

Article Responses

A Response to: “Is Muhammad Also Among the Prophets?”

by John Azumah

Editor’s Note: Talman’s “Is Muhammad Also Among the Prophets?” appeared in IJFM 31:4. John Azumah has listened to and interacted with Harley Talman on the subject of Muhammad and given a short response here. He has also offered his own perspective on the role of Muhammad in his contribution at the Fuller Seminary lectureship in 2015. It is published as “Mission in the Islamic World: Making Theological and Missiological Sense of Muhammad” in the compendium entitled The State of Missiology Today: Global Innovations in Christian Witness, ed. Charles Van Engen (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2016), 197–214.

I find Talman’s piece very instructive and illuminating at several points. I fully agree with and endorse the spirit of Talman’s approach, which is one of “seeking constructive dialogue with Muslims.” I also concur with several of the points made in the article, including the unreliability of traditional Islamic sources and received narratives, the influence of Jewish Christianity and other variant Christian teaching on nascent Islam, and the fact that a number of early Christians did not demonize Islam or Muhammad but viewed it as a form of Christianity, albeit an aberrant form. I support Talman’s point that the biblical and theological basis some Christians have used to question and reject Muhammad’s prophetic claims does not stand up to serious exegetical scrutiny. Also, as a good Presbyterian, I fully share Talman’s concern about upholding the sovereignty of God—i.e., that God has and does use whomever and whatever he chooses. Prophecy continues!

Furthermore, I take issue with those who latch onto the teaching in 1 & 2 John to portray Muhammad and Islam as fitting the bill of the Antichrist. I have heard this interpretation both in casual conversation and in sophisticated missiological forums. In fact, I attended a missiological forum in 2014 where the AntiChrist issue was raised in response to Talman’s presentation. My main point on the AntiChrist argument is that the teaching in the Bible was primarily directed at false teachers from *within* the church. In my view, if we take the teaching

on the Antichrist to its logical conclusion—if we stretch it—billions of individuals who do not accept Jesus as Son of God would suddenly qualify as “antichrists.” The Jewish rejection of Jesus as the Messiah and Son of God would thus catapult all Jews into the antichrist category even more than all Muslims—since Islam holds a very high view of Jesus and accords him various unique titles and names, as Talman underscores in his paper. To therefore single out Muhammad and Islam as embodying the Antichrist and his world philosophy is pure prejudice. It is important to remind Christians that Jesus occupies the highest possible office in Islam, that of a Prophet.

Having said all that, I think Talman has been rather selective in the choice of voices he cites to support his thesis. Talman quotes Patriarch Timothy’s rather enigmatic statement that Muhammad “walked in the path of the Prophets” but fails to highlight the fact that John of Damascus, a contemporary of Timothy, denounced Muhammad as a false prophet and Islam as the Antichrist. In fact, some would say John’s views on Islam were more accepted within Eastern Orthodox Christian circles than those of the Patriarch. Talman is equally selective in the leading contemporary Christian and secular scholars he cites as affirming Muhammad’s prophethood with various qualifications. The problem with this approach is that one can easily come up with a string of equally respected Christian and secular experts who have arrived at opposite and more cautious conclusions. Jacques Jomier and Christian Troll are two leading Christian Islamicists whose inquiry into the topic leads them to more cautious conclusions.

While I fully agree with Talman that “the most widely accepted version of Muhammad, based upon Islamic tradition, is dubious,” I struggle with how such a dismissive, reductionist and revisionist approach towards mainstream Islamic sources and teaching helps his efforts to seek “constructive dialogue” with Muslims. Talman even talks about rejecting parts of the Islamic revelation “that are in error.” It appears to me that in order to accord Muhammad the status of a prophet of sorts, Talman has to “Christianize” or “convert” Muhammad into an anonymous Christian. Mainstream Muslim sources about Muhammad are rejected while marginal Christian sources are heavily drawn upon to arrive at his conclusions. In fact, what Talman has done with Muhammad is exactly what Muslims have done with Jesus. In order for Jesus to be a prophet in Islam, he is portrayed in an Islamic garb. Likewise for Talman, in order for Muhammad to qualify as a prophet, he has to be re-created in a Christian image. In effect, Talman succeeds in creating a Muhammad that many Christians will find difficult to accept, and no Muslim will recognize.

My main issue is with Talman’s methodology, which Martin Accad alludes to as comparative, apologetic and missiological.¹ It’s not that a “Christian Muhammad” is entirely without merit; in fact such a Muhammad could serve a very useful missiological purpose, as Talman points out in his paper.

T*o take Muhammad out of the Islamic milieu or to seek to fit him into some kind of Christian worldview in order to accord him “some kind of positive prophetic status” will be rejected as part of the “imperialist missionary endeavor.”*

If that were his purpose, Talman should be more explicit about that instead of mentioning “seeking a constructive dialogue with Muslims.” Talman’s methodology of assessing Muhammad through a Christian lens is the same methodology used by polemicists to brand him a false prophet. The only difference is the conclusions and, one may add, the ultimate purpose of the assessment. I don’t know exactly what Accad means when he talks about studying Islam “scientifically,” but I share with him the conviction that any “Christian theology of Islam” has to engage Islam on its own merits from within its own traditions and mainstream texts.

There is no question that any serious scholarship of Islam should treat the Qur’an and the Hadiths with critical openness. However, a truly academic research has to endeavor to engage the internal logic of Islamic thought: that the human problem is ignorance, not original sin; that God does not reveal Himself but his will in the Qur’an as a guide for humanity; that the Qur’an is the literal, uncreated, dictated Word or Speech of God, not inspired; that Muhammad is the last vessel of revelation; and that Islam is the final and preferred religion of God. If one is to take the Islamic witness seriously, there are only two possible outcomes. Becoming a Muslim (not “muslim”) or opting out of Islam. Whether talking about the prophetic office of Muhammad or the Sonship of Jesus Christ—these cannot be merely conferred or rejected rationally on the basis of propositional statements or texts alone. In the final analysis, Muhammad is not a prophet merely because the Qur’an says he is. He is a prophet because a community of believers, Muslims, confess him as such. There can be no prophet (or savior) without a body of believers. In other words, the offices of prophet and savior are conferred and validated by the *umma* in Islam and the church in Christianity.

In what is clearly a very thoughtful, well researched and carefully considered analysis, Talman offers no clear answer to the question “Is Muhammad also among the Prophets?” His answers come in the following statements: “we may be able to more readily support his being a prophet of the common kind—not the canonical kind (like the prophetic and apostolic writers of the Holy Bible).” And “we could allow the possibility that Muhammad is a prophet in the biblical sense.” Also, “I believe there is biblical warrant for considering the possibility of some kind of positive prophetic status for Muhammad.” He concludes:

This paper has provided theological, missiological, and historical sanction for expanding constricted categories of prophethood to allow Christians to entertain the possibility of Muhammad being other than a false prophet. *He may be seen as fulfilling a prophetic role . . .* (all my emphasis).

These tentative answers are all in keeping with the spirit of humility Talman calls for. But there is no doubt that many Christians will regard these answers as frustratingly vague and possibly conflicting, while Muslims will reject them all outright as reductionist and insulting.

To take Muhammad out of the Islamic milieu or to seek to fit him into some kind of Christian worldview in order to accord him “some kind of positive prophetic status” will be rejected by Muslims as part of the “imperialist missionary endeavor,” and rightly so. Thinking Muslims will wonder what use there is for anyone to affirm Muhammad as a prophet and to then reject the import of his mission. Prophets did not come to make fans. They came to gather followers (companions and disciples), people who would heed their message and change their ways of thinking and life in conformity with prophetic teaching. Thinking Muslims don’t need any affirmation or validation of Muhammad’s prophetic role from Christians just for the sake of it. That would amount to Muslims conceding to Christians the role of “final arbiters” in religious matters—a role Talman and other Christians of their persuasion seem to be claiming. All Muslims would reject this as a usurpation that is most condescending.

To be sure, Talman (and those opposed to his position) will argue that they are pursuing an internal Christian conversation aimed at making theological and missiological sense of Muhammad. It is one thing, however, to make theological sense of the other, and another thing to make theological space for the other. The latter could easily end up renouncing, revising, or downplaying orthodox doctrines on both sides.

A more helpful approach would be to take Islamic texts, traditions and claims seriously, debate and evaluate them rigorously and fairly *as is*, maintaining the integrity of both traditions as far as possible by drawing conclusions that the mainstream on both sides can recognize and live with. It is about respecting and preserving the internal logic and integrity of both traditions. Daniel Madigan is one who has reflected on the critical importance of understanding and respecting the integrity of the truth claims of Islam and Christianity. He emphasizes that for Muslims, Muhammad is not the Word made flesh but the bearer of the Word (as Mary is for Christians). Madigan believes that a firm grasp of this will prevent Christian responses to Muhammad from making the fundamental category mistake of assuming that Muhammad “is being proposed as a replacement [or supplementary] savior.”²

Understanding and respecting the integrity of the respective mainstream teachings is vital in any discussion of a Christian theology of Muhammad and Islam. When I do

One student said he did not think Muhammad was a false prophet, but rather a fallen prophet. He added that nearly all the biblical prophets had their own weaknesses! This was closer to my own answer to the question.

that, I end up with a similar attitude, as did Talman, of humility. After teaching a class in a theological seminary in Ghana on the Muslim view of Muhammad, I posed the question: “What sayst thou of Muhammad?” In response, some students said, “He is definitely a false prophet!” But one student responded that he did not think Muhammad was a false prophet, but rather a fallen prophet. He added that nearly all the biblical prophets had their own weaknesses! This was closer to my own answer to the question.

Better still, rather than trying to fit Muhammad into a Christian framework in order to accord him some prophetic role, I view and respect him as *the Prophet of Islam*—a prophet whose mission transformed a polytheistic society into a monotheistic one; a prophet whose family life, devotional and spiritual experiences, and public life (in all their complexities and contradictions in Islamic traditions) have shaped the collective memories, identities and the trajectory of the religious orientations of multitudes over the centuries. To use an analogy, it is like asking me, a Ghanaian, whether Robert Mugabe is a president. My answer will be, of course yes. He is President of Zimbabwe! He is not president of Ghana and therefore not my president. It is in the same vein that I see Muhammad as *Prophet of Islam*. I take this view for the sake of the over a billion and half Muslims around the world—some of them fellow citizens, some neighbors, friends and acquaintances, and some family relations whom I respect and honor—without accepting or confessing Muhammad as Prophet (of Islam). In return I expect Muslims to honor and respect Jesus as the Lord and Savior of over two billion Christians in the world, even if they can’t accept and confess him as such.

John Azumah, PhD, is an ordained minister of the Presbyterian Church of Ghana. John did his doctoral work with the University of Birmingham, UK, on Islam in Africa and Christian-Muslim relations. He is currently an associate professor of World Christianity and Islam at Columbia Theological Seminary, USA. Before that, John Azumah served as lecturer in Islamic and Mission studies and director of the Centre for Islamic Studies at the London School of Theology in the United Kingdom. He has taught in theological seminaries in India, South Africa, and Ghana and was a research fellow at the Akrofi-Christaller Institute in Ghana.

Endnotes

¹ Martin Accad’s article in response to Talman in *IJFM* 31:4 (Winter 2014), 191.

² Daniel, S. J. Madigan, “Jesus and Muhammad: The Sufficiency of Prophecy,” in *Bearing the Word: Prophecy in Biblical and Qur’anic Perspective*, ed. Michael Ipgrave (London: Church House Publishing, 2005), 90–99.

“Is Muhammad Also Among the Prophets?": A Response to John Azumah

by Harley Talman

I very much appreciate Dr. John Azumah’s constructive interaction with my article. He is gracious and fair to highlight our many significant points of agreement (such as the inappropriate application of anti-Christ passages to Muhammad). However, Azumah also has points of concern and disagreement which will be the focus of my remarks.

Selectivity of Sources

Azumah correctly observes that I was selective in the choice of scholars that I mentioned. Although I did give some indications of this fact,¹ I might have stated my aim in doing so more clearly—namely, to demonstrate that my proposal is not a radical innovation, given the existence of some respected Christian theologians and scholars of Islam who argue for some type of positive prophetic role for Muhammad. At the same time, I did make note of some voices to the contrary, including John of Damascus.²

Thus, the sources and figures that I selected were designed to create space for consideration of my proposal. Because I have often seen and experienced such strongly negative reactions of Christians, I expressed the hope that “for those who cannot accept this, perhaps this study will at least reduce the level of indignation toward those who differ with them.”³ I am delighted that such a reaction was not reflected in Azumah’s response.

Contribution to Constructive Dialog

The term “dialog” in some circles is still associated with the ecumenical efforts of theological liberals to advance an agenda of universalism. Instead, Azumah and I both seek “constructive dialog” that opens doors of opportunity for witness, removes barriers to hearing the gospel, and builds bridges of friendship, respect, and trust that can withstand the weight of biblical truth—so that Muslims might experience salvation offered by Jesus Christ. Such dialog is not confined to formal, public symposiums, but encompasses informal encounters as well. However, while Azumah affirms the value of my methodology for Christian missiology, he views that purpose and enhanced dialog as mutually

Rather than accepting the pejorative view of Muhammad that dominates Christian apologetics, I have examined our tradition in light of the scriptures, unnoticed voices in history, and alternative perspectives of modern thinkers.

exclusive (since my position differs so significantly from traditional Islamic notions). This indicates a lack of clarity on my part. So let me emphasize that my article is aimed firstly and primarily at Christians to spur us to rethink our missiology and theology—as I stated,

This paper has provided theological, missiological, and historical sanction for expanding constricted categories of prophethood to allow Christians to entertain the possibility of Muhammad being other than a false prophet.⁴

Martin Accad correctly observes that the primary value of my reassessment of Muhammad is to create space for Christians to rethink our theology of Muhammad and Islam—not to offer a compelling apologetic to Muslims.⁵ For as he emphasizes (and as I affirmed), the possibilities I explored differ greatly from typical Islamic views of Muhammad’s prophethood.⁶

Nevertheless, I also envision my proposal as promoting more constructive dialog with Muslims, because it shapes our attitude toward Muhammad, and thus how we view Islam. And as Accad elsewhere states:

Your view of Islam will affect your attitude to Muslims. Your attitude will, in turn, influence your approach to Christian-Muslim interaction, and that approach will affect the ultimate outcome of your presence as a witness among Muslims.⁷

Thus, the understandings of Muhammad and prophethood that I have set forth should have a positive impact on Christian-Muslim dialog by affecting our own attitudes as ambassadors. I am glad that Azumah’s question has given me opportunity to clarify this point.

The last (and least impactful) contribution of my proposal is in direct dialog. Though it would not be readily accepted by Muslims, I do see my alternative perspectives on prophets as a potential step forward in discussions with Muslims—though certainly not resolving our differences. Despite dissonance with Muslim beliefs and the necessity of explaining unfamiliar concepts, is it not likely to be an improvement over traditional answers to the frequent Muslim query: “We accept Christ Jesus as a true prophet, why do you not accept Muhammad as God’s prophet?”

The conventional Christian position that “Muhammad is a false prophet” is an affront to Muslims, and so for purposes of diplomacy or self-preservation, most Christians are compelled to hide their conviction. But Muslims familiar with Christianity have seen our true colors. Hence, there is reason to hope that my proposal may be viewed by many Muslims as a more conciliatory position on Muhammad.

Would not a Christian who says, “I respect Muhammad as having a prophetic role or mission, though I do not consider him a prophet the way that you do,”⁸ find more favor with Muslims than one who says, “I respect Muhammad as your prophet, but we do not accept him as a prophet (and in fact deem him a false prophet)?” Moreover, whereas the former response does not mislead the Muslim, but rather leads him to ask for elaboration, the latter is unlikely to be uttered in dialog.⁹

Respecting the Integrity of the Islamic Tradition

Azumah emphasizes the need to engage Islam on its own merits. I appreciate his (and Madigan’s) contention that it is important for us to respect Islamic texts and traditions. Certainly, Muslims need to see that we appreciate and have understood that which they hold so dear. Admittedly, my proposal challenges their tradition and therein lies the rub—we know that people naturally resist ideas that conflict with their religious traditions. The Pharisees of Jesus’ time, for example, were more devoted to their traditions than to the word of God; but those with ears to hear could consider what Jesus had to say and reassess their beliefs in light of the word of God. Similarly, the opportunity for more fruitful dialogue that I envision is based upon working more internally with the Qur’an against Islamic tradition in order to reform that tradition.

This is not an uncommon or unreasonable posture even for many Muslims. Numerous Muslims scholars will acknowledge the problem of fabricated *hadith*, and are willing to reject those hadith that contradict the Qur’an. The dubious nature of the hadith collections (and rejection of Salafism) has led to growth in the number of “Qur’anists” (Qur’an-only Muslims), signaling the willingness of some to reform their religious tradition. (Another voice calling for reform of the Islamic tradition are those Muslims who seek to interpret the Qur’an and tradition in harmony with the previous holy books which the Qur’an insists it confirms, instead of interpreting it through later sources).¹⁰

Therefore, I deem it appropriate, if not always appreciated, for us to bring to their attention where the Islamic tradition seems to contradict the Qur’an. In such cases, “respectful engagement with the ‘internal logic of Islamic thought’” does not necessarily preclude our challenging Islamic teachings. For instance, Azumah notes that Islamic teaching rejects the notion of original sin. But as Woodberry has shown, Muslims have overlooked Qur’anic verses and Islamic voices that align with biblical perspectives on this subject.¹¹ Can we not likewise challenge Muslims to attempt

I do not offer a clear answer to the question posed in my article's title....
 My purpose is to provide perspectives that can facilitate attitudinal change
 among Christians that will allow for re-examination of this issue.

to harmonize apparent differences, given the multitude of verses in the Qur'an that command active belief in the prior scriptures and the impossibility of their corruption?¹² Of course as Christians, we are obliged to make the Bible our final arbiter—as also the Qur'an instructs us to do.¹³

One advantage of my proposal that reassesses Muhammad as prophet is that it allows us to model for Muslims that which we invite them to emulate, namely, our readiness to question our own religious tradition. Rather than accepting the pejorative view of Muhammad that dominates Christian apologetics, I have re-examined our tradition in light of the scriptures, unnoticed voices in history, and alternative perspectives of modern thinkers, calling for a reform of our tradition. We are merely asking Muslims to do the same with regard to their own tradition. For example, hadith accounts of Muhammad performing miracles directly contradicts the Qur'an which insists he performed no miracles (apart from the Qur'an itself). Moreover, the Qur'an insists it brings nothing new, but is a confirmation of the Scriptures (not abrogation of them); also the Qur'an (contrary to Islamic tradition) exalts Jesus above other prophets (including Muhammad). Are these not valid grounds for encouraging Muslims to re-examine their tradition?

Azumah asserts that Muslims would view an attempt to fit Muhammad into a Christian worldview as an “imperialist missionary endeavor.” This is certainly a possible outcome, but it is not a necessary one; I believe it very much depends on our attitude. As Christians, we are compelled to align all that we believe and do with the Bible—including how we view Muhammad and prophethood—as the Qur'an likewise commands us to do.¹⁴ We do not thereby imperialistically impose our view upon them, but in contexts of dialog, when Muslims complain against Christian rejection of Muhammad as prophet, we can humbly state positions such as mine as that which accords with our understanding of our scriptures.

Azumah surmises that Muslims will “wonder what use it is for anyone to affirm Muhammad as a prophet and reject the import of his mission.” But this is little different from the Muslim position that accepts Jesus as a prophet, but rejects our understanding of his salvific mission. Surely half a loaf is better than none. Moreover, can we not challenge Muslims regarding what Muhammad's mission was? Numerous Qur'anic verses would argue that his mission was not to abrogate Christianity and discipleship to Christ.¹⁵

In addition, contrary to what Azumah implies, I do not see that I am claiming to be the final arbiter for Muslims—I am not even claiming to be the final arbiter for Christians,

since I am only making a plea for Christians to make room for proposals like my own. But my proposed position does allow us to accede more honor to Muhammad while remaining faithful to the scriptures. By putting Muhammad in a positive category of prophethood, Christians can now reply that they can accept Muhammad as a prophet in a way that is quite similar to how Muslims accept and honor Jesus as a prophet—they grant him many characteristics common to our understanding, but there are also fundamental differences.

Azumah's warnings about Muslim reactions to a “dismissive, reductionist and revisionist approach toward mainstream Islamic sources” are well taken. But confronting this sensitive issue is essential. Decades ago, Giulio Basetti-Sani asserted that Muslim exegetes must be persuaded to accept the application of principles of scientific and literary criticism (which has already occurred in biblical studies): “This is the first and most urgent condition for entering upon effective dialogue between Muslim and Christian.”¹⁶ Hans Kung likewise declared,

We shall make no real progress in Christian-Muslim dialogue unless we come to terms on the notion of truth required for the use of historicocritical instruments . . . the distance between the modern approach to the Bible and the traditional approach to the Qur'an is at present enormous. But it is not, I would hope, unalterable and unbridgeable for all time and eternity.¹⁷

We bear many wounds from hostile encounters of the past—unfortunately, apologists and polemicists have not provided fertile ground for new approaches. But God can give us dialogue partners of good will and open mind, and if we are prepared in different ways, the outcomes can be much different.

Lastly, I must disagree with Azumah's assertion that if we take “the Islamic witness seriously,” then we must either become a Muslim “or opt out of Islam.” As I explained (in my article in *IJFM* 31:4, 185, first column), this is a false dichotomy; there are other options—and especially if we move beyond binary categories.

Indeterminate Nature of Muhammad's Prophetic Role

Azumah correctly observes that I do not offer a clear answer to the question posed in my article's title and that this may be frustrating to some Christians. But given that critical study of the Qur'an is still in its infancy so that revisionist historians have not achieved a consensus, it will be some time before we can agree on a more precise definition of the nature of Muhammad's prophetic role. My purpose at this point is

to provide perspectives that can facilitate attitudinal change among Christians that will allow for re-examination of this issue. Others before me have endeavored to do the same.¹⁸

False or Fallen Prophet?

In closing, Azumah states his preference is to recognize and respect Muhammad as “the Prophet of Islam.” However, I should like to emphasize that despite his questions and concerns, Azumah’s own position seems not far from my own. He seems to reject the “false prophet” characterization of Muhammad (aligning with the primary thrust of my article), acknowledging that his student’s view of Muhammad as a “fallen prophet” is “closer to his own.” To regard Muhammad as a fallen prophet is to remove him from the false prophet category and place him in an alternative category of prophet—the very thing I have argued for. Consequently, despite Azumah’s disagreements and concerns, in the end it appears that we may be in agreement about my major point—the noises he made sound like music to my ears! **IJFM**

Harley Talman has worked with Muslims for over 35 years, including two decades in the Arab world and Africa, during which he was involved in church planting, theological education, and humanitarian aid. Talman holds a ThM from Dallas Theological Seminary and a PhD from Fuller Theological Seminary. He presently teaches Islamic studies at a graduate school.

Endnotes

¹ See Harley Talman, “Is Muhammad Also Among the Prophets?” *IJFM* 31:4 [Oct–Dec 2014]: “The above examples are sufficient to show that *some* prominent Christians have recognized or affirmed Muhammad as a prophet, albeit with various meanings of the term,” 184; I acknowledged that regarding the controversial question “Is Muhammad also among the prophets” that “the majority of Christians would answer ‘absolutely not,’ some are more tentative or affirming,” 169–170; also “none of the great Islamicists knew ‘quite where to land’ on this issue” but my hope was that readers of my article “will appreciate the reasons why this challenge has been so perplexing for so many,” 170; and again in the conclusion I state that “sincere and faithful Christians through the centuries have held vastly disparate viewpoints concerning the prophet of Islam—that may not change greatly,” 185.

² Talman, 186, footnote 18: “John of Damascus reacted scathingly to the Islamization of the civil service in Syria. After the Byzantines lost political dominion to Muslim armies, the polemicist Nicetas of Byzantium [c. 842–912] vented the most vitriolic slurs against them and their prophet that he could concoct.”

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, 185, emphasis added.

⁵ Martin Accad, “Towards a Theology of Islam: A Response to Harley Talman’s ‘Is Muhammad Also Among the Prophets?’” *IJFM* 31:4 (2014): 193.

⁶ *Ibid.* Accad states: “Despite Talman’s conciliatory approach to Muhammad and Islam, his conclusions are by no means mainstream

from a Muslim perspective. So by suggesting that there may be some space in the Christian biblical worldview to consider Muhammad as *in some ways* a prophet, the author is not conceding much at all, and certainly not for the purpose of ‘pleasing’ Muslims. Harley Talman’s work and conclusions are indeed more useful for Christians who are trying to make sense of Islam in their desire to reach Muslims with the gospel.”

⁷ Martin Accad, “Christian Attitudes Toward Islam and Muslims: A Kerygmatic Approach,” in Evelyn A. Reisacher, ed., *Toward Respectful Understanding and Witness among Muslims: Essays in Honor of J. Dudley Woodberry* (Pasadena: William Carey Library, 2012), 31.

⁸ We can state the *Injil* commands us to evaluate prophecy (1 Cor. 14:29) on the basis of the Bible, accepting that which is correct and rejecting that which is contrary to it (1 Thes. 5:20–22).

⁹ At least in Muslim majority countries, they are unlikely to say that they hold Muhammad to be a false prophet.

¹⁰ Surah 10:94 among other verses.

¹¹ J. Dudley Woodberry, “Different Diagnoses of the Human Condition,” in *Muslims and Christians on the Emmaus Road*, edited by J. Dudley Woodberry, 149–160 (Monrovia, CA: MARC, 1989).

¹² Surah 6:34, 115; 10:64, 18:27, etc.

¹³ Surah 5:47 “So let the people of the Injil judge by what Allah has revealed in it. Whoever doesn’t judge by what Allah has revealed are unbelievers.”

¹⁴ Surah 5:47 (and also v. 43).

¹⁵ e.g., Surah 5:48: “for each of you [Jews, Christians, and Muslims] we have made a law and a way” so that you will “compete with one another in good deeds.”

¹⁶ *The Qur’an in the Light of Christ*, Ron George (ed.), (Winpress, 2000), 96, is a reprint of Giulio Basetti-Sani, *The Koran in the Light of Christ: A Christian Interpretation of the Sacred Book of Islam*, translated by W. Russell Carroll (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1977).

¹⁷ Hans Kung: “Muhammad and the Qur’an: Prophecy and Revelation,” in *Christianity and the World Religions: Paths of Dialogue with Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism*, Hans Kung, Josef van Ess, Heinrich von Stietencron, and Heinz Bechert, New York: Doubleday, 1986, 35–36.

¹⁸ Basetti-Sani was willing to entertain the possibility of Muhammad’s prophethood by interpreting the Qur’an through the lens of the Bible in the light of Christ.