Jurnal Studi Ilmu-Ilmu al-Qur'an dan Hadis – ISSN: 1411-6855 (p); 2548-4737 (e)
Vol. 27, No. 1 (Januari 2026), hlm.73-94, doi: 10.14421/qh.v27i1.6336
https://ejournal.uin-suka.ac.id/ushuluddin/qurdis/index
Article History: Submitted: 02-05-25 Revised: 16-07-25 Accepted: 14-12-25

Abraham's Sacrifice in the Qur'an and the Bible: Comparative Hermeneutics of Narrative, Meaning, and Textual Authority

Pengorbanan Abraham dalam Al-Qur'an dan Alkitab: Hermeneutika Perbandingan terhadap Narasi, Makna, dan Otoritas Teks

Azhari Andi ([a])* Moch. Taufiq Ridho ([b])
*Coresponding Author, email: azhari.andi@uiii.ac.id
([a])Universitas Islam Internasional Indonesia (UIII) Depok, Jl. Radio Raya No.5, Cisalak, Sukmajaya, Depok, Jawa Barat 16416
([b])Institut Ilmu al-Qur'an An Nur Yogyakarta, Jl. Ngrukem, Area Sawah, Pendowoharjo, Bantul, Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta 55186

Abstract

This study examines the long-standing theological and exegetical debate over the identity of the intended sacrificial son in the story of Abraham's sacrifice—Isaac or Ishmael— and its implications for interreligious relations. The study departs from the observation that much of the existing scholarship on Q. 37:99-113 and Genesis 22 is shaped by polemical and identity-driven readings that privilege communal supremacy and scriptural integrity, while common ethical interpretations are often neglected. Methodologically, this article employs a comparative hermeneutic that juxtaposes classical and contemporary Qur'anic exegesis with Jewish and Christian interpretations of the Aqedah. By tracing the diachronic development of Muslim, Jewish, and Christian exegetical traditions, the study identifies both the points of contestation and the areas of convergence in reading Abraham's sacrifice. The article argues that, despite enduring disagreements regarding whether Isaac or Ishmael was the intended sacrifice, the three traditions share at least two major theological and ethical commitments: Abraham's unwavering faith and obedience to God, and a principled rejection of human sacrifice as incompatible with divine justice. These shared principles acquire renewed significance in the context of ongoing religiously motivated conflicts, where sacred narratives are frequently mobilized to legitimize violence. By foregrounding a harmonious and ethically oriented reading of Abraham's sacrifice, this study contributes to Qur'anic studies, comparative scripture, and interfaith dialogue. It suggests that the narrative can serve as a theological resource for peacebuilding and interreligious solidarity, while future research may further explore its application in peace education and liturgical practices.

Keywords: *exegesis; comparative hermeneutics; Abraham's sacrifice; Qur'an; Bible.*

Abstrak

Studi ini membahas perdebatan teologis dan eksegetis yang telah berlangsung lama mengenai identitas anak yang dimaksud sebagai kurban dalam kisah pengorbanan Ibrahim—apakah Ishaq atau Ismail—serta implikasinya bagi relasi antaragama. Kajian ini berangkat dari observasi bahwa studi terhadap QS. 37:99–113 dan Kejadian 22 selama ini didominasi oleh pembacaan polemis dan berbasis identitas yang terkungkung pada klaim supremasi kelompok serta integritas kitab suci masing-masing tradisi, sementara pembacaan etis yang bersifat universal kerap diabaikan. Studi ini menggunakan pendekatan hermeneutika komparatif untuk menganalisis tafsir al-Qur'an, baik klasik maupun kontemporer, serta interpretasi Yahudi dan Kristen mengenai Aqedah. Dengan menelusuri penafsiran Muslim, Yahudi, dan Kristen secara diakronik, kajian ini mengidentifikasi titik-titik perdebatan sekaligus

© 2026. The Author

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives BY-NC-ND: This work is licensed under a Jurnal Studi Ilmu-ilmu Al-Qur'an dan Hadis Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) which permits non-comercial use, reproduction, and distribution of the work whitout further permission provided the original work is attributed as spesified on Jurnal Studi Ilmu-ilmu Al-Qur'an dan Hadis and Open Access pages.

konvergensi dalam pembacaan kisah pengorbanan Ibrahim. Tulisan ini menyimpulkan bahwa meskipun perbedaan interpretasi mengenai identitas anak yang hendak dikurbankan—apakah Ishaq atau Ismail—terus bertahan, ketiga tradisi tersebut setidaknya memiliki dua komitmen teologis dan etis yang sama, yaitu keyakinan dan ketaatan Ibrahim yang tidak tergoyahkan kepada Tuhan, serta penolakan terhadap pengorbanan manusia yang dipandang tidak selaras dengan keadilan ilahi. Prinsip-prinsip bersama ini memiliki relevansi yang kuat dengan konteks konflik keagamaan kontemporer, ketika narasi-narasi kitab suci kerap dimobilisasi untuk melegitimasi tindak kekerasan. Melalui pembacaan yang harmonis dan berorientasi etis atas kisah pengorbanan Ibrahim, studi ini berkontribusi pada pengembangan studi Qur'an, studi komparatif kitab suci, dan dialog antaragama. Kajian ini juga menunjukkan bahwa narasi tersebut dapat berfungsi sebagai sumber teologis bagi pembangunan perdamaian dan solidaritas antaragama. Studi lanjutan disarankan untuk mengkaji penerapan temuan ini dalam konteks pendidikan perdamaian dan praktik liturgis lintas tradisi.
Kata kunci: *tafsir; hermeneutika komparatif; kisah pengorbanan Ibrahim; Qur'an; Bible.*

Introduction

The account of Abraham's Sacrifice occupies a central place in the three Semitic religions —Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Despite its shared origin, this narrative has generated intense theological debate and has become a marker of communal identity across the Abrahamic traditions. Each community has reshaped the story in ways that articulate and reinforce its distinctive doctrines. While the Bible explicitly identifies Isaac as the intended sacrificial son, Islamic tradition widely maintains that the son was Ishmael. The question of the son's identity, and the theological implications that follow from it, has therefore attracted sustained scholarly attention.

Existing scholarship on Abraham's sacrifice may be broadly grouped into three trajectories. The first is polemical and identity-centered, focusing on how the narrative is interpreted to support theological exclusivism and communal supremacy. C.T.R Hayward, for example, explores the ways in which early Christian reading of the Aqedah shaped, and were shaped by, Jewish interpretations.[1] In a similar vein, Reuven Firestone,[2] Azhari Andi, and Hamdi Putra Ahmad[3] show how Muslim exegetical traditions reframed the story by introducing Ishmael as the sacrificial son and critiquing Judeo-Christian readings for allegedly distorting the narrative for theological reasons. Other works, such as those by Saleh A. Nahdi[4] and Younus Y. Mirza,[5] highlight how the merging consensus on Ishmael as the sacrificial son

1 Hayward, *Targums and the Transmission of Scripture into Judaism and Christianity* (BRILL, 2010), 72, https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004179561.i-432.

2 Reuven Firestone, "Abraham's Son as The Intended Sacrifice (Al-Dhabīḥ, Qur'ān 37: 99–113) : Issues in Qur'ānic Exegesis," *Journal of Semitic Studies* XXXIV, no. 1 (1989): 95–131, https://doi.org/10.1093/jss/XXXIV.1.95.

3 Azhari Andi and Hamdi Putra Ahmad, "Before Orthodoxy; The Story of Abraham's Sacrifice (Dzabīh) in Early Muslim Commentaries," *International Journal of Islamic Khazanah* 14, no. 1 (2024): 1–12.

4 Saleh A Nahdi, *Yang Disembelih Ishaq Atau Isma'il?* (Jakarta: Arista Brahmatyasa, 1993), 13.

5 Younus Y. Mirza, "Ishmael as Abraham's Sacrifice: Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Kathīr on the Intended Victim," *Islam and Christian–Muslim Relations* 24, no. 3 (July 2013): 277–98, https://doi.org/10.1080/09596410.20

become integral to the formation of Islamic identity.

The second trajectory moves beyond sectarian polemics by examining points of similarity and divergence across the traditions through comparative analysis. Ayas Afsar's study is a notable example, offering a comparative reading of the linguistic features and overlapping motifs in the Qur'anic and Biblical accounts, particularly unwavering faith, obedience, and divine testing.[6] Likewise, David Weddle investigates how sacrificial practices in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam shape communal self-understanding and moral frameworks.[7] These studies represent a significant shift from competitive to dialogical approaches. Yet, in emphasizing harmony, they stop short of probing the deeper theological and ethical commonalities that might ground a shared moral discourse.

The third trajectory advances progressive reading within Islamic thought, especially through ethical and feminist perspectives. Asma Barlas, for instance, argues that the narrative of Abraham's sacrifice does not center on paternal authority or literal shedding of the son's blood; rather, it functions as an ethical allegory of consciousness, freedom, and spiritual surrender.[8] Similarly, Isra Yazicioglu reads the story as a profound manifestation of tawḥīd and total submission to God.[9] While these works significantly enrich Muslim engagement with the narrative, they largely remain within intra-Islamic discourse and draw primarily on Muslim exegetical traditions, with limited comparative engagement with Jewish and Christian interpretations.

Taken together, these three bodies of scholarship have deepened our understanding of Abraham's sacrifice. However, they reveal a persistent gap. Polemical, comparative, and reformist readings tend either to reinforce theological boundaries or to highlight surface-level convergence, while the shared theological–ethical core of the narrative across the Abrahamic traditions remains underexplored. What is still lacking is a comparative hermeneutic that takes seriously both the historical polemics and the possibilities for common ethical ground.

This article, therefore, proposes a comparative hermeneutic of Abraham's sacrifice in the Qur'an and the Bible that seeks to move beyond identity politics

13.786339.

6 Ayaz Afsar, "A Comparative Study of the Intended Sacrifice of Isaac and Ismael in the Bible and the Qur'an," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 46, no. 4 (2007): 483–98, https://www.jstor.org/stable/20839091.

7 David L. Weddle, *Sacrifice in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (New York: New York University Press, 2018), 47-155.

8 Asma Barlas, "Abraham's Sacrifice in the Qur'an: Beyond the Body," *Scripta Instituti Donneriani Aboensis* 23 (January 2011): 55–71, https://doi.org/10.30674/scripta.67380.

9 Isra Yazicioglu, "Engaging with Abraham and His Knife: Interpretation of Abraham's Sacrifice in the Muslim Tradition," in *Interpreting Abraham: Journeys to Moriah* (Fortress Press, 2014), 1-31, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt22nm9ng.7.

without ignoring theological differences. Following Wilfred Cantwell Smith's call in Towards a World Theology to read the scriptures of other religions empathetically and historically rather than from the standpoint of absolute truth claims,[10] and drawing on Francis X. Clooney's notion of "faith seeking understanding" through learning from other traditions,[11] this study reads Q. 37:99–113 and Genesis 22 in sustained conversation. Comparative analysis here is understood, following Giovanni Sartori, as a systematic inquiry into similarities and differences on the basis of carefully defined criteria.[12]

Specifically, this article asks: (1) What are the key polemical and convergent themes that emerge from Muslim, Jewish, and Christian exegetical traditions concerning the narrative of Abraham's sacrifice? (2) What shared interpretations of the narrative can be identified as cross-religious ethical principles that challenge violence committed in the name of God and promote peace? To address these questions, the study examines a wide range of classical and modern Qur'anic exegesis, alongside rabbinic and Christian writings on Q. 37:99–113 and Genesis 22, and then compares their theological and ethical hermeneutics. In doing so, the article aims to contribute to Qur'anic studies, intertextual approaches to scripture, and interfaith dialogue by foregrounding Abraham's sacrifice as a potential theological resource for human dignity and peacemaking.

Abraham's Sacrifice in The Bible: Tension between Jews and Christians

In Jewish tradition, the account of Abraham's sacrifice centers on Isaac as the sacrificial son. It is a central episode which is commonly referred to as the sacrifice of Isaac, the Aqedah, and the Binding of Isaac. The canonical account, as presented in Genesis 22, presents a detailed exposition of this profound theological event.[13] The narrative begins with God's command to Abraham to take his son, Isaac-depicted as a young man, to a distant mountain to be offered as a sacrifice. Abraham, with

10 Smith emphasizes that one cannot understand a religion without entering into its history, arguing the need for comparative study of religion. See Wilfred Cantwell Smith, *Towards a World Theology: Faith and the Comparative History of Religion*, Library of Philosophy and Religion (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan, 1989), 45–46.

11 Comparative theology marks acts of faith seeking understanding which are rooted in a particular tradition but which, from that tradition, venture into learning from one or more other faith traditions. Francis X. Clooney, *Comparative Theology: Deep Learning across Religious Borders* (Malden, Mass: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 10; "Toward a Comparative Feminist Theology," in *A Companion to Comparative Theology*, by Jerusha Tanner Rhodes (BRILL, 2022), 505–16, https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004388390_028.

12 Cécile Vigour, *Readings in Methodology: African Perspectives*, ed. Jean-Bernard Ouédraogo, Carlos Cardoso, and Codesria, Codesria Book Series (Dakar: Codesria, 2011), 217.

13 Hayward, *Targums and the Transmission of Scripture into Judaism and Christianity*, 72.

unwavering faith, assures Isaac that he is to be the consecrated offering, and notably, Isaac himself consents to the divine will. The Bible presents this moment not only as a test of obedience but also as a formative act of covenantal faith.[14]

After receiving the divine command to sacrifice Isaac, Abraham responded with immediate and unquestioning obedience, proceeding to carry out the act at the location revealed by God. He built an altar, arranged the wood, bound Isaac, laying him on the altar to prepare for the holy sacrifice. As Abraham was about to carry out the sacrifice, a divine messenger intervened, calling his name and commanding him to stop. At that critical moment, Abraham turned toward the source of the voice and refrained from harming his son. Instead, a ram was provided as a substitute, identifying God's acceptance of Abraham's unwavering obedience and submission. As a result, God reaffirmed His covenant, promising abundant blessings upon Abraham's descendants (Genesis 22:9-18).[15]

Some scholars, as quoted by Abraham Oh, have interpreted the Aqedah as a principal narrative that embodies the concept of redemption within Jewish theological thought. Within this framework, the sacrifice of Isaac is viewed as an act of atonement, symbolizing the collective suffering and spiritual endurance of the Jewish people through history.[16] However, this interpretation emphasizes more of a redemptive function without distinguishing it from a more literal reading. Firestone offers an interesting alternative interpretation that expands the significance of the Aqedah beyond its redemptive dimensions. He reveals the centrality of genealogy in shaping Jewish identity and theological self-understanding. According to Firestone, it functions not only as a narrative of obedience of sacrifice, but also as an assertion of genealogical legitimacy and spiritual election.[17] In this view, the Aqedah reinforces the notion of the Israelites' privileged status as God's chosen people. It portrays a sacred lineage that serves to legitimize their historical and theological claims.

The Aqedah holds an important place in Christian theology as a symbol of atoning sacrifice and significantly shaped Paul's thought in the New Testament, as well as Jesus' understanding of his own sacrificial mission. This reading, however, differs from Jewish exegesis, which does not interpret the sacrifice of Isaac as redemptive but

14 Douay-Rheims Verison, *The Holy Bible; Translated from The Latin Vulgate Diligently Compared With The Hebrew, Greek, and Other Editions In Divers Languages* (1609), 25–26.

15 Douay-Rheims Verison, *The Holy Bible; Translated from The Latin Vulgate Diligently Compared With The Hebrew, Greek, and Other Editions In Divers Languages*, 26.

16 Abraham Oh, "Canonical Understanding of the Sacrifice of Isaac: The Influence of the Jewish Tradition," *HTS Teologiese Studies / Theological Studies* 72, no. 3 (April 2016): 1, https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v72i3.3000.

17 Firestone, "Abraham's Son As The Intended Sacrifice (Al-Dhabīḥ, Qur'ān 37," 99–100.

instead highlights Abraham's obedience and his covenantal relationship with God.As Vermes observes, although the Aqedah originates within Jewish tradition, it was later incorporated into Christian theology, particularly through the annual celebration of salvation at Easter. This liturgical practice reflects the transformation of a key element of Jewish sacrificial thought into the core of Christian soteriology.[18] From this perspective, the Aqedah continues to function not only as a central narrative within Judaism but also as a foundational story reinterpreted within Christian theology,[19] as noted by Robert J. Daly, who writes:

> "Within the context of the Aqedah theology, as reconstructed here, all these problems disappear. According to its teaching, remission of sin, as well as present and future salvation, were due to the unique Sacrifice of Isaac. The Passover was not only the annual Commemoration of his Sacrifice but also a joyful reminder of its first decisive fruit and a prayer for the final salvation of man. In addition, God's remember sought yearly in Nisan, but day by day in a perpetual sacrifice of lambs invoking his forgiveness, mercy, and love. The frequent celebration of the Eucharist meal may, therefore, be understood as the introduction into Christianity of this other element of the Aqedah theology: the perpetual remembrance of the one perfect Sacrifice until the Kingdom comes."[20]

In contrast to scholars who emphasize the influence of the Aqedah on Christian theology, Philip Davies and Bruce Chilton offer a compelling reversal of that trajectory. They argue that developments in Christian theology—especially the passion narrative of Jesus—significantly influenced later rabbinic interpretations of the Aqedah. Rather than treating the Aqedah as merely a precursor to Christian atonement, they suggest that Jewish readings of the Aqedah emerged partly in response to these evolving Christian narratives.[21] They, as cited by Hayward, point to specific rabbinic elaborations that display striking parallels with the imagery of Christ's crucifixion. These include Isaac carrying the wood for his own sacrifice, echoing Jesus carrying the cross; his cries and lamentations paralleling those of the suffering Christ; and descriptions of Isaac shedding blood or being reduced to ashes—elements absent from the biblical text of Genesis 22 but present in later

18 Robert J Daly, "The Soteriological Significance Of The Sacrifice Of Isaac," *Catholic Biblical Association* 39, no. 1 (January 1977): 73–74, https://www.jstor.org/stable/43714225.

19 Y. Sherwood, "Binding-Unbinding: Divided Responses of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam to the 'Sacrifice' of Abraham's Beloved Son," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 72, no. 4 (December 2004): 821–61, https://doi.org/10.1093/jaarel/lfh081.

20 Daly, "The Soteriological Significance Of The Sacrifice Of Isaac," 74.

21 P.R. Davies and B.D Chilton, "The Aqedah: A Revised Tradition History," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40, no. 4 (October 1978): 516–17, https://www.jstor.org/stable/43715037.

Jewish midrashic and liturgical traditions.[22]

However, such readings often adopt a superiority tone, replacing or transcending Jewish and Christian theological meaning without engaging with their implications for interfaith understanding. Therefore, it is significant to recognize that parallels develop between the Rabbis' and Church Fathers' readings of Aqedah. Hayward elucidates several common viewpoints that Rabbis and Church Fathers shared on this matter. Among these are the repeated images of Isaac carrying the wood and a person holding the cross, which are familiar in both traditions. Furthermore, the depiction of Isaac as a victim of death and subsequent resurrection has significance in both Jewish and Christian textual exegesis. Furthermore, the attribution of the sacerdotal position to Abraham is recognized in both Jewish and Christian theological debates.[23] These similarities are the relationship between the Jewish and Christian traditions.

Although Judaism and Christianity share certain thematic elements in their interpretations of the Sacrifice of Isaac, there remains a crucial theological divergence in how Aqedah is understood within each tradition. In Christianity, the sacrifice of Isaac is often seen as a symbolic precursor to atonement, but one that is limited in scope, applying only to Jewish people. In contrast, the sacrifice of Jesus is regarded as the ultimate and universal act of atonement, intended for the redemption of all humankind.[24]

Nevertheless, beyond questions of theological influence, Modern Jewish and Christian scholars have shifted the focus toward the ethical and humanistic dimensions of the Aqedah. Rather than viewing the story through the lens of atonement or divine testing, modern scholars emphasize its underlying message that can be regarded as a shared ethical principle of religions, which we will discuss later.

From Isaac to Ishmael: Abraham's Sacrifice in Muslim Exegetical Tradition

While the Bible explicitly identifies Isaac as the intended sacrifice, the Qur'an adopts a more nuanced and open-ended approach, leaving the identity of the son unnamed. As the most recent of the Abrahamic faiths, Islam preserves and transmits the narrative of Abraham's sacrifice with profound theological and spiritual significance. Within Islamic tradition, this narrative holds a central place in the life of Abraham, who is honored as a prophet and exemplar of unwavering monotheism.

22 Hayward, *Targums and the Transmission of Scripture into Judaism and Christianity*, 73–74.

23 C.T. Robert Hayward, "The Sacrifice Of Isaac And Jewish Polemic Against Christianity," in *Targums and the Transmission of Scripture into Judaism and Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 74.

24 Firestone, "Abraham's Son As The Intended Sacrifice (Al-Dhabīḥ), Qur'ān 37," 97.

The Qur'an recounts Abraham's call to guide his people toward worship of the One God, as described in Q.37:83-98. However, his mission was met with fierce resistance, particularly from his own father and community. Abraham endured numerous trials, including persecution of being burned alive for denouncing idol worship (Q.21:69). Following these tribulations, Abraham chose to distance himself from his people and migrate in obedience to God. It was during this period of spiritual devotion and solitude that Abraham received a divine vision commanding him to sacrifice his beloved son. This is a test that marks one of the most pivotal moments in his prophetic journey. This episode is narrated by Q.37:99-113.

The Qur'an presents the account of Abraham's sacrifice in a concise and symbolic manner without explicitly naming the son involved. The Qur'an refers to him as *'ghulām ḥalīm'* (so We gave him the good news that he would have a *ghulām ḥalīm/* a patient son).[25] In the theory of *Ulūm al-Qur'ān*, this refers as one of the characteristics of the Qur'an in presenting the stories *(qaṣaṣ);* concise *(ījāz)* with a focus on *tawḥīd* and moral lesson, distinguishing it from the Bible.[26] However, the identification of *ghulām ḥalīm* has given rise to centuries of exegetical debate in Islamic tradition. While Jewish and Christian traditions identify Isaac as the intended sacrifice, the dominant view among Muslims, across Sunnī and Shī'ī traditions, is that the son was Ishmael.

This position has been widely upheld in both medieval and modern Qur'anic exegesis. Prominent contemporary Indonesian exegetes, such as Muhammad Quraish Shihab and Hamka, argue in favor of Ishmael as the intended sacrifice.[27] Shihab, for instance, maintains that the majority of Muslim exegetes across time have interpreted *'ghulām ḥalīm'* as a clear reference to Ishmael. He supports this claim by drawing connections with other Qur'anic verses that describe Ishmael in terms consistent with the sacrificial narrative. For example, Q. 21:85 refers to Ishmael as patient, mirroring the descriptor *ḥalīm* in Q.37:101. Moreover, Q.19:54 portrays Ishmael as a man true to his word, an attribute reflected in his willing acceptance of Abraham's vision to sacrifice him.[28]

Furthermore, Ibn 'Ashūr, a leading exegete from Tunisia, supports the view upheld by Muhammad Quraish Shihab and Hamka. He firmly asserts that it is Ishmael, not Isaac, who was the intended sacrifice. Through a careful textual analysis,

25 M. A. Abdel Haleem, ed., *The Qur'an* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 287–88.

26 Ahmad al-Sharbāṣī, "Min Khaṣā'iṣ al-Qiṣṣah Fī-Qur'ān al-Karīm," *Tafsir Center for Qur'anic Studies*, n.d., 2–6, accessed July 10, 2025, https://tafsir.net/article/5196.pdf.

27 Hamka, *Tafsir Al-Azhar* (Jakarta: Gema Insani, 2015), 166–68; Muhammad Quraish Shihab, *Tafsir Al-Misbah; Pesan-Kesan dan Keserasian al-Qur'an* (Jakarta: Lentera Hati, 2012), 10:284.

28 Shihab, *Tafsir Al-Misbah; Pesan-Kesan dan Keserasian al-Qur'an*, 10:284–85.

Ibn 'Ashūr argues that the Qur'an delivers two distinct announcements (*tabshīr*) to Abraham. The first is the glad tidings of Ishmael's birth, who would later be presented as the child to be sacrificed. The second is the prophecy of Isaac, which occurs afterward. This sequence, he contends, makes it unlikely that Isaac was the son meant for sacrifice.[29] A similar interpretation is presented by the renowned contemporary Shī'ī exegete, al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī in *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*. He clearly affirms that Ishmael was the only son Abraham was commanded to sacrifice,[30] thereby aligning with the views of Ibn 'Ashūr, Shihab, and Hamka. A survey of modern exegesis, both Sunnī and Shī'ī, demonstrates a strong consensus on this matter, tracing back to earlier exegetical traditions.

Medieval exegetes, such as Ibn Kathīr, also support the identification of Ishmael as the intended sacrifice.[31] Drawing upon linguistic and thematic evidence from the Qur'an, Ibn Kathīr argues that Ishmael is the intended sacrifice. For instance, the term *ḥalīm* (patient) used in Q.37:101 is also used elsewhere to describe Ishmael, reinforcing his identity as the sacrificial son. Furthermore, Ibn Kathīr provides a range of early Islamic traditions (hadith and athār) that strength this position: (1) Ibn 'Abbās is reported to have stated that Ishmael was the intended sacrifice; (2) Sa'īd ibn Jubayr, Ámir al-Sha'bī, Yūsuf ibn Mahrān, Mujāhid, Átha', and others all transmit similar statements from Ibn Ábbās (3) Isrā'īl narrated from Thawr, from Mujāhid, who reported that Ibn Umar identified the sacrificed son as Ishmael; (4) al-Sha'bī himself also declared that Ishmael was the intended sacrifice; (5) Ibn Abī Najīh reported from Mujāhid, reinforcing that Ishmael is the sacrificial son; (5) Muhammad ibn Ishāq transmitted a hadith from al-Ḥasan ibn Dīnār and 'Umar ibn Ubayd, quoting al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī as saying that there is no doubt that Ishmael was the son whom Abraham was commanded to sacrifice.[32] Ibn Kathīr affirms that the narrations identifying Ishmael as the intended sacrifice are *ṣahīh* (authentic) and thus should be recognized as authoritative by Muslim.[33] Based on this, he rejects another interpretation of the identity of the sacrificial son.

29 Muhammad al-Tāhir ibn 'Ashūr, *Al-Tahrīr Wa al-Tanwīr* (Tunis: Dar Tunisiyah, 2008), 23:157.

30 Muhammad Hussein al-Tabātabā'ī, *Al-Mīzān Fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān* (Beirut: Muassasah al-A'lamī li al-Matbū'āt, 1417), 17:155.

31 Abū al-Fidā' Ismā'īl ibn 'Umar ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr Al-Qur'ān al-'Azim* (Riyad: Dār al-Thayyibah, 1999), 7:34.

32 Kathīr, *Tafsīr Al-Qur'ān al-'Azim*, 7:33.

33 Kathīr, *Tafsīr Al-Qur'ān al-'Azim*, 7:32.

Such interpretations reflect the genealogical nuance of tafsīr in Islamic tradition, as emphasized by Walid A. Saleh.[34] Muslim exegetes build their interpretations upon prior tafsīr, implying layered meaning across generations. Considering tafsir as genealogical traditions allows for continuity and diversity within Islamic exegetical tradition.

However, this interpretation, now widely accepted among contemporary Muslim scholars and communities, stands in contrast to the interpretations found within early Islamic exegetical traditions. A closer examination of classical Qur'anic exegesis reveals that many early Muslim exegetes identify Isaac, not Ishmael, as the intended sacrifice. Notably, second-century Muslim exegetes such as al-Suddī (d. 128), Muqātil (d. 150), and Ibn Jurayj (d. 149/150) commonly interpret Q.37:101 as referring to Isaac.[35] Muqātil, in particular, supports this view by referring to Q.12:6. He draws a parallel between the story of Joseph and that of Abraham's son, noting that both were granted the ability to interpret dreams. His reading resembles that of many early exegetes. It appears to have been significantly shaped by *isrā'īliyyāt*, the corpus of Judeo-Christian traditions that permeated early Islamic thought.[36]

Furthermore, Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, one of the most influential classical Muslim exegetes, supports the interpretation that identifies Isaac as the intended sacrifice. In his seminal work *Jāmi al-Bayān 'an Ta'wīl Āy al-Qur'ān,* al-Ṭabarī presents two major opinions on the identity of the sacrificial son. After a careful textual analysis of Q.37:101 and related verses, he concludes that Isaac is the one whom God commanded Abraham to sacrifice.[37] In addition, al-Ṭabarī cites several narrations from early Islamic authorities that support this view, among them are: (1) Hamzah al-Ziyāt, transmitting from Abī Maysarah, recounts a narration in which the Prophet Joseph is reported to have said to the king " I swear by God, I am Joseph, the Messenger of God, son of Isaac, the sacrifice of God *(dhabīḥ Allāh)*, the son of Abraham, the friend of God (*khalīl Allāh*); (2) a similar version is narrated by Sufyān al-Tsawrī, from Abī Sinān, who reports from Ibn Abī Huzayl that Joseph used this same introduction before the king; (3) another report from Sufyān al-Tsawrī said, via Zayd ibn Aslam, from Abd Allāh ibn Ubayd ibn Umayr, from his father records

34 Walid Saleh, *The Formation of the Classical Tafsīr Tradition: The Qur'ān Commentary of al-Thaʿlabī (d. 427/1035)* (Leiden: BRILL, 2004), 14.

35 Muhammad "Athā" Yūsuf, *Tafsīr Al-Suddī al-Kabīr* (Beirut: Dar al-Wafa, 1414), 402–3; Hassan Abd al-Ghanī, *Tafsīr Ibn Juraij* (Cairo: Maktabah al-Turāts al-Islāmī, 1413), 292; Muqātil Ibn Sulaimān, *Al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr*, ed. Abdullah Mahmud Shahatah (Beirut: Muassasah al-Tarikh al-'Arabiy, 1423), 2:613–16.

36 Rahmatullah, "Hermeneutika Intertekstualitas Muqâtil Bin Sulaymân," *Jurnal Studi Ilmu-Ilmu Al-Qur'an Dan Hadis* 20, no. 2 (November 2019): 126–32, https://doi.org/10.14421/qh.2019.2002-01.

37 Abu Ja'far Muhammad ibn Jarir al-Thabari, *Jami Al-Bayan 'an Ta'wil Ay al-Qur'an*, 6 vols. (Cairo: Markaz al-Buhuts wa al-Dirasat al-'Arabiyyah wa al-Islamiyyah, 1422), 576.

that Prophet Moses once asked God why people addressed Him in prayer as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to which God replied, "Indeed, Abraham never committed any sin, and Isaac was sacrificed for Me"; (4) Shu'bah, transmitting from Abī Ishāq through Abī al-Aḥwaṣ, reports a similar statement affirming that Isaac was the sacrificed son of Abraham; (5) Ibn Ishāq narrates a hadith through a chain including Abdullāh ibn Abi Bakr, al-Zuhrī, Abī Sufyān, ibn al-Úla' ibn Jāriyah, Abi Hurairah, Kaáb al-Akbar, who explicitly states that the intended sacrifice was Isaac.[38]

Nevertheless, the interpretation that identifies Isaac as the intended sacrifice continued to find support into the fourth century of Hijri. For example, in his *Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ*, al-Samarqandī (d. 375) echoes the position of al-Ṭabarī and maintains that Isaac was the son designated for sacrifice.[39] However, by the eighth century of Hijri, this view encountered increasing resistance. Prominent scholars such as Ibn Taymiyyah and his student Ibn Kathīr rejected the Isaac interpretation outright and criticized it on both theological and textual grounds. They argued that identifying Isaac in early Muslim exegesis relies heavily on *isrā'īliyyāt* and undermines the narrative coherence of the Qur'anic account.[40] From that point onward, a decisive shift occurred within the Islamic exegetical tradition. The view that Ishmael was the intended sacrifice gained widespread and enduring acceptance.

Yet, it is important to note that Muslim interpretations of the sacrificial son did not develop in isolation. They are closely intertwined with theological and historical polemics vis-à-vis Jewish and Christian traditions, which predominantly identify Isaac as the intended sacrifice. The next section examines how Muslim exegetes engage with these interreligious debates. It shows how their understanding of the intended sacrifice emerges through dialogue—and often contention—with Jewish and Christian scriptures and interpretive traditions.

Claim of Identity and Scriptural Integrity; Muslim Polemics Against Jewish and Christian

Those familiar with the study of Qur'anic exegesis will recognize that Muslim exegetes have long engaged in polemical discourse concerning the identity of the intended sacrifice. This engagement has been particularly shaped by responses to Jewish and Christian claims that Isaac was the chosen son. At the center of this

38 Kathīr, *Tafsīr Al-Qur'ān al-'Azim*, 7:32.

39 Abū Laith Nasr ibn Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Samarqandī, *Tafsīr Al-Samarqandī; Bahr al-'Ulūm*, ed. Ali Muhammad Mu'awwid, Adil Ahmad Abd al-Maujud, and Zakaria Abd al-Majid al-Nawti (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1413), 119–20.

40 Kathīr, *Tafsīr Al-Qur'ān al-'Azim*, 7:32; Ibn Taimiyah, *Majmū'ah al-Fatawā*, 4 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Wafā', 2005), 204–5.

theological debate lies a fundamental question of authenticity. Muslim exegetes who argue for Ishmael as the intended sacrifice frequently challenge the reliability of the Isaac narrative. They also question whether it derives from an authentic and divinely preserved tradition. This polemical stance does not merely reflect concerns about textual integrity. It also functions as a broader critique of Judeo-Christian processes of scriptural transmission and interpretation.

Several narrations identifying Isaac as the intended sacrifice were transmitted by prominent companions of the Prophet, such as 'Umar, 'Alī, Ibn Mas'ūd, and Ibn Abbās, as well as notable figures among the tābi'īn, including Ka'b al-Aḥbār, Sa'id Ibn Jubayr, Qatādah, Masrūq, 'Ikrimah, 'Aṭā', Muqātil, al-Zuhrī, and al-Suddī.[41] These reports formed the basis of the interpretation adopted by several early Muslim exegetes such as Ibn Jurayj, Muqātil, al-Ṭabarī, and al-Samarqandī, and all of whom upheld the view that Isaac was the intended sacrifice. However, Muqātil and Ibn Jurayj appear to rely heavily on *isrā'īliyyāt* without critical scrutiny. Both al-Ṭabarī and al-Samarqandī adopt a more analytical approach by presenting and comparing multiple reports. They ultimately favor the narration that identifies Isaac as the intended sacrifice.

However, this interpretation came under critical scrutiny during the medieval period. Influential exegetes such as Ibn Kathīr and his teacher, Ibn Taymiyyah, begin to question the reliability of these narrations. After a careful examination of the transmission chains, Ibn Kathīr raises concerns about the credibility of their earliest sources. He argues that many of these reports ultimately trace back to Kaʿb al-Akhbār, a former Jew who converted to Islam. He also points to others like him whose interpretations were heavily influenced by Judeo-Christian traditions. Ibn Kathīr classifies such narrations as part of *isrā'īliyyāt*. He defines them as external Qur'anic traditions rooted in biblical literature. In his view, these sources lack the epistemological rigor required for interpreting the Qur'an. Consequently, Ibn Kathīr asserts that Qur'anic interpretation should remain independent of *isrā'īliyyāt*, which he believes cannot serve as a reliable foundation for understanding the divine message.[42]

Accordingly, Ibn Kathīr and Ibn Taymiyyah favor the narrations transmitted by companions that explicitly name Ishmael as the designated son for sacrifice. Ibn Taymiyyah argues that it is widely known textually and historically that the event of the sacrifice occurred prior to the birth of Isaac. On this basis, he rejects the possibility

41 Abū Muhammad al-Hussein ibn Mas'ūd al-Baghawī, *Ma'ālim al-Tanzīl* (Riyād: Dār al-Taibah, 1989), 47–48.

42 Kathīr, *Tafsīr Al-Qur'ān al-'Azim*, 7:32.

that Isaac was the intended sacrifice and maintains that only Ishmael coheres with the Qur'anic and historical framework of the narrative.[43] Moreover, Ibn Kathīr casts doubt on the authenticity of the Biblical account of Isaac's sacrifice. He contends that Jewish and Christian scriptures have undergone distortion (*taḥrīf*). According to him, their versions of the story were altered over time. His skepticism is reinforced by testimonies from several converts from Judaism to Islam. These individuals reported inconsistencies within Jewish tradition. One such account, cited by Ibn Kathīr, recounts a conversation between the Umayyad caliph ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and a former Jew who had embraced Islam. When asked which of Abraham's sons was intended for sacrifice, the convert swore by God that it was Ishmael. He then added that the Jews themselves knew this to be true. However, he claimed that they rejected this view because Ishmael, the chosen sacrifice, was regarded as the ancestor of the Arabs. As a result, the story was attributed to Isaac, whom they considered their own ancestor. [44] In this sense, the interpretations of Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Kathīr function not only as exegetical arguments but also as reflections of Arab identity politics. Mun'im Sirry likewise argues that an agenda of identity politics underlies this debate.[45] He observes that Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Kathīr cite testimonies from Jews who claimed that the name Ishmael was replaced with Isaac in the Bible out of jealousy over the prophetic lineage associated with Ishmael.

Ibn Kathīr's defense of Ishmael as the intended sacrifice centers on questioning the authenticity of the Biblical account that names Isaac.[46] Central to his argument is the claim that the Biblical narrative has been distorted over time, particularly in ways that reflect ethnic and theological biases. In support of his view, Ibn Kathīr references earlier authorities that have been recorded by Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, al-Samarqandī, and al-Baghawī. For instance, Ibn Kathīr cites al-Ṭabarī as reporting: "Ibn Jarīr said: Yūnus told me, Ibn Wahb told us, Amr ibn Qays told me, from 'Aṭā' Ibn Abī Rabah, from Ibn 'Abbās who said, 'The one who was to be sacrificed was Ishmael, the Jews claimed it was Isaac, and they lied." [47] Despite preserving these narrations, the attitudes of earlier Muslim exegetes toward them are in contrast to Ibn Kathīr. They did not necessarily endorse the same conclusion, while Ibn Kathīr emphasizes this report to support his claim. This divergence highlights the broader complexity within the exegetical tradition regarding the identity of the sacrificial son.

43 Ibn Taimiyah, *Majmū'ah al-Fatawā*, 206.

44 Kathīr, *Tafsīr Al-Qur'ān al-'Azim*, 7:24.

45 Mun'im Sirry, *Islam Revisionis; Kontestasi Agama Zaman Radikal* (Yogyakarta: Suka Press, 2018), 113.

46 Mirza, "Ishmael as Abraham's Sacrifice," 288.

47 Kathīr, *Tafsīr Al-Qur'ān al-'Azim*, 7:33.

Like Ibn Kathīr, contemporary Muslim exegetes such as Muhammad Quraish Shihab and Hamka also question the authenticity of the biblical account that identifies Isaac. They raise doubts about the reliability of this narrative. Shihab notes that some scholars argue the mention of Isaac in Genesis 22 may be a later addition or interpolation. This view, however, is contested by Jewish scholars. They maintain that although Ishmael had already been born at the time of the narrative, he was not regarded as the rightful heir. According to this interpretation, Ishmael was the son of a slave woman, Hagar (Siti Hajar), and therefore was not fully acknowledged as a legitimate child in the same way as Isaac.[48] The view of Isaac aligns with the ancient Near Eastern norm of primogeniture, which generally excluded children of concubines from inheritance rights.[49]

In conclusion, Muslim exegetes challenge the narrative identifying Isaac as the intended sacrifice through close analysis of Qur'anic verses. They also critically engage with *isrā'īliyyāt* traditions and question the authenticity of biblical accounts, particularly Genesis 22. Skepticism toward the reliability of the Bible is further reinforced by Qur'anic passages such as Q. 2:75 and Q. 3:78. Muslim exegetes frequently employ linguistic analysis and reports attributed to the Prophet Muhammad's Companions to support alternative readings of the narrative. The claim that Jewish scribes altered the name Ishmael to Isaac in the biblical text predates Ibn Kathīr. It already appears in the works of earlier exegetes, including al-Ṭabarī, al-Samarqandī, al-Baghawī, Ibn ʿAṭiyyah, and others. This continuity indicates that Muslim critiques were not merely reactive or polemical in nature. Rather, they were rooted in a longstanding exegetical tradition. Nevertheless, the discourse reveals a persistent theological tension with Jewish and Christian narratives. This tension is marked by a reluctance to accept inherited Jewish traditions and by a broader skepticism toward the authenticity of non-Islamic scriptures.

The Muslim exegetical traditions discussed above also reflect a sectarian mode of reading that prioritizes the identity of the intended son. Such readings function to delineate theological and communal boundaries. Therefore, approaching the story through a comparative hermeneutical framework becomes necessary. By focusing on the shared moral and ethical values embedded in the narrative, this approach offers a more constructive foundation for interreligious dialogue.

48 Shihab, *Tafsir Al-Misbah; Pesan-Kesan dan Keserasian al-Qur'an*, 10:286–87.

49 "The Firstborn Son in Jewish Society," in *The Firstborn Son in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, by Kyu Seop Kim (BRILL, 2019), 27–63, https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004394940_003.

Beyond Identity and Scriptural Integrity; Faith and Humanism in the Story of Abraham's Sacrifice.

Despite the enduring debate over whether Isaac or Ishmael was the intended sacrifice in the sacrificial narrative of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, many authoritative voices in all three traditions converge on the view that God ultimately intervened and replaced the son with a ram. This shared belief is reflected in Genesis 22 and Q.37:107. Quraish Shihab emphasizes that the story, regardless of which son was involved, serves to highlight Abraham's profound obedience and submission to God's will.[50] Similarly, Ibn Áshūr interprets the event as a testament to Abraham's spiritual greatness and moral nobility.[51] In the same way, from a Christian theological perspective, Robert J Daily identifies Genesis 22 as conveying significant religious themes, especially Abraham's faith-obedience to divine command.[52] Likewise, the philosopher Kierkegaard, as quoted by Willerslev, also considers Abraham's willingness to sacrifice his son as the ultimate expression of religious faith.[53]

In line with these interpretations, David L. Weddle explains that Jewish teachers have traditionally understood the act of sacrifice as a moral and spiritual discipline, an expression of obedience and devotion to God.[54] Both Genesis 22 and Q.37:99-113 portray Abraham as a model of unwavering faith. His willingness to sacrifice his son, despite the unimaginable emotional burden, reveals a deep commitment to fulfilling God's command without hesitation. These shared narratives continued to serve as powerful examples of devotion and trust in divine wisdom across the Abrahamic traditions.

Another shared interpretation emerging from the narrative of Abraham's sacrifice is the implicit rejection of human sacrifice. Although this theme is not always emphasized in traditional interpretation, modern scholars increasingly view the replacement of Abraham's son with a ram as a powerful repudiation of human sacrifice. As Firestone notes, modern Jewish scholars widely interpret the primary theological message of the narrative as a protest against the practice of offering humans to the divine. [55] In contrast, most medieval and contemporary Muslim exegetes tend to focus more on Abraham's unwavering loyalty and submission to God. As a result,

50 Shihab, *Tafsir Al-Misbah; Pesan-Kesan dan Keserasian al-Qur'an*, 10:287.

51 'Ashūr, *Al-Taḥrīr Wa al-Tanwīr*, 23:150.

52 Daly, "The Soteriological Significance Of The Sacrifice Of Isaac," 45.

53 Rane Willerslev, "God on Trial: Human Sacrifice, Trickery, and Faith," *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 3, no. 1 (March 2013): 143, https://doi.org/10.14318/hau3.1.009.

54 Weddle, *Sacrifice in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, 47.

55 Firestone, "Abraham's Son As The Intended Sacrifice <I>(Al-Dhabīḥ , Qur'ān 37," 95.

this fundamental ethical dimension is often overlooked in Islamic exegesis. However, the idea that the story conveys a strong rejection of human sacrifice is not entirely absent from Islamic tradition. This view was already articulated by Ibn Hazm, an Andalusian scholar of the eleventh century. In a somewhat unexpected context, his discussion on the possibility of female prophethood, Ibn Hazm addresses the significance of Abraham's sacrifice. He argues that the core message of the narrative is Islam's absolute prohibition of human sacrifice. According to him, such an act is not only a grave moral crime but also irrational and incompatible with divine justice.[56]

Like Ibn Hazm, Sayyid Quṭb, a modern exegete from Egypt, affirms the rejection of human sacrifice in his *Fī Ẓilāl al-Qur'ān*, though he places strong emphasis on the unwavering faith of Abraham and Ishmael. While highlighting their spiritual devotion, Quṭb makes a profound theological point: God does not desire human blood or bodies in any form *(lā yurīdu dimā'ahum wa ajsādahum fī sha'i*). What God truly seeks, according to Quṭb, is that His servants love Him above all else, even above their own children. [57] Quṭb's assertion that God has no need for human blood or flesh implies a fundamental Islamic rejection of human sacrifice. For Quṭb, the story of Abraham's sacrifice is not about fulfilling a demand for blood, but about demonstrating ultimate obedience and devotion to God. It is a moral and spiritual test, not a literal call for violence. This interpretation resonates closely with Q.22:37.

> "It is neither their meat nor their blood that reaches God but your piety..."[58]

This converging hermeneutical emphasis between Ibn Ḥazm, Quṭb, and modern Jewish and Christian readings of the texts reveals a shared ethical principle across religious traditions. It understands the story not only as a test of faith but also as an affirmation of the sanctity of human life.

The above discussion demonstrates that Muslim, Jewish, and Christian scholars share meaningful common ground in their interpretation of the story of Abraham's sacrifice. Across these faith traditions, the narrative emphasizes Abraham's profound faith and affirms the rejection of human sacrifice. Building on these shared interpretations, the story of Abraham's sacrifice acquires renewed relevance in the contemporary world. This relevance is especially evident in light of ongoing conflicts

56 Yazicioglu, "Engaging with Abraham and His Knife: Interpretation of Abraham's Sacrifice in the Muslim Tradition," 77; Abu Muhammad 'Ali bin Ahmad Ibn Hazm, *Al-Fasl Fi al-Milal Wa al-Ahwai Fi al-Nihal*, ed. M.I Nasr and A. Umayra (Beirut: Dar al-Jil, 1982), 5:120.

57 Sayyid Quṭb, *Fī Zhilāl Al-Qur'ān* (Cairo: Dār al-Shurūq, 2003), 19–25:2996.

58 Abdel Haleem, *The Qur'an*, 212.

carried out in the name of religion and God, many of which result in the tragic loss of innocent human lives. The ethical principle of Abraham's sacrifice stands in stark contrast to such violence.

In this context, the shared ethical principle among Muslim, Jewish, and Christian scholars, that God does not desire human sacrifice, serves as a powerful counter-narrative to religiously justified violence. As Quṭb, Ibn Hazm, and Jewish-Christian scholars emphasize, God seeks devotion and righteousness, not the shedding of blood. This interpretation resonates with Qur'anic and Biblical principles alike, which promote compassion, justice, and reverence for human life. Furthermore, this message is reinforced by *A Common Word Between Us and You* (2007), a declaration by Muslim scholars. The document underscores that love of God and love of neighbor constitute central and shared principles between Islam and Christianity.[59] Similarly, *Nostra Aetate*, the declaration of the Catholic Church, emphasizes that all religions uphold a common ethical heritage. This heritage includes respect for human life, justice, and peace. [60] In short, the story of Abraham's sacrifice should not be considered as a blood sacrifice but a moral transformation grounded in human dignity.

Thus, re-reading the story of Abraham's sacrifice through a shared, ethical lens can offer a much-needed theological foundation for peacebuilding. It reminds religious communities that the true test of faith lies not in taking life, but in honoring it. Rather than framing this topic in terms of opposition and conflict, we argue, it should be approached as an opportunity for meaningful and dialogical engagement. Focusing on common interpretations can foster mutual understanding and contribute to more peaceful and constructive interfaith conversations.

Conclusion

This study underscores the significance of Abraham's sacrifice in Islamic, Jewish, and Christian traditions. Even though disagreements persist, particularly concerning the identity of the intended son as sacrifice, Ishmael in Islam and Isaac in Judaism and Christianity, resulting in claims of exclusivism and scriptural integrity, the three religions have interpreted the account of Abraham's sacrifice as an unwavering faith, submission, and obedience to God's will.

More importantly, most major Abrahamic traditions have come to understand

59 "Kalimah Sawā'; A Common Word Between Us and You," The Royal Aal al-Bayt Institute for Islamic Thought, 2009, 6, https://www.acommonword.com/downloads/CW-Booklet-Final-v6_8-1-09.pdf.

60 Pope Paul VI, *Declaration on The Relation of The Church to Non-Christian Religions; Nostra Aetate*, October 28, 1965, https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651028_nostra-aetate_en.html#.

the story not as an endorsement of literal human sacrifice, but as a rejection of it. The consensus in God's intervention halting the act affirms the sanctity of human life. This ethical message, rooted in each exegetical tradition, challenges war and violence in the name of God. These shared ethical principles with all three traditions should be highlighted for interreligious dialogue, which allows communities across religions to move beyond sectarian identity towards shared ethics. Hence, this study contributes to reimagining theological narratives for moral responsibility and peacemaking grounded in humanism by reading the story of Abraham's Sacrifice beyond polemics and theological exclusivity.

However, this study limits the discussion on exegetical tradition across three religions. Further study might explore the implications of this shared ethics in peace education and liturgy, for example, by integrating it with the curricula in peace education or transforming it into a ritual in liturgies as a symbol of reconciliation. In the context of interfaith dialogue, the story of Abraham's sacrifice can serve as a theological source for human dignity.

Acknowledgements

As the corresponding author, I gratefully acknowledge the intellectual collaboration and constructive input provided throughout the research and writing process. May Allah, the Almighty, bless all efforts that contributed to the realization of this work.

Authors' Contributions

Azhari Andi served as the principal author and corresponding author of this article. He conceptualized the research topic, developed the theoretical framework, conducted the primary analysis, and drafted the manuscript. He was also responsible for integrating revisions, refining arguments, and preparing the final version of the article for submission. Moch. Taufiq Ridha contributed to the development of the comparative hermeneutical approach, enriched the discussion through critical feedback, and assisted in reviewing relevant Jewish and Christian interpretive sources. He also participated in revising the manuscript to enhance its academic clarity and coherence. Both authors jointly reviewed and approved the final manuscript and agreed to its submission to *Jurnal Studi Ilmu-Ilmu al-Qur'an dan Hadis*.

Conflicts of Interest

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author declares that there is no conflict of interest associated with this publication. The authors also confirm that

they have no competing financial, professional, or personal interests that could have influenced the research, analysis, or presentation of the findings in this article.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and publication of this article.

Data Availability Statement

No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

References

Abdel Haleem, M. A., ed. *The Qur'an*. Oxford World's Classics. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Afsar, Ayaz. "A Comparative Study of the Intended Sacrifice of Isaac and Ismael in the Bible and the Qur'an." *Journal of Islamic Studies* 46, no. 4 (2007): 483–98. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20839091.

Andi, Azhari, and Hamdi Putra Ahmad. "Before Orthodoxy; The Story of Abraham's Sacrifice (Dzabīh) in Early Muslim Commentaries." *International Journal of Islamic Khazanah* 14, no. 1 (2024): 1–12.

'Ashūr, Muhammad al-Tāhir ibn. *Al-Tahrīr Wa al-Tanwīr*. Vol. 23. Tunis: Dar Tunisiyah, 2008.

Baghawī, Abū Muhammad al-Hussein ibn Mas'ūd al-. *Ma'ālim al-Tanzīl*. Riyād: Dār al-Taibah, 1989.

Barlas, Asma. "Abraham's Sacrifice in the Qur'an: Beyond the Body." *Scripta Instituti Donneriani Aboensis* 23 (January 2011): 55–71. https://doi.org/10.30674/scripta.67380.

Clooney, Francis X. *Comparative Theology: Deep Learning across Religious Borders*. Malden, Mass: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Daly, Robert J. "The Soteriological Significance Of The Sacrifice Of Isaac." *Catholic Biblical Association* 39, no. 1 (January 1977): 45–75. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43714225.

Davies, P.R., and B.D Chilton. "The Aqedah: A Revised Tradition History." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40, no. 4 (October 1978): 514–46. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43715037.

Douay-Rheims Verison. *The Holy Bible; Translated from The Latin Vulgate Diligently Compared With The Hebrew, Greek, and Other Editions In Divers Languages*. 1609.

Firestone, Reuven. "Abraham's Son as The Intended Sacrifice (Al-Dhabīḥ, Qur'ān 37: 99–113) : Issues in Qur'ānic Exegesis." *Journal of Semitic Studies* XXXIV, no. 1 (1989): 95–131. https://doi.org/10.1093/jss/XXXIV.1.95.

Ghanī, Hassan Abd al-. *Tafsīr Ibn Juraij*. Cairo: Maktabah al-Turāts al-Islāmī, 1413.

Hamka. *Tafsir Al-Azhar*. Jakarta: Gema Insani, 2015.

Hayward. *Targums and the Transmission of Scripture into Judaism and Christianity*. BRILL, 2010. https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004179561.i-432.

Hayward, C.T. Robert. "The Sacrifice Of Isaac And Jewish Polemic Against Christianity." In *Targums and the Transmission of Scripture into Judaism and Christianity*, 72–87. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

ī, Muhammad Hussein al-Tabātabā'. *Al-Mīzān Fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*. Vol. 17. Beirut: Muassasah al-A'lamī li al-Matbū'āt, 1417.

Ibn Hazm, Abu Muhammad 'Ali bin Ahmad. *Al-Fasl Fi al-Milal Wa al-Ahwai Fi al-Nihal*. Edited by M.I Nasr and A. Umayra. Vol. 5. Beirut: Dar al-Jil, 1982.

Ibn Taimiyah. *Majmū'ah al-Fatawā*. 4 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Wafā', 2005.

"Kalimah Sawā'; A Common Word Between Us and You." The Royal Aal al-Bayt Institute for Islamic Thought, 2009. https://www.acommonword.com/downloads/CW-Booklet-Final-v6_8-1-09.pdf.

Kathīr, Abū al-Fidā' Ismā'īl ibn 'Umar ibn. *Tafsīr Al-Qur'ān al-'Azim*. Vol. 7. Riyad: Dār al-Thayyibah, 1999.

Mirza, Younus Y. "Ishmael as Abraham's Sacrifice: Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Kathīr on the Intended Victim." *Islam and Christian–Muslim Relations* 24, no. 3 (July 2013): 277–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/09596410.2013.786339.

Nahdi, Saleh A. *Yang Disembelih Ishaq Atau Isma'il?* Jakarta: Arista Brahmatyasa, 1993.

Oh, Abraham. "Canonical Understanding of the Sacrifice of Isaac: The Influence of the Jewish Tradition." *HTS Teologiese Studies / Theological Studies* 72, no. 3 (April 2016): 1–7. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v72i3.3000.

Pope Paul VI. *Declaration on The Relation of The Church to Non-Christian Religions; Nostra Aetate*. October 28, 1965. https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651028_nostra-aetate_en.html#.

Quṭb, Sayyid. *Fī Zhilāl Al-Qur'ān*. Vols. 19–25. Cairo: Dār al-Shurūq, 2003.

Rahmatullah, Rahmatullah. "Hermeneutika Intertekstualitas Muqâtil Bin Sulaymân." *Jurnal Studi Ilmu-Ilmu Al-Qur'an Dan Hadis* 20, no. 2 (November 2019): 126–42. https://doi.org/10.14421/qh.2019.2002-01.

Saleh, Walid. *The Formation of the Classical Tafsīr Tradition: The Qurʾān Commentary of al-Thaʿlabī (d. 427/1035)*. Leiden: BRILL, 2004.

Samarqandī, Abū Laith Nasr ibn Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn Ibrāhīm al-. *Tafsīr Al-Samarqandī; Bahr al-'Ulūm*. Edited by Ali Muhammad Mu'awwid, Adil Ahmad Abd al-Maujud, and Zakaria Abd al-Majid al-Nawti. Beirut: Dār

al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1413.

Sharbāṣī, Ahmad al-. "Min Khaṣā'iṣ al-Qiṣṣah Fī-Qur'ān al-Karīm." *Tafsir Center for Qur'anic Studies*, n.d. Accessed July 10, 2025. https://tafsir.net/article/5196.pdf.

Sherwood, Y. "Binding-Unbinding: Divided Responses of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam to the 'Sacrifice' of Abraham's Beloved Son." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 72, no. 4 (December 2004): 821–61. https://doi.org/10.1093/jaarel/lfh081.

Shihab, Muhammad Quraish. *Tafsir Al-Misbah; Pesan-Kesan dan Keserasian al-Qur'an*. Vol. 10. Jakarta: Lentera Hati, 2012.

Sirry, Mun'im. *Islam Revisionis; Kontestasi Agama Zaman Radikal*. Yogyakarta: Suka Press, 2018.

Smith, Wilfred Cantwell. *Towards a World Theology: Faith and the Comparative History of Religion*. Library of Philosophy and Religion. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan, 1989.

Sulaimān, Muqātil Ibn. *Al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr*. Edited by Abdullah Mahmud Shahatah. Vol. 2. Beirut: Muassasah al-Tarikh al-'Arabiy, 1423.

Thabari, Abu Ja'far Muhammad ibn Jarir al-. *Jami Al-Bayan 'an Ta'wil Ay al-Qur'an*. 6 vols. Cairo: Markaz al-Buhuts wa al-Dirasat al-'Arabiyyah wa al-Islamiyyah, 1422.

"The Firstborn Son in Jewish Society." In *The Firstborn Son in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, by Kyu Seop Kim, 27–63. BRILL, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004394940_003.

"Toward a Comparative Feminist Theology." In *A Companion to Comparative Theology*, by Jerusha Tanner Rhodes, 505–16. BRILL, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004388390_028.

Vigour, Cécile. *Readings in Methodology: African Perspectives*. Edited by Jean-Bernard Ouédraogo, Carlos Cardoso, and Codesria. Codesria Book Series. Dakar: Codesria, 2011.

Weddle, David L. *Sacrifice in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. New York: New York University Press, 2018.

Willerslev, Rane. "God on Trial: Human Sacrifice, Trickery, and Faith." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 3, no. 1 (March 2013): 140–54. https://doi.org/10.14318/hau3.1.009.

Yazicioglu, Isra. "Engaging with Abraham and His Knife: Interpretation of Abraham's Sacrifice in the Muslim Tradition." In *Interpreting Abraham: Journeys to Moriah*. Fortress Press, 2014. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt22nm9ng.7.

Yūsuf, Muhammad "Athā." *Tafsīr Al-Suddī al-Kabīr*. Beirut: Dar al-Wafa, 1414.