

# Critique of the Doctrine of Jesus as “Perfect Man and Fully Divine”

## Introduction

According to orthodox Christian theology, Jesus Christ is believed to be both fully God and fully human simultaneously – a doctrine known as the **Incarnation** or **hypostatic union** <sup>1</sup>. This means that in the one person of Jesus, all the attributes of divinity and all the attributes of humanity are united without mixing or diminution <sup>1</sup>. On the surface, this presents a **paradox**: how can one individual “simultaneously possess all the limitations of humanity and all the unlimited attributes of divinity?” <sup>2</sup>. This claim raises numerous questions and concerns from scientific, philosophical, and theological perspectives – especially when viewed through the lens of Islamic theology, which emphasizes God’s absolute oneness and transcendence. In this critique, we will examine the Christian belief in Jesus as a *perfect man* and *fully divine* and analyze the challenges it poses. We will draw on scholarly discussions and analogies – including examples of conjoined twins and **dissociative identity disorder** – to explore whether any natural phenomenon can metaphorically support or undermine the concept of multiple natures or persons in one being. Throughout, the analysis will reflect an Islamic perspective, upholding the **strict monotheism (tawhīd)** of Islam and questioning the coherence of the incarnation dogma.

## The Christian Doctrine of Incarnation and Dual Nature

In Christian doctrine, the Incarnation refers to God becoming human in the person of Jesus Christ. The Council of Chalcedon (451 CE) formalized the teaching that Jesus is “*truly God and truly man*,” possessing two complete natures (divine and human) united in one person <sup>3</sup> <sup>4</sup>. According to this creed, Jesus is co-equal with God the Father in his divinity, while being like other humans in his humanity (albeit without sin) <sup>4</sup>. In other words, Jesus Christ is asserted to be 100% God and 100% man at the same time. Christian theologians insist that these two natures are joined “*without confusion, without change, without division, without separation*,” such that Jesus remains one person (one “hypostasis”) <sup>1</sup> <sup>5</sup>. This mysterious union is considered essential for Christian salvation theology: as God, Jesus has the power to save, and as man, Jesus can represent humanity. The belief is celebrated each year at Christmas and is regarded as a profound mystery of faith <sup>6</sup>.

While all major Chalcedonian Christian denominations (Catholic, Orthodox, and most Protestants) affirm the hypostatic union, they also acknowledge it as a **divine mystery** that defies full human understanding <sup>7</sup>. Some early Christian sects grappled with this concept: for example, **Arians** denied Jesus’ full divinity, and **Docetists** denied his full humanity <sup>8</sup>. However, orthodox Christianity rejected these views and maintained that Jesus is fully both. Thus, the **official Christian claim** – and the one this critique examines – is that “*Jesus Christ is both a perfect man and fully divine*” simultaneously <sup>2</sup>.

## Islamic Theological Perspective on Jesus and Divinity

**Islam** categorically rejects the notion of any human being who is God or equal to God. In Islamic theology, God (Allah) is absolutely one (tawḥīd) – **unique, eternal, and transcendent** – and “*neither begets nor is begotten*,” as stated in the Qur’an (Surah Al-Ikhlāṣ 112:3-4). Jesus (ʿĪsā) is highly honored in the Qur’an as a remarkable prophet and Messiah to the Israelites, born miraculously of the Virgin Mary, but **never considered divine**. The Qur’an explicitly denies the Trinity and the incarnation:

**“O People of the Book, do not go to extremes in your faith. ... Jesus, son of Mary, was only a messenger of Allah ... So believe in Allah and His messengers and do not say ‘Trinity.’ Cease, it is better for you! Indeed, Allah is one God; exalted is He above having a son.” – Qur’an 4:171.**

From the Islamic perspective, calling Jesus “the Son of God” or worshipping him alongside God violates the pure monotheism that “*God is One*” (Qur’an 112:1) and is regarded as an act of *shirk* (associating partners with God). In fact, the Qur’an depicts Jesus on the Day of Judgment denying ever claiming divinity: **“When God says, ‘O Jesus, son of Mary, did you say to the people: Take me and my mother as gods besides Allah?’, he will say, ‘Glory be to You! I could never say what I had no right to say... I told them only what You commanded me: Worship Allah, my Lord and your Lord.’”**<sup>9</sup>. This emphasizes that Jesus in Islamic understanding instructed people to worship God alone.

Furthermore, Islam stresses that **God does not incarnate** as a human. God in Islam is all-powerful and does not experience human limitations such as birth, hunger, or death. The Qur’an challenges the idea of any lesser deities or god-men by asking, “*Show Me what your other ‘gods’ have created on the earth*”<sup>10</sup> – a rhetorical demand that false gods (or deified humans) have no creative power. This challenge applies to Jesus as well: from the Islamic standpoint, Jesus in his human nature “*did not create anything*” of the universe<sup>11</sup>. All creation is solely God’s work, and a finite human (whose human life began at a point in time) could not have created the heavens and earth<sup>12</sup>. Thus, for Muslims, the doctrine that Jesus is an eternal Creator in one aspect and a temporal creature in another is seen as a logical impossibility and a theological error<sup>12</sup>. The Qur’an also notes that Jesus and his mother “*both used to eat food*” (Qur’an 5:75) – underlining their human mortality and dependence on sustenance, which are incompatible with the idea of divinity. Any suggestion that God became a man is viewed as diminishing God’s majesty and purity of unity. In summary, Islam venerates Jesus as a **prophet and messiah** but firmly negates his divinity, considering the dogma of a God-Man as an affront to the oneness and perfection of God.

## Philosophical and Logical Contradictions of a God-Man

From a philosophical standpoint, the proposition that Jesus is fully divine and fully human at the same time faces serious logical challenges. The classical **law of non-contradiction** in logic states that something cannot be A and *not* A in the same sense at the same time<sup>13</sup>. Yet the Chalcedonian creed asks believers to accept that Jesus is wholly infinite God and wholly finite man simultaneously<sup>14</sup>. This appears analogous to claiming a being is a “**square circle**” – in other words, an outright contradiction<sup>15</sup>. The reason is that the

defining attributes of “God” and “human” seem mutually exclusive. Philosophers often formalize the paradox like this <sup>15</sup> :

- **Premise 1:** To be **fully God** entails having divine attributes (e.g. infinitude, omnipotence, omniscience, immortality, absolute perfection).
- **Premise 2:** To be **fully human** entails having human attributes (finitude, limited power and knowledge, mortality, fallibility).
- **Premise 3:** The Incarnation claims one person possesses *all* divine attributes and *all* human attributes at once <sup>15</sup> .
- **Conclusion:** Therefore, the claim “*Jesus is fully God and fully man*” implies one person simultaneously **has and lacks** the same properties (infinite *and* finite, omniscient *and* not omniscient, etc.), a *prima facie* **contradiction** <sup>16</sup> .

Indeed, examining specific attributes highlights the paradox. For example, God by definition knows everything, while a human mind is limited and does not know many things. Yet Christians assert Jesus had a divine mind that was omniscient *and* a human mind that could be ignorant. The New Testament itself illustrates this tension: Jesus sometimes displays supernatural knowledge, but at other times he explicitly admits limited knowledge. In the Gospel of Mark, Jesus says “*of that day or hour no one knows, not even the Son, but only the Father*” – indicating the Son (Jesus) did **not** know the timing of the end of days <sup>17</sup> . Such a statement is incompatible with **total omniscience**, since God by nature knows the “day and hour.” Similarly, the Gospel of Luke describes Jesus as a child who “*grew in wisdom*” (Luke 2:52), implying that his knowledge increased over time – something that makes sense for a human being, but not for an all-knowing God <sup>18</sup> . Christian philosophers acknowledge this apparent contradiction: “*How could Jesus be both omniscient God and non-omniscient human at the same time?*” <sup>19</sup> . If, as a baby or a boy, Jesus’s knowledge was limited, it begs the pointed question one theologian asked: “*When Jesus was a little zygote in the womb of Mary, did he also know what was happening on some planet at the other end of the universe?*” <sup>20</sup> . If one answers *yes* (he did know, by virtue of divinity), it defies the reality of a developing human brain; if *no*, then at that time he lacked divine omniscience. Any resolution seems to require partitioning Jesus’ identity into two awarenesses or two minds – but then is that one person or two?

The same kind of contradiction arises with other attributes:

- **Mortality vs. Immortality:** God is *immortal* (cannot die), yet Jesus as man *died* on the cross according to Christian belief. Did **God die** on Calvary? Most Christian theologians will say the **divine nature** did not die, only Jesus’s human nature experienced death. But if death is the separation of soul from body, and the *person* of Jesus died, how can one part of him die without implicating the whole person? It starts sounding as if *two different subjects* are at work (a mortal Jesus and an immortal Christ) – which verges on the heresy of Nestorianism (splitting Christ into two persons). If one says God the Son *did not* actually die, then the sacrifice is arguably not the death of an infinite God at all, but merely a human prophet – which undermines the theological claim that an infinite atonement was made. This dilemma – “*Did God die or not?*” – has no satisfying answer without stepping outside orthodox definitions. As one analysis puts it: if we say *yes*, then “*the immortal died – a contradiction.*” If we say *no*, “*then was it truly God who was incarnate and sacrificed?*” <sup>21</sup> . In either case, the **identity of Christ’s person** seems to split between two different sets of experiences, “*resembling two persons more than two natures of one person.*” <sup>21</sup> .

- **Omnipotence vs. human weakness:** God is all-powerful (**omnipotent**), yet as a man Jesus felt fatigue, pain, and physical limitations. The Gospels depict him hungry and exhausted, even too weak to carry his cross all the way <sup>22</sup>. A traditional explanation is that Jesus *chose* not to use his divine power to spare himself suffering – i.e. his infinite power was present but voluntarily restrained <sup>23</sup>. However, from a logical perspective, if an ability is *never* actualized or manifested, can we say it was truly there? During his earthly life, Jesus functioned within normal human limits, which is practically indistinguishable from not having omnipotence (aside from performing specific miracles occasionally) <sup>22</sup>. An omnipotent being could not be overpowered or killed by his creatures unless he mysteriously *allowed* it; but then the “allowing” again posits two centers of will – one that could act but defers to another that suffers. The scenario raises the puzzle of a *divided self*: one aspect of Jesus that has all power and one that experiences weakness. It’s unclear how that is meaningfully different from saying there are *two persons* (one divine, one human) cooperating, which Christianity denies.
- **Omnipresence vs. locality:** In Christian theology, God is omnipresent – present everywhere in the universe at once. A **human being**, on the other hand, is confined to one place at a time. During Jesus’s life in Palestine, his physical body occupied a single location, moving through towns in Galilee and Judea. He was not simultaneously present in China or the Americas in his human form. If Jesus was *fully divine* during that time, was he somehow also *everywhere* while his human nature was in one spot? Some Christian thinkers say that Jesus’ divine nature remained omnipresent (filling heaven and earth) even as his human nature was localized <sup>24</sup> <sup>25</sup>. But this implies the **Person** of Jesus had two modes of existence: one dispersed throughout the cosmos and one limited to a small locale <sup>26</sup>. It is hard to conceive of a single personal subject with two different spatial existences. It starts to sound like the divine Son was operating a remote “avatar” body on earth, which again makes one wonder if the incarnation is essentially a facade (Docetism) or a split personality of some kind. As a scientific matter, an infinite omnipresent being “**concentrating itself**” in one human body is beyond comprehension – it “*defies the notion of a localized incarnation.*” <sup>27</sup> No physical theory can accommodate an entity that is simultaneously the size of a human and the size of the universe. So either Jesus gave up omnipresence during incarnation (meaning at that time he wasn’t fully divine in that attribute), or the earthly Jesus was not the full extension of the Son of God. Both options concede a gap between **theoretical divinity** and **observed humanity**, underscoring that the two modes do not truly coincide <sup>28</sup>.

These examples (knowledge, mortality, power, presence, etc.) illustrate the *dual nature dilemma*. Christian apologetics responds by emphasizing that Jesus is *one person with two natures*, and that statements about him must be carefully attributed to the correct nature (a framework sometimes called “**the communication of idioms**” – e.g. “Jesus was thirsty” refers to his human nature, while “Jesus upholds the universe” refers to his divine nature). They argue this avoids direct logical contradiction because Jesus is not said to be “God and not-God in the same respect” – rather, he is God *in one respect* (nature) and man *in another respect* <sup>29</sup>. This hair-splitting is meant to satisfy the law of non-contradiction. However, critics point out that this solution often **just restates the paradox** instead of truly resolving it <sup>30</sup>. We are still left saying *one person* has two sets of predicates that fundamentally conflict. As the philosopher Leibniz’s Law of identity argues: if one entity has even one property that another lacks at the same time, they **cannot be identical** <sup>31</sup>. Applying that: if “God” by definition **cannot die or be ignorant**, but Jesus *did* die and at times lacked knowledge, then strictly speaking Jesus cannot be identical to God in the straightforward sense <sup>32</sup>. The incarnation doctrine tries to circumvent this by a kind of dual reference (Jesus with respect to divinity vs. humanity). Yet in the end, “*persons, not abstract natures, are the subjects who live, know, and die,*” so saying only the human nature suffered or didn’t know something tends to undermine the claim that a single

**personal subject** is fully both <sup>21</sup>. It leads to the question: Is Jesus one **conscious self** or two? If one self, how can a single self both know and not know a fact at the same time? If two centers of consciousness exist (a divine mind and a human mind), then in what meaningful sense is it one person and not two? <sup>33</sup> These are deep philosophical quandaries. Christian theologians often ultimately appeal to **mystery** – asserting that the incarnation is unique and not bound by ordinary logical categories. But from a rational perspective (and certainly from the Islamic perspective), invoking mystery at the point of contradiction can be seen as an admission that the doctrine is not fully coherent. As one rigorous analysis concluded, *“Jesus cannot be literally ‘fully human and fully God’ in the same moment without [inviting] some form of contradiction or mystery”* <sup>34</sup>.

## Scientific and Empirical Perspectives: Can Two Natures or Persons Coexist in One Being?

From a scientific standpoint – encompassing biology, physics, and psychology – the idea of a dual divine-human nature in one person also faces significant challenges. While science does not adjudicate theology, it provides an understanding of what is physically and cognitively possible for human beings. By examining whether any analogous phenomena exist in nature, we can test if the concept of multiple natures or persons in one being is coherent or if it resembles known pathologies.

### Human Cognitive Limits and Dual Consciousness

A human mind, as studied by cognitive science, is finite. Neuroscience shows that the brain has limited capacity for memory and information processing, and a human being’s knowledge grows gradually through learning and experience <sup>35</sup>. An **omniscient mind**, by contrast, would entail knowing every detail of the universe instantly and effortlessly. It is **difficult to imagine** a single mind or brain that could be both of these things at once <sup>36</sup>. For instance, the scenario posed earlier – *did the infant Jesus know about distant galaxies while lying in the manger?* – highlights a practical incompatibility <sup>37</sup>. If he **did** have such knowledge, his baby brain would have to somehow contain and handle infinite information, which **no finite neural network** could support <sup>38</sup>. If he **did not** have that knowledge, then at that moment he was not functioning as an omniscient divine mind. Some Christian theologians theorize that Jesus’ divine nature **“stored”** the infinite knowledge in a non-physical way, while his human consciousness was unaware of it except when selectively accessed <sup>39</sup>. But scientifically, this implies Jesus had something like a *dual consciousness* or *partitioned mind*. Notably, **“there is no precedent in psychology for a healthy single person having two independent centers of consciousness”** with such a gap in knowledge between them <sup>40</sup>. The only remotely comparable cases are *pathological* conditions – for example, patients with a split corpus callosum (split-brain patients) or **dissociative identity disorder (DID)** – and those are **impairments** rather than examples of a “perfect” unified mind <sup>40</sup>.

Dissociative Identity Disorder, formerly called multiple personality disorder, is a psychiatric condition in which one human body appears to host **two or more distinct identities or personality states** that take turns controlling the person’s behavior <sup>41</sup>. At first glance, one might think this is analogous to multiple “persons” in one being. However, DID is **far from a divine mystery – it is considered a mental disorder** resulting from trauma, wherein the mind has *fragmented* into disconnected parts as a coping mechanism <sup>42</sup> <sup>43</sup>. Each alter identity in DID typically has access to only certain memories or skills, and often one alter has amnesia for what another knows or does <sup>41</sup> <sup>44</sup>. For example, in one famous documented case from the 19th century, a patient named Louis Vivet exhibited as many as **ten distinct personalities**, with striking

differences among them: one personality was **paralyzed** in the legs while another could walk freely, and each alter had unique memories and habits <sup>44</sup>. This dramatic fragmentation shows how mutually exclusive traits can exist in one body – but only by isolating them into different personality streams, which is inherently dysfunctional. In DID, when one alter is “in control,” the others are not consciously present, leading to memory gaps and inconsistencies in behavior. This is clearly a *pathological* state, often requiring therapy to reintegrate the personalities into one cohesive self <sup>42</sup> <sup>43</sup>. No psychologist would describe DID as a “perfect” way of being; rather, it is a **disorder** to be healed, ideally by restoring a single, unified identity.

The relevance of DID to the Incarnation debate is that if one argues Jesus had essentially a dual consciousness (a human mind and a separate divine mind) contained in one person, this starts to resemble the concept of multiple personalities in one individual. And if *that* is the case, it raises the unsettling implication that the incarnation would be akin to a mental disorder rather than the state of a perfect divine-human union. In fact, scholars of DID raise fundamental questions that resonate here: “*What does it mean to be ‘one person?’*” and how essential is integrated memory and self-awareness to personhood <sup>43</sup>. A **mind divided against itself** – even if one calls one side “divine” and the other “human” – seems to violate the very notion of a single personal identity. It would mean Jesus Christ was not a singular consciousness, but a composite being whose halves might have had vastly different knowledge and perspectives. This is far from the harmonious unity one expects of a divine being. In short, modern psychology suggests that a “*many-in-one*” mind is either a **fiction** or a **malady**, not a description of a healthy, whole person <sup>42</sup> <sup>40</sup>. The **Islamic perspective** would add that prophets – especially one regarded as “perfect” like Jesus – would not be afflicted with such an internal dichotomy or confusion.

## Physical and Biological Constraints

Beyond the mind, the physical reality of a human body imposes limitations that conflict with divine attributes. A human being occupies a **finite volume in space** and cannot physically be present in more than one location at a time <sup>45</sup>. This is a basic fact of biology and physics. The Christian doctrine that Jesus is also God implies that he would be **omnipresent** (present everywhere) even during the Incarnation. But as discussed, it is inconceivable how a single living person could literally have two modes of spatial existence (localized and omnipresent) simultaneously <sup>26</sup>. No experiment or observation in physics has ever indicated that an entity of human size can also exist as a universe-spanning entity. If one were to frame it scientifically, the **density** of having infinite being squeezed into finite form would break our understanding of matter and space. It would mean an infinite amount of “God-stuff” somehow hidden inside or coincident with a 5-foot-something tall human frame – a notion that verges on meaningless. Thus, from a physics point of view, “*you cannot fit an infinite presence into a finite body*” <sup>28</sup> without abandoning normal definitions of presence.

Likewise, consider **mortality and biology**. Jesus, being human, experienced hunger, thirst, fatigue, and ultimately death (according to Christianity). These are functions of having a typical human biology – metabolism, cellular life cycle, susceptibility to injury. God, however, is understood in both Christianity and Islam to be **immortal and not subject to death or bodily needs**. To say the immortal became mortal creates a contradiction in terms. Some theologians claim that the divine nature is impassible and immortal, so only the human nature suffered and died. But biologically, if the human nature of Jesus died, then the person Jesus died – one cannot separate a dying “nature” from the person who has that nature. The **Islamic view** flatly rejects that God could be born or die at all; the Qur’an states “*He is the Ever-Living (al-Ḥayy) and does not die*” (Qur’an 25:58, 2:255). The idea of God subjecting Himself to human death is not just a theological absurdity to Muslims, but it undermines the very definition of **divinity**. As an early Christian

philosopher (and saint), Ignatius of Antioch, reportedly asked in perplexity: “*How can the Uncreated be created? How can the Immortal die?*” – questions that remain difficult for Christian theology to answer in purely logical terms.

## Metaphors and Analogies: Conjoined Twins and Other “Multiple-in-One” Phenomena

Christian apologists sometimes turn to analogies in nature to help illustrate the Trinity or the Incarnation. An interesting case is that of **conjoined twins** – two distinct persons who are physically joined in one body. Could this phenomenon serve as a metaphor for multiple persons in one being (as the Trinity posits) or two natures in one person (as in Jesus)? A recent essay raised the question of a “*Video of Conjoined Twins: Could it be a metaphor for or against the Trinity — as three persons in one being?*”<sup>46</sup>. Focusing on conjoined twins can indeed be illuminating.

**Conjoined twins** are identical twins whose bodies are fused in the womb and who are born physically attached to some extent. They are extremely rare (occurring in about 1 in 50,000–200,000 births) and often face severe medical challenges<sup>47</sup>. Those that survive into adulthood present a scenario of **two individuals sharing parts of one body**. For example, the famous 19th-century Siamese twins Chang and Eng Bunker were joined at the torso by a band of cartilage and liver tissue. More modern cases include twins who share significant organs or limbs. Perhaps the most well-known living example is **Abby and Brittany Hensel**, dicephalic conjoined twins who effectively share one body from the neck down with two heads (each controlling one side of the body). If one were looking for a **real-world instance of “multiple persons in one corporeal being,”** conjoined twins come close. However, the crucial observation is that even in these cases, *personhood and identity remain distinct*. The two heads house two separate brains and minds. **Each twin has their own personality, thoughts, and will**, even though their bodies are literally stuck together. They coordinate to walk or perform tasks, but they can have different preferences and even argue or disagree, just as any siblings might – only with far less physical privacy. Studies and personal testimonies of adult conjoined twins show that they emphatically consider themselves **two different people**, not one being. For instance, Abby and Brittany Hensel developed different interests and talents, and they will use “I” or their own name when expressing an individual opinion that the other twin does not share<sup>48</sup>. Another pair, Lori and George (formerly Dori) Schappell, remained conjoined into adulthood and led distinct lives to the extent possible; one twin adopted a transgender male identity and a musical career, while the other did not – vividly demonstrating that “*they are not one fused personality but two people who made different life choices within the constraints of their physical union.*”<sup>49</sup>. In short, conjoinment may merge bodies, but it **does not merge souls**. The twins may feel inseparable in a literal sense, and they often develop a profound cooperation and mutual understanding, but each twin experiences a distinct stream of consciousness.

If we attempt to use conjoined twins as an analogy for the Trinity (three persons, one being) or for Jesus’ dual nature, we encounter as many problems as insights. In the Trinity’s case, conjoined twins (or even theoretically conjoined triplets) would suggest multiple centers of consciousness sharing some physical matter. But in orthodox Trinitarian doctrine, God’s being is not a physical body that can be partitioned – God is spirit. Moreover, each Person of the Trinity is fully God, not one-third of God. Conjoined twins, however, are *two persons who each possess only part of a body*. They depend on each other’s cooperation to survive, especially if they share vital organs. This is clearly not an image of a singular omnipotent being. It might actually argue **against** the Trinity: if even in extreme physical union two human persons remain separate in mind and often in unequal control of their shared body, then the idea of three divine Persons completely sharing one *essence* without any division or conflict (as Trinity doctrine claims) has no real parallel in nature – it is even more **mysterious**. If one twin dies, the other often cannot survive depending on the shared

physiology; does that imply if one person of the Godhead “died” (e.g. Jesus’s human death), the Godhead would be jeopardized? (Christianity would answer no, thereby again departing from any natural analogy). Thus, conjoined twins illustrate how **two persons in one physical entity** still experience individuality and sometimes tension – not a harmonic single will. From an Islamic standpoint, this underlines the Quran’s argument that if there were multiple gods or divine persons, *“surely they would have competed with each other for power, and the universe would fall into chaos”* (cf. Qur’an 21:22). **Unity of will and essence is only perfectly possible if God is one**; multiple persons inherently introduce the possibility of divergence, as even conjoined twins show in a limited way.

On the other hand, could conjoined twins serve as a metaphor for Jesus having two natures? Perhaps one might imagine each twin’s mind representing one “nature,” and the conjoined body representing the one person of Jesus. But this falls apart on close analysis: Jesus is said to be one person with one consciousness, not two minds cooperating. If we liken it to conjoined twins, we’d have **two consciousnesses (one divine, one human) in one bodily frame**, which as discussed is essentially to posit **two persons** internally. That again is something orthodox Christianity denies (Jesus is not two persons). So the analogy doesn’t support the orthodox view – rather, it veers into a *Nestorian* view (dividing Jesus into two personal entities loosely connected). Additionally, conjoined twins are considered a birth abnormality – a tragic one in many cases. It would seem the wrong metaphor for the God-man, whom Christians consider the most perfect union of God with His creation. If anything, the necessity of **surgical separation** in many conjoined twin cases (to give each individual a chance at a healthier life) might metaphorically suggest that two fully functional beings are better off separate than forced into one body. In the Islamic narrative, interestingly, Allah created Jesus without a father as a **sign of His power**, but Jesus remains purely human and a servant of God. There is no concept of God needing to fuse Himself with a human; such an idea would seem as strange as the notion of two people fused in one body – an oddity, not a perfection.

Finally, the **scientific perspective** can be summarized as follows: the claim of a dual nature (infinite God and finite man) united in one being is **beyond anything observed in nature** and appears incompatible with fundamental realities of mind and matter. As one detailed analysis concluded, *“from the standpoint of cognitive science, being fully human (with a normal finite mind) is incompatible with being omniscient. From the standpoint of physics, a human body’s finite presence and power cannot literally encompass omnipresence and omnipotence.”* <sup>38</sup> <sup>28</sup> Any attempt to combine such disparate qualities ends up effectively suspending the laws of logic or the laws of nature – invoking the **supernatural** in a way that starts to sound self-contradictory. To Muslims, God is indeed supernatural and capable of all miracles, but **logical contradictions** are not things – even Islam holds that *“Allah’s power”* does not include doing the intrinsically impossible (such as creating a square circle or ceasing to be God). The Quran frequently appeals to reason and natural signs to understand God’s nature; nowhere does it hint that God can become a man – in fact, it says the opposite, *“God is not a man”* (see Numbers 23:19 in the Bible, which Muslims often quote in interfaith debates to make this point).

## Conclusion

In conclusion, from an **Islamic theological perspective** the doctrine of Jesus as a perfect man and fully divine is untenable – it conflicts with the absolute oneness and transcendence of God, and it raises insurmountable logical and scientific problems. The unity of God in Islam is simple and uncompromising: God does not incarnate and does not share His being with any other nature or person. The Christian claim that Jesus has two natures united in one person has been shown to entail deep **philosophical paradoxes**, essentially asking believers to accept that the immutable Almighty was also a mutable, mortal man – a



notion that to the Muslim mind compromises God's perfection and unity. Even on a conceptual level, attempts to rationalize the Incarnation end up in mystery or apparent contradiction <sup>16</sup> <sup>21</sup> .

Furthermore, looking at **empirical reality**, we find that any analogies for "multiple in one" – such as multiple personality disorder (DID) or conjoined twins – underscore division rather than a true unity of being. If one were to suggest that Jesus had something akin to multiple consciousness states (divine and human), that would resemble a psychological **impairment**, not the sublime state of a divine being <sup>40</sup> . And if one points to conjoined human persons sharing one body, it only demonstrates that distinct minds do not magically merge into one; they remain separate individuals who happen to share flesh <sup>48</sup> . In Islam's view, **God is far above** any such composite or divided existence: "*Glorified be Allah far above what they attribute to Him*" (Qur'an 21:22).

Ultimately, the critique can be summed up in a straightforward way: a being **cannot be finite and infinite, temporal and eternal, created and uncreated, mortal and immortal, all at once in the same sense**. The Christian doctrine of Jesus tries to say "yes, he is all of these at once," but then has to add many caveats ("in his human nature" vs "in his divine nature") to avoid open contradiction <sup>29</sup> . Those caveats, however, create an abstract and unfalsifiable idea that does not correspond to any clear reality we understand. In contrast, the Islamic portrayal of Jesus is logically consistent and spiritually pure: he was a **perfect man** – in the sense of being a righteous, miraculously born prophet – **but not divine**. His status as Messiah and Word from God (kalimatullah) is honored, yet he remains always a servant of God, never God Himself. Islam invites Christians to return to the clarity of worshipping the **One who alone has no limitations or equal**, rather than trying to reconcile an essentially **unsolvable puzzle** of a God-man. As the Qur'an rhetorically asks those who elevate Jesus to divinity: "*Now, show Me what your other gods have created of the earth*" <sup>10</sup> . Jesus, for all his revered qualities, did not create the world – **the Almighty Creator did**. Therefore, attributing full divinity to Jesus is, in Islamic theology, both a logical mistake and a theological transgression.

In a scholarly analysis of this doctrine (such as the articles we have drawn upon), the conclusion is often that one must either **accept paradox** or **rethink the doctrine**. Many contemporary Christian theologians concede that the Incarnation is a "*mystery*" beyond reason. From an Islamic viewpoint, however, God's truth is not irrational. The insistence on pure monotheism means God's nature is straightforward: utterly one, unparalleled, and indivisible. Any teaching that muddles this clarity – no matter how well-intentioned or ancient – is seen as a deviation from the original monotheistic message of Jesus and all prophets: "*Worship God, my Lord and your Lord*" (Qur'an 5:117) <sup>50</sup> . In the end, the critique of Jesus being *perfect man and fully divine* rests on a simple premise agreed upon by both religions: **God is perfect and unchanging**. Islam maintains that this perfection precludes incarnation as a vulnerable human, whereas the orthodox Christian stance asks one to accept that Perfection united Himself with imperfection out of love. It is a beautiful narrative to some, but to the Muslim, God's love and power do not necessitate such a self-contradictory act. Salvation and divine mercy, in Islam, require no logical impossibilities – only God's grace and our faith and obedience.

#### Sources:

- The Glorious Quran (transl. Abdel Haleem), especially 4:171, 5:72-75, 5:116-120, 19:88-95, 112:1-4.
- Council of Chalcedon Definition (AD 451) <sup>4</sup> <sup>5</sup> .
- Zia H. Shah, "*Jesus: 'The Perfect Man and Fully Divine,' Did not Create Anything*" <sup>12</sup> <sup>51</sup> , *The Glorious Quran & Science*, Dec 23, 2024.

- Zia H. Shah, “*The Paradox of the God-Man: Can Jesus Be Both Perfect Man and Fully Divine?*” 18 21 , *The Glorious Quran & Science*, March 8, 2025.
- Zia H. Shah, “*Video of Conjoined Twins... Metaphor For or Against Trinity?*” (case studies on conjoined twins) 48 49 , *The Glorious Quran & Science*, June 30, 2025.
- Zia H. Shah, “*Dissociative Identity Disorder: Documented Cases and Clinical Perspectives*” 43 40 , *The Muslim Times*, June 30, 2025.
- William Lane Craig, “*Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview*” (discussion of incarnation and logic).
- Anglican Archbishop Michael Ramsey, “*Jesus and the Living Past*” (on the mystery of the Incarnation).
- Fazlur Rahman, “*Major Themes of the Quran*” (on Islamic Christology).
- **Bible** (NIV), e.g. Mark 13:32, Luke 2:52, John 1:1-14, Philippians 2:6-7, Hebrews 2:17.

1 4 6 10 11 12 51 Jesus: ‘The Perfect Man And Fully Divine,’ Did not Create Anything – The Glorious Quran and Science

<https://thequran.love/2024/12/23/jesus-the-perfect-man-and-fully-divine-did-not-create-anything/>

2 3 5 7 8 9 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36  
37 38 39 40 45 50 The Paradox of the God-Man: Can Jesus Be Both Perfect Man and Fully Divine? – The Glorious Quran and Science

<https://thequran.love/2025/03/08/12931/>

41 42 43 44 Dissociative Identity Disorder: Documented Cases and Clinical Perspectives – The Muslim Times

<https://themuslimtimes.info/2025/06/30/dissociative-identity-disorder-documented-cases-and-clinical-perspectives/>

46 47 Video of Conjoined Twins: Could it be a Metaphor For or Against Trinity — As Three Persons in One Being – The Glorious Quran and Science

<https://thequran.love/2025/06/30/video-of-conjoined-twins-could-it-be-a-metaphor-for-or-against-trinity-as-three-persons-in-one-being/>

48 49 Conjoined Twins in Adulthood: Case Studies, Ethical Challenges, and Sociocultural Perspectives

[https://thequran.love/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/conjoined-twins-in-adulthood\\_-case-studies-ethical-challenges-and-sociocultural-perspectives.pdf](https://thequran.love/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/conjoined-twins-in-adulthood_-case-studies-ethical-challenges-and-sociocultural-perspectives.pdf)