Introduction
Three Journeys: Jesus—Constantine—Muhammad

David W. Shenk

I am editing this presentation in Chisinau, Moldova, at the conclusion of two weeks teaching courses on Islam and the Christian faith; most of the students are from Central Asia, and most from Muslim background. In discussions with these students I hear comments like this:

Some of our Muslim neighbors in Central Asia are disturbed about the recent wars in our regions. These wars seem to them to be Christian wars again Muslims. Furthermore, some American Christian leaders have said some unkind and critical things about Islam. These statements are broadly publicized in our countries. Sometimes the anger of our Muslim neighbors about these matters turns into hate against our churches.

Shortly after the 9/11/2001 attacks, I asked Mark Oxbrow, a missions director with the Church Missions Society of the Church of England, "What do you say in churches in the United Kingdom when you are asked to speak on the Christian faith and Islam?"

Mark responded, "I speak about three different journeys for peace: Jesus, Constantine, and Muhammad. Those different journeys are options for each of us, and each of us needs to choose which one we will take."

Just as is true of British Christians, followers of Jesus in North America and around the world are faced with the option of these three different journeys for peace. Bishop Kenneth Cragg, who has invested many years in the Middle East and is a reputable scholar of Islam, occasionally reminds both Muslims and Christians of the

theological significance of two journeys: Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem and Muhammad from Mecca to Medina. Mark Oxbrow reminds his audiences of a third journey as well, that of Constantine to Rome that laid the foundations for Christendom.[1]

The Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem

Jesus was at the height of his popularity in Galilee after feeding the five thousand men plus women and children by blessing and breaking five loaves of bread and two fish. The Galileans were impressed, and attempted to make him their king "by force" (John 6:15). Surely an army of Zealot independence fighters would have joined forces with Jesus to gain independence from the Romans, and then from the Galilee beachhead they could expand the Kingdom of God throughout Israel and eventually throughout the earth. Jesus resisted that invitation and from that time onward he "resolutely set out for Jerusalem" (Luke 9:51). In the following weeks Jesus tried to make his disciples aware that in Jerusalem the authorities will arrest the Son of Man and "…mock him, insult him, spit on him, and kill him. On the third day he will rise again" (Matthew 18:32-3).

By this time the disciples were convinced that Jesus was the promised Messiah. They could not fathom that an arrest and death were possibilities for the Messiah. Peter representing the convictions of all the disciples rebuked Jesus for such notions, and Jesus responded very sharply, "Get behind me Satan! Yu are a stumbling block to me; you do not have in mind the things of God, but the things of men" (Matthew 16:23).

Finally as Jesus approached Jerusalem, he mounted a colt. Jubilant children singing hosannas accompanied him. Yet as he came over the crest of the Mount of Olives and saw the city before him, he stopped his colt and wept, because Jerusalem would not receive "what would bring you peace" (Luke 19:41). Then with the children

still singing, he and the youngsters entered the temple and cleansed it of the merchants who were corrupting the whole system with their exploitative practices.

All of this is tremendously significant as it relates to the mission of Jesus and the nature of the Kingdom of God. In that colt ride he was proclaiming the fulfillment of two biblical prophesies in regard to the messianic kingdom.

First, he was fulfilling Zechariah's prophecy of five centuries earlier. Most frequently we read only the introduction to the prophecy and miss the universal, peacemaking, nonviolent, and voluntary messianic rule that Jesus was announcing in riding that colt into Jerusalem.

> *Rejoice greatly, O Daughter of Zion! Shout, Daughter of Jerusalem! See your king comes to you, righteous and having salvation, gentle and riding on a donkey, on a colt the foal of a donkey. I will take away the chariots from Ephraim and the war-horses from Jerusalem, and the battle bow will be broken. He will proclaim peace to the nations. His rule will extend from sea to sea and from the River to the ends of the earth* (Zechariah 9:9-10).

A second observation is that Jesus was announcing that he was fulfilling Ezekiel's prophecy that the radiant glory of God would enter Jerusalem form the East, fill the temple with the glory of God, and cleanse the temple of all corruption forever (Ezekiel 43: 1-9). The contemporary British theologian, N. T. Wright, develops this theme.

In regards to Jesus entrance into Jerusalem and his encounter in the temple, Wright comments:

> Jesus of Nazareth was conscious of a vocation, given him by the one he knew as, 'father,' to enact in himself what in Israel's scriptures, God had promised to accomplish all by himself. He would be the pillar of cloud and fire for the people of the new exodus. He would embody in himself the returning and redeeming action of the covenant God."[2]

How, then, does Jesus establish the kingdom that he is inaugurating?

First, he went into the temple and drove those who exploited the poor from the temple precincts. In the confrontation he also made it known that the temple of stone was needed no more. He was the new temple; later the apostles proclaimed that the church as the body of Christ was the temple. "Place" was not necessary in the kingdom Jesus was establishing. The "place" of the kingdom was wherever Christ was welcomed.

Second, during his last meal with his disciples, Christ washed the feet of his betrayer! Consider a moment the significance. The One who is the radiant glory of God who created the fifty billion galaxies in space washes the feet of his betrayer!

Third, as Jesus the Christ is dying on the cross he cries out in forgiveness of those who have crucified him. This is God in Christ seeking to embrace the world in his reconciling invitation. In that suffering embrace, we are reconciled to God and to one another and with all of creation; in that embrace the kingdom of God breaks into human experience.

Fourth, after his resurrection he appeared to the disciples several times. John described an appearance where Jesus showed the disciples the nail prints in his hands and the wound from the spear thrust into his side. Then he said to them, Peace be with you!

As the Father has sent me, I am sending you. . . . . Receive the Holy Spirit" (John 20:21-2). In that same commissioning he proclaimed the forgiveness of sins!

Within several weeks the Holy Spirit came upon the gathering of disciples, and from that time onward the apostolic church believed that the journey of Jesus from Galilee to the cross in Jerusalem is the way of the kingdom of God. These first Christians believed that in Jesus crucified the God of all creation suffers for us and because of us. He identifies fully with the suffering of all humanity, and especially with the outcastes and powerless; he is crucified between two thieves. He suffers a "cursed death "hung on a tree" (Galatians 3:13) outside the centers of power; he dies in disgrace at Golgotha "outside the camp" (Hebrews 13:13). This one who is crucified with the outcastes stripped of all earthly power is in fact the full in history presence and revelation of the power of God. Christ crucified and risen is the power center of the universe; he is the Lamb slain who stands in the center of the throne of God (Revelation 5:6)! In his redemptive sacrifice Christ forgives and redeems people from "every tribe and language and people and nation" (Revelation 5: 9). Christ crucified – the power of God (1 Corinthians 1:23, 24)!

For the apostolic church, all kingdom ethics were grounded in the reality that in Christ crucified God has revealed himself to be our Suffering Servant. Jesus proclaimed, "A new command I give you: Love one another. As I have loved you, so you must love one another." (John 13:34) The Apostle Paul wrote, "Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus . . . who . . . made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, . . . he humbled himself and became obedient to death – even death on a cross" (Philippians 2:5, 8).

With remarkable consistency, for the next three centuries the church insisted that a cross-centered ethic meant that the Christian as a disciple of Jesus could not take arms. This was a costly commitment, for the church was a minority movement often persecuted for refusing to venerate the emperor. Yet the church confessed that Jesus is Lord—therefore disciples of Jesus could not venerate the emperor or participate in practices that were in variance with the way of the Lord Jesus Christ. This meant that Christians would not participate in sacrifices to the spirit of the emperor and they would not participate in the imperial military. Origen who was one of the early pioneers in developing the Alexandrian Catechetical School was a forceful yet typical voice insisting that Christians desist from any participation in warfare and informing the governing authorities on the commitments of the church.

Origen wrote, "No longer do we take the sword against any nation, nor do we learn war any more, since we have become sons of peace through Jesus who is our author…"[3]

Celsus was a scathing critic of the church and accused the church of abandoning the responsibilities of patriotic citizenship. To this charge Origen responded, "Even more do we fight on behalf of the emperor. And though we do not become fellow-soldiers with him, even if he presses for this, yet we are fighting of him and composing a special army of piety through our intercessions to God."[4]

Remarkably the early church thrived without the benefit of political support. It was a minority movement on the margins; yet the crucified and risen Christ it gave witness to was powerfully attractive.

The Journey of Constantine to Rome

However, the church's commitment to a cross-centered kingdom commitment began to undergo a dramatic transformation when Constantine gained the Roman imperial throne. For months Constantine had been engaged in a long march from Britain south to Rome, where he knew he would meet in battle his rival to imperial power and his enemy, Maxentius. Constantine commanded only 40,000 troops. Maxentius had the full force of the garrison in Rome at his command. Where could Constantine acquire adequate power for the military engagement ahead? Perhaps the divine sun? So Constantine turned to the sun in worship, a commitment that he never fully abandoned.

Then on the eve of battle on the outskirts of Rome, Constantine allegedly saw the sign of the cross in the sky with the words beneath that cross: *In hoc signo vinces* (under this sign conquer). He took that as an omen and painted the *chi rho* sign of Christ crucified on his weapons of war.[5] The next day the battle with Maxentius was joined, and Constantine won a decisive victory. He went on to become emperor of the Western empire and Licinius emperor of the Eastern empire. Licinius in his wars in the East also reported on a message from God. Every night an angel appeared instructing him to pray to the Summus Deus.[6] He encouraged his troops to do so likewise.

Within a year of Constantine's victory, he and Licinius issued the Edict of Milan (313 A. D.) which assured religious freedom throughout the Roman Empire, not only for Christians, but for all religions. Letters were sent throughout the empire proclaiming, "Everyone who has a common desire to observe the Christian worship may now freely and unconditionally endeavor to do so without let or hindrance. . . . To others also freedom of their own worship is likewise left open and freely granted. . . ."[7]

The churches rejoiced in the new freedom. Yet the vision quickly developed into far more than that of a pluralist society with benevolent government assuring the freedom of worship to all. Constantine tilted the Western empire towards favoring the church. The church historian, Eusebius, was ecstatic when Constantine ordered Bibles to be made available for leaders in his seat of government in Constantinople. Eusebius believed that a Christian civilization was now a possibility. This civilization would unite political and ecclesial authority and power.

Eusebius wrote, "There was a multitude of rulers before the coming of Christ. All nations were governed by different tyrannies and democracies and men had no intercourse with each other . . . nation rose against nations and city against city, ..." [8] However, in the mind of Eusebius, Christ and Augustus were co-rulers whose mission was to bring order as well as peace. W. H. C. Frend observes, "Mankind was moving forward towards a universal monarch under one Church, and Constantine was God's chosen instrument, the reflection of his divine power."[9]

The Constantinian cross used as a weapon for violence against the enemy is not the cross of the one who proclaimed forgiveness for his enemies as he died absorbing their taunting violence. The cross within a theology of Caesaropapism (the coming together of papal authority and the power of Caesar) was a symbol of sacramentally effectuated grace, not a revelation of normative Christian ethics or the cross of the God who is our Suffering Servant, of the God who reaches out to us in forgiveness and redemptive love even as our sins crash upon his broken body, the cross of the One who has taken our place and in whom we are forgiven.

The implications were astounding and transformational for the church that had experienced three centuries of intermittent persecution, and which was always on the periphery of social and political norms. With astounding rapidity the church was seated with empire at the centers of power. Nowhere was that more evident than in the Council of Nicea (325), where the unbaptized Constantine presided over a council of bishops to determine Christological and Trinitarian doctrine. Not only did Constantine preside at the opening sessions, but he also implemented instruments of force to impose the decisions made at Nicea on recalcitrant churches, as for example the Donatists of North Africa.

For the ecclesial authorities, the preservation of the truth of the Gospel required temporal power. It is not surprising that before long the church joined hands with the political order to use "fire and steel"[10] to confront evil, such as the pagans who were outside the reach of the church. The imperial sword and the mission of Christ were merged.

To help the individual Christian as well as the Christian political authorities discern how to live in a world of conflict and war, Augustine developed a just war ethic. If a Christian nation had to fight, the bottom line was that the war had to be just and that there were no other alternatives. These principles of just war have been further refined, but Augustine borrowing from the wisdom of some of the Greek political philosophers has had significant influence on Western Christian understandings of just war.

The implications of this kind of politico-ethical transformation were devastating for the churches in the East. For the first three centuries of the Christian era, it was mostly the churches in the West that were persecuted. However, with the emergence of

caesaropapacy in the West, it was the churches in the East that began to experience the wrath of the persecutors. Under Constantine, Christianity in the West had become transformed into the religion of Western empire. Peace had come to the Western church, as Bishop Mar Jacob of Edessa wrote, "... Constantine, the chief of victors, reigns and now the Cross the emperor's diadem surmounts." [11] This legacy provided the paradigm for what became known as the Holy Roman Empire, and later as Western Christendom.

For the church in Persia developments in the Western church became the sentence of death. The Roman Empire and Persia had engaged in several centuries of conflict. Another war was pending when Constantine wrote to the Shah of Persia, Shapur II, "I rejoice to hear that the fairest provinces of Persia are adorned with ... Christians ... Since you are so powerful and pious, I commend them to your care, and leave them in your protection."[12]

For the Shah, this letter meant only one thing; the Christians were a fifth column representing Rome by sabotaging Zoroastrian Persia from within. Twenty years later Constantine massed his troops for war against Persia with bishops accompanying his armies. According to Eusebius, they accompanied Constantine "to battle with him and for him by the prayers to God from whom all victory proceeds." [13]

The rage of the Persians against the Christians knew no boundaries. For more than twenty years the Christians were systematically hunted from one end of the empire to the other, tortured and killed. The Persian Church was nearly eradicated by this, "The Great Persecution." It has never recovered from that blow. Ever since Constantine, the church in the East has sought to make it clear that it is not beholden to the church in the West. Constantine and the development of the "Holy Roman Empire" and later

"Christendom" have made it necessary for churches of the East to become alternatives to the Western church. Sometimes this need to preserve some distance from the Western church has pushed the Eastern church into directions that the Western church considered to be "heretical," e.g., Nestorianism.[14]

These alternative definitions were also expressed in a thousand years of Eastern missionary outreach across Central Asia into China; it is a remarkable story how these minority churches that had no imperial support reached out in mission across Asia.[15] This was quite different than the church in the West where the mission of the church was expressed in concert with empire and military conquest.

The Constantinian transformation in the Western church contributed to the opening for Islam in the East. This is because the persecutions in Persia decimated the church. It also meant that the churches of the East had to distance themselves from the churches of the West. One way they did this was by defining their theology as an alternative to that of the West. The Dutch historian of religion, Arend Theodoor van Leeuwen, insists that this redefinition has been most persuasively expressed by Islam for "islamic power, ... offered to anti-Byzantine sentiment a far more effective ideology than anything that heretical Christianity was able to provide." [16]

We should ponder. Are there themes within the American church today that are similar to those of the Constantinian era? How does the perceived alliance of the American evangelical churches with the American international agenda affect the vulnerable churches in Muslim lands?

These questions confronted me profoundly when I was engaged in several days of dialogue with a Muslim theologian in Germany, after I had presented the journey of Jesus

to the cross as the way of peace. She turned to me and with anger exclaimed, “This is the first time I have ever heard that the cross has anything to do with peace. Our Muslim perception is that the cross is a symbol of violence and that the Christian movement is a violent religion. I found myself weeping as I asked her forgiveness for the sins of the church in distorting the cross and the Gospel so tragically.

After a break she took the floor and thanked me for my tears of repentance. Then she said, “I have never before experienced a Christian asking forgiveness for the sins of the church against us Muslims. Your confession has opened my eyes to a Jesus I never knew was there, and I have been transformed.”

We now explore another journey that birthed an alternative vision of religion and territoriality, that of the Muslims.

The Journey of Muhammad to Medina.

Six centuries after Christ and three centuries after Constantine, the unlettered Muhammad began preaching in Mecca in Arabia, among a people who were on the periphery of civilization and power. For twelve years he proclaimed portions of the Qur'an as they came to him. He warned the Meccans to leave their polytheistic worship and evil practices. He preached a message of hope for the poor and compassion for the dispossessed.

Very few Meccans accepted Muhammad’s message, for he challenged the entrenched networks of polytheism that supported the political and economic structures of Arabian society. However, hope for the Muslim movement came from Medina; emissaries invited him to come to their city and become their prophet and statesman—the

same invitation that Jesus had received from the Galileans six centuries earlier. Muhammad accepted the invitation believing that this was a sign of favor from God.

This migration to Medina is the *hijrah*, which took place in 622 A.D. It is significant that this event is the beginning of the Muslim era—not the birth of Muhammad in 570 or the advent of revelations in 610. The *hijrah* is most significant theologically for this event enabled Muhammad to gain political and military control of a region. With those instruments of power he and his followers established the *dar al Islam*, the region under Muslim political control. This accomplishment was evidence indeed that Muhammad was a prophet of God and the thriving Muslim community had God's favor.

In Medina a constitution was developed that in later centuries formed the nucleus for full fledged Muslim systems of law known as the Shari'a. The goal of the Medina constitution was to include all minorities within a covenant of cooperation with the Muslims. The Muslims were tremendously disappointed when some minority communities resisted inclusion in the Muslim led covenant. Subsequently these dissidents who were perceived to be a threat to the Muslim community were dealt with as traitors. Judgment included banishment or death.

Battles ensued between the Meccans and the Muslim armies; the Muslims were victorious, and within ten years a triumphant army of ten thousand Muslim soldiers were peacefully received by the Meccans who had been defeated on the battle field. The Muslims then cleansed the Ka'bah of its idolatries, and Mecca became a Muslim city.

As Muhammad led the Muslim forces into Mecca he exclaimed, "Truth had come, and falsehood hath vanished away" (Qur'an 17:81).

In Medina Muhammad became both prophet and statesman. With the mechanisms of political power he established the embryonic *dar al Islam*, the region under Muslim political authority. Wherever *dar al Islam* was established, Christian, Jewish, or Zoroastrian communities were circumscribed a *dhimmi*, protected communities. They were assured peace providing they functioned within the parameters established by the Muslim state. This included paying a special tax. Regions outside the *dar al Islam* were the *dar al harb*, or regions of war not yet brought under the control of Muslim authorities.

Kenneth Cragg observes, "*Dar Al-Islam* and *Dar Al-Harb* is a fundamental distinction running through all humanity; the household of submission to God and the household of nonIslam still to be brought into such submission." [17]

Muhammad left the suffering of Mecca for Medina, and later returned to Mecca as victor. This pattern is normative. Defeat for the faithful Muslim *ummah* is a theological anomaly, for God is all powerful and sovereign. Tactical retreat might be necessary, but in time the *dar al Islam* of the Muslims must prevail.

Although Muslims are not to initiate aggression, if the *ummah* is under threat, then the defense of the ummah is mandated by any means necessary. This is *jihad*, a three dimensional striving in the defense of Islam (1) within ones soul, (2) with the pen, and (3) with the sword when necessary.

The Qur'an commands, "Fight in the way of Allah against those who fight against you....And fight them until persecution is no more, and religion is for Allah. But if they desist, then let there be no hostility except against wrongdoers" (Qur'an, the Heifer:2:190-193).

The *ummah* will persuade and even seek to induce non Muslims to convert, but are prohibited from using coercion to convert anyone. The Qur'an declares, "There is no compulsion in religion. The right direction is henceforth distinct from error" (Qur'an, the Heifer: 2:256).

Within a century of the *hijrah*, the *dar al Islam* had extended its political authority from the Indus River, throughout the Middle East, across North Africa, and into Spain. On the Western European front the advance was stopped in the Battle of Tours (732 A.D.), just over a century after the *hijrah*. Half of the Christian population on earth had come under the authority of the Muslim *dar al Islam*. These churches across North Africa and the Middle East were circumscribed as *dhimmi*. Within all these regions within the *dar al Islam* the primary function of the political system was protection of the integrity of the Muslim *ummah*.[18] Ideally the churches and Jewish communities were protected as long as they did not threaten the integrity of the *ummah*. Of course this meant that Muslim political, community and family systems cooperated to assure that conversions could go only one direction—toward the *ummah* and never away from Islam.

In modern times the *dar al Islam* vision of Muslim territoriality vis a vis the *dar al harb* persists with considerable resiliency. This is the reason that American military bases in Saudi Arabia in the wake of the Gulf War of 1991 became so tendentious apparently contributing to the decisions by militant *jihadists* to initiate the tragedy of 9/11/01. For the *jihadists* it is self evident that for regions of the *dar al harb* to place military forces within the soul of the territoriality of the *dar al Islam* is theologically untenable and must be rectified by any means necessary.

However, there are also significant countervailing forces. It is exceedingly significant that at the beginning of the 21st century one fourth of all Muslims live in regions that are not within the suzerainty of Muslim authority. This is a tremendous transformation—even a century ago is was exceptional for non Muslims to reside outside the parameters of Muslim authority. Even the western colonial powers generally respected the authority of the Muslim jurists in regions under western colonial administration. However there are now 300 million Muslims living outside the parameters of Muslim authority and whose neighbors are Hindus, Christians, atheists, or Buddhists. Notions of a monolithic idealized *dar al Islam* is diluted by the realities of modern mobility and globalization. The vision for a *dar al Islam* and Muslim diaspora are often in tension.

Christendom and the *Dar al Islam*

There are parallels between the theologies of territoriality within a Christendom world view that that of the *dar al Islam*. In Christendom the world is divided into two regions—the civilized regions that are ruled by Christianized governments and the uncivilized regions that are ruled by other kinds of governments. In the *dar al Islam* the world is divided into regions of peace under Muslim rule and those regions of war not yet brought under Muslim rule.

Christendom fights just wars; the *dar al Islam* fights jihads. Christendom seeks to extend territory—in modern times the United States has frequently taken up a secularized version of this agenda through it vision of manifest destiny – extending the gift of democracy and free enterprise into regions not yet democratized. The *dar al Islam* likewise from time to time has fought wars to extend the blessings of Islam into non-

Islamized societies. Both movements have occasionally merged their missionary impulse with imperialist nationalist goals. Both movements have sometimes viewed wars to extend territorial influence as providing opportunity to extend the faith.

These themes suggest convergences between the political theology of the Muslim *dar al Islam* and the Constantinian Western church. Both systems viewed their faith communities and the kingdom of God as identical to political control of territory. These convergences have provided ample grist for territorial conflict right from the beginning of the Muslim movement. Today the conflict is intensifying in the clash between Islamic theocratic systems and the secular democratic systems of the West. Samuel Huttington's *Clash of Civilizations* is remarkably relevant.

So What?

The confrontation between Islam and the West is not trivial. Both movements are moving to the edge of the precipice. In these times the West is largely incapable of engaging Islam at the spiritual level, for Islam is a profoundly spiritual and scriptural movement. Too often the church has also squandered its spiritual birthright and is incapable of addressing the conflict at a spiritual and scriptural basis. Yet a New Testament vision of the church as a community committed to the way of the cross that Jesus reveals, is healing for the nations and healing for our times. This was my profound impression when participating in a Muslim Shi'ite – Anabaptist dialogue with Iranian theologians, a dialogue sanctioned by the Guardian Council in Iran.

A significant dimension of these conversations took place in Toronto in the fall of 2003 with a follow-up in Qom, Iran, February, 2004. Anabaptists have miniscule

political power. Yet the Islamic theological establishment in Qom, Iran, invited the conversation.[19] However, the journey in dialogue and witness is fraught with challenges.

"Do not humiliate us," a mullah in Qom, Iran, advised me when I asked what his counsel is to North American Christians.

Another observed that Jesus would also have taken the same path that Muhammad took in Medina, if he had an opportunity. His public ministry lasted only three years! Given more time, Jesus would also have commanded an army!

"But thanks be to God," the mullah exclaimed, "Constantine brought to conclusion what Jesus could not do, for Constantine, like Muhammed, united the political and religious order."

Indeed the New Testament vision of the Kingdom of God is radically other than the understandings of these Shi'a Muslim clerics! Yet they listened! They engaged. We based our dialogue on the Scriptures—supremely the New Testament for us—a Christ-centered dialogue.

Others commented that never before have they spoken with Christians about faith in serious open dialogue. This is significant.

Yet even more significant are the hundreds and thousands of friendships that Christians meeting Muslims are developing in neighbor to neighbor relationships, whether in North America or regions around the world.

Surely all followers of Jesus are called of God to transcend territorial divisions and in the spirit of Christ serve in ways that enable wider and wider circles of Christians and Muslims to meet one another. Every Christian needs a Muslim friend! I also wish that every Muslim had a Christian friend. And friends never kill each other!

David W. Shenk has served in missions East Africa with a special focus on Islam; recently he served at Lithuania Christian College. He has served in missions administration with Eastern Mennonite Missions and at present he is Global Missions Consultant with EMM. He has written numerous books on themes related to Christian faith and world religions; the Christian engagement with Muslims is a special interest.

---

[1] I presented the main themes of this paper in a dialogue in Indonesia. The theme was peacemaking in Islam and the Christian faith. The Muslim presenter was Rahmawati Hussein from the Universitas Muhamadiah Yogyakarta. The venue of the dialogue was at the Universitas Hristen Satya Wacana, Salatiga. The sponsors decided to have the presentation published in the *Journal WASKITA, A Journal on Religion and Society*. By permission of the Journal WASKITA, I adapted that presentation for an essay in a compendium, *Anabaptists Meeting Muslims,* Herald Press. This essay is an abbreviation and adaptation of those two presentations. This essay it presented with permission from Herald Press.

[2] N. T. Wright, *The Challenge of Jesus, Rediscovering Who Jesus Was and Is* (Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1999), 123.

[3] Jean-Michel Hornus, *It is not Lawful for me to Fight: Early Christian Attitudes toward War, Violence, and the State (Revised Edition)* (Scottdale: Herald Press, 1980), 86-7, from Origen, *Contra Celsum*, V., 33.

[4] Hornus, 160, from Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 8:73.

[5] W. H. C. Frend, *The Early Church* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971), 136-7.

[6] Ibid., 313.

[7] J. W. C. Wand, *A Hhistory of the Early Church to A. D. 500* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1965), 128.

[8] *Demonstratio Evangelica* vii, 2 as quoted in Frend, 138)

[9] Frend, 138.

[10] Firmicus Maternus, *The Error of the Pagan Religions* (New York: Newman Press, 1970), 77-8.

[11] "Oration on Habib the Martyr," in *Cureton, Ancient Syraic Documents, 95* as quoted in Samuel Hugh Moffett, *A History of Christianity in Asia,* Volume 1 (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1988), 138.

[12] Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical Hisory* 1, 24, quoted in Moffett, 144.

[13] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, 4:56, quoted in Moffett, 138.

[14] Arend Theodoor van Leeuwen, *Christianity in World History*, *The Meeting of Faiths East and West* (New York: Charles Scribner;s Sons, 1964), 210).

[15] Moffett, 288-323.

[16] Ibid., 211.

[17] Kenneth Cragg, *The Call of the Minaret* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1985), 189.

[18] Bernard Lewis, *The Political Language of Islam* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1988), 29.

[19] "The Challenge of Modernity: Shi'ah Muslim—Mennonite Christian Dialogue," *The Conrad Grebel Review*, Volume 21, Number 3, Fall 2003 (Waterloo: Conrad Grebel University College), 2-111.