

The woman and the man guilty of adultery or fornication, -
flog them each with a hundred stripes.
-- Sura 24:2

If any of your women are guilty of lewdness,
take the evidence of four (reliable) witnesses from amongst you against them;
and if they testify, confine them to houses until death do claim them,
or Allah ordain for them some (other) way.

If two (men) among you are guilty of lewdness, punish them both.
If they repent and amend, leave them alone;
for Allah is Oft-returning, Most Merciful.
-- Sura 4:15-16

Yusuf Ali says "men", other translations just say "two". It is the masculine dual form of the word. This "could" also mean a man and a woman, but it might be more natural as reading this as a rule how to deal with homosexual acts, since verse 15 deals only with women, and so the attention turns to men in verse 16.

If 4:16 is about male homosexual acts, then interestingly, the homosexual men are to be left alone when they repent of their deed, while adulterers are to be punished in any case. This alone is not a contradiction, but certainly strange. Maybe because in an homosexual act no other man's right over a woman is violated? While in adultery with the wife of another man the "property" or right of an undefiled wife of this man is violated?

A homosexual act would violate only the wife of this other man but the violation of a woman is not as severe?

Nevertheless, there is the contradiction whether for a female adulteress the is punishment one hundred stripes [Sura 24:2] or confinement in the house until death [4:15].

If 4:16 does not speak only about homosexual acts but also about adultery of man and woman, then another contradictory element is added: If they repent they can get off the hook without punishment? Who will not repent with the prospect of a hundred stripes waiting for them?

Apart from the question whether the punishment should be as in 24:2 or 4:15, how come the man and woman are treated equal in 24:2, but seemingly different in 4:15?

All this is further complicated by the fact that in the Sharia the actual punishment for adultery is stoning on the basis of the Sunna of Muhammad and various hadiths and there are even traditions that [the verse of stoning was originally part of the Qur'an](#).

[Contradictions in the Qur'an](#)
[Answering Islam](#) Home Page

Believers, Jews, Sabaeans and Christians -
whoever believes in God and the Last Day and does what is right -
shall have nothing to fear or regret.
-- Sura 5:69

But just three verses further in the text it says

Unbelievers are those that say:
"God is the Messiah, the son of Mary." For the Messiah himself said:
"Children of Israel, serve God, my Lord and your Lord."
He that worships other gods besides God, God will deny him Paradise,
and the fire shall be his home. None shall help the evil-doers.
-- Sura 5:72

So, are Christians believers or unbelievers? Are they allowed to remain as Christians (knowing they worship Christ) as long as they do what is right, or are they condemned outright for their faith? Do we have to worry or not to worry according to the Qur'an?

Sometimes I even wonder if single Suras were even completely authored by the same person.

Now, the obvious answer that a Muslim would give is that the "true" Christians do not worship Jesus as God. Hence there is no contradiction. But the first verse does not specify that. It only talks about the believe in the existance of God and in the (Judgment of the) Last Day and doing right. Any serious Christian will fall in this category.

Muslims try to save the Qur'an by claiming that any Trinitarian is not a true Christian and hence verse 72 does not apply for them. But the problem is only shifted. Either the contradiction is as above, or, with the shift, the contradiction is with reality. It is historical fact that Christianity has always considered Jesus to be the LORD, to be of the same nature of God.

Therefore, either the Qur'an contradicts itself, or it shows itself very ignorant of historical Christianity.

One more comment: No Christian would ever say that Jesus is "another god" as this verse mistakenly says, nor that "God is Jesus". It is only the other way around: "Jesus is God, but not 'all of God'" But this is a big topic that cannot be dealt with in a few sentences here, so let me point you to the material on the deity of Christ and Trinity that is on this site.

[The Trinity](#) is a great, insightful presentation.

[A collection of much further material on the topic of the Trinity](#)

A Muslim's Response by [Randy Desmond](#)

Date: Wed, 2 Oct 1996 05:12:50 PDT

Jochen gives the correct answer for the Muslim perspective; true Christians do not worship Jesus(Peace be upon him) as God, and, as such, there is no contradiction.

For Jochen to prove there is any sort of contradiction, he must show

that it is a "historical fact" that Christianity has always considered Jesus to be "LORD, to be of the same nature of God." (Are you saying Jesus is God or not? Never mind, I see you say "he is God, but not 'all of God'")

Where are these "historical facts"? I have yet to be shown where Jesus(pbuh) is said to mention he is God or even shares in the Godhead (I seek shelter in God from such thoughts). As for historical facts that Christians have only worshipped God only, just take a look at a history book about the stuff. I have read the stuff before - I did not keep a record of the books. I'm sure if anyone interested enough they can go to the library and find the material.

And what does "the same nature of God" mean? In refuting a contradiction about what a "day" means in some verses of the Qur'an, I was unjustly accused of "moving God around" when I wanted to illustrate the relativity of time without saying or implying God physically moves around. However, having God (or part of God) become man, then "moving God around" on Earth is a perfectly acceptable logical belief? God is One. I have submitted to Him in Islam, and you are also invited. Just a reminder before the Day comes when a reminder will be too late.

But you didn't take a look at the Trinity articles I pointed to, did you? What point it is to be asked again and again for proof if you don't read the proof I have already provided? I give up. But looking the other way and demanding proof while refusing to look at it isn't very smart.

There is a second set of these statements:

Those who believe (in the Qur'an),
and those who follow the Jewish (Scriptures),
and the Christians and the Sabians, -
**any who believe in Allah and the Last Day,
and work righteousness,
shall have their reward with their Lord**
on them shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve.
-- Sura 2:62

If anyone desires **a religion other than Islam**
never will it be accepted of him;
and in the Hereafter He will be in the ranks of those who have lost.
-- Sura 3:85

In 2:62, those of the religions of Jews or Christians, in fact any who believes a small set of things and does good deeds will be saved [what else is the meaning of "will not grieve"?] yet in 3:85 those who are part of religions other than Islam are unacceptable and among those who are lost.

[Contradictions in the Qur'an](#)
[Answering Islam](#) Home Page

Sura 16:103 states that the Qur'an is "clear Arabic speech." If it were really clear, why is this explanation even necessary? But it doesn't seem to be so clear after all when we read:

He it is Who has sent down to thee the Book: In it are verses basic or fundamental (of established meaning); they are the foundation of the Book: others are allegorical. But those in whose hearts is perversity follow the part thereof that is allegorical, seeking discord, and searching for its hidden meanings, but **no one knows its hidden meanings except Allah**. And those who are firmly grounded in knowledge say: "We believe in the Book; the whole of it is from our Lord:" **and none will grasp the Message except men of understanding**.
-- Sura 3:7

In the same verse it says that **ONLY** Allah knows the meaning of these difficult allegorical verses in the Qur'an ... and then it goes on to tell that "men of understanding" can grasp it. Is that a contradiction or do we want to resolve it with the concept of "incarnation" [God becoming man] which is so much looked down upon by Muslims? But Christianity believes God became man only once. The Qur'an talks about men in the plural...

Actually Arberry translates "... desiring its interpretation; and none knows its interpretation, save only Allah." It does not talk about having a plain clear meaning and also a hidden meaning, but that there are verses which none knows at all what they mean, even though they desire its explanation or interpretation.

A Muslim's Response by [Randy Desmond](#)

Date: Wed, 2 Oct 1996 04:40:06 PDT

First, this verse talks about no one knows its hidden meanings except God. The basic or fundamental meanings are clear to all.

Second, what has been translated as "and none will grasp the Message" actually means "and none will take correction/admonition/reminder". So in this case, proposing a contradiction within the verse is irrelevant.

Third, I have read that this verse can also be read as "... but no one knows its hidden meanings except Allah **and** those who are firmly grounded in knowledge. They say "We believe...". A. Yusuf Ali (if I am recalling correctly) mentions this. In this case, the proposed contradiction is exactly opposite of the meaning (aside from the fact that the second point above still holds).

It is instructive to read Yusuf Ali's commentary in the footnote. He is aware of the problem, but also admits that most commentators agree that the sentence ends as he has translated it and then it IS a problem. Making a different sentence structure is **ONLY** motivated by avoiding a problem, not by the Arabic structure of the sentence.

Look at the second paragraph in the initial response. It is mentioned

exactly where A. Yusuf Ali's translation renders "take reminder/admonition/ correction" to be "grasp the Message". There is a HUGE difference in meaning between these two phrases which Jochen uses as a basis for proposing a contradiction.

I only mention my third point as another alternative point of view which would also disprove your proposed contradiction. (You may consider it a problem, but A. Yusuf Ali is just mentioning it for reference.) Suffice it to say, you can throw this point a view out, and you are still disproven in your accusation.

And Jochen is right - it is instructive to read A. Yusuf Ali's commentary regarding the third point to the initial response. Reread it and the verse above. A. Y. Ali is not commenting on the "and none will grasp the message" it is the "and those who are firmly grounded in knowledge" that he is commenting upon. Jochen is mixing apples and oranges here.

[Contradictions in the Qur'an](#)
[Answering Islam](#) home page

Last edited: October 7, 1996

In Sura 10:92, Allah speaks to Pharaoh who ferociously chased the Children of Israel, "But this day We save you in your body, that you may be a portent for those after you." Although this verse makes it clear that Allah saved Pharaoh from drowning, Suras 28:40, 17:103, and 43:55 contradict this, stating that Pharaoh was drowned: "Therefore We seized him and his hosts and abandoned them unto the sea ... But We drowned him and those with him, all together ... And [We] drowned them, everyone."

Muslim Response by [Basar, Timucin](#)

Date: Tue, 19 Aug 1997

Selam and Peace to all Readers!

Let me begin with Sura 10:93 (all quotations will be after H.M.Shakir's Version - note to add one Verse, because Shakir is using the verse numbers while taking the Basmala: Bismillahir-ar-rahman-ar-rahim as ONE verse.)

Let us now take a look at both verses in an sober way, withouth own interpretations:

[Yunus 10:92] But We will this day deliver you with your body that you may be a sign to those after you, and most surely the majority of the people are heedless to Our communications.

vs.

[al-Qasas 28:40] So We caught hold of him and his hosts, then We cast them into the sea, and see how was the end of the unjust.

+

[bani Isra'il 17:103] So he desired to destroy them out of the earth, but We drowned him and those with him all together;

+

[az-Zukhruf 43:55] Then when they displeased Us, We inflicted a retribution on them, so We drowned them all together,

My humble answer:

It is obviously and true that the Pharaoh and his soldiers were drowned into the sea. The next Day or some Days later the BODY of the Pharaoh was found and embalmed in the rituals of these days with an high percentage (because he was Pharaoh). So i cant see ANY contradiction inhere. The Pharaoh was drowned - True! His Body was saved - True! He died, but HIS body was saved, as described in the Quran. I cant see ANY problems here: If someone is drowned, his body is coming to the surface of the water after a few days, so that he can be buried (or embalmed). His body was saved for us, for the later generations as PREDICTED in the Quran in 10:93. This become all true, Menpthera was the Pharaoh after Pharaoh Ramses the II. According to what we know today from Science, Egyptology, Bible, Quran and Chronology of the Pharaohs, it must be Menpthera whom we see today as an mummy in the Museum of Cairo!

If someone has questions please dont hesitate to ask me by email.

Peace
Timucin

My response has two parts, a linguistic question and a historical information.

When the Qur'an says "But this day We save you in your body, ..." what exactly does this mean? Today Muslims want us believe that this means "We will preserve your body for posterity", but why doesn't then the Arabic say "We will save your body" (but not your life)? Why does it use the preposition "in" when it says "save you IN your body"? The "you" is distinguished from "your body" and what is saved is not "the body" but the "you". That is how I read the translation. I would like to know if that is the common way how one would express it in Arabic that the person will die but the body will be preserved. In order to establish that this has always been the meaning, I would like to ask that somebody please tell me what the classical commentators said about this verse up to 100 years ago. Too many verses are given "new meanings" these days. What did Jalalayn, Razi, ibn Kathir, Tabari and others say is the meaning of this verse? Is it the saving of the life of Pharaoh [you in your body, i.e. you will stay alive in this body] or is it "you will die but your body will be preserved for those after you."? This is the linguistic question.

Also, it was well known that the Egyptians were embalming their Pharaohs and all through the centuries have there been grave robberies and people have been rediscovering those bodies. Maybe it is the background knowledge of this "general truth" of embalmed Pharaohs that Muhammad then applied specifically to this Pharaoh without any special knowledge about him. (Just like all Pharaohs are embalmed, so you will be preserved also and people will remember what mighty sign God did on you because of your disobedience when Moses brought you the message of God. Then this would not be a prophecy of any special impact even if it is true.) How can we know what it is? If it is a special prophecy about this specific pharaoh, then the next information below will maybe spell more trouble for the Qur'an instead of being a great vindication of the Qur'an as many Muslims believe this "prophecy" to be.

This last point was argued a bit more detailed but similar by another Muslim on the Islamic newsgroup:

i think you have not dug hard enough to find the information. the best book to start with is "Mummies of the Pharaoh" by Maurice Bucaille. it is written for more serious kind of students of egyptology who are interested in forensic studies of the pharaohs. this book is also quoted by other authors who deal in the similar field for its rather exhaustive investigation.

this book also has a small section on the verses of the qur'an dealing with the preservation of the body of the pharaoh who pursued after moses (as) during the time of exodus and was overcome by the sea. bucaille identifies Merneptah as the pharaoh of exodus because of many reasons: the most important one being the stela of israel which says: "the seed of israel is no more and palestine has become the slave of egypt" (for exact quote please refer the book "chronicle of the pharaohs"). this stela is from the time of Merneptah *not* Ramases II. and many bible archeologists use this stela to make their point on this issue. there is also a verse in the qur'an which talks about the pharaoh killing all the male children i.e., the seed of israel is annihilated.

Truly Pharaoh elated himself in the land and broke up its people into sections, depressing a small group among them: their sons he slew, but he kept alive their females: for he was indeed a maker of mischief.
(Qur'an 28:4)

the body of Mernaptah has been found and it is a sign for those who believe. and allah knows best.

Some comments: Others don't have so high an opinion of Dr. Bucaille. This book is incredibly biased in its presentation and frequently plain wrong. For details please see [Dr. Campbell's rebuttal](#) to Dr. Bucaille's book "The Bible, the Qur'an and Science".

I don't think Dr. Campbell touches on the issue with the Pharaoh, but since Dr. Campbell wrote his book even more things have come to the attention of the scientific community.

Maurice Bucaille wrote his book in the early 70ies, long before the current reconstruction of Egyptian history. If indeed this body is of Merneptah as both of the above Muslims confirm just as it is the claim of Dr. Bucaille, then it is most probably not the body of the Pharaoh of Moses time. New research during the last 5 years or so tells a different story.

For details please see [the review of David Rohl's new Egyptian chronology](#).

By the way, David Rohl who is putting forth this research is not a Bible believer (to my knowledge). The fact that all his research dovetails very well with the Biblical account was a surprise to him.

Furthermore, a careful investigation of the text on Merneptah's Stela mentioned above is contrary to the presented claim a strong indication that Merneptah is **not** the Pharaoh of the Exodus. You will easily be able to conclude this after reading the following article on the [Menerptah stela](#).

Mysteries of the Bible: Another [Series on Egyptian and Biblical Chronology](#).

[Dr. Bucaille's chapter on Menerptah's Mummy](#)

And one last thought. Much of the old knowlegde has been lost. Maybe it was still known at the time of Muhammad that this particular pharaoh was preserved and he just used the information he had and put it into the Qur'an. This wouldn't qualify as prophecy since prophecy is about something that will be in the future, but as a fact he know and then couched in words of a prophecy spoken to the Pharaoh. Let us look at the Qur'anic text to see what we can observe there. Sura Yunus, 10:90-93 reads in Yusuf Ali's translation:

(10:90) We took the Children of Israel across the sea:
Pharaoh and his hosts followed them in insolence and spite.

At length, when overwhelmed with the flood, he said:

"I believe that there is no god except Him
Whom the Children of Israel believe in:
I am of those who submit (to Allah in Islam)."

(10:91) (It was said to him):

"Ah now! - But a little while before, wast thou in rebellion! -
and thou didst mischief (and violence)!"

(10:92) This day shall We save thee in the body,
that thou mayest be a sign to those who come after thee!
but verily, many among mankind are heedless of Our Signs!"

(10:93) We settled the Children of Israel in a beautiful dwelling-place,
and provided for them sustenance of the best:
it was after knowledge had been granted to them,
that they fell into schisms. Verily Allah will judge between them
as to the schisms amongst them, on the Day of Judgment.

"At length, when overwhelmed with the flood" tells me that he is already (nearly) drowning, at least the water is rushing at him. On the other hand the children of Israel were securely on the other side across the sea as the Qur'an says in verse 90. Who then told Pharaoh the words of verses 91 and 92? Was there another prophet with him other than Moses who drowned with him? Was the Pharaoh a prophet himself that God would speak to him directly? But it doesn't say "we said to him", it only gives the content of what was (supposedly) said to him. There is only Yusuf Ali's interpolation "it was said to him" (which isn't in the Arabic at all). Who said this to the pharaoh?

This very much looks like it is something "made up" that was put in the Qur'an only by its author for his own reasons (it has a meaning a message for the listener), but it is hardly possible to think this was actually said to the Pharaoh himself while he was drowning.

As such, Muhammad certainly being aware of the ancient practice of the Egyptians to embalm their pharaohs he might just have taken up this general fact and worded it as a prophecy applying it to this Pharaoh who chased Moses. Even if he knew of this particular pharaoh being preserved in his tomb it is still not a prophecy about what WILL happen in the future but written at Muhammad's time it is a projecting back of what HAD happened and putting what had happened into the mouth of some person (whom?) telling (Pharaoh) about the future. The Qur'an itself, only came into existence (or at least an accessible state) 2000 years after Moses at a time when the preservation of this body was already a fact. Hence this is no prophecy at all.

All this, obviously, is assuming this particular mummie is actually the right Pharaoh. This is not at all clear as we noted above.

[Contradictions in the Qur'an](#)

[Answering Islam](#) Home Page

Sura 40:23-25 says, "And truly We sent Moses with our revelation and a clear warrant unto Pharaoh and Haman and Qarun, but they said, `A lying sorcerer!' And when he brought them the truth from our presence, they said, `Slay the sons of those who believe with him....'"

From this, we learn that Pharaoh ordered the killing of the sons of the Jews when Moses approached him with the truth. But Sura 20:38-39 says, "When We inspired in your mother that which is inspired, saying, `Throw him into the ark, and throw it into the river....'"

This means that Pharaoh commanded his men to kill the sons of the Jews when Moses was a child. Moses had not yet received any revelation from God.

[Contradictions in the Qur'an](#)

[Answering Islam](#) home page

Last edited: October 15, 1996

Sura 97:3,4 says, "The night of power is better than a thousand months. The angels and spirit descend therein, by the permission of their Lord, with all decrees."

Sura 44:3 also says, "Lo! We revealed it on a blessed night."

To Muslims, the "Night of Power" is a blessed night on which fates are settled and on which everything relating to life, death, etc., which occurs throughout the year is decreed. It is said to be the night on which Allah's decrees for the year are brought down to the earthly plane. In other words, matters of creation are decreed a year at a time.

Contradicting this, Sura 57:22 says, "No affliction befalls in the earth or in your selves, but it is in a Book before we create it." This means it is written in the Preserved Tablet, being totally fixed in Allah's knowledge before anyone was created.

Also contradictory is Sura 17:13: "And every man's fate We have fastened to his own neck." This says that man alone is responsible for what he does and what happens to him.

[Contradictions in the Qur'an](#)

[Answering Islam](#) home page

Last edited: September 23, 1996

Qur'an Contradiction:

Wine - good or bad?

Wine is forbidden for a Muslim here on earth:

O you who believe! Strong drink and games of chance and idols and divine arrows are only an infamy of **Satan's handiwork**. Leave it aside that you may succeed.

-- Sura 5:90

See also Sura 2:219.

On the other hand in Paradise are rivers of wine:

A similitude of the Garden which those who keep their duty (to Allah) are promised: Therein are rivers of water unpolluted ... and **rivers of wine delicious to the drinkers**.

-- Sura 47:15

Surely the pious will be in bliss ... their thirst will be slaked with pure wine sealed. .

-- Sura 83:22,25

Is wine good or bad? Is us forbidden on earth something that is truly good? Or is in Paradise not only allowed but provided in overflowing measures (rivers of...) something that is so bad that it is even called "Satan's handiwork"?

[Discussion of Saifullah's response](#)

[Further Muslim responses](#)

[Contradictions in the Qur'an](#)

[Answering Islam](#) Home Page

Date: Thu, 07 Nov 1996 15:20:05 -0500

From: Shaahin Amiri-Sharifi amirishs@QUAGMIRE.CIMS.NYU.EDU

This is to answer "wine good or bad" in your page!

--Is wine good or bad?

--Is us forbidden on earth something that is truly good?

--Or is in Paradise not only allowed but provided in overflowing measures

(rivers of...) something that is so bad

that it is even called "Satan's handiwork"?

--Why should we see every thing in black and white?! It is not that it is "bad" or "good" the issue is which one, goodness or badness, is dominant. Prohibition of drinking alcoholic beverages came in three steps,

-do not come to worship while you are drunk

-...there is "good" in it and bad in it, but the the later in more..

-do not drink it, it is an act of satan...

As you can see it is mentioned that "there is good in it", exact quote of Quran. For example, there is alcohol in some medicine, and there is no prohibition in taking those syrups if prescribed by a doctor. Islam encounters with issues realistically.

--Answered in the above paragraph!

--What does it mean to compare paradise with earth?! Do you really think standards (yes even standards!) are the same?! And how can we (both me, a Muslim and you, a Christian, who both believe in hereafter and paradise) "analyze" what happens or is allowed or forbidden in paradise?! We lack empirical evidence! Don't we?! Point is, about paradise, all I have is my believe, nothing more, stories in Quran and said by Prophet,.... Absolutely no empirical evidence. If I want to see something is O.K (!) there or else, I'll need to know the conditions, circumstances, ..., I rather wait till I see it (insha`allah=God willing).

But, all that matters, for now, is this world, and the ruling is clear : DO NOT DRINK (unless for some reason it is necessary, as mentioned in the case of medicine)

One more point, the world is translated differently in different translation of Quran, For example Shakir translate it as "drink" and not wine! And Please always remember that Quran is written in a "symbolic" manner (very reasonable, after all it is for everybody everywhere and at any time), and one should consider that words are

used mainly in a metaphoric way. To clear this up, if you study about Islamic mysticism, you realize that "wine" along with so many words that mean : pretty girl, mistress, lover, ... are used frequently, specially in poetry. One should admit that it would be so simplistic to take them as what they mean according to a dictionary!!

Note: Generally, describing paradise in Quran, shows the wealth and richness of its residence. All signs (verses) in this regard should be interpreted in this relation. People of paradise have no economical problems! They are free to do what a human is meant to do...

In this regard, the word "hour" specially when is translated with this kind of interpretation (yours) of "wine", means nothing more than a prostitute! But if we consider the root of this word, it means nothing but a "companion" ! Notice that "Companions of Jesus (Peace be Upon Him)" are translated to Arabic as "havarion"(plural for "havari" of Jesus. Where "havary" is from the same root as "hour"!

Shaahin

* E-mail --> amirishs@quagmire.nyu.edu * Shaahin
*
* WWW --> http://www.math.nyu.edu/phd_students/amirishs*
Amiri-Sharifi *

Muslim Response by [Randy Desmond](#)

Date: Thursday, 27 Feb 1997

Just read the Qur'an... Surah 37:43-47

[43] In gardens of felicity [44] facing each other on thrones,
[45] round will be passed a cup from a clear flowing fountain,
[46] crystal white, of a taste delicious to those who drink
thereof, [47] **Free from headiness; Nor will they suffer
intoxication therefrom.**

[Contradictions in the Qur'an](#)

[Answering Islam](#) home page

Last edited: February 27, 1997

I have only created Jinns and men, that they may serve Me.

-- Sura 51:56

Many are the Jinns and men We have made for Hell:

-- Sura 7:179

It would be no problem to say that all of them were created to worship and serve God, but because they have free will and some or many decided to disobey they will be punished in Hell. But to state that **many were made for Hell** is an obvious contradiction to the first statement - or else we must conclude that they were created in order to serve Allah in Hell, but this would require a serious shift in the understanding of the meaning of Hell as well as the issue of justice in who is sent to hell.

[Contradictions in the Qur'an](#)

[Answering Islam](#) Home Page

Who is the Father of Jesus?

Is Jesus the son of Allah? The Qur'an says no. Yet it is also entirely consistent with the Qur'an to consider Allah the Father of Jesus for the following reasons:

- 1) Allah caused Mary to become pregnant with Jesus
- 2) Allah determined some of the physical characteristics of Jesus
- 3) All of the genetic characteristics of Jesus were determined by just two parties: Allah and Mary.

A Muslim might argue "Being a father implies having sex", and therefore Allah cannot be the father. No. Modern science has brought us "test tube babies", which are conceived without any sex. There is nothing to support the idea that if Allah wants a baby, he must resort to normal human means to have one.

Again, a Muslim may say that if we are going to call Jesus the son of Allah, then we should say that Adam is the son of Allah too. No, because Adam popped into existence without a mother. We cannot compare Adam to Jesus this way.

Let us first review some background material. What does the Qur'an say about how Mary became pregnant with Jesus? In Surah 3:45-49 we read:

The angels said to Mary: "Allah bids you rejoice in a word from him. His name is the Messiah, Jesus the son of Mary. He shall be noble in this world and the hereafter, and shall be favored by Allah. He shall preach to men in his cradle and the prime of manhood, and shall lead a righteous life."

"Lord", she said, "how can I bear a child when no man has touched me?"

He replied: "Such is the will of Allah. He creates whom He will. When He decrees a thing He need only say: 'Be' and it is. He will instruct him in the Scriptures and in wisdom, in the Torah and in the Gospel, and send him forth as an apostle to the Israelites..."

From this passage we can draw the conclusions presented above:

1) Allah caused Mary to become pregnant with Jesus. Muslims infer from this passage and others like it that Jesus was conceived while Mary was a virgin by the word spoken by Allah, and not by a man.

Not that this in itself implies that Allah is the father. When a doctor causes a woman to become pregnant by artificial insemination, he is not considered the father. Hence the following two points:

2) Allah determined some of the physical characteristics of Jesus.

When Allah said "Be", did he have something specific in mind? Certainly! Allah had a very detailed plan in mind for Jesus. In particular, Allah decided that Jesus would be male. Normally, it is the sperm that decides the gender of the baby. Here Allah made the choice instead.

3) All of the genetic characteristics of Jesus were determined by precisely two parties: Allah and Mary.

This is clear because they were the only two parties involved. So we conclude that Allah and Mary are the only two possible candidates for the title "Father".

Hence it appears legitimate to call Allah the father of Jesus, *at least in a figurative sense*. Therefore we are at a loss to explain why the Qur'an spends so much space arguing against this. Certainly more and better justification is needed than what appears in these passages:

Surely they lie when they declare: "Allah has begotten children".

-- Sura 37:151

Where is the "lie" in our reasoning above?

They say: "Allah has begotten a Son". Glory be to Him! His is what the heavens and the earth contain; all things are obedient to Him. Creator of the heavens and the earth! When he decrees a thing, He need only say "Be", and it is.

-- Sura 2:116

Allah made Mary pregnant. What more would Allah have to do if he wanted a legitimate son?

Allah forbid that He Himself should beget a son! When He decrees a thing He need only say "Be," and it is. -- Sura 19:35

So is Allah unable to beget a son by saying "Be"?

Say: "If the Lord of Mercy had a son, I would be the first to worship him". -- Sura 43:82

We would prefer something more convincing from the Qu'ran than this.

[Muslim response](#)

[Contradictions in the Qur'an](#)

[Answering Islam](#) home page

Last edited: November 30, 1996