

A CATHOLIC PERSPECTIVE ON THE QUR'AN

IN SEARCH FOR A METHOD

Proefschrift ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan Tilburg University op gezag van de rector magnificus, prof. dr. W.B.H.J. van de Donk, in het openbaar te verdedigen ten overstaan van een door het college voor promoties aangewezen commissie in de Aula van de Universiteit

op maandag 15 juni 2026 om 16.30 uur

door

Roman Nazarenko,

geboren te Lviv, Oekraïne

A Catholic Theological Perspective on the Qur'an. In search for a method.
Roman Nazarenko

Open Press Tilburg University

Published by Open Press Tilburg University
Warandelaan 2, 5037 AB Tilburg, The Netherlands
[Open Press Tilburg University | Tilburg University](#)

Design: De Bondt Grafimedia

Cover: De Bondt Grafimedia

Cover image: The cover image was generated using artificial intelligence based on author-developed prompts

ISBN: 9789403888873

DOI: 10.26116/tst.31568

Free download at: <https://doi.org/10.26116/tst.31568>

© 2026 Roman Nazarenko



This work is licensed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license. For the full license, see <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Promotores:

Em. Prof. dr. Marcel J.H.M. Poorthuis
Prof. dr. Edward J. Alam

Tilburg University
Notre Dame University, Louaize

Leden promotiecommissie:

Em. Prof. dr. Herman. L. Beck
Dr. Peter Coppens
Dr. Juliëtte M. van Deursen-Vreeburg
Dr. Harm J.M.J. Goris
Prof. dr. Christian R. Lange
Prof. dr. Marcel Sarot
Prof. dr. Frans J.S. Wijzen

Tilburg University
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
Tilburg University
Tilburg University
Universiteit Utrecht
Tilburg University
Radboud University

I dedicate this dissertation to all the fallen soldiers, volunteers, and fellow citizens who gave their lives fighting the enemy during the Russo-Ukrainian War.

Eternal memory to them!

Glory to Ukraine!

Glory to the Heroes!

Acknowledgments

The process of writing this dissertation turned out to be truly challenging, and it faced numerous obstacles. Initially, there was the annexation of my native Crimea by Russian forces (2014) and the Revolution of Dignity in Ukraine, which affected thousands of people, both Christians and Muslims.¹ In addition to the dramatic events in my country, I faced personal challenges as well. In December 2019, I was involved in a severe car accident that forced me to suspend work on this dissertation for a year. There were also global challenges, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, which hindered my regular visits to the Netherlands, followed by the full-scale invasion of Ukraine by the Russian Federation on February 24, 2022, which understandably delayed the final stages of this research.

I was able to navigate this path thanks to divine Providence and the presence of incredible people who turned this dream into a reality.

First and foremost, I extend my heartfelt thanks to my academic supervisors, Professor Marcel Poorthuis and Professor Edward Alam.

I am especially grateful to Professor Marcel Poorthuis, whose unwavering guidance, mentorship, and encouragement have been crucial throughout my research journey. His patient support, insightful feedback, and constant encouragement significantly shaped this dissertation and deepened my understanding of theology. Despite the challenges along the way, his belief in me and his steadfast support during the most trying times were truly invaluable. I am profoundly indebted to him.

¹ Ukraine may be rightly regarded as a *cradle* of interreligious dialogue and peaceful coexistence. In contrast to much of Europe, Muslims in Ukraine are not merely a minority but are an indigenous community with nearly a millennium of presence, particularly in Crimea. This unique history of cultural and religious integration distinguishes Ukraine as a context for rich interreligious engagement between Christians and Muslims, for exchange and communal harmony.

My deepest gratitude also goes to Professor Edward Alam, whose commitment to academic excellence, to Eastern theology and his dedication to fostering interreligious dialogue have profoundly influenced this work and contributed to my growth as a scholar. His unwavering support, honest feedback, and continuous prayers have been a source of strength, for which I am sincerely thankful.

I also extend my gratitude to the Ukrainian Catholic University community, particularly to Borys Gudziak the Metropolitan-Archbishop of the Ukrainian Catholic Archeparchy of Philadelphia, as well as to Rectors Fr. Bohdan Prach and Dr. Taras Dobko, who made significant efforts and gave me extensive support. I am also deeply grateful to the late Deacon Roman Zaviyskyy, whose efforts made my studies in the Netherlands possible.

I am also profoundly indebted to my colleagues at Tilburg University for their support throughout my doctoral journey.

This research would not have been possible without the financial support of friends and benefactors from *Aid to the Church in Need* (Kirche in Not) and *Porticus Foundation*.

I would like to thank Lyudmyla Lisovska and Ihor Andriychak for their hospitality and warmth. Thanks to you, I can confidently say that the Netherlands has become a home for me.

I would like to thank Andriy Hrynykha for the intellectual guidance provided throughout the writing of this dissertation.

Last but not least, I want to thank my parents for their absolute support over the years and, most importantly, for their unwavering belief in the successful completion of this research.

And most importantly, I thank the Armed Forces of Ukraine, all the volunteers, and everyone who makes tremendous efforts every day to defend the independence of my country. Without you, none of this would matter.

Preface

Despite the numerous armed conflicts plaguing the world, we constantly hear calls for reconciliation and peace. The need for dialogue becomes particularly urgent in a globalized society where diverse cultures, religions, and values are increasingly intertwined. In my view, interreligious dialogue has a unique potential to effectively reduce tensions within societies. The shared values incorporated in the world's religions can serve as a foundation for understanding and trust among people, regardless of cultural or religious differences. Such dialogue can build bridges of understanding, promote social stability, and foster peaceful coexistence, especially in regions where religious or ethnic divisions exacerbate conflicts.

However, to achieve this, it is essential to avoid several associated pitfalls. One significant danger is so-called interreligious romanticism or the naive and excessive belief that interreligious interaction will solve all problems and eliminate all tensions. Proponents of this approach believe that the sole and key precondition is to focus exclusively on the things that unite us. Additionally, secularism, eclecticism, religious relativism, and similar issues can also be identified as potential threats to a genuine mutual understanding.

However, I am convinced that what divides us does not pose dangers but rather presents a wonderful opportunity and represents the greatest treasure for a representative of any religion. Dialogue can only be honest, successful, and effective when we are truly willing to listen to the voice of the other and remain open to it. This is not about all religions blindly merging into one religion; rather, by listening to the other, I can understand their perception of God, the sacred, and their paradigm of thought. Consequently, I can redirect the questions posed by my dialogue partner back to myself.

I am convinced that the Catholic tradition's commitment to interreligious dialogue can be expanded to including engagement with other sacred texts.

Real theology extends beyond a purely mystical or abstract study of the Bible and religious doctrines. It is a dynamic practice which should not be limited only to the past. It must be actively connected with the present, explaining the role of religion in the modern world and the reality of contemporary life. And what is perhaps the most important: theology must be oriented to the future. As a theologian, my theological framework should be far from static. So, theology should engage deeply with present challenges and anticipate future needs; it should not solely relate to tradition or past understandings, but actively explore how religion can shape and support modern existence. Thus, theology functions as a connecting link grounded in tradition yet extending outward to deliver meaningful and insightful guidance to a world striving for profound understanding.

In conclusion, my aspiration for this research is that it will serve meaningfully as a valuable contribution to Catholic theology and provide fruitful interreligious dialogue and interreligious engagement, particularly with the Qur'an. By employing Comparative Theology as a central method, this study aims to present a model of respectful and intellectually substantive dialogue that embraces both the integrity of faith and the pursuit of mutual understanding. I hope this research will inspire numerous theologians to engage in honest inner reflection within the Christian community and that it will also build a bridge between Muslims and Christians, respecting our theological differences and not hiding our differences.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	i
Preface	iv
Introduction and research question	1
Chapter 1	
From polemics via religious studies (including comparative religion) to interreligious dialogue.	10
1. Four stages in Christian-Islamic relations:	
1.1 Polemics	12
1.2 From polemics to mission	18
1.3 Religious studies	25
1.4 Interreligious dialogue	29
Chapter 2	
The theological meaning of the Qur'an for an Eastern-Christian theologian: On the way to a method	38
2.1 The strong reservations against historical criticism among believing Muslims	39
2.2 The historical-critical approach(es) to the Qur'an	42
2.3 The inspiration of Scriptural Reasoning	52
2.3.1 Challenges of Scriptural Reasoning and its limitations	60
2.4 Comparative theology	61
2.4.1 How I proceed?	68
2.4.2 The Qur'an as a religious document	72
2.5 The lens of an (Eastern) Christian theological perspective	74
Chapter 3	
Responsibility for the loss of Paradise: Qur'an 2:30-39; Genesis 3:1-7.	80
3.1.1 A close reading of the story of the responsibility for the loss of Paradise – Qur'an 2:30-39	82
3.1.2 The broader context of the Qur'anic story – Qur'an 2:30-39	91

3.2.1 A close reading of the Biblical account of the story of the responsibility for the loss – Gen 3:1-7	96
3.2.2 The broader context of the Biblical account of the story – Gen 3:1-7	101
3.3 Responsibility for the loss of Paradise: questions of a Catholic theologian posed to the Qur’an	105
3.4 Responsibility for the loss of Paradise: theological reflection on the Qur’anic story	111
3.4.1 The responsibility for the “Paradise lost”	111
3.4.2 The figure of Iblis in the Qur’an compared to the serpent in the Bible	130
3.4.3 Paradise trees: <i>The Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil</i> and <i>The Tree of Life</i>	135
3.4.4 Does the rivalry between angels and Human Beings as Vorlage for the figure of Iblis, throw new light upon the Qur’an itself?	140
Chapter 4	
The Annunciation story: Qur’an 19:16-22; Qur’an 3:42-47; Luke 1:26-35.	150
4.1.1 A close reading of the first Qur’anic account of the Annunciation story – Qur’an 19:16-22	151
4.1.1.2 A close reading of the second Qur’anic account of the Annunciation story – Qur’an 3:42-47	157
4.1.2 The broader context of the stories from the Qur’an	161
4.2.1 A close reading of the Biblical account of the Annunciation story – Luke 1:26-35	164
4.2.2 The broader context of the Biblical account of the Annunciation story – Luke 1:26-35	168
4.3 The Annunciation story: questions of a Catholic theologian posed to the Qur’an	170
4.4 The Annunciation story: theological reflection on the Qur’anic story	175
4.4.1 Can we consider the story of Mary in the Qur’an as relevant for Catholic theology or even as revelation?	175
4.4.2 How do we evaluate the apocryphal gospels on Mary and which consequences does this have for our appreciation of similar stories about Mary in the Qur’an?	180
4.4.3 How do I as a Christian theologian evaluate the Islamic idea that Mary can be compared to some other women?	191
4.4.4 What are the implications of Mary’s association with prayer and with the temple?	194

4.4.5 How should Catholic theology evaluate the fact that according to one version the Annunciation to Mary happens through God's Spirit (Qur'an 19:17)? Is it theologically possible to view the Holy Spirit as uniting Christians and Muslims?	201
Chapter 5	
Muhammad and Jesus confronted with the demand for a miracle: Qur'an 4:153; Mark 6:4-6; Luke 11:29-32.	216
5.1.1 A close reading of the story of Muhammad's attitude to miracles – Qur'an 4:153	217
5.1.2 The broader context of the story of Muhammad's attitude to miracles – Qur'an 4:153	224
5.2.1.1 A close reading of the first Biblical account of the story without a miracle – Mark 6:4-6	228
5.2.1.2 A close reading of the second Biblical account of the story without a miracle – Luke 11:29-32	233
5.2.1.3 The broader context of the stories from the Bible	238
5.3 The demand for a miracle: questions of a Catholic theologian posed to the Qur'an	243
5.4. The demand for a miracle: theological reflection on the Qur'anic story	246
5.4.1 Is the inability to do miracles with the same for Jesus and Muhammad?	246
5.4.2 Can we compare the notion of the Qur'an as the miracle par excellence to Jesus' self-designation as being "more than Jonah"?	256
5.4.3 Is it possible for a Christian theologian to appreciate Muhammad's call to faith in one God?	259
5.4.4 How should we in Catholic theology evaluate the typological connection between Moses and Muhammad?	274
Chapter 6	
Theological evaluation.	283
6.1 Responsibility for the loss of Paradise. A Christian theological evaluation	284
6.2 The Annunciation story in the Qur'an. A Christian theological evaluation	292
6.3 The demand for a miracle to Muhammad and to Jesus. A Christian theological evaluation	299
6.4 Five attitudes of Catholic theology towards the Qur'an and my position	308

6.5 My own opinion as a Catholic theologian: Qur'an – as a part of “venerated tradition”	322
6.6 The question of the Holy Spirit	329
Chapter 7	
Conclusion.	333
7.1 The historical-critical method and the rehabilitation of typology	334
7.2 The relationship between Scripture and Tradition	337
7.3 The interplay between interreligious dialogue and intrareligious dialogue	340
7.4 The relationship between the Holy Spirit and the Qur'an	341
Bibliography	344
Appendix	378
Colofon	379

Introduction and research question

In the contemporary world, the relationship between Christianity and Islam presents itself not only as a social and political reality but also as an urgent theological question. Within Catholic theology, the issue has shifted from the question whether the Qur'an should be taken into serious consideration at all to the more demanding task of discerning in what way it should to be approached. The Qur'an stands as a religious text that has profoundly shaped the faith and identity of millions, while simultaneously functioning as a theological counterpart that raises fundamental challenges to certain Christian convictions, and as a testimony to humanity's persistent search for God. This challenge is felt with particular intensity in the Eastern-Catholic tradition, which has historically lived in close proximity *to*, and often *in* dialogue with, the Islamic world. It is within this context that the present dissertation explores the possible theological significance of the Qur'an for an Eastern-Catholic theologian, asking how such an engagement can maintain adherence to Catholic doctrine while also creating genuine space for interreligious dialogue with Islam.

Hence my central research question is:

What is the theological significance of the Qur'an for an Eastern-Catholic theologian?

In this formulation there is an explicitly personal element: the focus lies on *an Eastern-Catholic theologian*, not on Eastern-Catholic theology as such. It would not be possible nor desirable to presume to speak on behalf of a tremendously rich tradition that spans centuries of history, culture, and theological reflection. Still, the task of speaking as a theologian cannot be reduced to a merely subjective or autobiographical perspective. Theological inquiry is always embedded in a

particular tradition, drawing from its spiritual, liturgical, and intellectual resources, while at the same time contributing to its ongoing development. Thus, my position as an Eastern-Catholic theologian both situates and shapes the inquiry: it provides a horizon of meaning, but also demands accountability to the broader ecclesial community.

In what follows, I will therefore make explicit what parameters are indispensable for an Eastern-Catholic theologian when engaging with the Qur'an. These include fidelity to the Catholic tradition and its magisterial teaching, attention to the distinctiveness of the Eastern theological and liturgical heritage, and openness to learning through dialogue with Islam. They also involve a hermeneutical awareness: the recognition that one's own theological lens both illuminates and limits what can be perceived in the Qur'an. To ask about the theological significance of the Qur'an, then, is not to search for a definitive "Catholic" answer, but rather to explore how the encounter with the Qur'an might enrich, challenge, and clarify the vocation of an Eastern-Catholic theologian today, with respect to Islam and towards the world.

It seems a good choice for Catholic theology to take the Qur'an as point of departure. The declaration of the Second Vatican Council, *Nostra Aetate* (1965) affirmed that Muslims believe in the one true God, but it has left open the logical follow-up question how Muslims may have arrived at that insight. Kenneth Cragg (1913–2012), the pioneer in Islamic-Christian relations, adopted another approach. In his frequent encounters with Muslims, he experienced that for them the central question to Christians was: "what do you think of Muhammad?" Cragg even devoted a whole book to answer that question.² Still, this question is bound to create

² Kenneth Cragg, *Muhammad and the Christian: A Question of Response* (London and New York: Geoffrey Chapman, 1984).

misunderstandings. On the one hand, the respect that Muslims have for the prophet of Islam is profound, but on the other hand, the Islamic concept of revelation dictates that Muhammad did not contribute anything of his own to the revelation of the Qur'an. This makes the question of the meaning of Muhammad highly complicated and in fact quite paradoxical. As will be explained in this dissertation, Catholicism and Islam depart from radically different concepts of revelation.

This is why it seems advisable to take the Qur'an itself as the point of departure. A modern Catholic theological perception of the Qur'an should account for the polemical and distorted views of the Qur'an during its history, especially in the Western world.

At this point, it is important to outline the structure of the research. The first chapter of this dissertation, *From Polemics via Religious Studies to Interreligious Dialogue*, offers an overview of that history, which has over the last hundred years or so eventually been replaced by interreligious dialogue, be it only partially. Obviously, in the light of this history, a Christian theological perspective of Islam and the Qur'an is bound to be treated with suspicion. As an offshoot of religious studies, Islamic studies claims to have an unbiased attitude to its object of study, Islam and the Qur'an. Indeed, it is very important to combat prejudice and discrimination. And still, despite the achievement of Islamic studies, the question remains (and it should be considered a legitimate question), what the meaning of the Qur'an can be for Christian theology. It is debatable whether it is even possible to claim a neutral position in the light of hermeneutics, which implies a kind of rehabilitation of a prior question. One could even speak of a rehabilitation of "prejudice", i.e., a prior judgment that is bound to be refined by further study. This philosophical debate, raised by Hans-Georg Gadamer (1900–2002), is also relevant for the relation between theology and religious studies.

The second chapter, entitled *The Theological Meaning of the Qur'an for an Eastern-Catholic Theologian: On the Way to a Method*, begins by addressing the strong reservations many Muslims express toward applying historical-critical methods to the Qur'an. These concerns are then contrasted with the diverse historical-critical approaches that have shaped modern Qur'anic studies. The chapter subsequently turns to Scriptural Reasoning, which is explored as a potential resource for interreligious engagement with sacred texts, while also recognizing its inherent challenges and limitations. From there, the discussion moves to Comparative Theology, which provides the main methodological framework for the research. The chapter further considers the Qur'an as a religious document in its own right—worthy of theological interpretation beyond purely historical or philological concerns. Finally, it clarifies the specific lens of an Eastern-Catholic theological perspective through which this research is undertaken. In this way, Chapter 2 provides the methodological grounding for the textual and theological analyses that follow.

The next three chapters—*Responsibility for the Loss of Paradise (Qur'an 2:30–39; Genesis 3:1–7)*, *The Annunciation Story (Qur'an 19:16–22; 3:42–47; Luke 1:26–35)*, and *Muhammad and Jesus Confronted with the Demand for a Miracle (Qur'an 4:153; Mark 6:4–6; Luke 11:29–32)*—all proceed according to the same structure. Each begins with a close reading of a selected Qur'anic passage: the account of Paradise, the Annunciation to Mary, and the role of miracles in the preaching of repentance. These are then placed in their broader Qur'anic context and compared with their Biblical counterparts. The Biblical texts serve to highlight my frame of reference as a Catholic theologian. The procedure should be distinguished from a mere comparison of Qur'an and Bible from an outsider's perspective. This is why the heart of each chapter is formed by a set of several theological questions.

Although a theological perspective should be distinguished from a historical critical approach to the Qur'an, it proved fruitful to take a side glance at that impressive and growing field of research. Hence the final question in each case (3.4.4; 4.4.5; 5.4.4.) engages in dialogue with modern Qur'anic scholarship, particularly the contributions of Angelika Neuwirth and Nicolai Sinai. Neuwirth's rehabilitation of typology shows a striking parallel with Catholic theological hermeneutics of the Bible. Her appreciation of Byzantine Christian traditions, roughly contemporaneous with the Qur'an, obviously deserves some attention in my theological approach. Still, her approach remains loyal to the historical-critical method in that she refrains from self-reflection of her theological position. Neuwirth's reservations about seeking pre-Qur'anic sources—at the expense of the Qur'an's own canonical context—contrast with Sinai's position. Yet I will argue that his search for pre-Qur'anic traditions may, in fact, benefit from a theological perspective (3.4.4; 4.4.5; 5.4.4.).

The sixth synthesizes the results of the comparative readings and offers a theological evaluation of the Qur'an from a Catholic perspective. It examines the Qur'anic and Biblical narratives on the three chosen themes before articulating five possible Catholic theological attitudes toward the Qur'an. It concludes by clarifying my own position on how the Qur'an may be approached theologically, and by offering final reflections on the potential and limitations of Christian–Muslim dialogue rooted in shared Comparative Theology. The Qur'anic narratives, by provoking reflection, do not threaten Christian identity but deepen it. They enable what comparative theologian Pim Valkenberg calls “mutual illumination”—the discovery of new theological insights through the light of the other's faith.³

³ Pim Valkenberg, *World Religions in Dialogue: A Comparative Theological Approach* (Winona, MN: Anselm Academic, 2013), 28–32.

The final chapter summarizes the results of his research in some four conclusions.

Inter/intrareligious dialogue and the historical-critical method:

A preliminary clarification

Interreligious dialogue and *intrareligious dialogue* should not be treated as separate domains, as the dialogical moment is always double: it simultaneously involves both the *other* and the *self*. The engagement with Islam, therefore, does not merely serve to clarify what Muslims believe or how they interpret their sacred texts, but rather, it challenges me to re-examine how my own theological tradition interprets, expresses, and embodies its faith.

Interreligious dialogue presupposes the recognition of religious otherness as a positive and potentially enriching element within the divine economy of salvation. Intrareligious dialogue, by contrast, refers to the inner process that occurs within the believer or within a religious community when it reflects upon its own beliefs in the light of other traditions.⁴ For an Eastern-Catholic theologian, this dual movement is particularly meaningful, since the Eastern theological heritage—shaped by patristic hermeneutics, liturgical imagination, and apophatic theology—is profoundly dialogical.⁵

Engaging with the Qur'an, therefore, becomes a moment of both interreligious encounter and intrareligious self-examination. In this sense, the Qur'an functions as a mirror: it reflects not only the image of the other but also aspects of my own tradition that had remained unarticulated or forgotten.⁶ This process reveals that theological dialogue is never one-directional. By engaging with another tradition's self-understanding, I also participate in the renewal of my own. Thus, *interreligious*

⁴ Francis X. Clooney, *Comparative Theology: Deep Learning Across Religious Borders* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 12–14.

⁵ John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1983), 15–20.

⁶ Francis X. Clooney, *Comparative Theology: Deep Learning Across Religious Borders*, 12–14.

dialogue becomes the catalyst for *intrareligious dialogue*. Without this inner dimension, interreligious dialogue risks remaining superficial—a polite exchange of facts or an exercise in diplomacy. But when accompanied by intrareligious reflection, it becomes transformative: it reshapes theological categories, widens horizons, and deepens faith.⁷

This integrated dynamic differs from the historical-critical method, which has dominated much of modern Biblical and Qur’anic scholarship. The historical-critical approach, though indispensable for understanding textual origins, seeks primarily to reconstruct historical contexts, linguistic layers, and sources. It demands a methodological neutrality that brackets questions of faith. The dialogue it engages in is between *texts and history*, not between *believers and traditions*.⁸ By contrast, my approach as an Eastern-Catholic theologian does not set aside faith but begins from within it. While I respect and make use of historical-critical insights, my ultimate concern is not to explain how a text came to be, but to discern what theological meaning it holds when read within the horizon of revelation and living tradition.⁹ The distinction is crucial: the historical-critical method strives for ‘objectivity’ through distance; theological dialogue seeks understanding through participation. Where the historical-critical method isolates, dialogue integrates; where the first explains, the second transforms.

Therefore, interreligious and intrareligious dialogue form a hermeneutical circle that transcends mere dispassionate comparison. They recognize that understanding the Qur’an—or any sacred text—is not a neutral intellectual operation, but a relational and theological event. As Paul Ricoeur observed,

⁷ Raimon Panikkar, *The Intrareligious Dialogue* (New York: Paulist Press, 1999), 56–60.

⁸ John Barton, *The Nature of Biblical Criticism* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 21–24.

⁹ David Tracy, *The Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 412–16.

interpretation always involves a “second naiveté”: a return to meaning through critical reflection.¹⁰ Likewise, dialogue with Islam enables a “second naiveté” for the Christian theologian—a rediscovery of faith through the mirror of the other. Thus, what is at stake here is not the replacement of one method by another, but the transformation of theological practice itself.

From this perspective, the task of an Eastern-Catholic theologian is not to construct a synthesis of Islam and Christianity, nor to relativize their differences, but to allow the encounter itself to become a space of theological creativity. True theological vitality requires both: rootedness and openness, faithfulness and encounter. The interreligious dialogue thus becomes not merely a methodological choice but a spiritual discipline—a way of being Church in a pluralistic world.¹¹

¹⁰ Paul Ricoeur, *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), 351–52.

¹¹ Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Truth Is Symphonic: Aspects of Christian Pluralism* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1987), 7–10.

Chapter 1

FROM POLEMICS VIA RELIGIOUS STUDIES (INCLUDING COMPARATIVE RELIGION) TO INTERRELIGIOUS DIALOGUE

The relationship between Christianity and the other religions and the place of Christianity in the non-religious world are important questions posed by our time. Whereas Vatican II can be considered as the official beginning of the Roman Catholic Church's dialogue with Islam, this positive stand has not remained unchallenged. An increasing number of voices within the Catholic Church is skeptical about, or even hostile to, Muslim-Christian dialogue. There is a real threat of diminishing the considerable achievements of Muslim-Christian dialogue because of the strengthening of these positions.¹² Still, interreligious dialogue is always a challenging and complex effort.

In the remote past, Islamic-Christian exchange was mainly one of polemics. This, however, has not prevented present-day theologians who represent these religions from seeking mutual understanding and common values. Interreligious dialogue is indeed associated with a kind of risk. First of all, there is the risk that the dialogue will be interpreted by its initiators as an alliance of the two groups of participants against a third one, in this case secularism. Faced with challenges such as fundamentalism, secularism, and modernity, the Roman Catholic Church struggles with many uncertainties connected with interreligious, intrareligious, and ecumenical concerns.¹³ The rapid development and establishment of Islam in Europe as a religion full of ideas about social, political, and religious renewal, in combination with the substantial decline of Christianity in Western Europe, has prompted the Roman Catholic Church to reevaluate and modernize its official position towards Muslims.¹⁴ From the standpoint of the Church, interreligious dialogue constitutes an essential component of the mission of Christianity to foster

¹² James L. Heft, *Catholicism and Interreligious Dialogue* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 57.

¹³ John L. Esposito, *The Oxford Dictionary of Islam* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 298.

¹⁴ Roman Nazarenko, "Hans Küng and John Paul II: Contributions to the Theology of Interreligious Dialogue between Islam and Christianity. A Comparative Analysis," STL thesis, Tilburg University, 2015, 4.

peace and solidarity among humanity (*Ecclesiam Suam* 94).¹⁵ However, it has become a bone of contention within the Catholic Church whether these generous statements should be put into practice or not? In this sense, contemporary approaches to interreligious engagement cannot be understood simply as extensions of earlier dialogue frameworks. Rather, they arise as attempts to address long-standing obstacles and methodological limitations that have shaped inter-religious encounters in recent decades. These newer models seek to move beyond the impasses of classical dialogue—such as superficial consensus, theological dilution, or purely diplomatic exchange—while equally avoiding any return to the polemical posture that characterized pre-dialogical relations. What emerges is a more reflexive, textually and theologically grounded mode of engagement that invites partners in dialogue not merely to converse but to think, interpret, and discern together.

1. Four stages in Christian-Islamic relations

Christian-Islamic encounters date back to the rise of Islam in the seventh century. For numerous centuries thereafter, Christian and Islamic communities remained interconnected due to their diverse theological perspectives and geographical closeness. This connection endured through epochs characterized by significant tension, animosity, and outright conflict, as well as through periods of delicate tolerance, harmonious cohabitation, and collaborative endeavor.¹⁶ It might even be said that debates on religion started right in the infancy of Islam in the year 615, when “the first group of converts to Islam arrived as ‘religious migrants/refugees’ at Aksum, where they were questioned with interest about their

¹⁵ Paul VI, *Encyclical Letter*, 1964. Quoted in Heft, *Catholicism and Interreligious Dialogue*, 73.

¹⁶ Charles A. Kimball, “Muslim-Christian Dialogue,” in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Islamic World*, ed. John L. Esposito (Oxford Islamic Studies Online, 2010), 377, <http://www.oxfordislamicstudies.com/article/opr/t236/e0567>.

new faith by the Christian emperor.”¹⁷ Still, it is not exaggerated to state that from the early beginning on, Christians perceived Islam nearly exclusively in a polemical context and vice versa.

1.1 Polemics

Our information about Islam in Byzantine literature before the beginning of the eighth century is scant. It is well known that the spiritual and intellectual encounters between the prophet Muhammad and the first generations of his followers on the one hand and Christianity on the other took the form not of an official meeting with the Orthodox (Chalcedonian) Church but with Miaphysite and Nestorian communities, who made up the majority of the Christian population in Arabia, Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia. “*The medieval centuries had no explicit concept of ‘polemic,’ and therefore did not develop textual genres clearly defined as such. However, instances of discourse we call polemical, were in many cases spread much further over different genres and discourses than just the classical formats of dialogues and disputations,*” Sita Steckel emphasizes.¹⁸ The Orthodox Church in the East was represented by the Byzantines. The first theoretical formulation of a Byzantine position with regard to Islam arose during the period from the mid-eighth to the ninth centuries (whereas the West hardly had any reliable information about Islam during that period). The Byzantine position was rather ironic and dismissive. This period marks a pivotal moment in the history of Christian-Muslim relations, as it was during this time that both groups first encountered each other’s beliefs and

¹⁷ Jan Abbink, “Religion in Public Spaces: Emerging Muslim-Christian Polemics in Ethiopia,” *African Affairs* 110, no. 439 (2011): 257-58, <https://doi.org/10.1093/afraf/adr002>.

¹⁸ Sita Steckel, “Verging on the Polemical: Towards an Interdisciplinary Approach to Medieval Religious Polemic,” *Medieval Worlds Journal* VII (2018), <https://www.medievalworlds.net/0xc1aa5576%200x00390b10.pdf>.

religious assertions, while sharing the Arabic language. The attitudes formed during this era have continued to exert a profound influence up to the present day.¹⁹

Any list of Christian anti-Muslim polemicists is usually headed by St. John of Damascus (died December 4, 749 C.E.). In the eighth century, John of Damascus provided the first coherent treatment of Islam. He may have underestimated the importance of this new religion, seeing it as something frivolous. His administrative and military engagement with the Umayyad in Damascus caused him to develop a perspective in which Islam was not perceived as an alien religion, but rather as a heretical branch of Christianity.²⁰ An illustrative instance is that John, who was proficient in Arabic, undertook translations of certain Islamic doctrines which he characterized as “ridiculous.”²¹ Even before John of Damascus, the towering personality of the theologian Maximus the Confessor (580–662) witnessed the beginning of the Arab conquests. For him, the invasion of the Arabs was an attack on Christian civilization, and an unwelcome interference in Christological debates within the Byzantine Church. John of Damascus in turn saw Islamic monotheism as the revival of Jewish conceptions of God. He even dealt with the text of the Qur’an, without, however, concentrating on references about Jesus, looking instead at the general Islamic concept of God. John denied the prophetic status of Muhammad and the status of the Qur’an as a book revealed by God. This set the tone for the majority of the Byzantine polemicists.

¹⁹ David Thomas and Barbara Roggema, eds., *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History, Volume 1 (600-900)* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 1.

²⁰ Timothee Baciunjuze Mushagalusa, *John of Damascus and Heresiology: A Basis for Understanding Modern Heresy* (Doctor of Theology dissertation, University of South Africa, 2008), 107.

²¹ Daniel J. Janosik, *John of Damascus: First Apologist to the Muslims: The Trinity and Christian Apologetics in the Early Islamic Period* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2016), 71.

Another important contribution to the polemic with Islam was made by Theodore Abu Qurrah²² (750–830), one of the earliest Christian theological writers in Arabic. Abu Qurrah and some others wrote in Arabic to defend the Christian faith and to respond to critical questions that Muslims posed with regard to Christian theology. He further contended that Moses and Jesus were successful because of the numerous miracles they performed. Moreover, according to Abu Qurrah, there were no predictions from preceding prophets regarding Muhammad’s activities.²³ He also criticized Muslims for their adherence to fatalism and their theological conviction attributing both good and evil to God.²⁴ Theodore Abu Qurrah, following an Arianizing interpretation of Islam, regarded Muhammad as a false prophet. This form of criticism was typical during that era, in which Islam was often interpreted through the lens of Christian “heresies.”

Even after the Arab conquests, the interaction between Christians and Muslims continued to take place within the framework of ideological and religious conflict, shaping their perceptions accordingly.²⁵ In addition to polemical writings by Christian Arabs, accounts of dialogue exist, whether authentic or fabricated, between Christians and Muslims.²⁶ In the meantime, it is essential to highlight the initial attempts at cultural exchange between Christians and Muslims. One document from the early Abbasid era, studied by A. Mingana and Louis Cheikho in the original Syriac manuscript and by Hans Putman in the subsequent Arabic rendition, narrates a “dialogue” between the Nestorian Catholicos Timothy I (728–823) and the Caliph

²² Theodore Abu Qurrah belonged to the Melkite community during the Abbasid kingdom in the ninth century.

²³ Yuriy Maksimov, ed., *Byzantine Writings on Islam (with Commentaries and Translations)* (Moscow: St. Tikhon’s Orthodox University Press, 2012), 33-34.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 53.

²⁵ Jacques Waardenburg, *Muslims and Others: Relations in Context* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), 133.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 139.

al-Mahdi (r. 775–785).²⁷ This dialogue,²⁸ which took place in 780/781 C.E., definitely shows courtesy to the Muslim leader, even if there is no hint of compromise. In addition to signifying the Islamic government’s ongoing receptivity to respectful theological discourse during this era, the dialogue evidences Timothy’s familiarity with the Christological tenets delineated in the Qur’an, which he strategically incorporated into his argumentation.²⁹ “These were the questions for Timothy to answer: on the nature of Christ, the three persons of God, circumcision, the *qibla*³⁰ towards Jerusalem for prayers, the supposed testimony of the Bible on Muhammad, the judgment given by Christians about Muhammad, the death of Christ (was it by his free will, if it happened on the cross?), Muhammad’s appearance as a prophet after Christ, and the accusation of the corruption (*tahrif*) of the Bible.”³¹ This apologetic methodology was distinctive of that time, as it used the language of the Qur’an and Islam.³² In contrast to the preceding Greek apologists, the Arab-speaking Christians formulated their arguments within the religious framework of Islam and the traditions connected to Muhammad.³³

Between the ninth and fourteenth centuries, the center of anti-Islamic literature shifted to the capital of the Byzantine Empire. The striking success of Islam and its broad spread became a nightmare for the Byzantines. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, polemics became more scholarly in nature. In disputes and

²⁷ Jacques Waardenburg, *Muslims and Others: Relations in Context*, 111.

²⁸ Marcel Poorthuis, “The Three Rings: between Exclusivity and Tolerance,” in *The Three Rings: Textual Studies in the Historical Trialogue of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, ed. P. Valkenberg, B. Roggema, and M. Poorthuis (Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 281.

²⁹ Daniel Janosik, “Trinitarian Controversy in the Court of the Caliph: John of Damascus on the Trinity in the Context of Mission,” 2016, 11-14, http://danieljanosik.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/John-of-Damascus-on-the-Trinity-in-the-Context-of-Mission.ETS_Final.pdf.

³⁰ *Qibla* is the direction that a person should face during Muslim prayer.

³¹ Jacques Waardenburg, *Muslims and Others: Relations in Context*, 112.

³² Sidney Griffith, “Muslims and Church Councils: The Apology of Abu Qurrah,” in *The Beginnings of Christian Theology in Arabic* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 273.

³³ Daniel Janosik, “Trinitarian Controversy in the Court of the Caliph”: John of Damascus on the Trinity in the Context of Mission, 12.

dialogues, the leading roles were taken by Byzantine thinkers, such as St. Gregory Palamas, and emperors, such as John VI Kantakouzenos. Firstly, the Byzantines continued to view Islam as a kind of revival of Arianism. Christian criticism of Islam and Islamic criticism of Christianity were primarily concerned with Jesus Christ and the dogma of the Holy Trinity. The traditional Christian polemic with Islam followed a quite fixed pattern and intended to demonstrate:

- 1) The failure of Islam compared to Christianity.
- 2) The groundlessness of Muhammad's claims to a prophetic mission.
- 3) The baselessness of the claims of Muslims that the Qur'an is the word of God.
- 4) The supposedly immoral lifestyle of Muslims.
- 5) And that the Qur'an itself confirms the Christian truth.³⁴

The main goal of Christian polemics was to prove that Muhammad was a false prophet, based on five arguments:

- 1) There were no witnesses to buttress the claim that Muhammad had received a revelation. In contrast, when Moses received a revelation from God, the whole nation was a witness.
- 2) Muhammad slept alone in a cave when God allegedly spoke to him. In contrast, the Biblical God appeared in fire and storm.
- 3) None of the preceding prophets foretold the mission of Muhammad.

³⁴ Алексей Журавский, *Христиане и Мусульмане: Проблемы диалога*. Библейско-богословский институт св. апостола Андрея, 2008, 17. [Aleksey Juravskiy, *Christians and Muslims: The Problem of Dialogue*, St. Andrews's Biblical Theological Institute, 2008, 17].

4) Muhammad did not perform any miracles.

5) Muhammad could not predict the immediate future.

Obviously, the figure of Muhammad was the main object of criticism by Christian polemicists. They pointed to what they perceived as the inherent sensuality, cruelty, and inclination to violence of Muhammad – qualities considered incompatible with a prophetic status. Most of the Byzantines believed that Muhammad served the cause of the Antichrist and that he was the sign of the End of Times. Later, these derogatory definitions were mitigated – at least in official texts. During this period, Western Europe actively engaged in polemics against Islam. The predominant issue in these polemics revolved around highlighting the perceived significant differences between the teachings of Jesus and those of Muhammad.³⁵ The outcome of the medieval controversy in its most negative form was summed up concisely by Martin Luther, who identified Muhammad with the Devil. He believed that Islam was fundamentally a false religion, representing evil itself.³⁶ Hence, according to the Christian polemicists, the Qur'an cannot be the word of God since it was believed to distort the Biblical narration by adding legends and conjectures. Although understanding of Islam was seriously flawed in Western Christianity in comparison with Eastern Christianity, in a way it was the Byzantine³⁷ polemicists who had identified the most sensitive and painful topics that have continued to haunt Islamic-Christian encounters until today – the prophetic status of Muhammad and debates about revelation. The polemic against Muslims can be characterized as follows: *prejudice; absence of genuine questions; lack of empathy; lack of self-reflection*. On

³⁵ Aleksey Juravskiy, *Christians and Muslims: The Problem of Dialogue*, 17.

³⁶ Jamal Malik, "Islamic-Christian Dialogue," *The Journal of Oriental Studies* 15 (2015): 131.

³⁷ It is obvious that Eastern Christianity has been more familiar with Islam because of the common borders, the shared Arabic language and close encounter with Islamic countries.

the other hand, Christians have become more acquainted with Islam, which enabled a more dialogical approach.

1.2 From polemics to mission

The transition from polemics to mission should not be understood as one stage following another. In general, a previous stage may remain more or less in force while new approaches develop. This is why this section still deals with the polemical stage, but in a new form in which mission becomes a central goal, together with a somewhat more positive attitude to Islam as such. In a way, this approach is closer to dialogue. We will see that religious studies as they arose in the nineteenth century also contributed, like missions, to the development of dialogue.

From the thirteenth century onwards, Christian initiatives seem to have sought to develop an understanding of the Muslim community aimed at promoting peace between the two religions and establishing an ideological framework for mutual understanding and peaceful coexistence.³⁸ Unlike Matteo Ricci's encounter with Confucianism and Buddhism in China, or Portuguese sailors' encounter with Hinduism in India, early modern Europeans with an interest in Islam had a rich body of medieval sources from which they could draw to develop their own knowledge about Islam: crusaders' chronicles, missionaries' travelogues, and translations of Eastern Christian polemical texts.³⁹ In Western Europe after the beginning of the Crusades, there was a notable lack of precise understanding of Islam, which was replaced instead by numerous misunderstandings.⁴⁰ Peter the Venerable, a prominent figure in Western Europe during the twelfth century, was the abbot of the

³⁸ Lewis R. Scudder, *The Arabian Mission's Story: In Search of Abraham's Other Son*, The Historical Series of the Reformed Church in America No. 30 (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998), 37.

³⁹ Lewis R. Scudder, *The Arabian Mission's Story: In Search of Abraham's Other Son*, 37.

⁴⁰ William Montgomery Watt, "The Study of Islam by Orientalists," *Islamochristiana* 14 (1988): 201.

Benedictine abbey of Cluny from approximately 1092 to December 25, 1156. He emerged as one of the earliest figures in the West to initiate a substantial dialogue with Muslims, marking a significant endeavor within the context of the Cistercian monastic reform movement. There is a hypothesis that Robert of Ketton, who began the first (partial) translation of the Qur'an into Latin in 1143, had been influenced by Peter the Venerable. Although it contains inaccuracies, Ketton's translation aimed to harmonize the language and style of the Qur'an with the literary conventions prevalent in Europe. This remained the standard Latin translation for four centuries. A hundred years later, St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) displayed an interest in the philosophical aspects of Islam, recognizing it as a monotheistic religion.⁴¹ Still, he remained critical of Muhammad and Islamic religious observances. More frequently, Islam was perceived as a formidable competitor to Christianity, regarded as a heresy requiring opposition. In the fourteenth century, Raymond Lull from Mallorca argued that Christians should engage in a scholarly examination of Islam, emphasizing the importance of learning Arabic and establishing educational institutions to train Christian missionaries among Muslims.⁴² Frustrated by the Latin Church's delayed response to his request, Lull established his own educational institution in Mallorca and dedicated his life to its development and to missionary journeys amongst Muslim communities in North Africa.⁴³

These approaches to Islam may be distinguished from the utterly polemical attitude described above, as long as we keep in mind that the ultimate goal of the Christian scholars of the later Middle Ages and the Renaissance remained the mass

⁴¹ David A. Kerr, "Christian Witness in Relation to Muslim Neighbours," *Islamochristiana* 10 (1984): 8-9.

⁴² David A. Kerr, "Christian Witness in Relation to Muslim Neighbours," 8.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

conversion of Muslims and the combating of Turkish aggression. After the fall of Constantinople, the Ottoman Empire became a direct threat to Europe. As early as in the medieval period, scholars of both Islam and Christianity were chiefly concerned with showing the errors and weaknesses of the other religion.

Over the last two hundred years, scholars have proceeded towards a more positive appreciation of Islam, although ideological bias often remained the underlying pattern. Nonetheless, this optimistic perspective of Islam has been fostered by collaboration with Muslims, which has enriched Western scholars' comprehension of Islam.⁴⁴ Islamic texts were analyzed in their original linguistic contexts, and consultations with Muslims scholars were increasingly sought. The predominant discourse concerning Islam shifted from considering Islam as a Christian heresy to viewing it as an independent religion. This perspective emerged as the main paradigm in the academic study of Islam, gradually diminishing the centrality of the Christian perspective. Still, the missionary approach did not refrain from considering Islam as a Christian heresy. Obviously, it is important to differentiate this position from the dialogical approach, which will be discussed further on. In the second part of the seventeenth century, Ottoman expansionism and the battle of Vienna on September 12, 1683, gave rise to eschatological and even prophetic interpretations. It might be said that this influenced missionary endeavors targeting Muslims in the Islamic World and in Europe.⁴⁵ Toward the close of the seventeenth century, Europe witnessed a multiplication of literature dedicated to Islam, authored by the Jesuits.⁴⁶ Missionary efforts targeting Muslims notably began to employ handbooks aimed at facilitating conversions and addressing controversies.

⁴⁴ David A. Kerr, "Christian Witness in Relation to Muslim Neighbours," 9.

⁴⁵ Emanuele Colombo, "Jesuits and Islam in Seventeenth Century Europe: War, Preaching, and Conversions," in *L'Islam Visto da Occidente* (Milan, Marietti 2007), 315.

⁴⁶ See more Emanuele Colombo, "Jesuits and Islam in Europe," (Leiden: Brill 2007), 315.

These resources often featured transcripts of actual or fictitious dialogues between Muslims and Catholics.⁴⁷ The Dominicans had been the first to develop a thorough knowledge of Islam in order to foster mission (cp. the *Pugio Fidei* from 1270 C.E. directed both against Jews and against Muslims). However, from the inception of their order onwards, the Jesuits as well exhibited an extensive interest in Islam. The founder of the Society of Jesus, Ignatius of Loyola (1491–1556), emphatically articulated his views on mission to the Muslims. During his time as general of the Society, he established the *Casa dei catechumeni* in Rome specifically for Jews and Muslims, with the intention of converting them to Christianity.⁴⁸ This vision materialized through the establishment of an Arabic-speaking house in Messina, a college dedicated to Arabic studies in Montreal, an Islam study program in Malta, and in the planning of projects aimed at missions to Muslims in Beirut, Cyprus, and Tunisia.⁴⁹ In 1554, Ignatius instructed the Society’s houses to acquire Islamic literature, and urged Jesuits to study the Qur’an and to engage in religious dialogue with Muslims.⁵⁰ By 1650, Jesuits were residing and operating in various regions of the Ottoman Empire, with the permission of the Sultan and under the protection of the French ambassador.⁵¹

“Ignatius also instructed the Jesuits that they should initiate interaction with Muslims through theology, music, and art”.⁵² Michel Nau (1633–1683), Tirso Gonzalez (1624–1705), and other prominent figures within the Society exerted

⁴⁷ See more Emanuele Colombo, “Jesuits and Islam in Europe,” (Leiden: Brill 2007), 315.

⁴⁸ Damian Howard SJ, “Ignatius Loyola: Apostle to the Muslims,” *Thinking Faith*, 2016, <https://www.thinkingfaith.org/articles/ignatius-loyola-apostle-muslims>.

⁴⁹ Damian Howard SJ, “Ignatius Loyola: Apostle to the Muslims,” <https://www.thinkingfaith.org/articles/ignatius-loyola-apostle-muslims>.

⁵⁰ Thomas Michel, “Jesuit Writings on Islam in the Seventeenth Century,” *Islamochristiana* 15 (1989): 60.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 61.

⁵² Paul Shore, “Contact, Confrontation, Accommodation: Jesuits and Islam 1540–1770,” *Al-Qantara* XXXVI, no. 2 (July–December 2015): 430.

considerable influence on the interaction between Islam and Christianity. Tirso Gonzalez authored an impressive Jesuit missionary study, entitled *Manductio ad conversionem mahumetanorum*, drawing from his firsthand experience of preaching to Muslims in Spain. He shows a remarkably accurate knowledge of Islam and of typical Muslim objections to Christianity. The idea presented by Gonzalez – to regard Islam as a heresy of Christianity – continued to be held by numerous Catholic theologians until the 1960s. Various elements of Gonzalez’s interpretation of Islam echoed ideas that were endorsed within the Catholic Church throughout the twentieth century.⁵³

In the seventeenth century, the Jesuit Michel Nau journeyed to the Holy Land. In his treatise *Religio christiana contra Alcoranum per Alcoranum pacifiche defensa ac probate*, presented in the form of a fictional dialogue, Nau demonstrates the contemporary attitude, characterized by respect for the interreligious partner.⁵⁴ Nau challenged the long-standing belief, prevalent since at least the sixteenth century, that engaging in religious dialogue with Muslims should be avoided in order to protect missionary endeavors in Islamic territories. Nau’s argument was strengthened by his direct engagement with Muslims, promoting honest dialogue across religious boundaries.⁵⁵

The Jesuit involvement in the Middle East and North Africa is associated with their missionary activities in the nineteenth century. The Jesuits’ venture into Syria can be marked as one of the first missions undertaken by the Society after its restoration. It began in 1831 with the departure of three Jesuits – Paul-Marie

⁵³ Emanuele Colombo, “Even Among Turks: Tirso González de Santalla (1624–1705) and Islam,” *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 44, no. 3 (2012): 4.

⁵⁴ Damian Howard SJ, “Ignatius Loyola: Apostle to the Muslims,” <https://www.thinkingfaith.org/articles/ignatius-loyola-apostle-muslims>.

⁵⁵ Bernard Heyberger, “Polemical Dialogues between Christians and Muslims in the Seventeenth Century,” *Journal of the Economic History of the Orient* 55 (2012): 499.

Riccadonna (1799–1863), Benoît Planchet (1802–59), and Brother Henri Henze (1794–1848) – as they embarked on a journey to Syria.⁵⁶ Undoubtedly, the most significant achievement of this mission is the establishment of the Saint Joseph University in Beirut in 1875 C.E., which stands as one of the region’s most prestigious universities. It continues to uphold its esteemed reputation and serves as a foundation of France’s *francophonie* policy.⁵⁷ Following World War II, a practice emerged in which Jesuit archivists started publishing works based on the documents in their archives. The Jesuit archivist, Henri Jalabert (1913–99) published a description of the activities of the new province in 1957 and biographical profiles of the Jesuits in the Middle East and North Africa.⁵⁸ Sami Kuri, who succeeded as the head of the general archives after Henri Jalabert, was a former provincial who curated various documents of past missions of the Society and assembled correspondence in his work entitled *Histoire du Liban à travers les archives des Jésuites* (A History of Lebanon based on Jesuit Archives).⁵⁹

The White Fathers are integral to discussions dedicated to the evangelization of Africa. While Catholic missionaries had had a strong presence in Africa from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, the nineteenth century saw a new significant missionary effort led by Cardinal Charles Lavigerie. He established the Missionaries of Africa, also known as the White Fathers due to their distinctive white robes.⁶⁰ Cardinal Lavigerie established two missionary institutes in Algeria in 1868. By

⁵⁶ Chantal Verdeil, “The Jesuits and the Middle East from the Nineteenth Century to the Present Day: A Historiographical Essay,” in *Jesuit Historiography Online*, 2018, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2468-7723_jho_COM_205617.

⁵⁷ Damian Howard SJ, “Ignatius Loyola: Apostle to the Muslims,” <https://www.thinkingfaith.org/articles/ignatius-loyola-apostle-muslims>.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Chantal Verdeil, “The Jesuits and the Middle East from the Nineteenth Century to the Present Day: A Historiographical Essay,” 2018, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2468-7723_jho_COM_205617.

⁶⁰ Dyron B. Daughtry, *The Changing World of Christianity: The Global History of a Borderless Religion* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2010), 208.

1875, the initial White Father missionaries arrived, encountering only a French military presence and a few Berber villages. In addition to offering spiritual guidance to the soldiers, the White Fathers began studying local languages, such as the Berber dialect *Mozabit*, while also gathering ancient texts, scrolls, and photographs.⁶¹

In the late 1970s, the White Fathers established CIBEDO,⁶² the Center for Christian-Muslim Encounter and Documentation.⁶³ In addition, they founded an extensive library that covered interreligious dialogue between Islam and Christianity, religious studies and Islamic studies. They also accumulated a valuable repository of documentation and correspondence.⁶⁴

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries European scholars and intellectuals engaged in discourse concerning the role of religious and cultural aspects in the Middle East and North Africa, encompassing both Christian and Muslim perspectives. This interest did not remain without criticism. The well-known writer Edward Said developed the concept of *orientalism* to analyze and criticize the European depiction of Islam, considering it to be an intellectual component of European colonialism.⁶⁵ Bernard Heyberger's analysis, featured in *Islam visto da Occidente*, emphasizes that many early modern texts concerning Islam were not directed at an Islamic audience, but at European scholars.⁶⁶

⁶¹ "AFRICA/ALGERIA – White Fathers' Cultural Centre bears witness to the 'universality' of the Church." *Information Service of the Pontifical Mission Societies since 1927*, 2018, http://www.fides.org/en/news/63977-AFRICA_ALGERIA_White_Fathers_Cultural_Centre_bears_witness_to_the_universality_of_the_Church.

⁶² The initial motivation behind this initiative was above all to help the large number of Muslim guest workers who entered Germany in the 1960s and 1970s to gain access to German society and help them to create an infrastructure for their spiritual needs.

⁶³ Said Yazid and Lejla Demir, *The Future of Interfaith Dialogue: Muslim-Christian Encounters through A Common Word* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 252.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 252.

⁶⁵ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978), 368.

⁶⁶ Bernard Heyberger, "Polemic Dialogues between Christians and Muslims in the Seventeenth Century," 313-314.

As orientalist studies advanced, the importance for European scholars to acquire knowledge of spoken Arabic and other languages by which they could gain access to crucial texts became increasingly apparent. Speaking these languages would allow them to communicate directly not only with Arab-speaking Christians, but also with Muslims.⁶⁷ As Giovanni Pizzorusso indicates in *Islam visto da Occidente*, numerous new linguistic centers emerged from evangelization efforts, forming part of a broader cultural initiative in Catholic Europe aimed at converting all peoples to Catholic Christianity.⁶⁸

1.3 Religious studies

Religious studies developed especially in the nineteenth century (with some earlier pioneers in the eighteenth century). The insufficient scholarly engagement with Islam can be attributed, in part, to longstanding polemical attitudes within Europe.⁶⁹ For centuries, Islam was often dismissed, without academic consideration, as a false religion. In the nineteenth century, many Islamic manuscripts were edited for the first time according to scholarly standards. The emergence of academic oriental studies on the continent was initiated by the Austrian scholar Joseph Freiherr von Hammer-Purgstall with the establishment of an oriental academy in Vienna in 1754.⁷⁰ Even earlier, the Utrecht scholar Adriaan Reland (1697-1736) contributed to a more unbiased portrait of Muhammad, regrettably lesser known than his famous but biased contemporary Voltaire. It is necessary to acknowledge the impact of

⁶⁷ Nora Lafi, “The Eighteenth Century in the Arab Provinces of the Ottoman Empire: Perspectives for a Global History,” in *Cultural Transfers, Encounters, and Connections in the Global 18th Century*, ed. Matthias Middell (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2014), 241.

⁶⁸ Emanuele Colombo, “The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theology, 1600–1800,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theology, 1600–1800*, ed. Ulrich L. Lehner, Richard Muller, and A. G. Roeber (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 493.

⁶⁹ David Thomas and John A. Chesworth, eds., *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History, Volume 17: Britain, the Netherlands, and Scandinavia (1800–1914)* (Leiden: Brill, 2021), 36.

⁷⁰ Arnoud Vrolijk and Richard van Leeuwen, *Arabic Studies in the Netherlands: A Short History in Portraits, 1580–1950* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 94.

Dutch scholars during the nineteenth century. Their remarkable contributions significantly enriched understanding of Islam through exemplary editions of texts and focused studies. Hendrik Arent Hamaker (1789–1835) was one of the first Dutch orientalist of the nineteenth century. He began cataloging Eastern manuscripts at the university of Leiden.⁷¹ L.W.C. van den Berg (1845–1927), whose academic background encompassed both law and the Arabic language, holds the distinction of being the first Dutch orientalist to immerse himself in the Islamic world.⁷² Nonetheless, perhaps the most notable Dutch Arabist of this period was Reinhart Pieter Anne Dozy (1820–1883), who concentrated on Spanish-Arabic texts.⁷³ Dozy traveled extensively across Europe to study manuscripts and he published his significant *Histoire des musulmans d'Espagne*⁷⁴ in 1861. This influential book, translated into multiple European languages, offered the first scholarly portrayal of the history of Muslims in Andalusia.⁷⁵ Dozy's notable contributions to oriental studies in Europe are exemplified by his efforts to establish and cultivate a global scholarly network through extensive correspondence with academics across the European continent.⁷⁶ Michael Jan de Goeije (1836–1909) and his disciple Christiaan Snouck Hurgronje (1857–1936), are considered to have been the

⁷¹ Ahmed El Shamsy, *Rediscovering the Islamic Classics: How Editors and Print Culture Transformed an Intellectual Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020), 204. See for Reland: Christian Lange, "Follow the Light. Adriaan Reland (1676-1718) on Muhammad", in: *The Orient in Utrecht: Adriaan Reland (1676-1718), Arabist, Cartographer, Antiquarian and Scholar of Comparative Religion*. (The History of Oriental Studies; Vol. 10). Brill, Leiden 2021, 65-90.

⁷² David Thomas and John A. Chesworth, eds. *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History Volume 17. Britain, the Netherlands and Scandinavia (1800–1914)*, 36.

⁷³ Arnoud Vrolijk and Richard van Leeuwen, *Arabic Studies in the Netherlands: A Short History in Portraits, 1580–1950*, 96.

⁷⁴ Reinhart Dozy, *Spanish Islam. A History of the Moslems in Spain* (London and New York: Routledge, 2017). Dozy characterizes Muhammad's military campaigns as marked by cruelty and aggression. Furthermore, he ascribes an excessive sensitivity to mockery to Muhammad, which, according to Dozy, accounts for the execution of a woman and a Jew. See more David Thomas and John A. Chesworth, eds. *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History Volume 17. Britain, the Netherlands and Scandinavia (1800–1914)*, 509.

⁷⁵ Arnoud Vrolijk and Richard van Leeuwen, *Arabic Studies in the Netherlands: A Short History in Portraits, 1580–1950*, 96.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 102.