

Consensus

Volume 35

Issue 1 *Christianity and Islam in Dialogue*

Article 3

5-25-2014

Conquest and Violence: The Christian critique of Muhammad

David D. Grafton

The Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, dgrafton@ltsp.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Grafton, David D. (2014) "Conquest and Violence: The Christian critique of Muhammad," *Consensus*: Vol. 35 : Iss. 1 , Article 3.
Available at: <http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus/vol35/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Consensus by an authorized editor of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

Conquest and Violence: The Christian critique of Muhammad

David D. Grafton

*Associate Professor of Islamic Studies and Christian-Muslim Relations
The Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia*

In the previous article (Apples to Apples or Apples to Dates? The Muslim Critique of Christian Scriptures) I demonstrated that the way in which Christians and the orthodox Islamic tradition talk about and understand the purpose and role of their own scriptures is fundamentally different from one another. We have different kinds of bodies of literature or traditions that do different things and they serve different theological purposes. In discussing the general comparison of Muslim and Christian scriptures we utilized a particularly common Muslim critique of the “corruption” of Christian scriptures. In this article we would like to address a similar topic; that is, the traditional comparison of Persons, namely Jesus and Muhammad. There is a long tradition in the West, from Latin medieval, orientalist, and missionary literature, comparing the lifestyle of Muhammad with Jesus in order to critique Islam and find it wanting. Thus, we will begin by reviewing this general western critique of Muhammad, then focus upon one particular critic; that of the Lutheran-Reformed missionary Karl Gottlieb Pfander (1803-1865). Finally, we will suggest another way for Christians to understand the role of Muhammad through a better different comparison of Persons between our two faiths, if such a comparison is really a necessary endeavor.

Western Presentations of Muhammad

Edward Gibbon, in his classical text, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, describes the coming of Muhammad in his manner: “While the state was exhausted by the Persian war, and the church was distracted by the Nestorian and Monophysite sects, Mahomet, with the sword in one hand and the Koran in the other, erected his throne on the ruins of Christianity and of Rome.”¹ This has become the accepted narrative of Islam among many North Americans: a violent, imperialist, fundamentalist religion and culture.² This perspective was highlighted this past spring in the media after the most recent terrorist event at the Boston Marathon.

Gibbon, however, was much more congenial to Muhammad than the tradition that has followed in his footsteps. He recognized the very positive and generous descriptions of Muhammad by his own followers, to which we will return back to later in this article. However, at the end of the day Gibbon faults Muhammad for following the slippery slope of lust for power:

Charity may believe that the original motives of Mahomet were those of pure and genuine benevolence; but a human missionary is incapable of cherishing the obstinate unbelievers who reject his claims despise his arguments ... the stern passions of pride and revenge were kindled in the bosom of Mahomet.... The

injustice of Mecca and the choice of Medina, transformed the citizen into a prince, the humble preacher into the leader of armies ... In the exercise of political government, he was compelled to abate of the stern rigour of fanaticism, to comply in some measure with the prejudices and passions of his followers, and to employ even the vices of mankind as the instruments of their salvation. The use of fraud and perfidy, of cruelty and injustice, were often subservient to the propagation of the faith.³

From Gibbon forward, Muhammad has been described as a bloodthirsty warrior, a misogynist, and a pedophile. The political cartoons that appeared in the Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* in 2005 depicted Muhammad wielding scimitars, carrying bombs in his turban, and horns growing from his head. These images all played upon the long standing European tradition handed down from a corpus of Latin literature throughout the Middle Ages. Muslims throughout the world responded to these images with anger and violence that “freedom of speech” was being used to denigrate the one person who was at the heart of over a billion members of the human race. Detractors simply pointed to the responding violence as proof of their point. It did not help matters that Pope Benedict the XVI added fuel to the fire with his infamous 2006 Regensburg speech where he quoted the 14th century Byzantine Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos: “Show me just what Muhammad brought that was new and there you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command to spread by the sword the faith he preached.”⁴

After September 11, 2001, the images and vitriolic attacks against the person of Muhammad reached legion in the United States, but they all followed the same familiar themes. In 2002 the Southern Baptist Convention President Jerry Vine claimed that Muhammad was a “demon-possessed pedophile” for claiming that God told him to marry nine year old Aisha.⁵ Two of the most prominent author’s whose works are utilized within the North American English Speaking audience are Robert Spencer, particularly his 2007 *The Truth About Muhammad: Founder of the World’s Most Intolerant Religion*, and a Muslim convert who writes under a pseudonym, Ibn Warraq’s 2000 *The Quest for the Historical Muhammad* and the 2002 *What the Koran really Says*. (Interestingly, Robert Spencer has been banned from visiting Great Britain by the Home Office because his writings are “not conducive to the public good.”⁶)

Aside from a violent Muhammad, the western tradition has primarily labeled Muhammad as the “Great Impostor.” Humphrey Prideaux (1648–1724), Dean of Norwich, developed the most prominent view of Muhammad within the English speaking world of the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries. His work, *The True Nature of Imposture Fully Display’d in the Life of Mahomet* that was published in 1698 was brought to the American colonies and reprinted throughout the eighteenth century. Prideaux’s view, built upon by many after him, was that Muhammad was an impostor who duped poor and uneducated Arabs into following him by faking miracles and claiming to be a Prophet.

While most of this literature is not novel, in that it has rehashed medieval Latin material, it has now taken on a more popular role being displayed and bandied about on websites, blogs, and forwarded through chain emails.⁷ There have been many occasions where this author has been invited to a congregation to do a forum or lecture and was presented at the door with the latest email that members in the congregation had received

warning them about *jihad* in America. (Perhaps members of your congregation have forwarded these to you; or you yourself have forwarded them on to others.)

It is not the purpose of this article to investigate the “historical Muhammad,” which is an interesting topic for another day. Rather, I would like to review this western critique as a way that has been used to compare the life of Muhammad with the life of Jesus. The purpose of this western Christian comparison within the literature, of course, has been to demonstrate that Muhammad cannot compare to Jesus in any significant manner; morally, ethically, or spiritually. To this end, it would be helpful to review a typical western protestant (and Lutheran) perspective on Muhammad. The most prominent piece of missionary literature from the nineteenth century, which is still very popular on websites today that demonstrates this perspective, is the book *Mizan al-Haqq* by the Lutheran-Reformed missionary Karl Gottlieb Pfander (1803-1865).

Karl Pfander and *Mizan al-Haqq*

Karl Pfander was originally from Saxony and grew up in the Lutheran-Reformed pietist tradition. At the age of twenty he enrolled in the ecumenical the missionary training college in Basel, Switzerland. After graduation he was ordained within the Lutheran Church of Saxony and then sent out by the Basel Mission to Russian-controlled Susha, Armenia in 1825. During this time he developed a penchant as a public preacher in *bazaars* (outdoor markets) and for developing arguments against Islam among Persian Muslims in the Caucasus region. He began to collect these arguments and put them down into writing. In 1833 he was expelled from the region by the Russian Orthodox Czar who did not take too kindly to the Protestant view of things.

Eventually Pfander was called by the Anglican Church Missionary Society (CMS) where he was placed in Agra, India. He once again began preaching and writing tracts, proving the truth of Christianity and what he considered the falsehood of Islam. Pfander became famous, or infamous, for his two-day public debate with the Muslim scholar Rahmat Allah Kairanawi in 1845. While each side naturally claimed victory in the debate, the scholarly record has demonstrated that Rahmat Ali got the best of it. Having been trained in the Pietistic center of the Basel Mission house Pfander had no knowledge of the latest eighteenth and nineteenth century German higher criticism of the Bible. Rahmat Allah, however, did and used in some of the latest critical studies in their debate. Pfander was at a loss as to how to respond to Rahmat Ali’s questions surrounding D.F. Strauss’ *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet* first published in 1835. After the debate the Church Missionary Society had Pfander transferred from Agra as a way for him to save face.⁸

Pfander’s most famous contribution, aside from the scandal of the debate at Agra, was his publication of the *Mizan al-Haqq* (The Balance of Truth). It was translated into numerous languages during his life, and is still very popular, and can be found on several important websites.⁹ Rahmat Allah Kairanawi eventually responded and published *Izhar ul-Haqq* (The Demonstration of Truth), which can also be found online.¹⁰

Pfander’s underlying thesis of the book is that both Islam and Christianity claim to be the final revelation from God. In comparing Apples to Apples (see the previous article “Apples to Apples or Apples to Dates? The Muslim critique of Christian scriptures”), therefore, one must be right and the other wrong. There is no ambiguity about the mater,

according to Pfander. He then sets out to argue for Muslims why Christianity is the true final revelation. Part III of *Mizan al-Haqq* is a comparison of the lives of Jesus and Muhammad. In Chapter 6 of Part III, Pfander attempts to prove that Muhammad was a false prophet by looking at two things; how he treated his wives and how he treated his enemies.

Regarding his treatment of his wives, Pfander notes that Muhammad was a polygamist who (as we heard before from the former Southern Baptist President) married Aisha at age nine. He also points out that the story of Muhammad and Zaynab is particularly troubling for one claiming to be a Prophet. The tradition goes that Muhammad officiated at the wedding of his followers, Zayad and Zaynab. One day he went to their house and saw Zaynab unveiled. He was taken with her beauty and had “adulterous thoughts.” In at least one version of the tradition, Zayad then divorced Zaynab so that Muhammad could marry her if he wished. Muhammad then received a revelation from God telling him to marry her (33:37).¹¹ Pfander concludes, “It is not pleasant reading, nor is it very edifying or profitable, except as casting light upon Muhammad’s moral character.”¹²

Regarding his treatment of his enemies, Pfander mentions the very troubling episode of Muhammad and the Jewish tribe of Banu Qurayza in Medina. After the Battle of the Trench in 627 CE in which Muhammad suspected them of reneging on a treaty he signed with them and acting in a treasonous manner. He then had all the men of the tribe beheaded (about 800 or 900 in all) and sold the women and children into slavery.¹³ Pfander goes on to provide other examples of Muhammad’s complicity in killing his enemies as the leader of the Muslim community. He then closes this section with a very curt conclusion: “We do not make any comment on these deeds of his, nor do we venture to express any opinion regarding them.”¹⁴

However, earlier in Chapter 4 of Part II, Pfander has laid before his Muslim reader the story and Messiahship of Jesus:

When the Lord Jesus Christ was about thirty years of age, He began to proclaim the Good News, as the Gospels inform us. He went about doing good: He wrought many miracles, healed the sick, cast out devils, opened the eyes of the blind, the ears of the deaf, cleansed lepers, and enabled the lame to walk, in accordance with the predictions of the Old Testament Prophet Isaiah. Yet, though He possessed and exercised such great power, He never wrought a miracle for His own advantage, or to punish His enemies. He lived in poverty and lowliness, and did not seek any earthly honour and glory. He refused to let people make Him an earthly monarch.¹⁵

In addition, writes Pfander, Jesus taught for his followers to “pray for your enemies.” The Muslim reader, according to Pfander, is left with a simple choice of comparing the lives of Jesus with Muhammad.

Muslim views of Muhammad

Let us now return for a moment to the initial western biography of Muhammad as set out by Edward Gibbon in *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Gibbon, reading translations of early Muslim sources, does recognize that Muslims see Muhammad in a very different light than western critics. He writes this about how the Muslim sources describe Muhammad:

Mahomet was distinguished by the beauty of his person... They applauded his commanding presence, his majestic aspect, his piercing eye, his gracious smile, his flowing beard, his countenance that painted every sensation of the soul, and his gestures that enforced each expression of the tongue. In the familiar offices of life he scrupulously adhered to the grave and ceremonious politeness of his country: his respectful attention to the rich and powerful was dignified by his condescension and affability to the poorest citizens of Mecca: the frankness of his manner concealed the artifice of his views; and the habits of courtesy were imputed to personal friendship or universal benevolence. His memory was capacious and retentive; his wit easy and social; his imagination sublime; his judgment clear, rapid, and decisive. He possessed the courage both of thought and action; and, although his designs might gradually expand with his success, the first idea which he entertained of his divine mission bears the stamp of an original and superior genius.¹⁶

The themes of this very generous image of Muhammad have been passed down from generation to generation among Muslims. Two recent popular and accessible reflections of Muhammad by Muslims in English are *Memories of Muhammad: Why the Prophet Matters*, by the American Omid Safi,¹⁷ and *In the Footsteps of the Prophet: Lessons from the Life of Muhammad*, by the Swiss Tariq Ramadan.¹⁸

Contrary to the images of Muhammad as described by Robert Spencer and Ibn Warraq, or even particular Islamic Radicalists who quote the *hadith* literature and verses of the Qur'an that focus on violence and killing; the Muslim "memories" focus primarily on the spiritual and moral stories of Muhammad, of Muhammad as a devoted family-man who was kind to children. Most recently, several Muslim publishing houses have published children's stories of Muhammad, which are now highly popular in North American Muslim communities. There is *Just for Kids: Qur'an Stories*,¹⁹ *Goodnight Stories from the Qur'an*,²⁰ and *Goodnight Stories from the Life of the Prophet Muhammad*,²¹ just to name a few.

It has always been puzzling to this author that the vast majority of Muslims see Muhammad in a very different light than do western critics of the violent pedophile diametrically opposed to the pacifist Jesus. How can one person be viewed so differently? But then again, Schweitzer demonstrated this of our own views of Jesus back in 1910 in *The Quest for the Historical Jesus*.²²

Clinton Bennett, in his book *In Search of Muhammad*, has argued that knowing the sources of Islam is insufficient for "knowing" Muhammad for Muslims. Rather, argues Bennett, we have "insider" and "outsider" perspectives.²³ To put it another way, having faith in a particular set of scriptures or documents or narratives makes all the difference in the world. A Muslim who believes ardently in their faith as revealed to the Prophet Muhammad through the Qur'an is going to be predisposed to approach, interpret and respond to their religious texts in ways intuitively different than those who are not attached to them. By the same token, un-churched or under-churched individuals who attend a Lutheran worship service might not be interested in any part of a "Confession" as part of their spiritual renewal. The Law-Gospel dialect that is foundational for Lutheran understandings of faith and life may not be intuitive to others. Having a predisposed commitment to one's faith and tradition sets apart those who are uncommitted, and especially those who are deeply suspicious of a religious tradition.

Given Bennett's argument, we would like to suggest that western critiques of Muhammad, on the one hand, and images of Muhammad by Muslims, on the other hand, tend to focus on those aspects and characteristics that help them achieve their needs at any given time. Western critics after September the 11th have had a need to find out "Why they hate us," and develop rationales for future policies to protect against *jihadis*. Such perspectives usually see the lighter side of Muhammad as pure "propaganda." Muslims, as believers who look to Muhammad as a guide to find solutions to the joys and problems of everyday life, look to those stories that speak to normal events. For most Muslims (at least those known to this author), the more troubling historical aspects of Muhammad's life or the early Muslim community are quite often seen as history in context not applicable to their lives, or simply beyond the realm of their experience.

This is certainly not a novel idea. As already noted, Schweitzer's work already revealed that our images of Jesus are in many ways cultural and historically conditioned. While this is necessary and helpful, it can also be dangerous. There is a temptation to create a Jesus or a Christianity that suits our needs. One can simply browse through any popular book store and find a wide variety of "editions" of the Bible that are packaged and provide introductions for people with different educational, social or political commitments. Children's bibles have long been instrumental for Christian education. However, now one can spend time in devotion with the *Green Bible*²⁴ or the American's *Patriot's Bible*.²⁵

In an age in which Muslims have more access to their primary spiritual and historical texts than ever before, the wide variety of Muslim interpretations and spiritualities is myriad. Due to increased literacy in predominantly Muslim cultures over the last hundred years, the role of publishing and printing books, and now the posting of Islamic texts online, Muslims from all walks of life are able to access their own sources and have begun applying their own individual "spin" on their tradition, for good and ill. Muslims, no matter where they are, all have a need to find meaning in their particular social location. And, in their search for meaning they are led first to the Qur'an and then to the example (*sunnah*) of the Prophet Muhammad. Given the radically different lifestyles, Christians have always been particularly befuddled that Muhammad would be an example of a faithful life, as opposed to that of Jesus.

Incidentally, Muslims have never had difficulty in accepting the positive elements of the life of Jesus as portrayed by Pfander above. In fact, the Islamic tradition has upheld much of the same elements of Jesus lifestyle that Pfander holds up as proof of God's presence in his life. Within the *Qisas al-'anibya'*, or the "Stories of the Prophets" in the Sunni tradition, one can find many of the same themes of Jesus' lifestyle that Christians read in the Gospels of the wandering teacher and prophet. In addition, there are many Shi'a and Sufi *hadith* that extol the virtues of Jesus healing powers, including that of raising the dead.²⁶ His role as the Virgin-born preacher, teacher, healer who will return at the judgment day has deep roots in Islamic sources. Jesus' role as a Prophet is important, even vital for Muslims. No, the Muslim critique of Christianity has never attacked the positive spiritual lifestyle that Jesus led. Rather, Muslims have always taken issue with Christian claims about the divinity of Jesus and his atoning death. That being said, Jesus' influence is only so effective, argue Muslims, because as a wandering ascetic preacher who went about doing good and healing people, he has little to offer society with its inherent legal and social opportunities and problems. While he may have been able to do well, he did not provide a lasting transformation of a just society.

In addition to the theological difference between Christianity that believes in the need for an individual savior and Islam that believes in the need for a communal guide for the righteous life, Islam looks for concrete religious assistance in daily individual and social affairs, much like Judaism. How can Jesus help in matters of family concerns, when he himself was never married, the Muslim interlocutor would ask? While Jesus may have forgiven the woman for adultery, would Jesus advocate no social laws to curb behavior or protect society from aberrant behavior? ‘What would Jesus do’ (WWJD) in the face of civil litigation between families over property issues? While Christians have looked to Jesus to help them understand difficult social issues (such as sexuality, the death penalty, and even war) there has been a great diversity of opinion. The Islamic tradition, however, is built upon the sayings and actions of Muhammad that provides a witness and guidance in the most mundane matters of individual, family, social and political life. Even in this endeavor, the diversity of views and opinions is again, myriad. One cannot speak about “an” Islamic position, but rather “positions.”

In order to help Christians better understand how and why Muslims look to Muhammad, we’d like to suggest that, at least from the Christian perspective, rather than comparing Muhammad to Jesus why not compare Muhammad to David? Muhammad and David are more alike and a more appropriate comparisons from the Biblical perspective than Muhammad and Jesus, if comparisons are necessary. Both were military leaders, rulers and law makers; both were husbands and family men; and both are recognized for their unique piety toward God through revelation that either came to them in the case of Muhammad, or through them in the case of David. (Muslims may have particular concerns over this comparison. However, we would ask for patience as we explain this from the Christian perspective.)

Why not David?

I remember very well my earliest children’s Bible. It was a black and white cartoon Bible. Among the many bible stories was that of David and Goliath from 1 Samuel 17. I can still see the image of little David with his sling shot, penciled marks around the sling to indicate its motion. The next box showed little David standing over Goliath, holding Goliath’s huge sword in his two hands. The New Revised Standard Version of the bible concludes this pericope thus: “Then David ran and stood over the Philistine; he grasped his sword, drew it out of its sheath, and killed him; then he cut off his head with it” (1 Sam. 17:51). Of course, this particular image was not included in my children’s Bible, but if there were a current X-Box game of this story, most certainly there would be plenty of blood. For us, in the Lutheran tradition, especially, this story found its way into our homes through the moral and ethical lessons of *Davie and Goliath*, a stop-motion animation series from the 1960s of a little boy and his dog who provided important lessons for children each Sunday morning on television.

The role of David in the Hebrew Scriptures provides us with a very human image of what Frederick Gaiser has called “God’s Shepherd, Warrior and King.”²⁷ David is a figure who we are introduced to as the “underdog” whom we grow to love, who has the ability to soothe the savage soul of Saul with his music, and whose Psalms speak to the deepest needs of our own lives; and yet who is capable of crimes of passion (2 Sam 11:2-27), the

tragic decisions of political expediency (2 Sam. 21:7-10), the horrors of genocide (2 Sam 8:2), who receives permission from God to kill the Philistines (1 Sa 23:2-5).

The point here is not to drag out the dirty laundry and to engage, once again, in a tit-for-tat of whose religion is better than the other. Rather, the issue is that in the mist of these stories that have somewhat less than noble or certainly not always age-appropriate lessons we consider scripture that we have a variety of ways in which we deal with these tough passages. Apparently, we have found ways to take these stories, these sometimes violent stories, and appropriate them. The story of David cutting the head of Goliath has become transformed to express the importance of perseverance in the face of adversity, where even the littlest child can overcome any obstacle to succeed.

I have been particularly impacted in this thinking by Walter Bruggeman, as many of us have been. In his book *David's Truth in Israel's Imagination and Memory*, he writes: "David occupies a central position in the imagination of ancient Israel and in the rendering of "faith and history" by that community The inescapable conclusion is that "David," who generates many "truths" in many literary presentations yields traditions that are competing and conflicting, thus a multi-voiced truth that does not have a settled, foundational truth behind or beneath these many renderings."²⁸

Bruggemann argues that there are various layers of historical tradition that have come to us in the David saga of 1st - 2nd Samuel, 1st Kings, and the Psalms. His interest is not in discovering the "Historical David," but the thematic content out of which these different narratives were constructed. According to Bruggemann, not only did ancient Israel have many "Davids" that grew out of different traditions where "memory and presence keep generating more and more stories," but we too have multiple "David's" whom we appropriate in our own various contexts.²⁹ Perhaps as a child I found the military prowess of David over Goliath cool, but to be quite honest, these days I find it very troubling and would rather explore the reflective and poetic song writer. If we are able to interpret our scripture in such fashions, is it not possible that Muslims are capable of the same hermeneutical skills in their views and appropriations of Muhammad?

Conclusion

Each year on Palm Sunday Lutheran congregations have a traditional Hymn that is sung: "Lead on, O King Eternal." This past year, as I stood in the mist of the congregation and sang, I was overcome with a sickening sense:

*Lead on, O King eternal! The day of march has come;
Henceforth in fields of conquest your tents will be our home.
Through days of preparation your grace has made us strong;
And now, O King eternal, we lift our battle song.*

I have sung that hymn many times, and found solace in the tunes and the hymnody of the community. And yet, at least on this particular Sunday, I was overcome with its stark imagery of violence. As I looked around though, it seemed as if I was the only one in the sanctuary with any sense of hesitation in such pronouncements. And yet, I know that the community with which I was gathered had no thoughts about military conquests.

Apparently most of the people around me were taken to different places in their own singing.

Muslims have never claimed that Muhammad is anything other than human, with all that this entails, especially as a political and military leader. Yet, they feel that he is the best example of a human being; demonstrating compassion, mercy and kindness in the best and worst of circumstances. While some branches of Islam do have what we might call a high view of Muhammad as *ma'sum*, or infallible; this is nothing like our views of the essential Christological nature of Jesus. Muslims have always talked about Muhammad as a Prophet, like the other Prophets, including Jesus and David. For Muslims, Prophets are sent to speak God's Words to particular communities who are in need. Muhammad, then, is different in that he speaks to all communities. Reiterating the thinking of the late Anglican Bishop Kenneth Cragg, can the "particularity of Muhammad's story" be "appreciated in its own right as it was" in its own context?³⁰

Christians have always talked about Jesus as the very "icon" of God, the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world through the willing solitary pacifying suffering at the hands of both human evil, as well as human intransience to evil. For Christians, there are particular theological reasons why this is to be. However, the two views of God and humanity in Islam and Christianity, of the Prophetic activity of Muhammad and the salvific work of Jesus, share and diverge in many interesting ways. If Christians wish to look at Muhammad and understand how Muslims find him to be *al-insan al-kamil* (the perfect human being), then why not look toward David as a comparison? At least then, I think, at least from the Christian perspective we might be talking about apples to apples.

Endnotes

¹ Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Chap. 50 (London, 1782). (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/gibbon/decline/files/volume2/chap50.htm>) [accessed 4/11/13].

² See Efraim Karsh, *Islamic imperialism: A History* (New Haven : Yale University Press, 2006).

³ Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Chap. 50 (London, 1782). (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/gibbon/decline/files/volume2/chap50.htm>) [accessed 4/11/13].

⁴ Benedict XVI, "Faith, Reason and the University: Memories and Reflections," University of Regensburg, Germany, 2006 (http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2006/september/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20060912_university-regensburg_en.html) [accessed 11 April 2013].

⁵ Thomas S. Kidd, *American Christians and Islam* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2009), 147.

⁶ "US bloggers banned from entering UK," *BBC News UK* (<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-23064355>) [accessed 6/28/13].

⁷ See Norman Daniel, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image* (Oxford: OneWorld, 2000). The Original edition was from 1960.

⁸ See Clinton Bennett, "The Legacy of Karl Gottlieb Pfander," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, Vol 20 (No 2, 1996): 76-81; and David D. Grafton, "The Death of Christ on a Cross," in *Christian-Muslim Relations in the Anglican and Lutheran Communion*, eds. David D. Grafton, Joseph Duggan and Jason Craige Harris (New York: Pivot Publishing, 2013): forthcoming. The record of the debate at Agra can be found at W. Muir, *The Mohammedan Controversy* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897), and Powell, Avril A. *Muslims and Missionaries in Pre-Mutiny India*. Surrey: Curzon Press, 1993.

⁹ See, for example, <http://www.answering-islam.org/>.

¹⁰ Found at: <http://www.sunniforum.com>

-
- ¹¹ See the polemical article by Sam Shamoun, “Revisiting Muhammad's Marriage to His Adopted Son's Divorcee, Zaynab Bint Jash: A Response to a Muslim's Defense of the Moral Ramifications of such a Union,” *Answering Islam.org* (<http://www.answering-islam.org/Responses/Menj/zaynab.htm>) [accessed 11 April 2013]. Shamoun picks up on many of Pfander’s themes.
- ¹² <http://www.answering-islam.org/Books/Pfander/Balance/p330.htm>, p. 332.
- ¹³ Pfander, 332-3.
- ¹⁴ Pfander, 348.
- ¹⁵ Pfander, 159.
- ¹⁶ Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Chap. 50 (London, 1782). (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/gibbon/decline/files/volume2/chap50.htm>) [accessed 4/11/13].
- ¹⁷ Omid Safi, *Memories of Muhammed: Why the Prophet Matters* (New York: HarperOne, 2009).
- ¹⁸ Tariq Ramadan, *In the Footsteps of the Prophet: Lessons From the Life of Muhammad* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- ¹⁹ Saniyasnain Khan, *Just for Kids: Qur'an Stories* (New Delhi: Goodword Books, 2004).
- ²⁰ Saniyasnain Khan, *Goodnight Stories From the Qur'an* (New Delhi: Goodword Books, 2005).
- ²¹ Saniyasnain Khan, *Goodnight Stories from the Life of the Prophet Muhammad* (New Delhi: Goodword Books, 2006).
- ²² Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest for the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede* (New York: Macmillan, 1910).
- ²³ Clinton Bennett, *In Search of Muhammad* (London: Cassell, 1998), 205.
- ²⁴ *The Green Bible* (New York: HarperCollins, 2008). This edition of the NRSV Bible has green highlighted portions that refer to how the Bible reflects on the environmental crisis facing the planet.
- ²⁵ John Eagleson and Philip J. Scharper, eds., *The Patriot's Bible* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1975).
- ²⁶ See for example Tarif Khalidi, *The Muslim Jesus* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001).
- ²⁷ Frederick J. Gaiser, *David: God's Shepherd, Warrior, and King*. Inspire Bible Study Series (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1998).
- ²⁸ Walter Bruggemann, *David's Truth in Israel's Imagination and Memory* 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), x-xi.
- ²⁹ Bruggemann, *David's Truth*, 1.
- ³⁰ Kenneth Cragg, *Muhammad and the Christian: A Question of Response* (Oxford: OneWorld Press, 1999), 13.