


Reformation
& Revival



A Quarterly Journal for Church Leadership

Volume 6, Number 2 • Spring 1997

Oropeza, B. J. *99 Reasons Why No One Knows When Christ Will Return*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1994. This immensely useful little book is filled with warnings regarding date setting.

Pate, C. Marvin and Calvin B. Haines, Jr. *Doomsday Delusions*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1995. Another title similar to the Oropeza book above.

*Peterson, Robert A. *Hell On Trial: The Case for Eternal Punishment*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1995. A fine treatment and much needed.

Ridderbos, Herman. *The Coming of the Kingdom*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1962. A massive and important work. Ridderbos is one of the best contemporary Reformed minds who dealt carefully with the text as well.

Stephenson, John R. *Eschatology* (Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics, Volume XIII in series, Robert D. Preus, editor). Fort Wayne, Indiana: The Luther Academy, 1993. A solid contemporary Lutheran work that non-Lutherans should consider.

Wilmot, John. *Inspired Principles of Prophetic Interpretation*. Swengel, Pennsylvania: Reiner, 1975. Martyn Lloyd-Jones highly praised this valuable book. It is not easy to find.

Witherington, Ben III. *Jesus, Paul and the End of the World*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992. Witherington, a professor at Ashland Theological Seminary, is an important contemporary scholar.

* Highly recommended.

***Ecumenical Jihad:
Ecumenism and the Culture War***

Peter Kreeft

San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1996.

172 pages, paper, \$11.95.

Sometimes a book appears which captures considerable interest among only a few evangelical leaders but has, at the same time, implications which far exceed the book's actual sales. Such is the case with this book, *Ecumenical Jihad*, by the distinguished philosopher, speaker, and Boston College professor, Dr. Peter Kreeft.

Because this book has been cited and analyzed by several evangelical leaders, and because the distinguished evangelical scholar and teacher, Dr. James I. Packer, wrote a brief endorsement for the volume, the editorial staff of this publication considered it appropriate to interact with this book in a significant way, seeking to demonstrate both its strengths and its weaknesses.

In the present discussion of ecumenicity between Protestant evangelicals and conservative Roman Catholics there are two dangers that face the evangelical Christian. One is to veer to the right, using the older, and often incorrect, rhetoric of nineteenth-century anti-Catholicism. The other is to veer leftward, embracing the new political correctness that immerses differences into a sea of subjectivity. Even more likely could be the growth of mistrust and even misrepresentation of views held by public spokespersons for the faith. It is into these sometimes confusing discussions that we enter in publishing two excellent reviews of Kreeft's controversial work.

It should be understood that Reformation & Revival Ministries has never agreed with the now famous accord,

Evangelicals and Catholics Together. For those who would like to see my own thoughts you may consult my book, *A View of Rome* (Moody, 1995). We believe that if the Protestant signers really wanted to state a common co-belligerency position they could have accomplished this quite easily without stating that there was a new theological agreement on doctrinal matters where it simply does not exist, except in some informal discussions. There is clearly not agreement between *consistent* Protestants and *consistent* Roman Catholics who adhere to the doctrinal confessions of their respective communions. The great *solas* of the Reformation should not have been omitted in *ECT* and the document written as if to imply that we now agree on several important disagreements of the Reformation.

At the same time we are committed as a ministry to fairness and to open discussion of important ideas. With this policy we felt it fair to publish Jim Packer's review of this book, letting him speak for himself with regard to his public endorsement of this controversial work. We also felt that it was fair to invite a leading student of the Islamic world and a missionary to Muslims for a lifetime, Bassam Madany, to review the book. By doing this we allow the reader to interact with several very important matters as expressed by two good Christian minds.

Finally, though I did not and would not sign *Evangelicals and Catholics Together*, Dr. Packer, who is a signatory of this much-debated document, is still my friend and has repeatedly supported this ministry. He is, in my estimation, an esteemed scholar and a devout and orthodox Christian. I have personally expressed to him, on several occasions, my reasons for *not* supporting the *Evangelical and Catholics Together* accord. At the same time I believe that it should be said, and said very plainly, that James I. Packer has never renounced a single tenet of Protestant orthodoxy. Actually, the opposite is the case, as his article earlier in this issue of

Reformation & Revival Journal will plainly indicate.

When Packer endorsed Kreeft's book he was not endorsing all that Kreeft believes or writes. He was endorsing this book as a teacher who delights in getting his students to think and to form opinions for themselves. This is the role of the teacher, and Packer has always been a teacher of the older and wiser sort. To suggest that this means Packer endorses the entire argument of Kreeft is fallacious reasoning. He believes that Kreeft has something to say about the present cultural breakdown of the West that should be heard and pondered. When he concludes his comments on the jacket of the book with the question, "What if he is right?" he is not saying that he is or even that he might be right in his aberrant theological views. He is asking if Kreeft might be right in the big picture regarding the cultural war of the present. That Packer plainly disavows Kreeft's post-Vatican II vision of things his review will clearly show to the honest reader.

I hope that you, the reader, will ponder both of these reviews very carefully. They are written by two Christian gentlemen who clearly have something that we Christian leaders need to hear.

John H. Armstrong

Review Number One

James I. Packer

This review comes from the doghouse. The back jacket of *Ecumenical Jihad* carries a commendation from me to the effect that "Peter Kreeft's vision of things" should be pondered and discussed, because his theme is far-reaching and a great deal hangs on whether what he says is right. I have been publicly rubbished for this, as if recommending a book for discussion implies agreement with all it affirms. But not so. Kreeft is a Roman Catholic convert (he tells his

story in chapter 8), and his enthusiastic projection of Rome as home, and of final salvation for honest non-Christian religionists according to C. S. Lewis and Vatican II, leaves me cold. Yet he is a top-class philosopher of the Thomist type, and a top-class writer with a whimsical imagination and a charmingly chummy style, and he digs you in the mental ribs in a most thought-provoking way. I commend his book because facing up to his energetic rib-digging seems to me a healthful discipline for all Christian minds.

He unfolds his theme as follows. First, he focuses on North America's culture wars, and pleads for the "co-belligerence" (Schaeffer's word, meaning cooperation in battle) of all who, for whatever reason, uphold the familial, communal, and educational values of historic Christendom in face of attacks from post- and anti-Christian opinion- and policy-makers (media, press, public school and university teachers, organs of government, etc.) His vision here is of Christians of all stripes, plus Jews, immigrant Muslims, and fellow-traveling agnostics and atheists, massing together for cultural counter attack (the *jihad* of his title), and he rubs the reader's nose in the question, when the foundations are being destroyed, what should those who think of themselves as on God's side do? Then he dreams up conversations with Confucius, Buddha, Muhammad and Moses, and a dialogue between C. S. Lewis, Thomas Aquinas, and Martin Luther, to dramatize concretely the idea that all religious roads, faithfully followed, lead savingly to God in Jesus Christ, if not here, then hereafter. Framed by Mary and the Mass, Kreeft's Christ is the Christ of Vatican II and the new *Catholic Catechism*; one may ask whether at these points he is the Christ of the Scriptures. But be that as it may, Kreeft's hope clearly is that joining in the *jihad* will lead Protestants and other prodigals to Roman-type faith in Jesus, as well as helping Mary (yes, that is what he says) to win the war. Thus he put it, as would sixteenth- and seven-

teenth-century writers.

Why should any evangelical bother with such a book? Why should I ever commend it for discussion? My answer is: because Kreeft's brilliant buttonholing forces us to think out answers to questions that in our defensive somnolence we tend to duck, such as these:

1) What, precisely, should evangelicals be doing in today's culture wars (violent in the United States, insidious in Canada)? Should we be retreating, under protest, into isolation, or (as Kreeft thinks) actively counterattacking? If the latter, by what means, and with what allies? And what will constitute victory?

2) How, precisely, should we regard adherents of other faiths in our multireligious society? Should we posit universal grace and perhaps a hidden Christ in their lives (as Kreeft inclines to do)? Or should we see saving knowledge of Christ as the one thing necessary that at present they lack, and that we should therefore try to share with them?

3) What, precisely, should happen to the Roman Catholic Church, with its infallibility claim, its irreformably defined doctrines, and its sacramentalist soteriology? Ought it to stand, as being every religious person's true home (Kreeft's view)? Or should it break up, and the papacy be abolished, and the *ex opere operato* sacramentalism be left behind (Packer's view)? Or what?

4) What, precisely, is the Gospel? Granted that the living Christ is at its heart (Kreeft is right on this point), just what does it say about sin? Atonement? Faith? The church? Justification? Mary? The Eucharist? The moral life? Final destiny? Though Kreeft does not directly raise these questions, an evangelical reading him cannot avoid doing so.

Kreeft conceives his essay as a wake-up call to American Catholics. His spectacular triumphalist account of what he hopes for should wake up evangelicals as well (and the Orthodox, too, whom his argument totally ignores). Those

who truly seek renewal, reformation and revival will find that working out how far they agree with Kreeft, where they differ from him, why, and what their alternatives are, is a bracing experience: a healthy exercise, like half an hour on a Nordic Track, that we would miss if we stayed asleep. No more attractive version of the Roman vision is likely to come our way, and parrying its pull matures us. That is why this provocative, though mistaken, book seems to me to merit the reflective reading and discussion that I recommended.

Author

Dr. James I. Packer is formerly Sungwoo Youtong Chee Professor of Theology at Regent College, where he taught since 1979. Previously he taught and lectured widely in his native Great Britain. He is a prolific author and has written scores of articles and books, the best known being *Knowing God*, a modern classic. He also serves as visiting scholar and a Senior Editor of *Christianity Today*.

Review Number Two

Bassam M. Madany

Reading *Ecumenical Jihad* is a unique experience. Many of us share with Peter Kreeft his intensity of feeling regarding the by-products of secularization in America. I find it very difficult, however, to accept his plan for the actual battle plan which includes a so-called *ecumenical jihad*. Furthermore, I am baffled by the absolute assurance of Kreeft that the Roman Catholic Church is *the* church our Lord Jesus Christ established 2000 years ago! Kreeft is a twentieth-century convert to Rome, much like Cardinal Newman in the last century, who appears to think of himself as herald to summon Protestants home to Rome. (In this book he goes even further, to summon the followers of other

major world religions as well!) His thesis is quite simple at this point—the leading world institution in the great war against secularism will be the Roman Catholic Church.

In this review article, I will set forth the several theses of Kreeft's book before I provide my own analysis of its contents.

While there have been many articles written in religious magazines describing and deploring the present moral chaos in American society, Peter Kreeft is singularly gifted in the way he enumerates the glaring and shocking sins which pervade our public life. He writes simply and convincingly, endeavoring to follow in the footsteps of C. S. Lewis, a man he greatly admires and often quotes. In his first chapter he describes the problem as follows:

So: without religion, no morality, and without morality, no salvation of society or of individuals. But: there are two structural obstacles to this solution, this only possible solution. One is the separation between our society and religion, and the other is the separation and split both within the Christian religion and among the religions of the world. This does not help in our war against secularism (p. 21).

These words help us get into the mind of Professor Kreeft. He acknowledges an inherent problem within the American experience: that of attempting to define the foundations of private and public morality apart from their source in religious faith. This is due, as many contemporaries argue, to the constitutionally mandated separation between church and state. Furthermore, recognizing that we live in a global milieu, Kreeft is tremendously exercised by divisions among the religions of the world. He maintains that this does not help in our war against secularism.

How are Christians (as well as followers of other world religions) to face the *common foe* and eventually defeat

him? Peter Kreeft's answer is that followers of the major world faiths must work together in a struggle which is nothing less than a worldwide *jihad*. As he puts it:

The battle lines are obviously changing. No longer are Protestants and Catholics anathematizing each other. Relations with Jews and even Muslims are beginning to show signs of understanding and respect never before seen in history. . . . It seems that our divine Commander's strategy is to bring this change about by confronting us with the increasingly clear and present danger of the common enemy, the new Tower of Babel (p. 28).

The war against secularism is bringing people of different faiths together. More than that, in spite of their theological differences, they are fighting together. This is the important thing today. No one can tell what the outcome of this new alliance will be. It is still in its ". . . early stages of formation. That formation is in a clearer and more advanced stage in front of abortuaries and in inner-city drug centers than it is in the churches or seminaries or universities. Practice is leading theory" (p. 28).

This war, or *jihad*, must take place within several circles. First, it needs to happen within Christian groups, regardless of their ecclesiastical differences. This is Christian ecumenism in the trenches. It must be followed by a new Jewish-Christian ecumenism, a Christian-Muslim ecumenism, and even an ecumenicity which embraces Hinduism and Buddhism. Finally, Kreeft concludes, following the pattern of thought expressed at Vatican II, that

. . . even atheists and agnostics, if they are of good will and intellectual honesty and still believe in objective truth and objective morality, are on our side in the war against the powers of darkness. Perhaps they can be called "anony-

mous Christians," as Karl Rahner suggested (p. 31).

That this is not merely a *practical* alliance in the war against secularism can be seen in the hopeful words Kreeft uses regarding the future possibilities of *ecumenical jihad*. He writes: "I have no idea what new theological understanding might emerge from this new tactical alliance; but I think that such an understanding will happen. For love causes knowledge. Orthopraxy leads to orthodoxy, as well as vice versa" (p. 31).

Kreeft sees this coming together of people of different religions in their spiritual warfare as part of "God's Strategy." He has the highest admiration for Pope John Paul II whom he regards as "a new Gregory the Great." After all, "he has surely done more than anyone else in our century to save the world from Communism and from nuclear war" (p. 33).

Sensing that many Western readers will object to the use of the term *jihad* in describing the war against secularism, Kreeft devotes his second chapter to the defense of his theme, followed in the third chapter by another defense, that of fanaticism. A further defense appears in chapter four, namely "Culture Wars." In a rather amusing way, he tells of a unique experience which he had when attempting to surf after "Hurricane Felix turned the East Coast into Hawaii for two weeks." He was caught by a "twelve-foot wave" which ushered him onto "a Heavenly beach" where he had a great discussion with Confucius, Buddha, Muhammad and Moses (chapter 6).

The remaining part of the book marks a shift from the main theme of *Ecumenical Jihad*. Having set forth the urgency for all religions to work together in the fight against godless secularism, Kreeft begins a discussion designed to prove that the Roman Catholic Church is the *true* church of Jesus Christ. This is accomplished in a rather skillful literary

manner by a meeting between C. S. Lewis, Martin Luther and Thomas Aquinas. Our author, as a lifelong student of the popular British apologist Lewis, enlists the “help” of the German Reformer and the Italian Doctor of Theology, to heal the great rift within Western Christianity. The dialogue is built around a subject treated in one of Lewis’s well known books in which he asks if there is such a thing as “Mere Christianity.”

Finally, Peter Kreeft displays his ardent faith in the power of the Eucharist to bring Christians together. “No Catholic dogma is so distinctive and so apparently anti-ecumenical as the dogma of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Yet this dogma may be the greatest cause of ecumenism and eventual reunion” (p. 145).

His testimony follows. He was born and brought up in the Reformed Church in America, received his college training at Calvin College of the Christian Reformed Church, and at 21 converted to Rome. He is now a professor of philosophy at Boston College and a prolific popular author. It should be remembered that Kreeft is not the only Protestant intellectual in recent years to switch to Rome. Tom Howard, from a respected evangelical family, and a former professor of English at Gordon College, is another such intellectual convert. In the dedication of this book, Kreeft includes another illustrious Protestant convert to Rome, the former Lutheran, Richard John Neuhaus.

The Analysis

I must confess that even before I began to read this book I was quite intrigued by the title. I noticed it first in an ad in a religious journal. The juxtaposition of *ecumenical* and *jihad* seemed extremely awkward, especially to me as a Christian and as a lifelong student of Islam. As a teacher of philosophy Kreeft surely must be aware of the tradition that one cannot arbitrarily decide the meaning of a specific

word. After all, words are not simply etymologically defined, they also carry historical baggage. This is especially the case with foreign words. While some modern writers on Islam have tried hard to downplay the meaning of *jihad*, claiming that it denotes primarily a spiritual struggle with self, the reality has always been different. Over the long course of 1400 years of historical usage, *jihad* has always consistently referred to the kind of holy war that expands the territory of *Daru’l Islam*, i.e., the household of Islam.

Before the rise of this theistic faith in the seventh century, the tribes of the Arabian peninsula raided each other as a way of life. After they had accepted Islam (by 632 A.D.) their energies were directed against the Persian and Byzantine empires in a holy war of conquest. Within a hundred years after the death of Muhammad (in 632 A.D.), a huge Islamic empire stretched from Spain to the western parts of India. The terms which *jihad* offered to the conquered Christians, Jews and Zoroastrians, were either conversion to Islam, or the status of *dhimmi*, i.e., “protected groups.” While *dhimmi* were allowed to remain within their own religions, they were required to pay special taxes and to refrain from public witness to their faith. The by-product of *jihad* was the eventual disappearance of the church in North Africa, and the marginalization of various Eastern churches in the Middle East.

War against secularism may be desirable to a certain extent, but not the *ecumenical jihad* envisaged by Kreeft. Kreeft has based his extremely optimistic view of Islam (as well as other nontheistic faiths) upon his personal encounter with some of their followers in the West. This is never the proper way to plan alliances with followers of world religions. Had he armed himself with a realistic global outlook Kreeft would have realized that his dream of a common front against secularism is utopian.

At the very time I am writing this review (during Advent

season), a real *jihad* is being waged by Islamic fundamentalists against Christians and animists in southern Sudan. In Iran, Protestants are officially denied the status of *dhimmi* which is accorded to the older Christian churches (Assyrian and Armenian). They are persecuted severely, several pastors having been martyred during the 1990s. This is real *jihad* in action, not the *jihad* of Kreeft's imagination. No amount of Anglo-Saxon rhetoric can redeem this word!

Another matter that disturbs me in Peter Kreeft's apologetic is his historiography. No responsible church historian has the right to make such generalizations as

the first millennium was the millennium of Christian unity. There was one and only one worldwide visible Church from Pentecost to 1054. The second millennium was the millennium of disunity: tears in Christ's seamless garment: 1054, 1517 and all the further tears that followed 1517 (p. 26).

Nothing is more damaging than divisions within the body of Christ, especially when we face the challenge of secularism at home and resurgent non-Christian religions abroad. But equally devastating is departure from the truth of God's Word, the Bible. So when dealing with church history, we must never simplistically gloss over certain undisputed facts. For example, division in the church did not begin in 1054 but in the aftermath of the Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon in 451! Several churches in the Middle East did not accept the formula of the one person of Christ with two natures (divine and human), and exercising two wills (divine and human). I am not defending the theology of these non-Chalcedonian churches. However, I cannot condone the severe persecution which was inflicted upon these Christians by the Byzantine emperors and the Orthodox Church.

The 1054 schism, furthermore, was not about an insignif-

icant matter. While it is evident that quite early in the history of the body of Christ, episcopacy became the *modus operandi* within the church, no specific episcopal center was ever acknowledged as primary or superior to others. It was the persistent claim of the bishop of Rome that he had primacy over the other centers of the church (i.e., in Antioch, Jerusalem, Alexandria and Constantinople). This claim precipitated the division between the Western and Eastern churches. Thus, no objective research can substantiate the claim that the Roman see was the unique center of Christianity during the first millennium. At this point, I'm afraid that Peter Kreeft is simply engaging in propaganda, not in a serious account of history.

The saddest part of the book is in chapters 7 and 8. Having fully expounded his thesis in defense of a global ecumenical war against secularism, the author shifts gears to the second division of his book.

While formally staying in the background, it is Peter Kreeft who directs the proceedings of the "Dialogue with C. S. Lewis, Martin Luther, and Thomas Aquinas." His goal is to prove that whatever wrongs happened in the Western church under Rome, today it is no longer defensible to remain separated from Rome.

Kreeft allows Luther to give a shocking description of our times in which the awful consequences of secularism are depicted. Underneath this fair treatment of Luther's view, we encounter the real agenda of the author, which is that we may differ in our theologies, both Protestant and Catholic (and others as well) and yet still work together in a common war against the enemy. Eventually, our orthopraxy must enable us to reformulate our doctrinal positions. Luther is treated cordially. But this is simply not the way he was actually handled by Rome after the Diet of Worms. Here is an important part of the "imagined" response of Aquinas to the German Reformer:

Historical research will show one position or the other. And I claim it will show the continuity of Catholic dogma and the roots of that dogma in the earliest writings of the Church Fathers. Many a Catholic convert has trod this path to Rome, the historical path—for instance, Cardinal Newman. All the distinctively Catholic doctrines are to be found there very early in Church history, though some more clearly than others. And none of the distinctively Protestant denials of Catholic doctrines is there, except in those writers who were identified by the universal Church as heretic (p. 135).

Peter Kreeft believes that ultimately, the unique claims of Roman Catholicism are to be decided by the Eucharist. In his autobiographical account of his journey “from Dutch Reformed Calvinism to Roman Catholicism, the one Catholic dogma that most drew me in was the Eucharist.”

The subject of the real presence of Jesus Christ in the elements of the Lord’s Supper was of primary importance for Kreeft’s journey Romeward. He considers that Protestants merely have “Christ . . . present only subjectively in” their souls! But what magnetically drew Kreeft to Rome was the doctrine that Christ was

more fully present, present also objectively, in the Eucharist . . . I became a Catholic essentially for the very concrete historical reason that I discovered that Jesus Christ had founded the Catholic Church. . . . A Protestant taking a time machine back to any time at all before the Reformation would not feel at home. I knew that, because I was that Protestant, and history is a time machine, and I did not feel at home. He would feel that he had stumbled into a Catholic church. The center of worship was the Eucharist, not the Bible; the altar, not the pulpit; the consecration of the bread and wine, not the preaching of the sermon (pp. 147-48).

Here is the theology of Peter Kreeft stated in the most succinct way. It is too bad that he caricatures the Protestant doctrine of the Holy Supper as a *mere symbol*. This is a real blunder, especially for someone brought up in a Calvinistic church and educated at Calvin College. Had he ever seriously studied John Calvin’s *Institutes* and the Genevan Reformer’s commentary on John 6 he would have found the case quite different. Had he consulted Article 35 of the *Belgic Confession* dealing with “The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper” he would have found the matter different. His own specific ecclesiastical tradition actually teaches a very high doctrine of the Lord’s Supper. It is not the Zwinglian view which unfortunately considers the sacrament as only a memorial supper. The sixteenth-century confessions of the Reformed wing of Protestantism do acknowledge a real presence of Christ in the Holy Supper, but the manner of his presence is spiritual (i.e., by the Holy Spirit), not physical.

Further, it is certain that Jesus Christ did not prescribe His sacraments for us in vain. He works in us all that He represents through these holy signs, though the manner in which He does this goes beyond our understanding. It is incomprehensible to us, just as the operation of God’s Spirit is hidden and incomprehensible to us.

Yet we do not go wrong when we say that what is eaten is Christ’s own natural body and what is drunk is his own blood—but the manner in which we eat it is not by the mouth, but by the Spirit, through faith. *Belgic Confession*, Article 35

Ecumenical Jihad has some very helpful and serious sections where Peter Kreeft, as mentioned earlier, is at his best. This is especially the case when he describes the ravages of secularism in American culture. This aspect of his work is

laudable. However, his veering at one time toward universalism and at another time toward theological pluralism, ultimately renders this book quite confusing. Perhaps this is due to the fact that his religio-sociological laboratory was limited by a North American academic experience.

The author's argument that Rome should be our ultimate home is not convincing to those carefully grounded in the fundamental disciplines of theology, church history, and above all, the Bible. I hope that this passionately written book will actually bring Protestants together, not in some kind of shallow ecumenicity, but around the heritage of historic Christianity as it has been preserved and handed down to us in the ecumenical creeds and the Protestant catechisms and confessions of faith of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. If this book can act as a catalyst for such ecumenicity, it will have served a useful purpose, notwithstanding the manifest desire of Peter Kreeft who wants us to follow in his steps to Rome.

A Short Bibliography

Atiya Aziz. *History of Eastern Christianity*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.

Belgic Confession is found in the *Psalter Hymnal of The Christian Reformed Church in North America*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: CRC Publications, 1987.

Robert B. Betts. *Christians in the Arab East: A Political Study*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1978.

George W. Braswell, Jr. *Islam: Its Prophet, Peoples, Politics and Power*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1996.

Kenneth Cragg. *The Arab Christian: A History in the Middle East*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991.

John Kelsay. *Islam and War: A Study in Comparative Ethics*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1933.

Bernard Lewis. *Race and Slavery in the Middle East: An Historical Enquiry*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Judith Miller. *God Has Ninety-nine Names: Reporting From a Militant Middle East*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.

Neal Robinson. *Christ in Islam and Christianity*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1991.

Bat Ye'or. *The Decline of Eastern Christianity under Islam: From Jihad to Dhimmitude*. Cranbury, New Jersey: Associated University Presses, 1996.

Author

Bassam M. Madany was Arabic Broadcast Minister of the Back to God Hour of the Christian Reformed Church, from 1958 to 1994. His broadcasts, still aired daily in the Arabic-speaking world of North Africa and the Middle East, reach thousands of Muslims. Madany was born in Seleucia, in the province of Antioch, Syria, and educated at British and French schools in the Middle East. In 1950 he came to the United States and studied at Reformed Theological Seminary in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, graduating in 1953. He served as a missionary in Syria for several years and then pursued further study in the United States, at Calvin Theological Seminary. He has made a lifetime study of Islam and is author of the book, *The Bible and Islam*. Presently he is teaching missions and traveling widely, speaking about the challenge modern Islam presents to the Christian church.

In the third century, a prophet called Novatian gathered a huge following by crying, "Come, Lord Jesus!" Donatus, a fourth-century prophet, commanded attention when he stressed that only 144,000 people would be chosen by God. He found this magic figure in Revelation 14:1 (a verse which the Jehovah's Witnesses use to proclaim their own version of this heresy). Both Novatian and Donatus were branded as heretics by the church.

John C. Souter

Many people will be surprised when Jesus comes again—but nobody will be mistaken.

John Blanchard

As Christians, we should not be exitists, looking for our going, but adventists, looking for His coming.

William Freel

In the first advent God veiled his divinity to prove the faithful; in the second advent he will manifest his glory to reward their faith.

John Chrysostom