

## **The Imāmīte Interpretation and the Response to the Falsities about Ādam's (a) Story in the Qur'ān**

**\*Ali Rād\***

*Associate Professor, the Department of the Qur'ān and Ḥadīth Sciences, the College of Fārābī, the University of Tehran, Qom, Iran*

(Received: February 11, 2019 ; Revised: May 24, 2019 ; Accepted: June 8, 2019)

### **Abstract**

The story of Ādam (a) in the Qur'ān has always been targeted with falsities about the historical reality of Ādam's (a) existence, the specific rulings of Ādam's (a) religion, and his prophethood. A review of the interpretations of the Qur'ān reveals that there are in general three groups of falsities about the personality, religion, and infallibility of Ādam (a). These falsities existed during the lifetime of the Descendants of the Prophet (a). This indicates the oldness of these falsities. The narrative evidences for these falsities do not have the required validity and their content is affected by the motive to eradicate the belief in the infallibility of the Prophets. The traditionalist approach has had a role in the promotion of these falsities. In the article at hand, each of these falsities about Ādam's story is evaluated and answered based on the Imāmīte principles for the interpretation of the Qur'ān.

### **Keywords**

Ādam's (a) story, The Qur'ānic stories, Prophets' infallibility, Falsities about the Qur'ān, Imāmīte interpretation.

---

\* **Email:** ali.rad@ut.ac.ir

## **Introduction**

Due to the specificity of Ādam's (a) personality as the first human and the owner of the first religion, there have appeared falsities about the reality of Ādam's (a) existence, the reason for his disobedience and expulsion from the Garden, some rulings about getting married with congenial relatives in his religion, his seduction by Satan's temptations in some narrative, interpretive, and theological resources. The origin of these falsities is the seeming content of some qur'ānic verses that have set the ground for suggestion of them. The narrations show that relying on some specific events of Ādam's (a) life and using a different interpretation of the appearance of the related verses, some have cast falsities and challenges on the reality of Ādam (a) and his infallibility, because in essence, disobeying God's prohibition, forgetting the covenant, and being deceived by Satan is not congruent with the prophetic status of Ādam (a), but rather, these events are more compatible with an ordinary human. All these falsities can be divided into three groups that regard the personality, religion, and infallibility of Ādam (a). In this article, in addition to the presentation of each of these falsities, analytical responses to each of them have been suggested based on the Imāmīte interpretation principles. Adoption of a major approach to the recognition of the falsities about Ādam (a) and the responses to them based on the Imāmīte interpretation theory are the features that make this article distinct from the previous studies about Ādam's (a) story.

### **The falsities about Ādam's (a) character**

One of the falsities that has targeted the historical reality of Ādam's (a) existence is the application of the verses on Ādam (a) who lived in the Garden to the general species of human or the same natural, ordinary human residing on the Earth. The presupposition required for this falsity is to consider the original story of Ādam (a) in the Qur'ān as allegorical. These two falsities and their responses are analyzed in the following.

### **The falsity of the allegoricalness of Ādam's (a) story**

There are two views regarding the type of Ādam's (a) story: realistic and allegorical. The common theory among Muslim scholars is the realistic nature of this story as a historical event, and the appearance of the verses, the originality of the reality, the consensus of the interpreters, Islamic narrations, etc. are all considered as the indicators that emphasize the historical and external reality of this real story. However, based on the allegorical consideration of this story, Ādam (a) in this story is not viewed as the first human and so, not a divine prophet. Rather, Ādam's (a) story is introduced as an allegory of the human's life conditions on the Earth in which it is shown

that he has forgotten the Divine Lordship period and has lost the life comfort under the Divine guidance. It is clear that this interpretation of the story casts doubts on the historical reality of Ādam's (a) existence and may even lead to the rejection of his historical existence, as such doubts have been suggested about Jesus (q.v.: Robertson, 1999). Although this approach to Ādam's (a) story has not been evidently suggested due to the consensus over the reality of this story, it has been sporadically referred to in some interpretive and mystical resources that shows tendencies to this hypothesis. Some of these can be compatible with the historicity and realness of Ādam (a), while some cannot be so (Amīnī Hājīābādī, 2014: 155-178; Naqībzādeh, 2011: 65-92; Mahdawīnezhād, 2013: 99-116).

### **Evaluation**

- Allegories are of two types. The first kind includes hypothetical and imaginary allegories that are void of truth and reality and are merely the outcome of human imagination and fancy in which no derivation or imitation of a historical or natural event or occurrence has happened. The second type involves realistic allegories that in fact should be called "allegorized reality". These allegories have real theme and essence, and it is only their literary and linguistic processing that forms them as an allegory or simile or makes them to be relied upon as a reminder, advice, or admonition. It is even possible for them to be used within a story. Therefore, the attribution of the term *allegory* to them is solely based on their outward structure and their style of use in the verbal or written speech. As a result, all literary allegories are not imaginative, unreal, or non-historical, but rather, a lot of them are borrowed from external reality and historical truth that are presented as allegory in the literary structure and specific expressive style of a certain language. Ādam's (a) story is of the latter type, and its seeming similarity to other allegories does not mean that it is imaginative or symbolic (Muṭahharī, vol. 1: 515 & vol. 16: 100). Although it might be claimed that the Qur'ān has made allegorical and ironical use of Ādam (a) and Eve's story, this claim does not necessitate the origin of the story to be symbolic or allegorical (Ma'rifāt, 2007: 439); "Rather, it is a reasonable truth and metaphysical knowledge that has been narrated in a tangible and perceptible manner" (Jawādī Āmūlī, 2013, vol. 28: 188). The similarity of the life of the ordinary humans with the life of Ādam (a) and his wife does not necessarily mean that Ādam's (a) story is unreal. Rather, it implies that the ordinary human generations are the

descendants of the same Ādam (a) and Eve, have the same tendencies, and can possibly make the same mistakes.

- In order to deem a story unreal, reliance on its literary style does not suffice and such a reason cannot be used to prove this claim, because the reality of a story is a sensory, narrative, and historical issue and its rejection or confirmation requires robust narrative reasons and historical evidences, and its literary style cannot be a reason to prove or reject its reality or imaginativeness. Regarding Ādam's story in the Qur'ān, the appearance of the verses and narrations that testify the personal and real nature of this story nullifies the possibility of considering it as allegorical and imaginative.
- The theory of allegorical and mythical nature of some qur'ānic stories is a minority viewpoint that lacks a robust literature, and there has been found no trace for this viewpoint in the early interpretive works. This view was mostly strengthened in the era of Muḥammad 'Abduh and followers of the new literary interpretation school such as Aḥmad Khalafullāh through reliance on pure literalism and literary analysis without consideration of the narrations. In Khalafullāh's opinion, the qur'ānic stories should be analyzed as a literary play that cannot be historically confirmed or rejected (Khalafullāh, 1999: 169). In his *Tafsīr al-manār*, 'Abduh suggested the idea of the allegoricalness of Ādam's (a) story and considered it as attributable to real and allegorical types ('Abduh, 1947, vol. 1: 280-284). Muṣṭafā Khumeinī, too, rejects the acceptability of taking Ādam as a real, distinct person in the story of his sin and repentance, and prefers to take Ādam to mean the human species in general (Khumeinī, 1997: 457). In addition, Muḥammad Shaḥrūr takes Ādam's story as an enigmatic allegory (Shaḥrūr, 1997: 304). It is evident that the understanding of the Companion-era interpreters is the scientific criterion for judging the reality or allegoricalness of Ādam's (a) story due to their familiarity with the language of the Qur'ān and their access to other indicators; the foregoing hypothesis has not been proved by them. The evidence for this claim is the widespread opposition to Khalafullāh's theory in Egypt that attacked and nullified it due to his specific analysis of the qur'ānic stories – that could lead to the permeation of the Qur'ān with myths and imaginative allegories – and accused of it as being a novel secularism. It seems that this theory is influenced by specific mystic principles and new literary school in interpretation that faces serious challenges imposed by critiques upon its interpretive principles (Ṭayyib Ḥuseinī, vol. 2: 298-370).

- It seems that the theory of the allegoricalness of Ādam's (a) story has been suggested mainly as a way to avoid the theological problems of this story, especially the seeming conflict between violating the divine prohibition of the Forbidden Tree and Ādam's (a) infallibility. It is clear that considering this story as an allegorical story changes the outcome of its analysis and removes the bases of many related theological problems. Nonetheless, the foregoing conflict can be solved through other means that are discussed in the following.

### **The falsity of the generic, impersonal human**

The outcome of considering Ādam's (a) story as allegorical is the genericness and impersonality of the word *Ādam* that can be applied to numerous cases of human individuals. According to this falsity, the main character of this story is not a certain, unique person. Rather, with the word Ādam, the story means the general species of the human that includes all human beings. Some have expressed this idea in their second inference of the story of Ādam's (a) creation,

I talk using the Qur'ān's language which I have found the deepest and the most advanced type of Humanism in its story of Ādam (a) and his creation. Ādam is the symbol of the human species; the generic reality of the human; the human in a philosophical meaning, not a biological one. When the Qur'ān talks about the human, he talks about him in the biological sense; it has exactly the language of the natural sciences; it talks about the sperm, coagulum, embryo, etc. But when it comes to Ādam's (a) creation, its language is allegorical, expressive, and philosophical. The human's creation means the reality of his spiritual destiny and his generic attributes. It has a formula for Ādam's (a) creation: the Divine Soul plus the stinky mud equals the human (Sharī'atī, 2002, vol. 23: 184-185).

### **Evaluation**

- The claim for similarity or unity of the Qur'ān's language and the language of the natural sciences in specification of the biological nature of the human is disputable, because the Qur'ān does not use the scientific or specialized language of biology in this regard. Rather, concerning the scientific affairs, it has talked in a way congruent with the vernacular and common language of the revelation-era audience.
- With the rejection of the allegoricalness of Ādam's (a) story, the falsity of the generic human is consequently nullified.

- The appearance of the verses and narrations imply the individual existence of Ādam (a), and the genericness hypothesis, even if it is philosophically and logically acceptable, cannot come into conflict with the qur'ānic and narrative texts.
- The commonality of the attributes of other humans with those of Ādam (a) is not a reason for the sameness of their referents, and Ādam (a) is the first instance of the human species that is historically earlier than all members of this species. Even if we take the story to mean with Ādam the generic human, definitely this generic species should have been started with someone, and according to the qur'ānic reports, this individual has been a person called Ādam (a).

### **Falsities about Ādam's (a) religion: marrying the congenital relatives**

One of the falsities about Ādam's (a) religion is permissibility of marrying the congenital relatives, since the children of Ādam (a) married each other and his lineage bred and spread this way; this type of marriage has also been attributed to Mazdakians, too ('Ayāshī, n.d., vol. 1: 312) who married their congenital relative despite the prohibition of this act, and then attributed it to the divine will (Māzandarāni, 2000, vol. 5: 11; Majlisī, 1989, vol. 5: 6). Some have claimed that such a marriage is not even common among animals (Faḍlullāh, 1998, vol 7: 28). The appearance of the verse "O mankind! reverence your Guardian-Lord, who created you from a single person, created, of like nature, His mate, and from them twain scattered (like seeds) countless men and women" (Qur'ān 4:1) implies that the present human species has been developed purely from Ādam (a) and Eve and this necessitates the marriage of their children together, and this is the logical necessity of the verse, because the verse has not expressed any other means other than Ādam (a) and Eve for the spread of the human species, and this shows that Ādam (a) and Eve's sons and daughters have married each other (Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1996, vol. 4: 144). Now, the question is that how it could be justified that this act has been permissible in Ādam's (a) religion, but has come to be prohibited in other divine religions. This falsity can be called *the falsity of Ādam's (a) lineage spread through marriage with congenital relatives*.

### **Evaluation**

- In response to this falsity, some viewpoints in the narrative and interpretive books have been suggested. According to the first two viewpoints, the repulsiveness of marrying the congenital relatives is inherent to human and such a marriage is against chastity and natural disposition, and so, such an act has not occurred among Ādam's (a)

children. The first viewpoint has offered the marriage of Ādam's (a) sons with the daughters of the humans before Ādam (a) and Eve (Majlisī, 1989, vol. 11: 224) and the second viewpoint has suggested their marriage with the jinn or the Heavenly Houris ('Ayāshī, n.d., vol. 1: 215-216). In addition to the incompatibility of these two viewpoints with the first verse of the Women chapter on the exclusive role of Ādam and Eve in expansion of the human species, they also face problems such as incongruity of the human and the jinn or angels in marriage (Abū Zuhrah, 1987, vol. 3: 1577), the weakness of reasons for proving the existence of the remnants of the human generations before Ādam (a) (Ṭabarī, 1991, vol. 1: 158; Ṭūsī, n.d., vol. 1: 133), and the falseness of considering marriage with one's sister against chastity and natural disposition (Faḍlullāh, 1998, vol. 7: 28). Nonetheless, the following responses seem to be stronger than the foregoing ones.

- The prohibition of marrying one's sister is not genetic, but rather, it is a legislative issue which depends on the public interest and corruption. Since there has been no corruption among the first generation of Ādam's (a) children, this type of marriage was permitted in that generation but was prohibited in the following generations (Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1996, vol. 4: 144; Faḍlullāh, 1998, vol. 7: 28-30).
- Commonality of the parentage – as defined as the sameness of the sperm and blood – is not the only reason for prohibition of marrying the congenital relatives, because if this was the case, Ādam (a) should have not married Eve, too, as the matter used in their creation was the same. This reason has been suggested in a narration from Imām Sajjād (a) in response to the narrator's rejection of the possibility of this marriage due to its similarity to the customs of Mazdakians (Ṭabrisī, 1931: 171). It is clear that in this narration, there has occurred a kind of comparative likening so as to remove the addressee's mental obstacle in the prohibition of the marriage of Ādam's (a) children together. The point is that if the sameness of lineage and blood is a reason for prohibition of marriage, the marriage of Ādam (a) and Eve could not have been permissible, too, while marriage depends on the legislator's command and prevention that is referred to in the foregoing narration in the sentence "then he made it permissible for you".
- It has been emphasized in some narrations that marriage between Ādam (a) and Eve's sons and daughters have not occurred between the identical pairs of them. Rather, the difference of Eve's accouchements in giving birth to sons and daughters has been emphasized. That is to

say, boys married the girls from the subsequent accouchements, not the identical ones. The intention of the narrations might be that the time/accouchement difference in birth-giving was the condition for the permissibility of marriage among children. Therefore, the marriage of the boys with the girls of the same accouchement was not permissible. Of course, this ruling was exclusive to the first generation of Ādam's (a) children and was banned later (Himyarī Qomī, 1992: 366). This analysis has no conflict with the other type of narrations that merely report the marriage among Ādam's children, because the first group of narrations are considered as the specification and interpretation of the second group of narrations, or regard the marriage of Ādam's (a) children from the second generation onward that has been and is a permissible act.

### **Falsities about Ādam's (a) infallibility**

#### **The falsity of Ādam's (a) disobedience**

The falsity of Ādam's (a) disobedience is the most important and the earliest falsity to nullify or reject his infallibility. This falsity dates back to the narrations of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AH. According to the appearance of the verses, "In the result, they both ate of the tree, and so their nakedness appeared to them: they began to sew together, for their covering, leaves from the Garden: thus did Adam disobey his Lord, and allow himself to be seduced. But his Lord chose him (for His Grace): He turned to him, and gave him Guidance. He said: 'Get ye down, both of you,- all together, from the Garden, with enmity one to another: but if, as is sure, there comes to you Guidance from Me, whosoever follows My Guidance, will not lose his way, nor fall into misery'" (Qur'ān 20:121-123). Ādam (a) committed an act of disobedience toward God and after a while his repentance was accepted. According to the linguistic context of these verses as well as other qur'ānic verses, Ādam's (a) act of disobedience was the same eating from the forbidden tree that God had prohibited him from approaching it, but he could not withstand Satan's temptations and ate the fruit of that tree (Qur'ān 2: 35). In the narrations from the Descendants of the Prophet (a), this sin is introduced as greed, and greed is suggested as the motivation or reason for approaching the forbidden tree (Kulaynī, 1986, vol. 2: 131). As a result, the appearance of the verses and narrations demonstrate that Ādam's (a) infallibility has not been so robust and the claim for the prophets' absolute infallibility is not applicable to him.

## Evaluation

- As it was indicated at the beginning of this article, according to the Qur'ānic verses, Ādam (a) has had two periods of life as a human and a prophet. Definitely, his prophethood has started after his disobedience in the Heaven and his fall onto the Earth. The narrative texts stipulate that he was not a prophet when he lived in the Garden, and essentially the divine will was not set on his eternal life in the Garden. His appointment to prophethood happened in the next period, and immediately after being appointed as *the divine proof* his infallibility also came into existence (Ṣadūq, 1996: 151). Therefore, as Ādam (a) was not a prophet during the first period, the rejection or confirmation of his infallibility is out of discussion. The Qur'ān has maintained this separation of periods in Ādam's (a) life in the verses 115-123 of Ṭāhā chapter using the keyword *thumma* (then). This should be taken into account in the interpretation of these verses. This separation shows that before this period, Ādam (a) has been an ordinary human and the divine will has not been set on appointing him as a prophet. Therefore, in the eyes of some interpreters, taking Ādam's (a) disobedience in this period as abandoning the prior act, guiding prohibition, lack of legislation and suchlike justifications is against the appearance of the verses and narrations. These justifications are weak, strange esoteric interpretations that have been offered without considering the dignity of the Qur'ān (Ṣādiqī Tehrānī, 1986, vol. 19: 211-212). Some researchers who believe that there is a difference in these verses between the human Ādam and the prophet Ādam might have wanted to emphasize the point that there has been a time lapse between these two stages of Ādam's life and that the consideration of the human Ādam as the same as the prophet Ādam is an idea taken from the Old Testament that has influenced the interpretation of the Qur'ān (Jam'īyyah al-Tajdīd al-Thaqāfīyyah al-Ijtimā'īyyah, 2007: 327-330). Of course, if the referent of the human Ādam is separated from that of the prophet Ādam, this hypothesis will face some challenges, the main one being its incongruity with the appearance of the verses and narrations that emphasize the unity of the referent of the name Ādam.
- On top of the verses about Ādam's (a) disobedience in the Garden, God mentions Ādam's forgetfulness of the (a) covenant (Qur'ān 20: 115-116), and by expressing it earlier than the verses of his life in the Garden and Satan's temptation, He wants to emphasize the point that in his affliction with Satan's temptation, Ādam (a) became oblivious –

i.e. a kind of abandoning or forgetting; this is the habit of the ordinary humans who are susceptible to committing mistakes due to internal temptations or deception by external factors – while God had reminded Ādam (a) of Satan's enmity. However, Ādam (a) showed weakness in fulfilling God's advice because he forgot the covenant, though Satan's deceptive and tempting act that was done through his repetitious promises and pretentious benevolence had a role of an external factor. In the verse 120 of Ṭāhā chapter and the verse 122 of A'rāf chapter, the Qur'ān emphasizes the trickiness of Satan and considers for him an important role in Ādam (a) and Eve's approaching to the Forbidden Tree. This shows that Ādam (a) and his wife did not intend to oppose the divine prohibition and it was Satan who provoked their greed through his temptations (Māzandarāni, 2000, vol. 8: 386) and they imagined that coming close to the Forbidden Tree, even if it involved hardships, is more important than the eternal life. In narrations from the Descendants of the Prophet (a), special care has been paid to this role of Satan in provoking Ādam (a) and Eve (Majlisī, 1989, vol. 11: 122) and in some of them it has been stipulated that Satan's vow to the Divine Essence was the reason for Ādam (a) and Eve's trust in Satan, because they could not imagine that one would falsely vow to God (Ibid.: 188). Definitely, if approaching to the Forbidden Tree was an issue related to the prophethood and would violate Ādam's (a) infallibility, it would be incumbent on God to protect and safeguard Ādam (a) against oblivion and Satan's effective temptation. Therefore, Ādam (a) has not been a prophet when he committed this oblivion and sin, and the foregoing verses could not be used to reject the falsity of his infallibility.

- In narrations from the Descendants of the Prophet (a), the reason for this justification has been introduced as a kind of subjective interpretation. The creator of the falsity has imposed two untrue assumptions onto the verses: that Ādam (a) has been a prophet at the time intended by the verse "thus did Adam disobey his Lord" (Qur'ān 20:121) and that the prophets' infallibility can be violated. In a narration from Imām Riḍā (a), both these assumptions have been rejected (Ṣadūq, 1989, vol. 1: 192). Both hypotheses are the outcome of the interpretation of the Qur'ān merely based on its appearance and the negligence of the theological and logical principles in its interpretation. If the prophethood of Ādam (a) in this period is definite and is proved by theological, logical, and narrative reasons, how the creator of the falsity has taken this verse as implying the perpetration

of the sin by Ādam (a)? The bases of such question-like falsities are nothing but reliance on the appearance of the Qur'ān and being influenced by the personal ideas. As an Imāmīte theologian, Shaykh Ṭūsī stipulates that "understanding the appearance of the Qur'ān should be based on the logical reasons, not vice versa, and if the narrative appearance conflicts with logical reasons, it needs esoteric interpretation" (Ṭūsī, 1979: 162). According to Ṭūsī's viewpoint, the revelation of the verses is essentially based on the logical reasons, and the necessity of interpreting the appearance of the Qur'ān that is seemingly contrary to reason is due to this very issue. With regard to the foregoing discussion, as perpetration of the sin by Ādam (a) is a vile issue and its commission by the prophet is not permissible, any meaning that relies on the appearance of these verses is not valid. Therefore, the foregoing verse has another meaning, including the notion that Ādam (a) has not been a prophet in this period or that the aforementioned sin is not among the issues that violate the infallibility. In fact, the criticism by Shaykh Ṭūsī is a methodological criticism and refutation that has been neglected by the creator of the falsity. If the correct method and robust regulations of the interpretation were observed in the understanding of these verses, the foregoing perception would not appear.

- Some interpreters who use the literary approach to single words have interpreted the verse on Ādam's (a) disobedience and oppression in a way that it does not need rejection of the infallibility, even if the infallibility is believed necessary in the period before Ādam's (a) prophethood. According to this interpretive viewpoint, departure from the Garden is not oppression to God's right or violation of His forbidding prohibition, but rather, it means losing the benefit and Divine blessing (Ṭūsī, n.d. vol. 1: 158; Subḥānī, 1992: 116-128). In Ādam's (a) story, it has been the preference to live out of the Garden over the life inside that special garden with welfare and comfort that led Ādam (a) to lose that welfare and the blessing of living in the Garden (Abū Muslim Iṣfahānī, 2009: 441). According to this stance, the falsity of infallibility violation is the outcome of jurisprudential-theological approach to these verses that have influenced the understanding of the single words of the verses on Ādam's (a) disobedience and oppression.

### **The falsity of Ādam (a) and Eve's polytheism**

From the appearance of the verses "It is He Who created you from a single person, and made his mate of like nature, in order that he might dwell with

her (in love). When they are united, she bears a light burden and carries it about (unnoticed). When she grows heavy, they both pray to God their Lord, (saying): 'If Thou givest us a goodly child, we vow we shall (ever) be grateful.' But when He giveth them a goodly child, they ascribe to others a share in the gift they have received: but God is exalted high above the partners they ascribe to Him" (Qur'ān 7:189-190) and some narrations (Tirmidhī, 1983, vol. 5: 267; Ibn Ḥanbal, n.d. vol. 7: 255) it seems that after bestowal of a goodly child to Ādam (a) and Eve, they perpetrated a kind of polytheism toward God. How is this polytheism compatible with the prophethood and infallibility of Ādam (a)?

### **Evaluation**

- According to an interpretive viewpoint, the addressee of the verses relied upon in this falsity are not Ādam (a) and Eve, but rather, these verses address the human species including men and women who – after been given a child – have been fully engaged with their child and have decreased the purity of their attention to God or have totally neglected Him (Ṭabrisī, 1993, vol. 4: 782; Fakhr Razi, 1999, vol. 15: 428). In addition, some have considered the addressee of the phrase "the partners they ascribe to Him" the polytheist children of Ādam (a) and Eve. This view could be compatible with the foregoing interpretive viewpoint and is in line with some narrations from the Descendants of the Prophet (a) (Sayyid Murtidā, 1989, 16).
- The majority of the narrations relied upon in this falsity suffer from weak origin and content, because they have not been reported in the Shī'a and Sunnī canonical and authentic resources and the owners of the early narrative collections of both denominations have avoided quoting them. With regard to content, too, they have serious conflicts with the concept of Divine Unity as they are in need of ascribing a clearly untrue act to Ādam (a). It seems that the content of the foregoing traditions aim at promotion of polytheism and glorification of Satan. Reports of these narrations in some Shī'a resources can be justified by taking them as acts of precautionary concealment, narration fabrication, or their ascription to the Shī'a in these resources by opponents of this denomination (Majlisī, 1989, vol. 11: 251).
- According to some narrations, the foregoing polytheism has been polytheism in obedience rather than in worshipping ('Ayāshī, n.d. vol. 2: 43). Therefore, the acceptance of Satan's suggestion in naming the child is not incompatible with the infallibility and prophethood of Ādam (a). It seems that this narration, because of its agreement with

the laymen's opinion and incongruity with the theological bases of prophethood, has been issued due to precautionary concealment, because it requires Ādam (a) and Eve's lack of experience and awareness about the bitter departure from the Paradise that would follow Satan's temptation, as well as the point that the prophets' realm is free from any polytheism. However, Ādam (a) has been a prophet in that period, because the birth of his children has happened at the time of his prophethood on the Earth, not at the time when he lived in the Paradise.

### **Conclusion**

The falsities about Ādam's (a) story in the Qur'ān can be generally classified into three categories of personality, religion, and infallibility. This falsity is the outcome of reliance on the appearance of the Qur'ān in the interpretation of the verses, ignorance of the theological bases in discussing the prophethood and infallibility of the prophets as well as some literary ideas. Observing the correct rules of the interpretation of the Qur'ān and relying on narrations from the Descendants of the Prophet (a), the Imāmīte interpreters have criticized these falsities and have provided a response compatible with the qur'ānic aims of quoting the story of Ādam and congruent with the theological bases of the prophethood. The narrative evidences of these falsities do not enjoy the necessary authenticity and have been influenced by ideas that wanted to obviate the infallibility of the prophets. Sometimes, the traditionalist approach has had a role in the promotion of these falsities. The mere reporting of these narrations in a narrative resource does not mean that these narrations have content validity. Therefore, the Imāmīte interpreters have not accepted their authenticity. Expansion of these falsities in the era when the Descendants of the Prophet have been present is an indicator of their oldness and it is necessary for the Imāmīte denomination to attain a unitary theory in responding to these falsities.

**Resources**

The Noble Qur'ān

‘Abduh, M. (1947), *Tafsīr al-Manār*. Cairo, Dār al-Manār.

Abū Muslim Iṣfahānī, M. (2009), *Jami‘ al-ta’wīl limuḥ kam al-tanzīl*. Edited by Maḥmūd Sarmadī, Tehran, n.p.

Abū Zuhrah, M. (1987), *Zuhrah al-tafāsīr*. Beirut, Dār al-Fikr al-‘Arabī.

Amīnī Ḥājīābādī, M. R. & M. R. Khudā’ī (2014), «The historical and imaginative allegorical esoteric interpretations of Ādam's story in the selected commentaries». *Qur’ānic Teachings*, No. 19, pp. 155-178.

‘Ayāshī, M. (n.d.), *Tafsīr al-‘Ayāshī*. Edited by Hāshim Rasūlī Maḥallātī, Tehran, Al-Maktabat al-‘Ilmīyyah al-Islāmīyyah.

Fakhr Rāzī, M. (1999), *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb*. Beirut, Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī.

Faḍlullāh, M. Ḥ. (1998), *Tafsīr min waḥy al-Qur’ān*. Beirut, Dār al-Malāk lil-Ṭibā‘ah wa al-Nashr.

Ḥimyarī Qomī, A. (1992), *Qurb al-isnād*. Qom, Āl al-Bayt institute.

Ibn Ḥanbal, A. (n.d.), *Musnad Aḥmad*. Lebanon, Daru Ṣādir.

Jawādī Āmūlī, A. (2013), *Tafsīr tasnīm*. Qom, Isrā’ Institute.

Jam‘īyyah al-Tajdīd al-Thaqāfīyyah al-Ijtimā‘īyyah, *Wa ‘aṣā Ādam (a): al-Ḥaqīqah dūn qinā‘* (2007), Damascus, Dār Kuyūn.

Khalafullāh, M. A. (1999), *Al-fan al-qiṣaṣī fī al-Qur’ān*. Beirut, Al-Intishārāt al-‘Arabī.

Khumeinī, M. (1997), *Tafsīr al-Qur’ān al-karīm*. Qom, the Institute for the Arrangement and Publication of Imām Khumeinī's Works.

Kulaynī, M. (1986), *Al-Kāfī*. Edited by ‘Alī Akbar Ghaffārī. Tehran, Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmīyyah.

Mahdawīnezhād, M. Ḥ. & M. R. Khudā’ī (2013), «Analysis of Mullā Ṣadra's principles in his interpretation of Ādam's (a) story». *Ḥikmat Ṣadrā’ī*, No. 1, pp. 99-116.

Majlisī, M. B. (1989), *Biḥār al-anwār*. Beirut, Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī.

Ma‘rifāt, M. H. (2007), *Shubahāt wa rudūd Ḥawl al-Qur’ān*. Qom, Tamhīd Institute.

Māzandarānī, M. Ṣ. (2000), *Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfī*. Beirut, Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī.

Muṭahharī, M. (2006), *The Divine Revelation and Prophethood*, Collection of Martyred Master Muṭahharī. Tehran, Ṣadrā Publications.

Naqībzādeh, M. (2011), «Realization of the Qur’ān and its effects on the interpretation from the viewpoint of Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī». *Qur’ān Shinakht*. No. 8, pp. 65-92.

- Robertson, A. (1999), *Jesus: myth or history?* Translated by Ḥusein Tuḥfīqī. Qom, the Center for Studies and Research on Religions and Denominations.
- Ṣādiqī Tehrānī, M. (1986), *Al-Furqān fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān bil-Qurʾān*. Qom, the Islamic Culture Publications.
- Ṣadūq, M. (1996), *Amālī*. Qom, Mūʾassisah al-Biʿthah.
- Id. (1989), *ʿUyūn akhbār al-Riḍā (a)*. Beirut, Mūʾassisah al-Aʿlamī lil-Maṭbūʿāt.
- Sayyid Murṭiḍā, A. (1989), *Tanzīh al-anbiāʾ*. Beirut, Dār al-Aḍwāʾ.
- Shahrūr, M. (1997), *Al-Kitāb wa al-Qurʾān: Qirāʾah Muʾāṣirah*. Damascus, Al-Ahālī.
- Sharīʿatī, A. (2002), *The Collection of works*. Tehran, Ḥuseinīyyah Irshād.
- Subḥānī, J. (1992), *The sound interpretation of the verses with difficult words*. Edited by Hādī Khusrushāhī, Qom, Imām Ṣādiq (a) Institute Press.
- Tirmidhī, M. (1983), *Al-Sunan*. Beirut, Dār al-Fikr.
- Ṭabāṭabāʾī, M. Ḥ. (1996), *Al-Mīzān fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān*. Qom, Jāmiʿah Mudarrisīn Ḥawzah ʿIlmīyyah.
- Ṭabarī, A. M. (1991), *Jāmiʿ al-Bayān fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān*. Beirut, Dār al-Maʿrifah Publications.
- Ṭabrisī, F. (1993), *Majmaʿ al-Bayān fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān*. Tehran, Nāṣir Khusru Publications.
- Ṭabrisī, A. (1931), *Al-Iḥtijāj*. Najaf, Al-Maṭbaʿah al-Murtaḍawīyyah.
- Ṭayyīb Ḥuseinī, M. (2013), *The Pathology of interpretive movements*. Qom, Ṭūsī, M. (1979), *Al-Iqtisād fīmā Yataʿlāq bil-Iʿtiqād*. Tehran, Maktabat Jāmiʿ Chihilsutūn.
- Id. (n.d.), *Al-Tibyān fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān*. Lebanon, Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī.