose was to use anthropology to bring the Greeks to hear and receive the gospel, and he moves effortlessly to the resurrection of Christ as the culmination of anthropology. In that way, my call is to modify elenctics to begin with what people do with the doctrine of humanity as creation. It differs in focus from Bavinck's (1960:223) "… what have you done with God?" It begins with anthropology as another suitable Biblical motif.

Paul's preaching and ministry in Ephesus are critical for understanding encounter with non-Christian people. After an extended time in Corinth, Luke's description culminates with the declaration that "… all the residents of Asia heard the word of the Lord, both Jews and Greeks" (Acts 19:10 ESV). Further, the news of the miracles that the apostle performed "… became known to all the residents of Ephesus, both Jews and Greeks. And fear fell upon them all, and the name of the Lord Jesus was extolled" (Acts 19:17 ESV). New believers came confessing sins, burning old religious materials, and relinquishing possessions and practices of notable value. As Paul prepared to exit Ephesus and journey towards Jerusalem, a silversmith named Demetrius expressed his concern to the various guilds of craftsmen associated with the temple of Diana in the city. Luke records his speech,

> Men, you know that from this business we have our wealth. And you see and hear that not only in Ephesus but also in almost all of Asia this Paul has persuaded and turned away a great many people, saying that gods made with hands are not gods. And there is danger not only that this trade of ours may come into disrepute but also that the temple of the great goddess Artemis may be counted as nothing, and that she may even be deposed from her magnificence, she whom all Asia and the world worship (Acts 19:25–27).

Great anger, confusion, even rioting followed until the entire city is enraged. After two hours of prolonged exuberance in this state and some believers in the Lord Jesus being taken by the crowd, the town clerk urged the citizens to calm themselves, for a likely result of rioting would be Roman military intervention (Bruce 1988:378). He urged the populace not to be alarmed for the goddess, for her fame and majesty were universally acknowledged. "Everyone knew that her image was of no mortal workmanship, but had fallen from the sky … Therefore, the town clerk went on, the divine power of the goddess was undeniable and unassailable … The men they dragged into the theater were guilty of no crime" (Bruce 1988:378).

The town clerk's assertion in Acts 19:36 is a fulcrum for elenctics. He states, "Seeing then that these things cannot be denied, you ought to be quiet and do nothing rash" (ESV). His claim that there was no real threat to the position of the goddess or her worship in Ephesus and Asia was untrue. Demetrius admits, in Acts 19:26, that Paul had persuaded many people throughout the region to turn from idols to the Lord Jesus. The result was certain, for the guilds of idol makers were threatened, in addition to the actions

mentioned in Acts 19:18–19. Paul had clearly, repeatedly, and publicly spoken against "these things," resulting in those he mentored taking the ministry and proclamation upon themselves. His actions and ministry are far removed from the DEM axiom of non-extraction of the new believer from his or her birth culture. I do not mean to call for Evangelical ministry to seek to reproduce exactly the radical repentance that resulted from Paul's ministry. It ought not be taken as a model for Evangelical mission, for such actions are illegitimate, even dangerous, if forced or contrived. However, the direction of Paul's proclamation, of his speaking against the religion of the Diana, indicates that an essential element of authentic Christian encounter with non-Christians is repentance from worshipping all else besides the Triune God of the Bible. Evangelicals must handle the "these things" of Islam as they encounter Muslims. Our witness is to Christ as Lord, in accordance with the record and testimony of the Scriptures.

6.2.3. A working definition and goal for elenctics

I propose Qur'anic pre-evangelism as a summary term for an indirect method of elenctics for Evangelicals encountering Muslims. Following the lead of the Spirit and Word, Qur'anic pre-evangelism occurs when Evangelicals engage in questioning, and being questioned by Muslims concerning their lives and spirituality. As regards the Qur'an, it seeks to expose the inability of the Qur'an to impact vitality and life for Muslims, and its corresponding lack in reference to teachings on Christ and humanity. The goal of Qur'anic pre-evangelism is to lead Muslims gently towards becoming true spiritual seekers and finders of the Triune God of the Scriptures.

6.3. Towards a pre-evangelistic method for encounter with Muslims

Evangelicals must have a defined place in their methodology for dealing with the Qur'an as they encounter Muslims. Islam's prophet and holy book are the grid from which Muslims understand God, religion, and humanity. My intent is not to construct a formula for dealing with the Qur'an, or produce a single method that can be handed neatly over during encounter. Instead, I hope to describe the perimeters of a Biblical and Evangelical approach, and give a simple example that can be called upon at the proper time. In order to be equipped to survive and thrive in faith and obedience, new converts must be certain

on where truth about God, Christ, humanity, and salvation can be found. The degree to which they interact with the Qur'an as they encounter non-believers is adjustable, but the mindset from which they speak must be one of viewing the Christian Scriptures as the unique word of God.

6.3.1. A simple and Biblical methodology

In order for a method to be useful for widespread ministry among Muslims it should be both simple and Biblical. Simplicity in the method ensures that communication is clear and replication is possible for converts. The primary purpose of any method of encounter is to provide a way for Evangelicals to minister the gospel to Muslims. The gospel is "according to the Scriptures" (ESV 1 Corinthians 15:3), and any approach to encounter must also be drawn from the Bible.

6.3.2. Testimony and encounter

Several of the five methods I review in chapter 5 emphasize the importance of relationship in the process of encounter with Muslims. Though not stated explicitly, the structures of QT (1997) and WHLQ (2008) lend themselves to forming relationships with Muslims as ministry occurs. Accad (1997) insists that his seven principles are best utilized after a process of personalization, then presented in the context of a friendly relationship (1997:71–72). I call for allowing personal testimony to have a greater part in the methodology of Evangelicals as they encounter Muslims, while acknowledging that the methods I review in chapter 5 recognize the place of relationship in ministry.

Experience among Muslims in South Asia has taught me that the Biblical notion of personal testimony in witness is a promising point for breaking down barriers, introducing new possibilities, and establishing personal connection. An oft-quoted local proverb states, "No one born of this earth (land) can change his or her religion." As an expatriate, there is little counter-argument I can offer to the statement. The social reality of the prevalence of Islam makes the proverb compelling, and the emic perspective renders it out of reach apologetically. However, an insider can dismantle the argument with a simple testimony to the power of the gospel to bring new life. The pre-evangelistic model I set forth here has produced hundreds of new believers in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Pre-evangelism is best done in tandem with the confession that faith in the Lord Jesus Christ performs work in the human heart that no ethical, social, or religious force can offer.

There is substantial Biblical support for Evangelicals to use personal testimony in encounter with Muslims. I choose to focus on the life and Epistles of Paul, as well as an important example from the Gospel of John. In Acts, Luke records two instances where Paul presented his personal testimony in detail. "I am a Jew," he confesses, "born in Tarsus in Cilicia, but brought up in this city, according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers" (ESV Acts 22:2–3). Having been taken captive while in the Temple, Paul gives information of his life and background to the Jews. The apostle paints a picture of himself as not merely the controversial figure his opponents have caricatured him as, but also one brought up in the same town as his audience. He addresses them in Hebrew, bestowing familial terms upon them and further attaching himself to their own upbringing and recollection. The first reason to employ personal testimony in encounter with Muslims is modeled by Paul. The testimony of one's own life clarifies the speaker as one identified easily with the audience. This is important in Islamic contexts because most assume that anything not explicitly Islamic is incompatible with the life of a Muslim person. In verse four the apostle says, "I persecuted this Way to the death, binding and delivering to prison both men and women" (ESV Acts 22:4). In effect, Paul sets forth his life as an example of how the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ can bring significant change to identity and life direction. The reasoning inherent in an insider's personal story is simple and direct. It says, "… faith in the Lord Jesus Christ produced such a change in me that it could be called a new spiritual birth. It will do the same for you." Personal testimony can align with pre-evangelism to show that all people can learn the truth of the gospel. It is not foreign and impractical, but can change and bless all people through repentance and faith.

Acts 26 contains Paul's speech before Agrippa, before his being carried to Rome. This second detailed account of his life story and conversion adds another element to methodology for how to approach encounter with Muslims. "I stand here on trial because of my hope in the promise made by God to our fathers" (ESV Acts 26:6). The apostle's conversion is an example of how personal testimony can clarify the hope that the gospel

offers in Christ as Lord. Being brought up in the strictest manner of Judaism and having been involved in imprisoning and executing alternative voices, like Stephan, did not prevent the grace of God from taking hold of Paul's life. The hope of the gospel offered in Christ was greater than anything the world or his birth society could threaten him with. The two speeches of Paul in Acts work together to exhibit how personal/conversion testimony identifies the audience with the speaker (Acts 22:2–4), as well as the hope of the gospel.

Among the writings of Paul, Galatians and Philippians show personal testimony as well suited for use in difficult or hostile environments. Prefacing his experience of defending the gospel among the Jews and conversion from his birth culture, he reminds the Galatians "… that the gospel that was preached by me is not man's gospel … I received it through a revelation of Jesus Christ" (ESV Galatians 1:11–12). The apostle clarifies the gospel as divine in its origin and affect. In Acts 22:2–6 he presents his testimony as a simple human story and himself as a contemporary to his audience. In Galatians 1:11–12 he labors to show how his testimony recounts how the supernatural message of the gospel impacted his life. The divine message works to transform ordinary human hearts, bringing repentance and change on a deeper level than any philosophy or religious sentiment could. Philippians 3:7–8a enumerates the joyous choice repentance affords the believer in Jesus Christ as Lord. "But whatever gain I had, I counted as loss for the sake of Christ. Indeed, I count everything as loss because of the surpassing worth of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord." Paul values Christ above any past or potential future benefits faith in Christ causes him to forsake. The joy of knowing life in Christ is esteemed better than anything that could have been gained apart from Him. Philippians continues, "For his sake I have suffered the loss of all things and count them as rubbish, in order that I may gain Christ, and be found in him, not having a righteousness of my own that comes from the law, but that which comes through faith in Christ" (ESV Philippians 3:7–9). Paul's life story makes it clear that there can be genuine and significant loss in the lives of those who accept and follow Christ. It clarifies the place of repentance in adverse or hostile environments as costly but worthwhile.

The final Biblical passage I reference for the place of personal testimony in pre-evangelism is John 9. The evangelist recounts how the Lord Jesus healed a person with

congenital blindness. The blind person is not named, but it is clear that his social status is low, even that of a beggar. After washing the Lord's mud ointment from his eyes in the pool of Siloam, he went about seeing and moving freely. Amazed at his inexplicable recovery, his neighbors took him before the Pharisees, who were offended that the healing occurred on the Sabbath. The leaders lashed out against the Lord first, who did the miracle, and then made accusations toward the formerly blind man. The Pharisees pressured his parents to give them some way to dismiss the healing and its significance. Despite their high religious and social stature, they could not dismiss the testimony of a beggar. John records, "One thing I do know, that though I was blind, now I see" (ESV John 9:25). Though the man was uneducated, the logic of his personal experience with Christ was undeniable. Responding to the Pharisee attempt to dismiss Christ because they did not know where he originated:

> The man answered, "Why, this is an amazing thing! You do not know where he comes from, and yet he opened my eyes. We know that God does not listen to sinners, but if anyone is a worshipper of God and does his will, God listens to him. Never since the world began has it been heard that anyone opened the eyes of a man born blind. If this man were not from God, he could do nothing" (ESV John 9:30–33).

This narrative clarifies that even those of low social, religious, economic, and educational status can give powerful witness to the work of the gospel. Experts are not needed. What is needed is a clear and passionate testimony of a life transformed and a joy-filled heart that results from repentance to God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

The potential connection between personal testimony and pre-evangelism comes into sharper focus in the conclusion of the narrative of the man healed of congenital blindness. In John 9:39, the Lord Jesus states, "For judgment I came into this world, that those who do not see may see, and those who see may become blind" (ESV). He spoke this in the presence of the Pharisees, who were offended at his charging them with guilt. "Jesus said to them, 'If you were blind, you would have no guilt; but now that you say, 'We see,' your guilt remains'" (ESV John 9:41). The healed man's testimony is intended to lead the audience to confess their guilt and place trust in the saving power of the Messiah. Pre-evangelistic (elenctic) employment of the Qur'an for Evangelical encounter with Muslims has the same goal. As I express earlier in this chapter, the purpose of pre-

evangelism is to lead Muslims to entertain answers to the human predicament in sin and relationship to God that the Spirit and Word offers. An elenctical use of the Qur'an turns their attention away from the Qur'an, and personal testimony highlights the power of faith in Christ to give spiritual life. The points of application in methodology differ slightly, but the goal is the same.

6.3.3. Examples of pre-evangelistic uses of the Qur'an in mission

My proposal of Qur'anic pre-evangelism for Evangelical encounter with Muslims provides a way to initiate interaction with Muslims and move them towards repentance and faith in Christ as Lord and Savior. It is exemplified in *Only the sick need a doctor!* Prior to expounding the method I believe it is helpful to examine other styles from past and present encounter with Muslims so that the scope of Qur'anic pre-evangelism can be heard with clarity. I do not intend this elenctic approach to be all-inclusive. It is better employed as the first stage of transition into the broader Biblical message.

6.3.3.1. Classical style

By classical style, I refer to the writers of the imperialistic period. Their work is important to consider in formulating Qur'anic pre-evangelism because they interacted extensively with the Qur'an and Muslims in their ministries. I consider *The balance of truth* (Pfander 1910) an excellent example of the imperialistic period's approach to encounter with Muslims. Pfander comes close to an elenctical motive in portions his book, questioning, "What is the nature of the Qur'an, and how can Muslims trust it, if it has failed to discharge the task committed unto it by God, as they believe?" (1910:78). Unfortunately, rather than expand upon this lack on the Qur'an's part, he changes course. Typical of the imperialistic period writers, Pfander (1910) devotes the majority of his efforts to making the case from the Qur'an that Muslims must consider the Old and New Testaments. He insists that a correct reading of the Muslim holy book forbids Muslims from thinking the word of Allah in the previous prophetic books could be dismissed as corrupt (1910:104).

Close to the end of *The balance of truth* (1910) Pfander returns to his initial supposition of lack in the Qur'an. He describes the futility of the blessed state prophesied

by the Qur'an for faithful Muslims in paradise. In that place they will be "… furnished with everything suitable for the gratification of men's sensual appetites, but there is no place in it for holy and pure-minded men and women" (1910:299). I have found this point helpful for raising questions in the minds of Muslims as to whether or not the final state in Islam is beneficial and reconcilable to true human nature. It could also be connected with the anthropological motive that I expand in this thesis, because men and women feel innately that their purpose is not exhausted by consuming physical pleasures. Pfander (1910) explains my point further, writing, "… how can the human spirit, created to know and serve God, which should ever seek spiritual joy in the love of its maker, be gladdened and satisfied with such earthly delights as these" (1910:299).

Other possibilities of elenctical employment of the Qur'an in Pfander (1910) include his quotations of Surah The Women 4:106, Surah The Victory 48:1–2, and Surah Muhammad 47:21 to support his claim that the Prophet of Islam was a sinner (1910:301–302). His final charge against the Qur'an is that it fails to produce a savior or repentance. He admits that it speaks of sin, but fails to account of the weight and tragedy of human transgression, as compared with the Biblical teaching (1910:304–305). In all these ways, Pfander (1910) shows potential for development of Qur'anic pre-evangelism, but lacks the presupposition needed in order to proceed. Some of his material, such as the section on the final state of the Muslim (1910:299) can be helpful for supplementing certain areas when Evangelicals encounter Muslims. As a whole, the classical method is not useful in Qur'anic pre-evangelism.

Some of the methods I examine in chapter 5 also make comments that could carry elenctical notions. Greeson's (2007) section on "the big question," focusing on Surah Winding Sand-tracts 46:9, highlights the limitations of the Islamic prophet concerning human destiny (2007:73). QT (1997) includes sections on the sovereignty of Allah and *jihad* (1997:72–79) that could also have pre-evangelistic application. The occurrence of pre-evangelistic tendencies in both the classical and CQH works supports my claim to the simple and Biblical nature of elenctics and Qur'anic pre-evangelism. As stated throughout my thesis, I claim that writers compromise the uniqueness of Biblical authority only to the extent they employ the CQH. Because pre-evangelism extends from the elenctical work of the Holy Spirit, it occurs occasionally in the ministry of writers of

the DEM. My contention is to construct Evangelical ministry's use of the Qur'an during encounter explicitly on a pre-evangelistic base.

6.3.3.2. Ethical and narrative styles

There are several topics in the Qur'an that can be developed along pre-evangelistic lines. Forgiveness in the Qur'an is one option to explore. Questions could be raised concerning how and to whom pardon of sin is obtained for Muslims. It seems doubtful that all Muslims could expect the same clemency Allah displays towards David in Surah Sad 38:30–39. Jihad and Islamic attitude towards outsiders is another possibility. Surah The Table Spread 5:95 calls for court to be convened in the case of wild game taken without permission from landowners during the pilgrimage to Mecca. Considerably less care is given to those weak in their devotion to Allah, and Surah The Women 4:89 commands that some of the hypocrites should be put to death. The latter Qur'anic quotation comes from a wartime context and could be understood as only for that period, but there is no counterpoint reference in the Qur'an to balance the harsh response against. The Hebrew Torah on occasion calls for quick justice to be dealt to Israel's enemies. However, in addition to definitive limitations inside the Torah, Biblical Christians can also place the Lord's great admonition to "… love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, pray for those who abuse you" (ESV Luke 6:27–28).

A final option I list under the ethical style has proven helpful to me in breaking through to a number of Muslims especially rigid in their thinking. I do not recommend this approach for widespread use, but on appropriate occasions. Initially, I ask them to listen to a short story and answer a simple moral question. The story centers on an influential man, in a village much like their own. The man adopts a son, one orphaned at an early age. Having grown a great affection for the boy as he matured, the leader arranges a marriage for his son with the daughter of a respected local family. Sometime after the marriage, the father visits his son's home. Supposing no one to be at home, the man enters unannounced, only to find the wife of his son improperly clothed. The village leader is taken back and exclaims, "My, how your move the heart of a man!" Then he turns and departs. Learning of the influential man's desire for her, the wife elaborates to her husband the mutual attraction she and her husband's father feel for one another. The

son feels great shame towards his wife, but equal devotion to the father who adopted him. He concludes that he is unable to live in the awkward position indefinitely, and divorces his wife. The wife and the adopted son's father are promptly married. Having concluded the story, I ask the audience if they would consider the marriage to be morally or religiously good. A negative answer to the question always follows. At this point I ask them to read Surah The Confederates 33, which depicts the same scenario from the story occurring in the life of Islam's Prophet. The boy mentioned is Zeid, a former slave of Muhammad's wife Khadija. As I write above, this ethical line of Qur'anic pre-evangelism is helpful in gaining hearing for the Biblical message for the most obstinate objectors. Like the example of Islam's treatment of non-believers, this approach is not a case of judging the whole of Islam by a single difficult point. The Islamic stance on adoption from the time of the prophet until the present is shaped by these events.

McIlwain and Everson's (1991) *Firm foundations: creation to Christ* is not an example of a pre-evangelistic hermeneutic for the Qur'an, but its detailed approach to encounter with non-Christians has several important lessons for this study as an example of a narrative approach. It makes no argument against other religions, but seeks as complete a presentation of the message of the Bible as possible. As far as classification is concerned, it should be categorized as part of the direct method. However, its depth is far beyond most direct method examples.

> The Bible proclaims that the God of history is the one and only Creator, almighty Judge, and Savior of the world (Isaiah 43:9–17). There is only one true historical religion, that is, the religion of the Bible which was revealed and guided through history by God Himself … God uses this biblical, historical presentation of Himself to convince people of the truth of the Scriptures … He is indeed the living personal God who was and is involved in the history of the world (McIlwain and Everson 1991:37).

The approach of McIlwain and Everson (1991) is a sort of cumulative one, presenting a bulk of Biblical teaching so as to overwhelm opposing views. It consistently points out the coherence of the Biblical message and its relation to life. I believe that this narrative approach has an important place in ministry for Evangelicals as they encounter Muslims. It is true also that Islam presents a religion of devotees especially confident in the historical veracity of their Prophet and Qur'an. Often they are unwilling to complete even a single conversation concerning the issues *Firm foundations: creation to Christ*

211

(McIlwain and Everson 1991) deals with in fifty lessons. For that reason I believe that Evangelicals need more ways, include a pre-evangelistic use of the Qur'an, to begin and sustain deep conversations with Muslims that lead to the gospel.

Important lessons can be learned from the narrative style for use in the Qur'anic pre-evangelism. The goal of the narrative approach, to make explicit the historical depth and chronological teaching of the Bible, should be the teleology of Qur'anic pre-evangelism. Of the fifty lessons, the first twenty are derived from Genesis. It is not until lesson thirty that the New Testament Christ is presented. In terms of broad methodology to be widely employed, planning to go through thirty heavy Bible studies with Muslims before presenting the gospel borders on idealism. Nevertheless, the bulk of the study has to do with establishing Biblical understanding of humanity, God, and sin. The aim of elenctics is similar to the narrative approach, because it begins with the mind of unbelieving people and works to draw them towards repentance to Christ as Lord and Savior according to the Scriptures. Qur'anic pre-evangelism can begin with a wider audience because it initiates encounter with the views of Islam. At any rate, Evangelicals should respect and address the mind of Muslims during and after initial contact and gospel presentation and move towards a comprehensive presentation of the gospel and Biblical message.

6.3.3.3. *Only the sick need a doctor!* - an eclectic case study

In a manner similar to *The camel* (Greeson 2007), I offer this case study in two formats: a shorter presentation and an advanced study. Many times I have witnessed the shorter version of this presentation given by a friend, whose name I shorten and Westernize as Joe. He was born into a Muslim family in South Asia and appeals to others from his background to consider following Christ through comparing the Biblical teaching of Christ with that of the Qur'an. The comparison hardly appears as such, since he wraps it in the story of his conversion to Christ. I have entitled his presentation: *Only the sick need a doctor!*

The personal testimony of Joe is the structure of *Only the sick need a doctor!*, and includes three major sections. The first section, his life before repentance and faith in Christ, is marked by desperation and conviction. Growing up in a Muslim community

and family, sermons from the local mosque and stories from friends and village elders often included gruesome depictions of Allah's punishment for all those unfaithful in practicing Islam. One story he reports hearing often as a child during weekly sermons in the mosque weighed heavily upon his soul. It depicts the angels of Allah in the afterlife levying punishment on Muslims who were inconsistent in their daily prayers, and claims that one thousand years of torture would be assigned for each missed prayer and visit to the mosque. Having heard this same story myself many times from the mouths of Muslims, I believe that it, in the least, represents a common fearful sentiment of South Asian Muslims.

The reference Joe gives to connect the meaning behind the local story with the Qur'an is Surah The Heights 7:188, where Islam's prophet proclaims, "… I have no power over any good or harm to myself except as Allah willeth. If I had knowledge of the Unseen, I should have multiplied all good, and no evil should have touched me: I am but a warner, and a bringer of glad tidings to those who have faith." To those not born into a Muslim family the connection may not be clear initially. To Joe the application is simple. Allah offers help to those who are strong and persevere in belief. The immediate context, Surah The Heights 7:186, asserts that Allah leads astray those who do not believe. At any rate, Joe takes the meaning to be that the ministry of the prophet would be focused upon helping the faithful. There is no word for those who struggle and no assistance for those weary of bearing the weight of life and sin. Growing up in such an environment, he felt a debilitating dread and uncertainty concerning his standing before Allah. The axiom of Islamic religion Joe received from his community and found to be in the Qur'an was that righteous Muslims would be blessed while those who were unable to keep faithfully to the right path, keep up prayers, make the pilgrimage to Mecca, and so on would be paid back for their lack of steadfastness.

In the second section of *Only the sick need a doctor!* Joe states that his fear of Allah's punishment led him to compare Islam's teaching on retribution with what he was able to learn from other religions. For example, Krishna states "For the protection of the devotees and the annihilation of the miscreants and to fully establish righteousness, I appear millennium after millennium" (Gita 4:8). Joe concludes that the essential message of Krishna is similar to the religion he grew up with; those strong and faithful to God, or

ultimate reality, are blessed while those who are unfaithful are cursed. He felt the verdict of God weighing heavily upon his heart, a pain he believes all Muslims feel deep in their hearts.

It was at this place of despondency that a Christian introduced my friend to an important Bible passage from Mark 2:17, which comprises the final section of Joe's presentation. The passage states, "… those who are well have no need of a physician … I came not to call the righteous, but sinners" (ESV). He found that his feeling of guilt and lack of spiritual vitality before God concurred with what the Lord Jesus taught. Christ correctly diagnosed humanity's condition. The Lord came to help and save the spiritually weak and, far from issuing commands that sinful humanity could not follow adequately, offers the proper cure for the ailment. This verse, and the Biblical anthropology it represents, became a refuge for Joe. I have witnessed him employ it with success in the lives of hundreds of Muslims. They agree that Islam and Qur'an call for dedication and discipline, but fail to supply a corresponding empowerment or renewal for maintaining obedience. Where Islam, and other religions, fails to deal with humanity's actual problem, Christ offers help, healing, and new life to men and women as sinful creations of God. From this point Joe makes a more direct gospel proclamation.

At times Joe's presentation is longer and more complex, drawing upon more material from the Qur'an and Islamic beliefs that testify to humanity's responsibility to follow the teachings of the Qur'an in order to be blessed in life. He adds supplemental information at each point to deepen the discussion of human sinfulness and need, as well as provide depth into the Lord Jesus' healing work of grace. Joe's testimony focuses on how the grace of Christ did in his heart what Islamic religion could not. That work of grace remains the starting point, direction, and conclusion for his presentation. Sin is a part of human life. People are unable to obey God from the heart with consistency unless first being renewed and reconstituted in spirit. I present the short version of his presentation initially to emphasize how his personal testimony of conversion is crucial in tying together the components of *Only the sick need a doctor!*

The focus of the first section is to create a relational connection between himself and Muslims he encounters. It is here that rationale from the audience's religious background is offered. Some Muslims desire more context, time, reflection, and support

before accepting the anthropology and salvation offered in Mark 2:17. In addition to the primary text of Surah The Heights 7:186–188, many other references can be supplemented. Surah The Table Spread 5:2 states, "… Violate not the sanctity of the Symbols of Allah, nor of the Sacred Month, nor of the animals brought for sacrifice … nor the people resorting to the Sacred House, seeking the bounty and good pleasure of their Lord … for Allah is strict in punishment." The Hypocrites 63:6 furthers the warning. Allah instructs the prophet concerning hypocrites, "It is equal to them whether thou pray for their forgiveness or not. Allah will not forgive them. Truly Allah guides not rebellious transgressors." Here is highlighted the tendency towards extreme reparations in judgment, especially in regard to those failing to bring forth a life befitting a Muslim. Being faithful to Allah means careful accounting of all religious duties. Failure to perform prayers, make the pilgrimage, and give offerings proscribed will be met with stern punishment from Allah.

Another passage that Joe may reference in his presentation is Surah Winding Sand-tracts 46:9, that states, "Say: 'I am no bringer of newfangled doctrine among the Messengers, nor do I know what will be done with me or with you. I follow but that which is revealed to me by inspiration; I am but a Warner open and clear." This ayat is helpful, especially when linked with his primary text, Surah The Heights 7:188 (quoted above). The prophetic office of Muhammad claims great certainty for Muslims as regards the Qur'an, the Prophet, and the way of Islam. No assurance is assigned to the contemporary state or everlasting destiny of Muslims. The prophet himself is not given a guarantee of blessing in the afterlife. Using these references, Joe calls attention to the lack of assurance the Muslim ought to have in his or her life. In *Only the sick need a doctor!*, the Qur'anic references work together to bring together the Muslim's self-perceived need of grace in life to deal with sin and the explicit lack of Islam to offer assistance. This is an excellent example of pre-evangelistic employment of the Qur'an. It is not a case of exploiting the most difficult places in people or religion. Instead, Joe begins his encounter with Muslims at the core of Islamic faith and confidence, the ministry of the Prophet. Having begun a discussion there upon the lack of assurance in the hearts of the audience, he appeals to Muslims to consider the assurance and confidence he has found in the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The greater narrative of Mark 2 is helpful in gaining insight into Joe's reading of the seventeenth verse. A paralytic is unable to gain access to the Lord Jesus, and those who accompany him, hoping for their friend to be healed, remove part of the roof of the house where Christ sits. Seeing the faith of the men as they lower the paralytic down in front of him, the Lord grants the sick man healing. However, instead of declaring the man whole again and helping him to stand, the Lord states, "Son, your sins are forgiven" (ESV Mark 2:5). The Scribes close by are angry to hear his claim to issue forgiveness, a work only God could do. He claims boldly to be the prophetic Son of Man from Daniel 7:13–14, who is to be worshiped by all humanity. The message of Christ in Mark 2:1–12 for encounter with Muslims is that he, himself, is the means of coming to God and forgiveness of sins. He is the Savior. Joe's supplementation for the final section of *Only the sick need a doctor!* helps to move people born into Muslim families towards recognizing Christ as Savior of sinful humanity.

In the next section of Mark 2 Christ makes a supplemental statement to the Scribes, who were enraged at him a second time for eating with tax collectors and sinners. Verse 17 states succinctly the Biblical position on anthropology and human need, relating it to religion. "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick. I came not to call the righteous, but sinners" (ESV). Not having understood the place of Jesus as the Son of Man in their first encounter with the Lord (Mark 2:1–12), the religious leaders lacked the spiritual discernment to see their own plight as roughly equivalent to the tax collectors and religious outcastes. On this second occasion of confrontation with the Scribes, the Lord Jesus sheds light on humanity's spiritual condition before God. Rather than assuming their possession of the Law of Moses and the tradition descending from the Old Testament as sufficient for religious good standing, they should have included themselves within the ranks of the condemned humanity. Joe's usage of Mark 2:17 recognizes that often Muslims feel their actual sinful condition before God, as attested to by the Lord. As the sick in body require help from medical professionals, people are in need of God's grace and forgiveness to heal and renew them spiritually. After leading the Muslim to see the Biblical teaching about themselves and sinners, he testifies to the sufficiency of Christ as Savior. If Muslims are able to agree

with Joe about the Lord Jesus's teaching from Mark 2 on anthropology, then there is a natural inclination for serious entertainment of Christ as Savior and Lord.

Joe's presentation can be supplemented further by a comparison of Qur'anic and Biblical texts concerning creation and humanity's fall into sin. In this section I expand the scope of Joe's presentation until it fits within the broader framework of the Scriptural narrative. In Surah The Heifer 2:30 records a conversation between Allah and the angels at the time of the creation of Adam. He speaks to the angels, saying, "Lo! I am about to place a viceroy in the earth, they said: Wilt Thou place therein one who will do harm therein and will shed blood, while we, we hymn thy praise and sanctify Thee? He said: Surely I know that which ye know not." In the following ayats Allah discloses to Adam secret knowledge concerning the names of earthly creatures, and calls upon the Angels to speak the names. Unable to produce the names, all of the Angels, except Iblis (Satan), they obey Allah's command and fall prostrate before Adam. Subsequently, Adam is commanded to live in the Garden and eat of its fruits, "… but approach not this tree, or ye run into harm and transgression" (Surah The Heifer 2:35). After Satan leads them towards disobedience of Allah's word they are cast out of the garden. The next ayat records, "Then learnt Adam from his Lord words of inspiration; for He is oft-Returning, Most Merciful" (Surah The Heifer 2:37). A fundamental tenet of Islam is that humanity has sinned against Allah. Allah's commands should be obeyed, but men choose not to follow him. His gift to humanity is revelation, a gift completed and perfected in the Qur'an. Revelation in the Qur'an is efficient for all of humanity's needs.

The Islamic doctrine of grace through the revelation of the Qur'an is seen also in Surah Bees 16:64–65, which states,

> And We sent down the Book to thee for the express purpose that thou shouldst make clear to them those things in which they differ, and that it should be a guide and a mercy to those who believe. And Allah sends down rain from the skies, and gives therewith life to the earth after its death: verily in this is a Sign for those who listen.

A farmer can till his land with expertise, but only Allah can give rain and life to dry ground. Islam teaches that the life-giving rain is the Qur'an. As the farmer prepares for rain from heaven, the hearer of the Qur'an should follow through in obedience to the message. Such is the Islamic notion of grace. In regards to the Qur'anic account of

creation and humanity's transgression we may conclude that following the transgression, Allah provided guidance and mercy for people in his commands, a process culminated and perfected forever in the glory of Islam, the Qur'an. I have found Muslims of all educational and social status agree quickly with this assessment of the religion of Islam and Qur'an. It does not set aside the points or direction of *Only the sick need a doctor!*, but provides a greater Qur'anic grid to complete both the lack of assurance Muslim's feel in their life and the Biblical alternative.

The Biblical side of the presentation that Joe provides centers on Mark 2:1–17. I expand that section to include more of the Biblical narrative. Genesis 1:26 says, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over the earth." Chapter 2:8–9 continues, "And the Lord God planted a garden in Eden, in the east, and there he put the man whom he had formed … The tree of life was in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil" (ESV). The position of humanity in the Bible as having dominion resembles the Qur'anic title *khalipah* from Surah The Heifer 2:30. Another commonality is Satan as the agent of temptation. However, the Qur'anic emphasis is on the Adam's receiving "… from His Lord words of inspiration, and his Lord turned towards him; for He is Oft-Returning, Most Merciful." (Surah The Heifer 2:37) a focus further attested to by the judgment of fire promised for those who disbelieve the revelations of Allah (Surah The Heifer 3:39).

At the heart of the Biblical narrative is the rending of the relationship between Creator and Creation. The Lord God granted Adam and Eve freedom to eat from the tree of life, and all other trees in the garden except the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. They choose to follow in the rebellion of the Serpent, and sin against their Creator. The Biblical emphasis is on the severed relationship, and more detail is included on the confrontation between the Lord God and the three parties involved. Adam responds to the Lord's questioning, stating that "I heard the sound of you in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked, and I hid myself" (ESV Genesis 3:10). The shame Adam felt was proper because of his breaking the relationship with God. In the same way, the shame contemporary people feel concerning their relationship with God is proper.

Instead of providing grace through commandments to obey, as in the Qur'anic account, the Biblical narrative presents the need for new life through the shedding of

blood and a promised savior. In Genesis 3:15 the Lord God judges the Serpent and declares that the Woman's "seed" would mortally wound the Serpent and end his power to deceive. Then God sacrifices an animal so that the man and woman could be clothed (Genesis 3:21). In each point of comparison the Biblical narrative declares a deeper meaning than the Qur'an. The relationship after creation is emphasized more, as well as the grievousness of the crime and tremendous requirement for redemption. Knowledge of a right path or better religious practices do not suffice to repair the damage done by following the example of the Serpent. Illumination of the mind is impractical unless paired with a corresponding reforming of heart and will. Taken in full Biblical context, Genesis 3:15, 21 signifies that the Seed would give his own life as redemption for humanity, bring a renewal of mind, and a cause a healing work in the inner person.

The hermeneutic for the Qur'an employed in *Only the sick need a doctor!* is pre-evangelistic. It takes an elenctical approach to the Qur'an, focusing attention on areas where Islam cannot deal with humanity's constitution and need in the same depth as the Biblical alternative. At times the two sources speak of the same events, but no attempt is made to read Biblical meaning into the Qur'an. This point is explicit in the longer version. Joe's method has sufficient depth in its interaction with the Qur'an and the lives of South Asian Muslim people. It brings out the heart of Islamic religion of the Qur'an from an insider's perspective and allows the meaning of the Qur'an to be derived from its native community. Reasoning from the Qur'an has the purpose of leading the Muslim towards repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, instead of a set of shared truths between source books. The presentation leads towards recognizing Qur'anic anthropology as unable to account for or heal the actual condition of humanity. Joe's method also has depth of Biblical interpretation. The discourse of Mark 2 contains a lengthy discussion of who Christ is, what his redeeming work accomplishes, and the place of men and women in appropriating salvation in Christ. As seen in Joe's method, Qur'anic pre-evangelism offers a new approach that preserves the depth of cultural and theological engagement found in using the Qur'an in encounter with Muslims. Unlike methods that employ the CQH, it does not compromise the uniqueness of Biblical authority.

As I state above, I rework the direction of elenctics to include not only leading unbelievers to ask and answer the question, "What have you done with God?," but also to ask "What have I done with humanity (creation)?" This alteration aids the Muslim, taught from the youngest age that Islamic knowledge of God is impeccable, to see how his or her religion separates Creator and creation. In Islam, duty to Allah remains but relationship with him is strained greatly. I have witnessed this approach result in the coming to repentance and faith in Christ of hundreds of Muslims. It is not mere theory, but the testimony of a person renewed and saved by the gospel. The focus on anthropology draws into sharp focus the call of Christ to those in need. He offers himself as their Lord, all they need for life and godliness (1 Peter 1:3). His account of humanity's true nature and guilt gives better explanation and promises better remedy for those born into Muslim families. The gospel does not demand a tighter adherence to religious practice or abstinence from forbidden practice from those unable to deliver. Rather, "… since the children share in flesh and blood, he himself likewise partook of the same things, that through death he might destroy the one who has the power of death, this is, the devil" (ESV Hebrews 2:14). Humanity's part is not to work to better our condition on our own, but to "… with confidence draw near to the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy and find grace to help in time of need" (ESV Hebrews 4:16).

My thesis seeks to make explicit in Evangelical encounter the process of Qur'anic pre-evangelism, defined as Bavinck's elenctics, which works to bring systemic repentance and faith to those born into Muslims cultures. I propose the self-perceived lack many Muslims feel in the area of anthropology as a starting point. The basic teaching of the Bible and Christianity is that Christ is Lord of all, and that He took flesh in order to redeem sinful humanity. The basic teaching of the Bible ought to be the basic intent and direction of our encounter with Muslims. I offer Qur'anic pre-evangelism, understood according to Bavinck's elenctical scheme, as an approach to initiate contact deep within the life and thought of Muslims, and move them towards repentance to God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

In order to build a continuous and blessed witness to the grace and Lordship of Jesus Christ in their birth culture, it is important that a new convert be confident in his or her identity. It is helpful for the new believers to remain in their family and community where they can give testimony to the power of the gospel. Immediate alterations on non-essential cultural issues, such as food choice and dress, should not be forced. Those from Muslim families that place repentance and faith in Christ as Lord must have assurance in the place where special revelation from the true God comes. The Bible alone is the Word of God. Only with the Christian Scriptures as source can the gospel be preached responsibly. The elenctical approach I outline in chapter 6 is called Qur'anic pre-evangelism. Though various points of contact and didactic schemes may be employed, I advocate beginning with a common non-technical conception ordinary Muslims feel. They testify that the teachings of Islam fail to provide a viable way to obtain assurance in relationship to God. *Only the sick need a doctor!* is an excellent example of employing the Qur'an in an elenctical, pre-evangelistic sense. There is no attempt to read Biblical meaning into the Qur'an. Instead, beginning from the common conception that Muslims feel regarding assurance, a simple comparison is made to the power and person of the Lord Jesus Christ.

While bringing my study to a close I offer several areas in which Evangelical theology and missiology should develop. A first and important area is in the doctrine of common grace. This issue arises from my discussion of the nature of truth as regards the competing sources of Bible and Qur'an. Though at times the categories are limited in expressing the Creator/creature relationship, revelation can be understood basically as general and special, and the categories of grace correspond to these. Common grace is truth that men can know without specific reliance on special revelation. Lack of sufficient development in Evangelical theology concerning common grace does little to produce clarity on similar issues in missiology. Further, fresh and Biblical statements of theology on this issue stands to beat fruit in theological and cultural anthropology.

Evangelical hermeneutics has had some encouraging development since the

1970s. Since writing his *Is there meaning in this text?,* Vanhoozer (1998) has moved on to sculpt a wide-ranging, multi-disciplinary approach called the theological interpretation of the Bible. He edited the *Dictionary for theological interpretation of the Bible* (2005), which includes a broad sampling of Evangelical scholarship. Its contributors are from around the world, and write from a variety of viewpoints. Theological interpretation of the Bible is Evangelical in the traditional sense of the world, but is in no way monolithic. Its emphasis is on the differing ways in which God speaks to the church through the Spirit and Word. The wooden model of conservatism that Kraft (1979a:32) wrote against is gone. However, more work needs to be done and the connection between the church and the Spirit/Word made more explicit.

An increased development in hermeneutics coupled with an emphasis on the Church and its mission in the World should result in a more Biblical Evangelical missiology. Correspondingly, placing such weight on interpreting the Bible by the Church in the world during its mission should result in a missiologically informed theology. Evangelicalism's hope for enduring and thriving in mission is on its faith to continually seek and find its origin, continuing sustenance, and consummation in the leading of the Lordship of Jesus Christ as expressed in the Scriptures.

Bibliography

Abdul-Haqq, AA. 1980. *Sharing your faith with a Muslim*. Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship.

Accad, FE. 1976. The Qur'an: a bridge to Christian faith. *Missiology* 4(3):331–42.

Accad, FE. 1997. *Building bridges: Christianity and Islam*. Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress.

Akhtar, S. 1991. *A faith for all seasons: Islam and the challenge of the modern world*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Aland, BA, Aland, K, Karavidopoulos J, Martini, CM & Metzger, BM. 1998. *The Greek New Testament*. 4th revised edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Ali, YA. 2000. *The Holy Qur'an.* Hertforshire: Wordsworth.

Basic principles and procedures for Bible translation. 2011. *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 28(3):149.

Baroi, S. 2008. *The way to heaven through the light of the Qur'an*. Dhaka: EKUSH.

Barth, K. 1956a. *Church dogmatics: the doctrine of the Word of God,* vol I (1). Translated by GW Bromiley, GT Thomson and H Knight. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Barth, K. 1956b. *Church dogmatics: the doctrine of the Word of God,* vol I (2). Translated by GW Bromiley, GT Thomson and H Knight. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Bavinck, JH. 1960. *An introduction to the science of missions*. Translated by DH Freeman. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing.

Bennett, C. 1988. A theological appreciation of the Reverend Lewis Bevan Jones (1889–1960): Baptist pioneer in Christian-Muslim relations. *Baptist Quarterly* 32(5):237–52.

Bevans, SB. 1992. *Models of contextual theology.* Maryknoll: Orbis Books.

Bosch, DJ. 1991. *Transforming mission: paradigm shifts in theology of mission.* American Society of Missiology Series. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.

Brown, R. 2000. What must one believe about Jesus for salvation? *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 17(4):32–41.

Brown, R, Gray, L & Gray, A. 2011a. A brief analysis of filial and paternal terms in the Bible. *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 28(3):121–25.

Brown, R, Gray, L & Gray, A. 2011b. A new look at translating familial biblical terms. *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 28(3):105–20.

Bruce, FF. 1988. *The Book of Acts*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Bultmann, RK. 1955. *Essays: philosophical and theological.* London: SCM Press.

Bultmann, RK. 1958. *Jesus Christ and mythology*. New York: Scribner Press.

Caldwell, S. 2000. Jesus in Samaria: a paradigm for church planting among Muslims. *International Journal of Frontier Missions*. 17(1):25–32.

Carson, DA (ed). 1984. *Biblical interpretation and the Church: Text and Context*. Exeter: Paternoster Press.

Carson, DA. 2002. *The gagging of God: Christianity confronts pluralism*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Carson, DA. 2008. *Christ and culture revisited*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Chapman, C. 1989a. Rethinking the Gospel for Muslims, in *Muslims and Christians on the Emmaus road: critical issues in witness among Muslims,* edited by JD Woodberry. Monrovia, CA: MARC, 105–26.

Chapman, C. 1989b. The God who reveals, in *Muslims and Christians on the Emmaus road: critical issues in witness among Muslims,* edited by JD Woodberry. Monrovia, CA: MARC, 127–48.

Clark, DK. 2003. *To know and love God: method for theology*. Wheaton: Crossway Books.

Cockerill, GL. 2002. *Guidebook for pilgrims to the heavenly city*. Pasadena: William Carey Library.

Coleman, RJ. 1972. *Issues of theological warfare: evangelicals and liberals*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Conn, HM. 1979. The Muslim convert and his culture, in *The Gospel and Islam: a 1978 compendium*, edited by DM McCurry. Monrovia, CA: MARC, 97–111.

Conn, HM. 1984. *Eternal word and changing worlds: theology, anthropology, and mission in trialogue.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Cragg, KA. 1959. *Sandals at the mosque: Christian presence amid Islam*. Christian Presence Series. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cragg, KA. 1971. *The event of the Qur'an: Islam in its scripture*. London: Allen & Unwin Press.

Cragg, KA. 1973. *The mind of the Qur'an: chapters in reflection*. London: Allen & Unwin Press.

Cragg, KA. 1979. Islamic theology: limits and bridges, in *The Gospel and Islam: a 1978 compendium*, edited by DM McCurry. Monrovia, CA: MARC, 196–207.

Cragg, KA. 1985a. *Jesus and the Muslim: an exploration*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications.

Cragg, KA. 1985b. *The call of the minaret*. 2nd edition. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.

Cragg, KA. 1985c. *The pen and the faith: eight modern Muslim writers and the Qur'an*. London: Allen & Unwin Press.

Cragg, KA. 1989. Contemporary trends in Islam, in *Muslims and Christians on the Emmaus road: critical issues in witness among Muslims,* edited by JD Woodberry. Monrovia, CA: MARC, 21–44.

Cragg, KA. 1993. The riddle of man and the silence of God. *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 17(4):160–63.

Culver, J. 2000. The Ismael promise and contextualization among Muslims. *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 17(1):61–70.

Duerkson D. 2012. Must insiders be churchless? Exploring insiders' models of "church." *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 29(4):161–67.

Dryness, WA. 1990. *Learning about theology from the third world.* Grand Rapids: Academie Books.

Erickson, MJ. 1989. *Christian theology.* Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Esack, F. 1997. *Qur'an, liberation, and pluralism*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications.

Esack, F. 1999. *On being a Muslim: finding a religious path in the world today*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications.

Farquhar, JN. 1971. *The crown of Hinduism*. New Delhi: Oriental Books.

Fleming, BCE. 1980. *Contextualization of theology: an Evangelical assessment.*

Pasadena: William Carey Library.

Frame, JM. 2000. Presuppositional apologetics, in *Five views of apologetics,* edited by SB Cowan. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, e-formatted edition, no page numbers, outlined as chapter 4.

Frame, JM. 2007. Greeks bearing gifts, in *Revolutions in worldview*, edited by A Hoffecker. Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Publishing, 1–36.

Frame, JM. 2010. *The doctrine of the Word of God.* Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P & R Publishing.

Fund for Theological Education. 2005. *The FTE guide to theological education*. Atlanta, GA: Fund for Theological Education.

Gairdner, WHT. 1920. *The rebuke of Islam*. London: United Council for Missionary Education.

Garrison, DV. 2004. *Church planting movements: how God is redeeming a lost world*. Monument, CO: Wigtake Resources.

Geisler, NL. 1996. *An apologetic for apologetics*. Available at http://normangeisler.net/articles/apologetics/AnApologeticForApologetics.htm (accessed on 15/03/2015).

George, T. 2002. *Is the Father of Jesus the God of Muhammad?* Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Gilchrist, J. 1985. Christ in Islam and Christianity – response to Christ in Islam: a comparative study to the Christian and Muslim attitudes to the person of Jesus Christ. *Qur'an and Bible Series* (4). Durban: Jesus to the Muslims.

Gilliland, DS (ed). 1989. *The word among us: contextualizing theology for mission today*. Dallas: Word Publishing.

Gilliland, DS. 2000. Modeling the incarnation for Muslims: a response to Sam Schlorff. *Missiology* 28(3):329–38.

Gita 4:8. Available at http://vedabase.net/bg/4/8en2.htm (accessed on 15/03/2015).

Glasser, AF. 1979. Conference report, in *The Gospel and Islam: a 1978 compendium*, edited by DM McCurry. Monrovia, CA: MARC, 43–51.

Greeson, K. 2007. *The camel: how Muslims are coming to faith in Christ!* Richmond, VA: Wigtake Resources.

Half devil—half child. 2012*,* video recording, Red Futon Films, Billings, Montana. Written by B Nikides & J Friesen.

Hawting, GR, & Abdul-Kader A (eds). 1993. *Approaches to the Qur'an*. London: Routledge Press.

Henry, CFH. 1976. *God, revelation, and authority*. Waco: Word Publishing.

Hesselgrave, DJ. 1991. *Communicating Christ cross-culturally: an introduction to missionary communication*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Hesselgrave, DJ. 2000. *Planting churches cross-culturally: North America and beyond.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Hesselgrave, DJ & Rommen, E. 2000. *Contextualization: meanings, methods, and models.* Pasadena: William Carey Library.

Hiebert, P. 1984. Critical contextualization. *Missiology* 12(3):287–96.

Hiebert, P. 1985. *Anthropological insights for missionaries*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Hiebert, P. 1987. Critical contextualization. *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 11(3):104–11.

Hiebert, P. 1989. Form and meaning in the contextualization of the Gospel, in *The Word among us*, edited by DS Gilliland. Waco: Word Publishing, 101–20.

Hiebert, P. 1999. *The missiological implications of epistemic shifts: affirming truth in a modern/postmodern world.* Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.

Hoefer, H. 2005. Proclaiming a "theologyless" Christ, *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 22(3):97–100.

Hocking, WE. 1932. *Re-thinking missions: a layman's inquiry after one hundred years.* New York: Harper & Brothers.

Jameson, R & Scalevich, N. 2000. First-century Jews and twentieth-century Muslims. *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 17(1):33–40.

Jones, LB. 1932. *The people of the Mosque: an introduction to the study of Islam with special reference to India*. Calcutta: YMCA Publishing House.

Jones, LB. 1938. *Christianity explained to Muslims: a manual for Christian workers.* Calcutta: YMCA Publishing House.

Keller, T. 1996–1997. *Reasons for our hope* (Basic Apologetics). SOSL Seminar III (Apologetics). Part III. Online version 2.1.

Kistemaker, SJ. 1990. The speeches in Acts. *Criswell Theological Review* 5(1):31–41.

Khair-Ullah, FS. 1976. Linguistic hang-ups in communicating to Muslims. *Missiology* 4(3):301–16.

Kostenberger, AJ. 2004. *John*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Knapp, SC. 1978. A word from the publisher: introducing *Gospel in Context*. *Gospel in Context* 1(1):1.

Koyama, K. 1967. Aristotelian pepper and Buddhist salt. *Practical Anthropology* 14(3):97–102.

Koyama, K. 1999. *Water buffalo theology*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.

Kraemer, H. 1956. *The Christian message in a non-Christian world*. 3rd edition. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications.

Kraemer, H. 1962. *Why Christianity of all religions?* Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Kraft, CH. 1974. Psychological stress factors among Muslims, in *Media in Islamic Culture. Report [of] conference on media in Islamic culture*, edited by CR Shumaker. Wheaton: Evangelical Literature Overseas, 137–44.

Kraft, CH. 1979a. *Christianity in culture: a study in dynamic Biblical theologizing in cross-cultural perspective*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.

Kraft, CH. 1979b. Dynamic equivalence churches in Muslim society, in *The Gospel and Islam: a 1978 compendium,* edited by DM McCurry. Monrovia, CA: MARC, 114–27.

Kraft, CH. 1983. *Communication theory for Christian witness*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Kraft, CH. 1989. Contextualizing communication, in *The Word among us*, edited by DS Gilliland. Waco: Word Publishing, 121–40.

Kraft, CH. 1999. *Communicating Jesus' way*. Pasadena: William Carey Library.

Kraft, CH (ed). 2005a. *Appropriate Christianity*. Pasadena: William Carey Library.

Kraft, CH. 2005b. Response to Herbert Hoefer's proclaiming a "theologyless" Christ. *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 22(3):101.

Kraft, CH & Wisley, TN. 1979. *Readings in dynamic indigeneity*. Pasadena: William Carey Library.

Krass, AC. 1979. Contextualization for today. *Gospel in Context* 2(3):27–30.

Küng, H & Moltmann, J (eds). 1994. *Islam: a challenge for Christianity*. London: SCM Press.

Lausanne Committee on World Evangelization 1978. *Willowbank Report: report of a consultation on Gospel and culture*. Wheaton: LCWE.

Lausanne Committee on World Evangelization. 1980. *The Thailand report on Muslims*. Wheaton: LCWE.

Lee, S. 1824. *Controversial tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism*. Cambridge: J Smith Press.

Macdonald, DB. 1911. *Aspects of Islam*. New York: MacMillan.

Massey, J. 1996. Planting churches underground in Muslim contexts. *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 13(3):139–52.

Massey, J. 2000a. Editorial: Muslim contextualization I. *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 17(1):3–4.

Massey, J. 2000b. God's amazing diversity in drawing Muslims to Christ. *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 17(1):5–14.

McCurry, DM (ed). 1979. *The Gospel and Islam: a 1978 compendium*. Monrovia, CA: MARC.

McIlwain, T & Everson, N. 1991. *Firm foundations: creation to Christ*. Sanford, FL: New Tribes Mission.

Moltmann, J. 1985. *God in creation: a new theology of creation and the Spirit of God*. Translated by M Kohl. San Francisco: SCM Press.

Morton, J. 2011a. Theology of religions: would Jesus be caught dead working in Islam? in *Christlam: how missionaries are promoting an Islamized Gospel*, edited by J Lingel, J Morton & B Nikides. Garden Grove, CA: i2 Ministries Publishing, e-formatted edition, no page numbers, outlined as chapter 3.3.

Morton, J. 2011b. Inappropriate missiology? in *Christlam: how missionaries are promoting an Islamized Gospel*, edited by J Lingel, J Morton & B Nikides. Garden Grove, CA: i2 Ministries Publishing, e-formatted edition, no page

numbers, outlined as chapter 3.5.

Muir, W. 1887. *Mahomet and Islam*. London: Religious Tract Society.

Muir, W. 1896. *The Coran: its composition and teaching: and the testimony it bears to the Holy Scriptures*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Nelson, J. 2011. Religion and identity – going public with faith in a Muslim context: lessons from Esther. *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 28(4):191–94.

Netland, HA. 1988. Towards contextualized apologetics. *Missiology* 16(3):289–303.

Nicholls, BJ. 2003. *Contextualization: a theology of Gospel and culture*. Vancouver: Regent College Publishing.

Nida, EA. 1954. *Customs and cultures: anthropology for Christian missions.* New York: Harper Collins.

Nida, EA. 1960a. *Message and mission: the communication of the Christian faith*. New York: Harper Collins.

Nida, EA. 1960b. Religion: communication of the supernatural. *Practical Anthropology* 7(3):97–111.

Nida, EA. 1972. Linguistic models for religious behavior. *Practical Anthropology* 19(1):13–26.

Nida, EA & Reyburn, WD. 1981. *Meaning across cultures: a study on Bible translating*. American Society of Missiology series. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.

Nida, EA & Taber, CR. 1982. *The theory and practice of translation with special reference to Bible translating*. Leiden: Brill Academic.

Osborne, GR. 2006. *The hermeneutical spiral: a comprehensive introduction to Biblical interpretation*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Packer, JI. 1996. *Fundamentalism and the Word of God: some Evangelical principles*. Christian Classics series. Leicester: InterVarsity Press.

Parshall, P. 1983. *Bridges to Islam: a Christian perspective on Folk Islam*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Parshall, P. 1989. Lessons learned in contextualization, in *Muslims and Christians on the Emmaus road: critical issues in witness among Muslims,* edited by JD Woodberry. Monrovia, CA: MARC, 251–66.

Parshall, P. 1998a. Other options for Muslim evangelism. *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 34(1):39–42.

Parshall, P. 1998b. Danger! New directions in contextualization. *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 34(4):404–17.

Parshall, P. 2002. *The Cross and the Crescent: understanding the Muslim heart and mind.* Waynesboro, GA: Gabriel Publishing.

Parshall, P. 2003. *Muslim evangelism: contemporary approaches to contextualization.* Waynesboro, GA: Gabriel Publishing.

Pfander, CG. 1910. *The Mizan Ul-Haqq (The balance of truth).* Translated by WSC Tisdall. London: Religious Tract Society.

Pinnock, CH. 1967. *A defense of Biblical infallibility.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing.

Prideaux, H. 1808. *The true nature of imposture, fully displayed in the life of Mahomet.* London: W Nicholson.

Ramm, BL. 1970. *Protestant Biblical interpretation: a textbook of hermeneutics.* Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Rheenen, GV (ed). 2006. *Contextualization and syncretism: navigating cultural currents.* Pasadena: William Carey Library.

Sale, G. 1857. *The Koran: commonly called the Alcoran of Mohammed.* London: W Tegg & Co.

Schaeffer, FA & Boice, JM (eds). 1978. *The foundation of Biblical authority.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Schaeffer, FA. 1998. *The God Who is there.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Schaeffer, FA. 2005. *How should we then live? The rise and decline of Western thought and culture.* Wheaton: Crossway Books.

Schlorff, SP. 1980. The hermeneutical crisis in Muslim evangelization. *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 16(3):143–52.

Schlorff, SP. 1993. Muslim ideology and Christian apologetics. *Missiology* 21(2):173–85.

Schlorff, SP. 2000. The translational model for mission in resistant Muslim society. *Missiology* 28(3):305–28.

Schlorff, SP. 2006. *Missiological models in ministry to Muslims*. Upper Darby, PA: Middle East Resources.

Schreiter, RJ. 1985. *Constructing local theologies*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.

Sell, E. 1923. *The historical development of the Qur'an*. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent.

Seng Song, C. 1964. Culture and incarnation. *Practical Anthropology* 11(3):138–41.

Sharpe, E. 1971. *The theology of AG Hogg*. Madras: Published for the Christian Institute for the Study of Religion and Society, Bangalore by the Christian Literature Society.

Shenk, D. 1989. Conversations along the way, in *Muslims and Christians on the Emmaus road: critical issues in witness among Muslims,* edited by JD Woodberry. Monrovia, California: MARC, 1–20.

Shumaker, CR (ed). 1974. *Report [of] conference on media in Islamic culture*. Wheaton: Evangelical Literature Overseas.

Smalley, W. 1955. Culture and superculture. *Practical Anthropology* 2(3):58–71.

Smith, J. 2011. An assessment of IM's principle paradigms, in *Christlam: how missionaries are promoting an Islamized Gospel*, edited by J Lingel, J Morton & B Nikides. Garden Grove, CA: i2 Ministries Publishing, e-formatted edition, no page numbers, outlined as chapter 6.1.

Sproul, RC. 2007. An apology for apologetics. Available at http://christianity.com/bible/an-apology-for-apologetics-11531708.html (accessed 15/03/2015).

Taber, CR. 1978. Is there more than one way to do theology? *Practical Anthropology.* 1(1):4–18;22–40.

Taber, CR & Yamamori, T (eds). 1975. *Christopaganism or indigenous Christianity*? Pasadena: William Carey Library.

Taylor, RB. 1956. Editorial. *Practical Anthropology.* 1(1):13–4.

The Qur'an's Testimony 1997. Mirpur, Dhaka: SKT.

Tisdall, WSC. 1904. *A manual of the leading Muhammedan objections to Christianity*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Tisdall, WSC. 1905. *The original sources of the Qur'an*. London: Society for Promoting

Christian Knowledge.

Tisdall, WSC. 1912. *A brief defense of the sources of Islam.* London: Christian Literature Society.

Tracy, D. 1975. *Blessed rage for order: the new pluralism in theology.* New York: Seabury Press.

Travis, J. 1998a. C1 to C6 spectrum. *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 34(4):407–08.

Travis, J 1998b. Must all Muslims leave 'Islam' to follow Jesus? *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 34(4):411–15.

Travis, J, & Workman, A. 2000. Messianic Muslim followers of Isa: a closer look at C5 believers and congregations. *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 17(1):53–60.

Trotter, IL. 1926. *The way of the sevenfold secret*. Nile House, Turnbridge Walls, England: Nile Mission Press.

Uddin, R. 1989. Contextualized worship and witness, in *Muslims and Christians on the Emmaus road: crucial issues in witness among Muslims*, edited by JD Woodberry. Monrovia, CA: MARC, 267–72.

Vanhoozer, KJ. 1998. *Is there a meaning in this text? The Bible, the reader, and the morality of literary knowledge*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Vanhoozer, KJ. 2005. *Dictionary for theological interpretation of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Vanhoozer, KJ, Smith, JKA & Benson, BE (eds). 2006. *Hermeneutics at the crossroads*. Indiana series in the philosophy of religion. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Vos, JG. 1973. *Biblical theology: Old and New Testaments*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Watt, WM. 1969. *Islamic revelation in the modern world*. Edinburgh: University Press.

Wilson, JC. 1950. *The Christian message to Islam*. New York: Fleming H Revell.

World Missionary Conference 1910. *The World Missionary Conference, 1910.* Vol 4*: Report on Commission IV: the missionary message in relation to the non-Christian religions.* Edinburgh and London: Oliphant, Anderson, & Ferrier.

Woodberry, JD. 1989a. Contextualization among Muslims: reusing common pillars, in *The Word among us*, edited by DS Gilliland. Waco: Word Publishing, 282–312.

Woodberry, JD (ed). 1989b. *Muslims and Christians on the Emmaus road: crucial issues in witness among Muslims*. Monrovia, CA: MARC.

Wright, NT. 1992. *The New Testament and the people of God*. Augsburg: Fortress.

Wright, NT. 2005. *The last word: beyond the Bible wars to a new understanding of the authority of Scripture*. New York: Harper Collins.

Zaka, A. 1998. Case study: church without walls: a North American ministry promoting understanding. *Urban Mission* 15(3):47–54.

Zwemer, SM. 1905. *The Moslem doctrine of God: an essay on the character and attributes of Allah according to the Koran and orthodox tradition.* New York: American Tract Society.

Zwemer, SM. 1912. *The Moslem Christ*. Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson, & Ferrier.

Zwemer, SM. 1916. *The disintegration of Islam*. New York: Fleming H Revell.

Zwemer, SM. 1932. The use of alms to win converts, *The Moslem World* 22:43–48.

Zwemer, SM. 1938. *The glory of the Cross.* London: Marshall, Morgan, & Scott.

Zwemer, SM. 1941. *The Cross above the Crescent: the validity, necessity and urgency of missions to Moslems*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Zwemer, SM. 1944. *Evangelism today: message not method*. New York: Fleming H Revell.

Zwemer, SM. 1946. Atonement by blood sacrifice in Islam, *The Moslem World* 36:187–92.

7 Signs. [Sa] [S1] (Evangelistic Method).