

عنوان مقاله:

A Critical Study of Muslim Theologians' Justifications of Adam's Sin

محل انتشار:

مجله مطالعات اسلامی معاصر، دوره 4، شماره 1 (سال: 1401)

تعداد صفحات اصل مقاله: 13

نویسنده:

حسین اترک - Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities, University of Zanjan, Zanjan, Iran

خلاصه مقاله:

Most of the Islamic theologians, particularly Shiites, who believe in prophets' infallibility assert that Adam's act in eating the forbidden fruit was not a sin. They have provided some justifications for Adam's act. The most significant justification is that God's prohibition of eating the fruit was not obligatory but advisory. In another justification, Muslim theologians attribute Adam's sin to his children and generation. Other justifications belong to those theologians who accept that Adam's act was a sin done in disobedience to God's necessary prohibition. They justify his act in these ways: ۱) Adam was misled by Satan's oath; ۲) He committed the sin out of oblivion or mistake; ۳) His sin took place in the heaven; ۴) That was a minor sin; and ۵) Adam was not a prophet when he committed the sin. The current study aimed at analyzing these justifications. In conclusion, according to some evidence, it seems that God's command to Adam was not advisory. Accordingly, Adam's sin was neither minor nor unintentional. The kind of command, advisory or necessary, or the place where sin was committed is not important. What matters is that Adam disobeyed God's strict and direct command. Since a prophet should obey all God's commands, Adam's act was a sin

کلمات کلیدی:

Adam, Advisory Forbiddance, Infallibility Prophets, sin

لینک ثابت مقاله در پایگاه سیویلیکا:

<https://civilica.com/doc/1518796>

