Theosophia Islamica EISSN: 2783-3240

A Comparative Analysis of Major Sins in Islam and Christianity: Structure, Criteria, and Ethical Consequences*

Mohamad Sahaaf Kashani
Assistant Professor, Theology Department, Research Institute for Islamic Philosophy and Theology, Research Institute for Islamic Sciences and Culture, Qom, Iran.
mskashani@chmail.ir

Abstract

The concept of "major sin" stands as a central and structuring principle within the moral framework of the Abrahamic religions. Owing to its profound consequences in the existential domains of the human being—both individual and social—and in the Hereafter, it has always been at the heart of theological and ethical inquiry. Adopting an analytical-comparative approach, this article investigates the structure and nature of major sins within the two traditions of Islam and Christianity. While examining the criteria for distinguishing "major sins" (*kabāʾir*) from "minor sins" (*ṣaghāʾir*) in Islam and the distinction between "mortal" and "venial" sins in Christianity, this study demonstrates that despite foundational differences in the theological underpinnings and epistemic criteria governing each tradition, a striking and meaningful convergence

* Sahaaf Kashani, M. (2026). A Comparative Analysis of Major Sins in Islam and Christianity: Structure, Criteria, and Ethical Consequences. *Theosophia Islamica, 6*(1), pp. 315-364.
https://doi.org/10.22081/jti.2025.72307.1100

▣ **Article Type:** Research; **Publisher:** Islamic Sciences and Culture Academy

▣ **Received:** 2025/08/02 ● **Revised:** 2025/09/29 ● **Accepted:** 2025/11/25 ●**Online Publication:** 2026/01/10

© 2026
"authors retain the copyright and full publishing rights"

is observable in their ultimate aims: moral cultivation, the preservation of human dignity, and the call to repentance and spiritual rectification. Ultimately, by elucidating the formative and spiritual implications of this doctrine, the article underscores its potential to foster a horizon for inter-religious dialogue in the field of ethics.

Keywords

Major Sin, Mortal Sin, Religious Ethics, Moral Theology, Repentance, Islam, Christianity.

1. Introduction

In the intellectual framework of the revealed religions, the concept of "sin" serves as a foundational moral category, charting the very boundaries of righteous conduct in the relationship between the human being and the Transcendent (God). Sin is understood as a transgression against the divine will and a breach of the sacred covenant between God and humanity. An analysis of sin is therefore essential to the comprehension of any system of religious ethics. Within this context, religious and theological literature distinguishes a specific category of sins as "major sins"—acts of such profound impurity and grave consequence that they not only sever the spiritual bond between a person and God but also entail devastating repercussions for the psychological and social dimensions of life, as well as the individual's ultimate destiny in the Hereafter.

While the two great traditions of Islam and Christianity share the core idea of sin, they diverge regarding its theoretical foundations and its criteria for identification. In the Islamic tradition, the distinction between a major sin, the *kabīra*, and a minor one, the *ṣaghīra*, is rooted in the foundational texts of the Quran and the sacred narrations or hadiths. Theologians, jurists, and ethicists, citing such proofs as the promise of otherworldly chastisement in the Quran, the establishment of fixed legal punishments (*ḥudūd*) in the Sharia, or the explicit declarations of the infallible leaders of Islam (*maʿṣūmūn*), have proceeded to compile and present lists of these grave offenses. The criterion in this approach is based principally upon the direct textual implications and the objective dimensions of the act itself.

In contrast, the Christian tradition, particularly within Catholic theology, divides sins into two categories: "mortal" and "venial." One might think of it like this: for a sin to be considered "mortal," three conditions must be met simultaneously. First, the act itself must

concern a "Grave Matter." Second, the person committing it must have "Full Knowledge" of the serious nature of the act. And third, they must perform it with "Deliberate Consent." In this framework, the focus is less on a pre-established list of prohibitions and more on a careful analysis of the inner state of the agent—that is, on their knowledge and their will as they consciously choose to rupture their relationship with God.

The present research endeavors to answer the following fundamental questions: How did the conceptual apparatus of "major sin" take shape in the Islamic and Christian traditions, and upon which theological and epistemological foundations does it rest? What are the structural and criteriological similarities and differences between these two systems of classification? And what distinct consequences do these variations entail for the domains of practical ethics, spiritual development, and the process of repentance? Employing an analytical-comparative methodology and referencing the primary texts of both traditions, this article seeks to arrive at a more profound and precise understanding of this key doctrine, thereby laying the groundwork for a constructive and inter-religious dialogue.

This article argues that despite the structural differences in the classification of sins (text-based in Islam and disposition-based in Christianity), both traditions arrive at a common moral grammar whose goal is to protect five fundamental principles: divine sovereignty, human dignity, the sanctity of the family, social justice, and honesty in relationships. This article shows that the fundamental distinction between the concept of sin in Islam and Christianity lies not in the list of instances, but in the locus of sin; while Islamic law focuses on the objective act, Christian theology considers the disposition or internal state as the origin of sinning—a distinction with profound consequences in the legal, ethical, and spiritual systems of each religion.

2. Theoretical Foundations and Structure of Major Sin in Islam

2.1. The Foundational Distinction in the Quranic Text: *Kabāʾir* and *Ṣaghāʾir*

Within the moral architecture of Islam, the concept of major sin is a deeply rooted one, having been explicitly addressed in both the transmitted sacred sources and the seminal works of the great ethicists and theologians. From the Quranic perspective, all sins are not of equal weight; they are divided into two categories: major sins, or *kabāʾir*, and minor sins (*ṣaghāʾir*), also called *lamam* (minor slips or faults). It is upon this scriptural basis that, in their exegetical and ethical understanding, Muslims have consistently distinguished between "major" and "minor" sins.

The Quran delineates this division, stating: ″those who avoid the major sins and shameful deeds, apart from minor sins– your Lord is rich in forgiveness.″ (Al-Najm, 53: 32).

This theological principle, which underscores a clear demarcation between the degrees of sin, is articulated in another verse as a luminous and hope-inspiring rule for the believers: ″If you avoid the major sins you have been forbidden, We shall wipe out your minor misdeeds and grant you an honourable entrance." (Al-Nisa, 4: 31).

The gravity of this distinction is also meticulously rendered in the Quranic depiction of the Final Reckoning. The Holy Quran, in its description of the Day of Judgment, conveys the state of those who are given the record of their deeds, quoting their cry of astonishment: ″Woe to us! What a record is this! It does not leave any sin, small or large, unaccounted for!" (Al-Kahf, 18: 49).

Furthermore, in the description of the reward that awaits the dwellers of Paradise, their avoidance of the great sins is mentioned as one of

their key virtues: ″for those who avoid the major sins and gross indecencies." (Al-Shura, 42: 37).

From these verses, it is clearly understood that from the Quranic perspective, sins are of varying degrees of gravity and reprehensibility, a distinction that bears direct consequences upon the economy of divine forgiveness and one's ultimate destiny in the Hereafter. This Quranic demarcation impelled the theologians and jurists to search for precise criteria within the Prophetic tradition and the principles of jurisprudence by which to identify the specific instances of the major sins, for the promise of divine expiation for minor sins is conditional upon the avoidance of the major ones.

2.2. The Criteria for Identifying the Major Sins

In Islamic jurisprudence (*fiqh*), the major sins are identifiable according to specific criteria that the jurists have elucidated based on the Quran, the Sunnah, and the legal structure of Islam. The hadiths transmitted from the Infallibles have established the very cornerstone of these criteria. It is narrated from Imām al-Bāqir (peace be upon him), in response to an inquiry concerning the major sins: "Every act for which God has promised the Fire [is a major sin]." (Majlisī, 1982, vol. 76, p. 2, ḥ. 6; al-Kulaynī, 1986, vol. 2, p. 276, ḥ. 1).

This foundational criterion finds its crystallization in the words of the great scholars of both the Shia and Sunni traditions. ʿAllāma al-Ḥillī (d. 1325) writes: (Al-Ḥillī, 1992, vol. 1, p. 497) "Every sin for which God has promised the Fire, or for which a *ḥadd* (a fixed legal penalty) has been instituted, or whose gravity has been explicitly stated, is among the major sins."

Al-Shahīd al-Awwal (d. 1384) clarifies in *al-Lumʿat al-Dimashqiyya* (Al-Shahīd al-Awwal, 1990, p. 58): "The major sins are those

for which God has promised the Fire, or for which He has appointed a *ḥadd*, or whose perpetrator He has cursed, or from whom He has negated faith."

Al-Shaykh al-Mufīd (d. 1022) writes in *Taṣḥīḥ Iʿtiqādāt al-Imāmiyya* (Al-Mufīd, 1992, p. 113): "The major sins are those by which God has necessitated the Fire, or a curse, or a *ḥadd*."

In the Sunni tradition, Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī (d. 1566) introduces the criterion in *al-Zawājir ʿan Iqtirāf al-Kabāʾir* as follows (Al-Haytamī, 1987, vol. 1, p. 6): "Everything for which a severe threat, or a curse, or a negation of faith has been established, is among the major sins."

And Imām Muḥammad al-Ghazālī (d. 1111) writes in his magnum opus, *Iḥyāʾ ʿUlūm al-Dīn* (Al-Ghazālī, 1987, vol. 4, p. 19): "A major sin is that for which God has promised punishment, or a curse, or wrath, or a negation of faith."

By way of induction from these definitions, five essential criteria for discerning a major sin in Islamic theology (encompassing both Shia and Sunni thought) can be formulated as follows:

An Explicit Promise of Divine Chastisement: A major sin is that for which the perpetrator is declared, in the Quran or in a mass-transmitted (*mutawātir*) hadith, to be deserving of the Hellfire or a severe punishment. An example is the act of intentional murder, concerning which the Quran states (Al-Nisāʾ, 4: 93): "If anyone kills a believer deliberately, the punishment for him is Hell..."

An Explicit Statement of the Sin's Gravity: A major sin is any sin described within a sacred text by such attributes as *ithm kabīr* (a great sin), *fujūr* (flagrant immorality), *rijs* (filth), or that which incurs a *laʿna* (curse).

The Mandate of a Fixed Legal Punishment (*ḥadd*): Sins for which the Divine Lawgiver has stipulated a fixed, mandatory punishment in the worldly life, such as those for theft and adultery.

Implication of the Negation of Faith or Divine Curse and Wrath: Actions that are described in the sacred texts as leading to an exit from the fold of faith, causing the perpetrator to be characterized by iniquity (*fisq*), or warranting the curse and wrath of God.

3. Instances and Classification of Major Sins in the Islamic Tradition

Having delineated the theoretical criteria for identifying the major sins, the Islamic tradition, in both its Shia and Sunni expressions, proceeded to determine the concrete instances of these offenses. These specific examples, which are rooted in the Prophetic hadiths and the words of the Infallible Imams (peace be upon them), have been meticulously codified by jurists and theologians in their specialized works.

3.1. Instances in Hadiths

In the vast corpus of hadiths, the Prophet of Islam and the Infallible Imams (peace be upon them) provided, in numerous transmissions, various lists of the major sins in order to practically elucidate the concept. These hadiths constitute the very heart of all subsequent scholarly discussions on the topic.

In a hadith transmitted from the Prophet of Islam (peace be upon him and his household), nine sins are identified as major, on top of which is the sin of polytheism (*shirk*): (Majlisī, 1982, vol. 76, p. 11, ḥ. 7) "The major sins are nine: the gravest of them is associating partners with God, the Mighty and Majestic; killing a believing soul;

consuming usury (*ribā*); devouring the property of an orphan; slandering a chaste woman; fleeing from the battlefield; undutifulness to parents; violating the sanctity of the Sacred House; and sorcery. Thus, whoever meets God, the Mighty and Majestic, being innocent of these, shall be with me in a Paradise whose door-leaves are made of gold."

In another narration, he (peace and blessings be upon him) emphasized four cardinal sins (Al-Muttaqī al-Hindī, 1981, ḥ. 43944): "The major sins are associating partners with God, undutifulness to parents, the taking of a life, and the engulfing oath [a false oath taken to usurp the rights of another]."

Furthermore, a more comprehensive list is narrated from Imām ʿAlī (peace be upon him), which also encompasses social and political dimensions (Al-Muttaqī al-Hindī, 1981, ḥ. 43931): "The major sins are associating partners with God, the taking of a life, devouring the property of an orphan, slandering a chaste woman, fleeing from the battlefield, reverting to nomadism after emigration [a cultural regression], sorcery, undutifulness to parents, consuming usury, separating from the community [of Muslims], and breaking one's pledge [in an oath of allegiance or a transaction]."

One of the most famous hadiths in the Sunni sources is that of the "Seven Destructive Sins" (*al-Sabʿ al-Mūbiqāt*), which is found in two most authentic collections (Al-Bukhārī, 2001, ḥ. 2766; Muslim, (n.d), ḥ. 89): "'Avoid the seven destructive sins.' They said, 'O Messenger of God, and what are they?' He said, 'To associate partners with God; sorcery; to kill a soul which God has forbidden except for a just cause; to consume usury; to consume the property of an orphan; to turn one's back on the day of battle; and to slander chaste, believing women who are unaware [of such evil].'"

Another hadith, which illustrates the hierarchy of sins, is narrated from Ibn Masʿūd (Al-Bukhārī, 2001, ḥ. 4477; Muslim, (n.d), ḥ. 86): "I asked the Messenger of God (peace and blessings be upon him), 'Which sin is gravest?' He said, 'That you set up a rival unto God, when it is He who created you.' I said, 'Then which?' He said, 'That you kill your child for fear that he should share your food.' I said, 'Then which?' He said, 'That you commit adultery with the wife of your neighbor.'"

3.2. Codification in the Works of Shia Scholars

The great scholars of the Shia tradition, drawing upon these hadiths, undertook the specialized codification of the discourse on major sins. ʿAllāma Muḥammad Mahdī al-Narāqī (d. 1794) in his *Jāmiʿ al-Saʿādāt*, enumerates such sins as polytheism, despairing of divine mercy, murder, the consumption of usury, and undutifulness to parents (Al-Narāqī, 1967, vol. 2, p. 91ff). Al-Shaykh al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī (d. 1692) in his monumental *Wasāʾil al-Shīʿa*, introduces approximately thirty major sins, substantiating each with specific hadiths (Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī, 1993, vol. 15, pp. 318–343). ʿAllāma al-Ḥillī (d. 1325), in *Qawāʿid al-Aḥkām*, addresses the issue from a jurisprudential perspective, analyzing sins that mandate a fixed legal penalty (*ḥadd*) or are accompanied by a threat of divine punishment, such as adultery, the consumption of wine, and theft (Al-Ḥillī, 1992, vol. 1, p. 497).

This body of hadiths and scholarly works demonstrates that in Shia theology, the instances of the *kabāʾir* are classified along several principal axes:

1. Doctrinal Sins: Associating partners with God (*shirk*), despairing of His mercy (*yaʾs*), and feeling secure from His plan (*amn min makr Allāh*).

2. Sins Against Human Life and Dignity: Murder (*qatl*), and the slander of chaste women (*qadhf*).
3. Socio-Economic Sins: The consumption of usury, and devouring the property of an orphan.
4. Familial and Civic Sins: Undutifulness to parents (*ʿuqūq*), breaking solemn covenants, and causing division within the community.
5. This categorization reveals that a major sin is not merely a private, individual failing; rather, it is an act that strikes at the very foundations of faith, the family, and society.

3.3. Codification in the Works of Sunni Scholars

Preeminent scholars of the Sunni tradition have also authored essential works based upon these hadiths. Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī (d. 1347), in his famous book *Al-Kabāʾir*, lists seventy major sins, including polytheism, murder, sorcery, abandoning the prescribed prayer, and adultery (Al-Dhahabī, 1987). Imām al-Nawawī (d. 1277), in his commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, explicitly regards sins such as abandoning the prayer, consuming intoxicants, and backbiting as major sins (Al-Nawawī, 1972, vol. 2, pp. 82-84). Imām al-Ghazālī (d. 1111) in his *Iḥyāʾ ʿUlūm al-Dīn*, approaches the subject from a moral and inward perspective, counting psychological vices such as arrogance (*kibr*), envy (*ḥasad*), ostentation (*riyāʾ*), and miserliness (*bukhl*) among the destructive maladies of the soul, and thus as inward major sins (Al-Ghazālī, 1987, vols. 3–4).

4 .The Perspectives of Islam and Christianity on Major Sins

Although a complete consensus does not exist among Muslims regarding the precise number of major sins, it can be said that a

significant degree of agreement exists concerning the following seven, which are recognized for their gravity in both traditions.

4.1. Polytheism

In the spiritual world of Islam, *shirk*, the act of associating partners with God (or polytheism), is presented as the gravest and most unforgivable of all sins, should one die without having repented from it. This principle is so foundational that the Holy Quran declares with absolute finality, meaning, "God does not forgive the joining of partners with Him..." (Al-Nisāʾ, 4: 48). This sin constitutes a direct violation of the singular right of God (*ḥaqq Allāh*) and strikes at the very foundation of the covenant of servitude.

Within Christianity, a similar principle holds firm. Although Christian theology is centered upon the Trinity, the Church has always taught that this doctrine does not negate monotheism. Outright polytheism—that is, the worship of multiple gods or the replacement of the Creator with the created—is unequivocally rejected. Think of the Ten Commandments, where the very first command establishes this unwavering principle: "you shall have no other gods before me" (Exodus, 20:3). The towering Christian theologian, Thomas Aquinas, gets right to the heart of the matter in his *Summa Theologiae*. For him, polytheism is not merely an error but a sin that strikes directly against the theological virtue of faith, constituting a profound injustice against God Himself (Aquinas, 1981, II-II, q. 94). Therefore, despite the deep theological chasm between the doctrines of God—absolute monotheism versus the Trinity—both traditions converge in their condemnation of worshipping anything other than God and insist upon the necessity of maintaining absolute fidelity to the one Creator.

4.2. Murder

In Islam, the sanctity of human life finds its most profound expression in the Quran, where the unjust taking of a single life is held to be equivalent to the slaughter of all humanity "...if anyone kills a person... it is as if he killed all mankind..." (Al-Māʾida, 5: 32) This verse illuminates the inherent and universal value God assigns to every human life.

This resonates powerfully with the Christian tradition, where the prohibition against killing is, of course, among the Ten Commandments: "You shall not murder" (Exodus, 20:13). But what is the deeper reason for this? St. Augustine, in his monumental work *The City of God*, offers a penetrating theological analysis. He argues that murder desecrates the sanctity of the human person precisely because every person is a bearer of the divine image, the *imago Dei*. To destroy a human being, then, is to commit an act of direct contempt against the Creator who fashioned humanity in His own likeness (Augustine, 2000, Book 1, Ch. 20). And so, we see both religions viewing the sin of murder not merely as a social crime, but as a theological transgression: in Islam, as the violation of a divine covenant concerning the sanctity of life, and in Christianity, as the desecration of the very image of God, which He entrusted to the human creature.

4.3. Adultery

In the Law of Islam, or the Sharia, adultery (*zinā*) is among the major sins, for it threatens the sanctum of the family and the integrity of lineage. The Quran has accordingly prescribed a fixed punishment for it, as mentioned in its verses (Al-Nūr, 24:2).

In Christianity, too, adultery is condemned as a grievous sin that violates the sanctity of marriage. What is more, in his Sermon on

the Mount, Jesus Christ expands the concept of this sin beyond the physical act, drawing it into the inner realm of intention and desire. He says, “But I say to you that everyone who looks at a woman with lust has already committed adultery with her in his heart” (Matthew, 5:28). This shifts the focus dramatically. Thomas Aquinas builds on this, arguing that the sin destroys fidelity, trust, and the marital bond, which he sees as the foundational cell of society (Aquinas, 1981, II-II, q. 154). Consequently, both traditions place a strong emphasis on preserving the family structure. Yet we can see a key difference in approach: while Islamic jurisprudence focuses on the external act and the evidence required to prove it (for enforcing its legal penalty), Christian theology, by internalizing the sin, stresses the paramount importance of a pure heart and intention as the very root of a righteous life.

4.4. Usury

In Islam, the practice of usury (*ribā*), is condemned in the Quran with a tone of unparalleled gravity, where it is presented as tantamount to a declaration of war against God and His Messenger (Deuteronomy, 23:19), "Those who consume interest rise up as one possessed by Satan’s touch"...

Likewise, in Christian history, particularly during the Middle Ages, charging interest was considered illicit. This prohibition has roots in the Old Testament, as the book of Deuteronomy states, “You shall not charge interest on loans to another Israelite” (Deuteronomy, 23:19). Christian theologians regarded usury as a form of theft and an exploitation of others’ vulnerabilities. Thus, both traditions, in their classical expression, regarded usury as a great sin against social justice, for it leads to the exploitation of the poor and the acquisition of wealth without genuine labor or risk.

4.5. False Accusation

In Islam, *qadhf*—the act of falsely accusing others of sexual immorality, especially chaste women—is a major sin that entails a severe worldly punishment and a chastisement in the Hereafter (Al-Nūr, 24:4), "As for those who accuse chaste women... flog them with eighty lashes"...

This finds a clear parallel in Christianity, where lying and slander are counted among the most serious sins. The ninth of the Ten Commandments warns directly: "You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor" (Exodus, 20:16). In his analysis of the virtue of justice, Aquinas argues that slander is a sin that damages not only the reputation of an individual but also the essential capital of "public trust" within a society (Aquinas, 1981, II-II, q. 73). Here again, the protection of human honor and dignity, and the preservation of trust as the foundation of social relations, emerges as a shared moral concern in both religions, manifested in the severe condemnation of slander and false testimony.

4.6. Consuming the Orphan's Property

Within Islam, the protection of the rights of the vulnerable, particularly orphans, stands as a central pillar of social ethics. The Quran condemns trespassing against the property of orphans in the most severe language imaginable, portraying it not as a mere financial transaction but as the literal ingestion of Hellfire (Al-Nisāʾ, 4: 10), "Those who consume the property of orphans unjustly are actually swallowing fire into their own bellies: they will burn in a blazing fire." This stunning image reveals the depth of this major sin, wherein illicit wealth is transfigured into an inner, consuming flame.

Now, while Christianity does not have a precise phrase equivalent to "consuming the orphan's property," the principle of

"caring for orphans and widows" is presented as the very benchmark of "true religion." The Epistle of James, sometimes known as the "Gospel of Works," puts it plainly: “Religion that is pure and undefiled before God the Father is this: to care for orphans and widows in their distress” (James, 1:27). We, therefore, see that both religious traditions hold up the treatment of orphans and the vulnerable as something of a "final exam" for measuring both individual and social faith and justice. In Islam, this principle is articulated as an explicit legal-ethical command, fortified by the threat of severe chastisement.

4.7. Disrespecting Parents

In Islam, reverence and kindness towards one's parents hold an unparalleled importance, second only to the worship of God Himself. On numerous occasions, immediately after commanding the worship of the One God, the Holy Quran commands kindness toward one’s parents. The apex of this reverence is found in the verse (Al-Isrāʾ, 17: 23), "...do not say ‘Ugh!’ to them or scold them, but speak to them with respect." In this verse, even the utterance of the slightest word of impatience or the showing of the smallest expression of disrespect ("Ugh!") is forbidden, revealing the depth of this moral and spiritual duty. *ʿUqūq al-wālidayn*, or being undutiful to one's parents, is considered one of the greatest of the major sins, one that can prevent the acceptance of prayers and bring about divine punishment.

This principle is likewise presented in Christianity as a direct and foundational divine command. "Honor your father and mother" is the fifth of the Ten Commandments, and it is the only one that comes with a specific promise attached: “Honor your father and your mother, so that your days may be long in the land that the Lord your God is giving you” (Exodus, 20:12). Clearly, both faiths elevate respect for

parents beyond a mere social courtesy or cultural norm, transforming it into a divine command. To sin in this regard is not simply to rupture an emotional bond; it is to violate a sacred covenant and to show contempt for the divine order and will.

This significant overlap in the specific instances of sin raises a deeper question: is the conceptual structure of sin itself also the same in the two traditions? The next section will demonstrate that despite this convergence in application, a key distinction exists in how each tradition defines the very locus of sin, drawing a line between the outward "act" and the inward "disposition".

5. The Concept of Sin in the Christian Tradition

In Christian theology, the concept of sin has gone through complex twists and turns, moving from the law-centric perspective of the Old Testament to the faith-centered, inward-looking approach of the New Testament. Whereas Islam defines the major sin as a distinct legal-theological category, Christian theology—particularly after the teachings of the Apostle Paul—tends to focus more on the fundamental polarity between a "life in sin" and a "life in grace," made possible through Christ.

5.1. The Moral Foundation in the Old Testament: The Decalogue

So, where does the Christian understanding of sin begin? For any Jew or Christian, the starting point has to be the Decalogue or the Ten Commandments. This set of divine statutes, which according to the Biblical account was revealed to Moses on Mount Sinai (See Exodus, 20:1-17; Deuteronomy, 5:6-21), not only forged the covenant between God and the people of Israel but was also embraced by Christianity as the foundational "moral law."

The Catholic Church, for instance, interprets these commandments

as the very basis of the moral life. The first command, with its emphasis on monotheism, serves as a prohibition against superstition, idolatry, divination, sorcery, atheism, and agnosticism (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, para. 2110-2132). The second command, by forbidding false oaths and blasphemy, demands that God's name be held sacred (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, para. 2142-2159). The fifth command, "You shall not murder," is understood to condemn any form of intentional killing, including abortion from the moment of conception, euthanasia (the so-called "mercy killing"), suicide, and sterilization, as a grave sin (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, para. 2258-2283). The sixth command, "You shall not commit adultery," mandates chastity and the sanctity of marriage, thereby forbidding acts such as masturbation, sexual relations outside of marriage, pornography, and homosexual acts (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, para. 2351-2359, 2390). The seventh command, "You shall not steal," prohibits any encroachment on public or private property, business fraud, and the paying of unjust wages (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, para. 2408-2418), while the eighth, "You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor," insists upon truthfulness in speech and rejects slander and calumny as destructive to social trust. Finally, we see a dramatic inward turn. The ninth and tenth commandments, by forbidding one to "covet" a neighbor's wife (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, para. 2514-2527) or possessions (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, para. 2534-2540), pull the very idea of sin into the internal realm of intention, insisting on the necessity of a heart purified from lust and envy.

The Ten Commandments, therefore, establish the objective, law-based framework for ethics in the Old Testament. They are the bedrock for conceptualizing sin as a "transgression of divine law," a concept that would undergo a profound transformation in the New Testament.

5.2. A Conceptual Revolution in the New Testament

With the dawn of Christianity, the understanding of the Torah's law was largely reframed. The Apostle Paul, for instance, drew a crucial distinction between the "ceremonial laws" and the abiding "moral law," arguing that many of the behavioral prohibitions, especially those concerning diet and ritual purity, were not binding on non-Jewish Christians (Dunn, 1998, pp. 153-162).

In this new paradigm, sin is no longer merely the violation of an external rule; it is an existential and internal state. As the New Testament itself puts it, “whatever does not proceed from faith is sin” (Romans, 14:23), and even more starkly, “Sin is lawlessness” (1 John, 3:4).

This internalization of sin reaches its zenith in the teachings of Jesus Christ himself. He insists that true defilement does not come from the outside but springs from within the human person: “For out of the heart come evil intentions, murder, adultery, fornication, theft, false witness, slander. These are what defile a person” (Matthew, 15:19-20). In his famous reinterpretation of the command “You shall not commit adultery,” he equates a lustful gaze with the act of adultery already committed in the heart (See Matthew, 5:27-28). In the same statement, he presses beyond the prohibition of false oaths to forbid the swearing of any oath at all, demanding instead an absolute and unadorned truthfulness in all speech (See Matthew, 5:34-37).

In the theology of the New Testament, the locus of sin shifts from the outward "act" to the inward "heart"—the seat of intention, faith, and will. Sin is no longer just a legal infraction; it is a state of faithlessness and alienation from God, from which wicked actions naturally flow. This approach makes ethics a deeply personal and internal affair.

5.3. The Crystallization of Sin in Christian Theology

To give a practical illustration of what a sinful life looks like, Paul, in his letters, frequently employs "vice lists," a common literary and philosophical tool in the Greco-Roman world. These lists are not abstract catalogues; they are stark warnings that a life defined by the "works of the flesh" will exclude a person from the "kingdom of God." In his letter to the Galatians, he writes: "Now the works of the flesh are obvious: fornication, impurity, licentiousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousy, anger, quarrels, dissensions, factions, envy, drunkenness, carousing, and things like these... those who do such things will not inherit the kingdom of God" (Galatians, 5:19-21).

In his letter to the Romans, he provides another long and sobering list of the sins that result from humanity turning its back on God: "...they were filled with every kind of wickedness, evil, covetousness, malice. Full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, craftiness, they are gossips, slanderers, God-haters, insolent, haughty, boastful, inventors of evil, rebellious toward parents, foolish, faithless, heartless, ruthless" (Romans, 1:29-31).

And to the Corinthian church, he declares with unmistakable force that the unrighteous—the sexually immoral, idolaters, adulterers, men who practice homosexuality, thieves, and the greedy—will not inherit God’s kingdom. He goes so far as to forbid association with anyone who bears the name of Christian while living in such a way (See 1 Corinthians, 6:9-10 and 1 Corinthians, 5:11).

From Paul’s perspective, sin is not just a series of poor individual choices. It is a cosmic "power," a malevolent force that has taken humanity captive. His lists demonstrate that a life lived under the dominion of this power leads to a comprehensive moral collapse,

corrupting every dimension of life: the personal (lust, drunkenness), the social (strife, envy), and the spiritual (idolatry). The path to liberation from this enslavement is not, for Paul, a matter of trying harder to uphold the law. Rather, it is faith in the saving grace of Jesus Christ, which alone makes possible the new life in the Spirit.

6. Mortal Sin in Catholic Theology

In the Christian tradition, particularly within Catholic theology, sin is not merely understood as an undesirable moral behavior; it is an act that damages the relationship between the human person and God. Based on this understanding, the Catholic Church divides sins into two principal categories: mortal sins, which empty the soul of God's sanctifying grace and completely sever the bond with God, and venial sins, which weaken and wound this relationship but do not destroy it entirely.

6.1. Theological Basis and Historical Genealogy

The primary Biblical basis for this distinction is found in the First Epistle of John (5:16-17), which differentiates between a "sin that leads to death" and a sin that does not: "There is a sin that leads to death... All wrongdoing is sin, but there is a sin that does not lead to death." Although this verse provides the foundational theological touchstone for the Catholic distinction between mortal and venial sin, it does not specify the precise instances of "deadly sin," leaving that task to the tradition and teaching of the Church.

The systematic formulation of this doctrine, especially the famous list of the "Seven Deadly Sins," can be traced back to the Christian monastic tradition in the East. It was Evagrius Ponticus, a desert monk of the fourth century, who first formulated a list of eight "evil thoughts" (in Greek, *logismoi*) to guide his fellow monks in their

spiritual warfare (Evagrius Ponticus, 1972). His student, John Cassian, then transmitted this teaching to the West (Cassian, 2000, Books 5-12). This list was ultimately revised and reduced to seven sins by Pope Gregory the Great in the sixth century, becoming solidified in his work (Gregory the Great, 1844, Book 31). The doctrine reached its philosophical apex in the works of Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century. Aquinas designated these sins not merely as individual acts, but as "capital vices" (*vitia capitalia*)—foundational evils that are the source and genesis of other sins—and he identified "pride" as the root and mother of them all (Aquinas, 1981, II-II, Q. 162, a. 2). This precise Catholic framework, however, met with staunch opposition during the Protestant Reformation. Martin Luther, rejecting this classification, declared that all sins equally separate a person from God and are forgiven only through "faith" (Luther, 2005, 1520), while John Calvin also emphasized humanity's fundamental sinfulness and the wholesale violation of God's law, rather than focusing on discrete, individual sins.

The history of this doctrine reveals an evolutionary trajectory, moving from a practical, mystical intuition (the desert monks) to a systematic ecclesiastical formulation (Pope Gregory) and finally to a profound philosophical-moral reflection (Aquinas). This trajectory transformed the concept of sin from a mere list of prohibitions into a deep analysis of the structure of the human psyche and character.

6.2. The Nature and Criteria of the "Seven Deadly Sins"

The list of the "Seven Deadly Sins" in the Christian tradition—comprising pride, greed, lust, envy, gluttony, wrath, and sloth—was selected on the basis of theological reflection, psychological analysis, and the spiritual teaching of the Church. These sins, recognized in the

official teaching of the Catholic Church as capital vices (*Catechism of the Catholic Church* [CCC], para. 1866), are character dispositions that draw a person into a cycle of sinfulness. The reasons for their centrality are as follows:

(1) They Are the Sources of Other Sins: These sins are recognized as the wellspring from which many other sins flow. Thomas Aquinas calls them "capital vices" because numerous secondary sins originate from them (Aquinas, 1981, I-II, Q. 84, a. 4).

(2) They Are Rooted in the Soul's Faculties: These vices represent the excess and distortion of the three fundamental powers of the human soul—namely, the rational faculty (which can lead to pride), the concupiscible appetite (leading to gluttony and lust), and the irascible appetite (leading to wrath and envy)—and are therefore deeply rooted in human psychology.

(3) Mystical and Spiritual Experience: In the experiences of the early ascetics, such as Evagrius Ponticus, these sins were repeatedly identified as the primary obstacles on the path of spiritual growth and union with God (Evagrius Ponticus, 1972, Ch. 6).

(4) Biblical Basis: The Bible contains serious warnings about these sins, including pride (Proverbs, 8:13), greed (Colossians, 3:5), lust (Matthew, 5:28), and envy (James, 3:16), indicating their destructive consequences.

(5) They Destroy the Relationship with God: Each of these sins expels divine love (Charity), which is the very life of the spiritual soul, from the heart and destroys the person's

relationship with God (*Catechism of the Catholic Church* [CCC], para. 1855).

(6) Educational Function: The sevenfold list was highly suitable for the moral instruction of the general populace during the Middle Ages, which is why it was formally adopted by Pope Gregory the Great (Gregory the Great, 1844, Book 31).

The selection of these sins is therefore a synthesis of Biblical tradition, mystical insight, moral analysis, and the Church's pastoral and pedagogical considerations. More than a legal classification, this list serves as a psychological and spiritual roadmap, warning the human person against the vices that desiccate the roots of faith, spiritual health, and social relationships.

6.3. The Conditions for a Mortal Sin

Catholic theology makes a critical distinction between the "capital vices" (like the Seven Deadly Sins) and a "mortal sin." A capital vice is a tendency or a disposition, but a mortal sin is a specific "act" for which three conditions must be met simultaneously. These conditions are (See *Catechism of the Catholic Church* [CCC], paragraphs 1857-1859):

Grave Matter: The act committed must, in itself, be seriously and significantly wrong. It must constitute a violation of one of the Ten Commandments or a foundational moral value, such as murder (Exodus, 20:13), adultery (Exodus, 20:14), or idolatry (Exodus, 20: 3).

Full Knowledge: The person must be fully aware of the sinfulness and gravity of the act they are committing. Involuntary ignorance can diminish one's responsibility.

Deliberate Consent: The person must choose to commit the act with complete freedom of the will, without external coercion or overwhelming psychological pressure.

This threefold framework tethers moral responsibility directly to the conscience, knowledge, and freedom of the individual. This means that an act that is inherently grave might not be considered a mortal sin if it is performed without full knowledge or deliberate consent. This approach is the cornerstone of modern Catholic moral theology, emphasizing the central role of an informed conscience and free will in determining a person's moral culpability.

6.4. The Protestant Perspective

The Protestant theology born out of the sixteenth-century Reformation offers a radically different understanding of the nature of sin and salvation, fundamentally challenging the Catholic classification of sins into "mortal" and "venial."

According to the Reformers, particularly Martin Luther, sin is not simply a collection of graded moral infractions; it is the fundamental "state" or "condition" of human existence after the Fall. From this perspective, the primary problem for humanity is not the commission of specific sins, but the very fact of being a sinner—a state in which the human will is turned in upon itself instead of being turned toward God. Luther expresses this idea radically in his lectures on the book of Romans: "All sins are mortal because they spring from unbelief and are directly against God" (Luther, 2005, 1515-1516).

In this view, therefore, the distinction between major and minor sins loses its meaning, because even the smallest sin is a sign and fruit of the same poisoned root of unbelief that severs the human relationship with God.

Logically, if all sins are equally deadly, the solution cannot be to simply avoid a particular category of them. The Reformers found the solution in the foundational principle of Protestant theology:

"Justification by faith alone" (*Sola Fide*). This doctrine means that a person is declared righteous and saved not by virtue of their good works or avoidance of sin, but solely through faith in the saving grace of God in Jesus Christ. As Luther asserts in his famous treatise, a person "is justified (saved) not by what he does, but by what he believes" (Luther, 2005, 1520).

This principle has significant practical consequences. First, contrary to the Catholic sacramental system of confession, the forgiveness of sin does not require the mediation of a priest but is obtained through personal repentance and the direct work of the Holy Spirit in the believer's heart. John Calvin, in his work, likewise emphasizes this direct and personal relationship with God for seeking forgiveness (Calvin, 2008, Book 3, Ch. 4).

Although Protestants reject the concept of "mortal sin" in the Catholic sense, they do grapple with the problem of "apostasy"—a complete falling away from the faith. This concept refers to a state in which an individual, after having professed faith, knowingly and deliberately denies it and turns completely away from divine grace. The key text for this view is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews (6:4-6), which states that it is impossible to restore such a person to repentance, because they have effectively re-crucified Christ for themselves.

However, a significant theological tension exists on this point within the Protestant tradition itself. Many theologians, especially those in the Calvinist tradition, emphasize the doctrine of the "Perseverance of the Saints." This doctrine holds that true salvation, which is based on God's foreknowledge and designation, is irreversible, and that someone who has obtained true faith cannot possibly lose their salvation. From this standpoint, a person who

commits apostasy never had true, saving faith to begin with. This view stands in contrast to Arminian and Wesleyan perspectives, which hold that a person can, through their own free will, reject God's grace and forfeit their salvation (Olson, 2006, Chapter 7).

The Protestant perspective shifts the discourse on sin from a quantitative analysis (measuring the gravity of sins) to a qualitative one (examining the state of the heart and the presence or absence of faith). In this framework, sin is not a discrete act but a symptom of a fundamentally broken relationship with God, and faith is the only bridge to repair that relationship. The internal debate between the "possibility of apostasy" and the "perseverance of the saints" further reveals a deeper discussion within Protestant theology about the interplay between the absolute sovereignty of God and the free will of humankind.

7. The Approach of Islam and Christianity to the Deadly Sins

While the list of the "Seven Deadly Sins" is a conceptual framework originating from the Christian tradition, the foundational vices referenced in this list are condemned with a similar intensity within the ethical system of Islam, where they are recognized as the "mothers of all vices" (*ummahāt al-radhāʾil*) or the very roots of spiritual and social decay. A comparative analysis of these sins reveals a deep and shared "moral grammar" between these two Abrahamic traditions.

7.1. Pride

In the Islamic Tradition: Arrogance (*kibr*) is regarded not merely as a moral vice but as a theological sin and the root of all deviation. The Quran attributes the first sin of pride to Iblīs (Satan), who, when faced with the divine command to prostrate to Adam, "he was arrogant and

rejected faith" (Al-Baqara, 2:34). This sin is tantamount to a declaration of independence from God and a direct negation of servitude, to the extent that the Quran states: "He does not love the arrogant" (Al-Naḥl, 16:23). In the hadith tradition, the Prophet of Islam (peace be upon him and his household) decisively declares: "One who has in his heart so much as a mustard seed of arrogance will not enter Paradise" (Muslim, n.d, hadith 91). ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī, in his Quranic exegesis *Tafsīr al-Mīzān*, considers arrogance the primary factor that prevents one from receiving divine guidance (Ṭabāṭabāʾī, 1996, vol. 1, p. 169).

In the Christian Tradition: Pride is famously known as the "mother of all sins" and the most perilous of vices. The Bible warns, “Pride goes before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall” (Proverbs, 16:18), and that “God opposes the proud, but gives grace to the humble” (James, 4:6). St. Augustine, in *The City of God*, emphasizes that pride—defined as "the love of one's own excellence to the point of contempt for God"—was the very sin that caused Satan's fall from his station (Augustine, 2000, Book 14, Ch. 13). Thomas Aquinas likewise defines pride as the "inordinate desire for one's own greatness" in opposition to the divine order, and he, too, considers it the root of all sins (Aquinas, 1981, II-II, q. 162, art. 6).

Both traditions, therefore, see pride not as mere behavior but as an "existential state" in which the self usurps the place of God.

7.2. Greed

In the Islamic Tradition: Greed (*ḥirṣ*) is strongly condemned as one of the key roots of moral deviation and heedlessness of the spiritual path. The Holy Quran describes humanity's avaricious nature thus: "and he is fierce in his love of wealth" (Al-ʿĀdiyāt, 100:8). The Prophet of Islam (peace be upon him and his household), in a powerful parable, condemned the insatiable nature of this desire: "If the son of Adam

had two valleys of wealth, he would seek a third, and nothing will fill his belly except dust" (Muslim, n.d, ḥadīth 1048). Islamic philosophers like Khwāja Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī in his *Akhlāq-i Nāṣirī* identify greed as a cause of social conflict and neglect of the Hereafter (Al-Ṭūsī, 1985, p. 247).

In the Christian Tradition: Greed, or covetousness, is one of the seven deadly sins and is explicitly equated with idolatry in the New Testament: "...and greed (which is idolatry)" (Colossians, 3:5). The Apostle Paul warns with force: “For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil” (1 Timothy, 6:10). In his *Summa Theologica*, Aquinas describes it as a sin against justice and love, because in it, a material good is substituted for the ultimate good, who is God (Aquinas, 1981, II-II, q. 118).

Both religions see the danger of greed as extending far beyond a simple desire for possessions, analyzing it as an "existential deviation" in which human security and identity are founded upon material wealth instead of upon God.

7.3. Lust

In the Islamic Tradition: Sexual desire (*shahwa*) is a natural force and a divine gift for the continuation of the species and for tranquility, but if it transgresses its legal and ethical framework, it becomes one of the greatest of vices. The Quran, with decisive language, forbids even approaching unlawful sexual relations: "And do not go anywhere near adultery: it is an outrage and an evil path" (Al-Isrāʾ, 17:32). The hadith "I have not left behind me a trial more harmful for men than women" emphasizes the destructive power of this instinct if left untamed (al-Nūrī, 1987, vol. 14, p. 306).

In the Christian Tradition: Lust, as one of the seven deadly

sins, signifies an inordinate sexual desire that is detached from the context of love and fidelity. Jesus Christ, internalizing this sin, traces its root to the human heart: "...everyone who looks at a woman with lust has already committed adultery with her in his heart" (Matthew, 5:28). In his *Confessions*, Augustine describes lust as a force that enslaves a person to fleeting pleasures (Augustine, 1998, Book 10, Ch. 30), and Aquinas deems it an act "contrary to reason and divine law" (Aquinas, 1981, II-II, q. 154).

The shared insight of both traditions is that unbridled lust is not merely a hedonistic act; they see it as a force that leads to the "objectification" of the other, thereby destroying human dignity.

7.4. Envy

In the Islamic Tradition: Envy (ḥasad) is among the most destructive spiritual and moral maladies. The Qurʾān commands the believers to seek refuge in God from the evil of the envier: "...from the evil of an envier when he envies" (Al-Falaq, 113:5). Imām al-Ṣādiq (peace be upon him) identifies it as a blight upon one's religion: "The blights of religion are envy, vanity, and pride" (Al-Kulaynī, 1986, vol. 2, p. 306).

In the Christian Tradition: Envy is one of the seven deadly sins, long defined as sadness at the good fortune and success of others. The Epistle of James states unequivocally: “For where there is envy and selfish ambition, there will also be disorder and wickedness of every kind” (James, 3:16). Aquinas considers envy to be in "direct opposition to the virtue of charity," because charity rejoices in the good of others, while envy grieves at it (Aquinas, 1981, II-II, q. 36). Augustine calls it the "begetter of hatred and the source of gratuitous animosity" (Augustine, 2000, Book 14, Ch. 3).

Both traditions view envy not just as a negative emotion but as a profound spiritual failure in upholding the principle of "love" and "goodwill" towards others.

7.5. Gluttony

In the Islamic Tradition: Gluttony (*biṭna*), which is exemplified in *isrāf* (extravagance) in eating and drinking, is not merely a personal weakness but a moral vice that distances a person from the key virtues of moderation, gratitude, and inner purity. The Holy Quran articulates this principle in a tone that is both commanding and wise: "Eat and drink, but do not be wasteful: He does not love the wasteful" (Al-Aʿrāf, 7:31). Imām ʿAlī (peace be upon him) points to the cognitive and spiritual consequences of this vice, stating: "Gluttony creates a barrier between a man and his intelligence" (Al-Āmidī, 1989, ḥikma 2046). Ethicists like Fayḍ al-Kāshānī in *al-Maḥajjat al-Bayḍāʾ* considered gluttony the root of many other sins, such as licentiousness, heedlessness, and hardness of the heart (Fayḍ al-Kāshānī, 1996, vol. 5, p. 150).

In the Christian Tradition: Gluttony is one of the seven deadly sins, and its meaning extends beyond simple overeating. The Apostle Paul, in his letter to the Philippians, describes this deviation in sharp terms: “Their god is their belly... With minds set on earthly things” (Philippians, 3:19). In his *Summa Theologica*, Thomas Aquinas defines gluttony as an "inordinate desire in the pleasure of food" and considers it contrary to the virtue of "temperance" (Aquinas, 1981, II-II, q. 148).

Both traditions view gluttony not as a nutritional issue, but as a "spiritual malady."

7.6 Wrath

In the Islamic Tradition: Anger (*ghaḍab*) possesses a dual nature. If it

is channeled in the path of truth, it can be a moral virtue. Unbridled anger, however, is one of the most destructive vices. The Holy Quran describes one of the highest qualities of believers as the restraining of their anger: "...who restrain their anger and pardon people" (Āl ʿImrān, 3:134). The Prophet of Islam (peace be upon him and his household) defines true strength not as physical dominance but as self-control: "The strong man is not the one who is victorious in wrestling; rather, the strong man is the one who controls himself at the time of anger" (al-Naysābūrī, n.d, vol. 2, p. 380).

In the Christian Tradition: Wrath is one of the seven deadly sins because it stands in direct contradiction to the foundational Christian virtue of "love" (charity). The Epistle of James states plainly, "for your anger does not produce God's righteousness" (James, 1:20). In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus also internalizes this sin, deeming that merely being angry with a brother or sister makes one liable to judgment (Matthew, 5:22). In *Summa Theologica*, Aquinas sees excessive anger as the source of secondary sins like malice and violence, and Augustine emphasizes that this vice hardens the heart and prevents a person from receiving divine love (Aquinas, 1981, II-II, q. 158).

Both religions insist upon the necessity of "managing" and "mastering" the force of anger.

7.7. Sloth

In the Islamic Tradition: Sloth (*kasal*) is more than a physical weakness; it is a spiritual vice that holds a person back from attaining perfection. The frequent supplication of the Prophet of Islam (peace be upon him and his household) against this trait—"O God, I seek refuge in You from incapacity and laziness" (Muslim, n.d, hadith 2722)—indicates its profound danger. The Quran also censures the hypocrites

for performing their prayers in a state of lethargy: "...when they stand up to pray, they do so sluggishly" (Al-Nisāʾ, 4:142).

In the Christian Tradition: Sloth is described in terms of the deeper concept of acedia, which means "spiritual listlessness or apathy." This concept, first introduced by the desert monks like Evagrius Ponticus (Evagrius, 1972, Ch. 6), describes a state of spiritual sadness and revulsion. Pope Gregory the Great equated it with a "laxity in divine love" (Gregory the Great, 1844, Book 31), and Aquinas defined it as a "paralyzing sorrow with respect to spiritual good." This sin is not merely inaction but a refusal to rejoice in the good that comes from God (Aquinas, 1981, II-II, q. 35).

While the Islamic concept of *kasal* focuses more on the "omission of action," the Christian concept of acedia describes an "internal and existential" crisis: a kind of spiritual depression rooted in despair and a loss of meaning.

8. The Distinction Between Major Sin and Mortal Sin in Islam and Christianity

Having examined the specific instances of major sins, a foundational analytical question now presents itself: Where is the primary locus of sin? Is sin rooted in the "act"—the external and observable behavior—or in the "disposition," the internal state of the agent's heart? Although both the Islamic and Christian traditions emphasize the importance of a pure intention and righteous deeds, a subtle yet meaningful difference in their approaches can be observed in response to this question. Islamic moral theology, particularly within its legal and jurisprudential context, tends to regard the "act" as the principal subject of judgment and sin. In contrast, Christian ascetic theology, especially in the tradition of the "Seven Deadly Sins," identifies the "disposition," or the capital vices, as the primary locus of sinfulness.

This section will explore this structural distinction and its implications.

8.1. The Islamic View: The Primacy of the "Act" over the "Internal State"

In the Islamic legal-ethical system, a clear boundary exists between the "internal states of the soul" (such as thoughts and inclinations) and "external acts" (which manifest in speech or deeds). The governing principle is that a person is held responsible primarily for their voluntary actions, not for the involuntary thoughts and feelings that may cross their heart. This principle is expressed in a renowned hadith from the Prophet of Islam (peace be upon him and his household): "Indeed, God has overlooked for my nation that which their souls chatter to them, so long as they do not act upon it or speak of it" (Al-Kulaynī, 1986, vol. 1, p. 20).

Based on this foundation, we can analyze the Islamic approach to the vices:

> Envy (*Ḥasad*): The feeling of envy in the heart, while a reprehensible spiritual malady and moral vice that one must strive to purify, is not in itself a sin that incurs otherworldly punishment so long as it does not lead to an external act, such as backbiting, slander, or an attempt to harm another. The sin is the "act" that arises from the envy.

Lust (*Shahwa*): The presence of sexual desire (instinct) is not a sin, but rather a natural and necessary force that, when channeled within the sacred framework of marriage, is praiseworthy and rewarding. The major sin occurs when this desire is transformed into a forbidden "act," such as fornication, sodomy, or even a deliberate "lecherous gaze."

Pride (*Kibr*): Pride in the heart is the root of many sins, but the

sin that is recorded is "arrogant behavior." Islam has even, in specific cases, permitted or even praised behavior that is outwardly arrogant, such as the saying: "Arrogance in the face of an arrogant person is a form of charity," which demonstrates that the primary criterion is the "act" and the context in which it occurs.

Therefore, from an Islamic perspective, the major sins are predominantly forbidden "acts" that originate from moral vices. Although the Islamic science of ethics (*Tazkiyat al-Nafs*, or purification of the soul) is deeply concerned with refining these inner roots and dispositions, the Sharia and its jurisprudence (*fiqh*) draw a clear line between the internal state and the sinful act.

8.2. The Christian View: The Primacy of the "Internal State" over the "Act"

In contrast, Christian moral theology, particularly within the framework of the "Seven Deadly Sins," shifts the locus of sin inward. These seven sins are not so much discrete actions as they are "dispositions," "inclinations," or "Capital Vices" that sicken the soul and naturally produce sinful acts. They are less about what a person does and more about the state a person is in.

The zenith of this internalization of sin is seen in the Sermon on the Mount, in the words of Jesus Christ himself. When he says, "...everyone who looks at a woman with lust has already committed adultery with her in his heart" (Matthew, 5:28), he effectively dissolves the boundary between act and intention, identifying the root of the sin in the "lustful disposition" itself. From this perspective, the physical act of adultery is merely the "fruit" and external manifestation of that poisoned inner root. In the same way, anger in the heart is presented as equivalent to murder, because both spring from the same disposition of "hatred" and the "negation of love."

Therefore, in this view, the list of the Seven Deadly Sins (pride, greed, lust, envy, gluttony, wrath, and sloth) is, in reality, a list of the "wellsprings" of sin. The moral struggle in Christianity is, in the first instance, an internal battle to transform these dispositions and replace them with their opposing virtues (humility, generosity, chastity, love, temperance, patience, and diligence).

8.3. The Complementary Relationship of "Root" and "Fruit"

The distinction between the Islamic and Christian approaches should be understood not as an absolute contradiction but as a difference in "focal point" and "moral methodology." The two perspectives are, in fact, complementary, offering a comprehensive picture of the structure of sin. One can use the metaphor of the "root and the fruit" to explain this relationship: The Seven Deadly Sins of Christianity are the internal and psychological "roots" of sin. Many of the major sins in Islam are the external and behavioral "fruits" of those roots.

For instance, the vice and "disposition" of wrath (the root) leads to the sinful "act" of murder (the fruit). The disposition of lust (the root) leads to the act of adultery (the fruit), and the disposition of greed (the root) leads to the act of theft or usury (the fruit).

The Islamic approach, by focusing on the "act," provides a clear legal and social framework for establishing justice and order in society, making objective accountability possible. In contrast, the Christian approach, by focusing on the "disposition," offers a powerful psychological-spiritual framework for self-knowledge and inner transformation.

Ultimately, both religious traditions share in the final principle that complete spiritual formation requires a struggle on both fronts. Lasting moral reform is not possible without addressing the inner

wellsprings and vices of the heart, while at the same time, the purification of the heart must manifest itself in the form of righteous deeds and just behavior in the external world. This final convergence demonstrates the profound and shared wisdom of the Abrahamic faiths in understanding the complexities of human existence.

9. Mechanisms for the Forgiveness of Sin in Islam and Christianity

9.1. Repentance in Christian Theology

In Christian theology, sin is understood as a rupture in the relationship between the human person and God, and repentance is the process of mending this rupture and returning to the embrace of divine grace. Although the Bible calls believers to live in holiness and to refrain from sin (Romans, 6:1-14), both the Old Testament (See Exodus, 34:6-7; 2 Chronicles, 7:14) and the New Testament emphasize the necessity of repentance for sinners. The call to repent is the central message at the start of the missions of both John the Baptist and Jesus Christ himself: “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come near!” (Matthew, 4:17) This necessity is so vital that the Apostle Paul severely critiques any teaching that would treat sin as insignificant for those who are saved, seeing such a view as a form of bondage to sensual passions (See 2 Peter, 2:19). However, concerning the mechanism and nature of this repentance, profound theological differences exist between the Catholic and Protestant traditions.

9.2. Repentance in the Catholic Tradition

In Catholic theology, repentance is a structured, tangible, and ecclesial (Church-based) process that finds its expression in the "Sacrament of Penance and Reconciliation." This sacrament, especially for the forgiveness of "mortal sins" which strip the soul of sanctifying grace,

is considered the ordinary and necessary path established by Christ: "reconciliation with God and with the Church is brought about by the sacrament of Penance after a mortal sin has been committed" (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, para. 1484). The Catholic Church obliges the faithful to "confess his or her grave sins at least once a year" (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, para. 1457).

This sacramental process is founded upon four essential pillars (See *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, para. 1450-1460):

Contrition: Sorrow of the soul and detestation for the sin committed, together with the resolution not to sin again.

Confession: The explicit and complete telling of one's mortal sins to a priest, who hears the confession in the person of Christ and on behalf of the Church.

Absolution: The forgiveness of sins by the priest through the formula "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

Penance (or Satisfaction): The carrying out of reparative and restorative acts (such as prayer, fasting, almsgiving, or service) assigned by the priest.

Although this sacrament is necessary for mortal sins, the Church acknowledges that in emergency situations where access to a priest is impossible, "perfect contrition," provided it includes the intention to confess as soon as possible, can obtain forgiveness (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, para. 1452). This perspective underscores the boundless mercy of God, as Pope Francis states: "God never tires of forgiving us; we are the ones who tire of seeking his mercy" (Pope Francis, 2013, §3). In the Catholic view, repentance is not a purely internal and personal process, but a juridical-spiritual and "ecclesial"

act that, through a tangible and observable mechanism, reconciles the individual with God and with the community of faith.

9.3. Repentance in the Protestant Tradition

The Protestant Reformation, centered on the principle of "justification by faith alone" (*Sola Fide*), launched a sharp critique of the Catholic approach to repentance. In Protestant theology, repentance is not an ecclesiastical sacrament but a deeply personal, internal experience and an inseparable component of "faith" itself. Martin Luther, in the first of his famous Ninety-five Theses, declared: "When our Lord and Master Jesus Christ said, 'Repent,' he willed the entire life of believers to be one of repentance" (Luther, 2005, The 95 Theses, Thesis 1). On this account, repentance is not a periodic act to cleanse specific sins, but a continuous "state of being"—a constant turning from sin toward grace.

Accordingly, Protestants reject the "Sacrament of Confession" to a priest, viewing it as an innovation that creates a barrier between the individual and God. Forgiveness of sins, they believe, is obtained only in a direct relationship with God and through faith in His promise of mercy, not through the action of a priest (Luther, 2005, The Freedom of a Christian). John Calvin likewise defines true repentance not as fear of punishment, but as "sorrow for having offended God and the desire to return to His favor" (Calvin, 2008, Book 3, Ch. 3, §7), and he maintains that this process is the internal work of the Holy Spirit in the believer's heart, not the result of the external words of a human being (Calvin, 2008, Book 3, Ch. 3, §14).

Nevertheless, the danger of "unrepentant sin" and falling from faith (apostasy) is also taken seriously in Protestant theology. The Epistle to the Hebrews states plainly that it is "impossible to restore

again to repentance those who have once been enlightened" and then have fallen away (Hebrews, 6:4-6). In Protestant traditions such as Methodism and Anabaptism, this verse is taken as evidence for the possibility of losing one's salvation. In contrast, the Calvinist tradition, emphasizing the doctrine of the "Perseverance of the Saints," holds that a true believer, chosen by God, will never completely fall from grace.

The Protestant perspective thus transforms repentance from an "ecclesial mechanism" into an "existential experience".

9.4. Repentance in the Islamic Tradition

Repentance (*tawba*) in Islam serves a central and foundational function in the spiritual life of a Muslim. It is defined as a direct, unmediated, and profoundly hopeful process between the servant and the Lord. This process has two dimensions: a divine dimension, wherein God, with His attributes of *al-Tawwāb* (the Ever-Repenting, the Accepter of Repentance) and *al-Raḥīm* (the All-Merciful), has perpetually made the path of return available (Al-Tawba, 9:104); and a human dimension, wherein the individual is obligated to fulfill the conditions for that return.

In opposition to any despairing outlook, the Holy Quran decisively forbids sinners from losing hope in divine mercy. God, who calls Himself *Ghāfir al-Dhanb* ("forgiver of sins") (Ghafir, 40:3), declares that every sin, no matter how grave, is capable of being forgiven before His mercy: "Say, 'My servants who have harmed yourselves by your own excess, do not despair of God's mercy. God forgives all sins..." (Al-Zumar, 39:53).

This divine love for the returning servant is so great that the Quran states: "...God loves those who turn back to Him..." (Al-Baqara,

2:222), and it counts the state of being constantly repentant (*awwāb*) as one of the preeminent qualities of His righteous servants (Ṣād, 38:44).

Muslim scholars, citing the verses of the Quran and hadiths, have stipulated conditions for a true repentance, the most important of which are as follows:

1. Remorse of the Heart (*al-nadāma*): A deep and sincere regret for the past.
2. Resolution to Abstain (*ʿazm ʿalā al-Tark*): A firm decision not to return to the sin.
3. Restitution of Rights (*jabr al-ḥuqūq*): In cases where the sin has violated the rights of others, making amends for that violation is a prerequisite for the validity of the repentance.

If these conditions are met, repentance not only removes the otherworldly punishment but also, in Islamic theology, yields a unique fruit: the transformation of sins into good deeds. The Holy Quran states: "...God will change their evil deeds into good ones..." (Al-Furqān, 25:70). This doctrine reveals the apex of the transformative power of divine grace, which not only erases the past but turns it into a foundation for spiritual growth. Furthermore, Islam recognizes other pathways to forgiveness, such as the intercession (*al-shafāʿa*) of the saintly friends of God or the prayer of a righteous child for their parents.

In conclusion, repentance in Islam is a juridical-moral process founded upon the direct and unmediated relationship between the human being and the All-Merciful God (*al-Raḥmān*).

10. The Penalty for Unrepented Sin

In both the Islamic and Christian traditions, the divine logic rests upon the principle that if a person commits major or mortal sins and departs from this world without repentance, in a state of complete rupture from God, their final abode will be Hell. Hell is not understood as arbitrary divine vengeance, but as the ultimate and just realization of a human free will that has consciously rejected the source of all goodness and life.

10.1. Hell in Christian Theology

The Bible describes the nature of this final state in order to depict its gravity. These descriptions can be categorized along several thematic lines:

- Images of Fire and Punishment: The "eternal fire" (Matthew, 25:41), the "unquenchable fire" (Matthew, 3:12), and the "lake of fire and sulfur" (Revelation, 20:10) serve as symbols of an all-encompassing and unpurifying suffering.
- Images of Loss: "Eternal destruction" (2 Thessalonians, 1:9) and separation from the presence of the Lord, indicating a complete rupture from the source of all goodness and joy.
- Images of Spiritual and Physical Torment: A "place of torment" (Luke, 16:23-24), a place of "weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matthew, 13:42), a place where the worms that consume the bodies of sinners never die (Mark, 9:47-48), and whose inhabitants exist in "shame and everlasting contempt" (Daniel, 12:2).

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, summarizing these

teachings, emphasizes a key theological point: "Jesus often speaks of 'Gehenna' of 'the unquenchable fire' reserved for those who to the end of their lives refuse to believe and be converted... The chief punishment of hell is eternal separation from God, in whom alone man can possess the life and happiness for which he was created and for which he longs" (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, para. 1034-1035).

However, among some Protestant denominations, a view known as "Annihilationism" also exists, which holds that Hell is the lake of fire wherein sinners will be destroyed forever and will not have a conscious existence in eternal torment.

10.2. Hell (*Jahannam*) from the Islamic Perspective

The Holy Quran also depicts *Jahannam* with vivid and powerful descriptions to illustrate the depth of the sinners' loss. Hell is called the "evil home" (*sūʾ al-dār*) (Al-Raʿd, 13:25) and the "house of ruin" (*dār al-bawār*) (Ibrahim, 14:28). This place is so insatiable that after engulfing the transgressors, it still cries out: "'Are there any more?'" (Qāf, 50:30) Other descriptions in the Quran include:

- Physical Torments: The drink of the inhabitants of Hell is scalding water (*ḥamīm*) (Al-Anʿām, 6:70), and their food is from the accursed tree of *zaqqūm* (Al-Ṣāffāt, 37:62-66).
- Spiritual and Social Torments: In describing the psychological and social torments of Hell, the Quran alludes to an atmosphere filled with wailing and cries for destruction (Al-Furqān, 25:13-14), faces that are blackened and downcast, and severe angels (Āl ʿImrān, 3:106). But the most significant torment is the pain of separation and distance from God.

This truth is expressed in the prayer of *Kumayl* through the words of Imām ʿAlī (peace be upon him): "Grant that I... could bear Your punishment, but how could I endure separation from You?" (al-Ṭūsī, 1991, p. 844).

- The Commander of the Faithful, ʿAlī (peace be upon him), in a stunning sermon, brings this suffering closer to human experience in order to dispel heedlessness: "Know that this delicate skin has no power to withstand the Fire of Hell! So have mercy on yourselves... How can one tolerate being between two layers of fire, beside scorching stones, as a companion to Satan?" (Imām ʿAlī, 1994, Sermon 183).
- However, a significant theological distinction exists in Islam. Although the sins of some, such as unrepented polytheism, lead to eternal torment ("they will remain in it") (Al-Baqara, 2:39), in the view of many Islamic schools of thought, Hell serves a "purgatorial" and "temporary" function for sinful believers. According to Islam, the only ways to be released from Hell are for the period of appointed punishment to end or to benefit from the intercession (*shafāʿa*) of the intercessors (Fayḍ al-Kāshānī, 1996, vol. 8, p. 371). In the mainstream Christian tradition (Catholic and Protestant), however, Hell is generally considered an eternal and irreversible state for all its inhabitants. In contrast, Islamic theology, by proposing the possibility of the exit of sinful believers after their purification, depicts a different picture, wherein Hell can, for this group, have a function similar to that of "Purgatory" in Catholic theology (Lange, 2016, pp. 179-182).

Conclusion

This comparative study, with the aim of investigating the structure, criteria, and consequences of the concept of "major sin" in the Islamic and Christian traditions, has built its central argument upon the proposition that the fundamental distinction between these two systems lies not in their list of specific instances, but in the "locus of sin." While Islamic moral theology, especially in its jurisprudential context, focuses on the objective, external "act," Christian ascetic theology, particularly in the tradition of the "Seven Deadly Sins," identifies the "disposition," or the capital vices, as the primary origin of sinfulness. This difference in focal point has left profound consequences on the legal, ethical, and spiritual systems of each of these religions.

The findings of this research can be summarized in several key areas. First, it was shown that in Islam, the definition of a "major sin" is text-based, relying on objective criteria, such as the promise of divine punishment or the stipulation of a fixed legal penalty in the Sharia. In contrast, in Catholic theology, a "mortal sin" is defined in terms of three internal conditions: graveness, full knowledge, and deliberate consent. Second, despite this difference in criteria, the analysis of specific instances revealed that both traditions demonstrate a remarkable convergence in condemning sins that harm the foundational principles of life (such as murder), the family (such as adultery), society (such as consuming the property of an orphan), and the relationship with God (such as polytheism). Third, this article has shown that the list of the "Seven Deadly Sins" in Christianity is understandable as the internal "roots" of sin, while many of the major sins in Islam are the behavioral "fruits" of those roots. Fourth, the mechanisms of repentance also displayed two distinct models: a

direct, unmediated, and hope-based process in Islam, versus a structured, ecclesial process in Catholicism and an experience based on personal faith in Protestantism. Finally, in the discussion of eschatology, it was determined that although both religions emphasize Hell as the penalty for unrepented sin, Islamic theology, by proposing the possibility of the "exit of sinful believers after their purification," depicts a different picture that brings it closer to the Catholic concept of "Purgatory."

These findings have significant implications. In the field of inter-religious dialogue, this comparative understanding shows that focusing on the "deep moral grammar" and shared values (such as justice, dignity, and mercy) can be far more constructive than a superficial comparison of legal catalogues. In the domain of understanding religious ethics, this research clarifies that religious moral systems, despite shared goals, can possess different structures and methodologies, the understanding of which is essential for precise analysis. Furthermore, the ethical principles underlying these doctrines holds a great potential for confronting modern challenges; the critique of "greed" as idolatry can be applied to the analysis of consumerist culture, and the critique of "lust" as the objectification of the human person aligns with contemporary discourses on human dignity.

In closing, it is necessary to acknowledge the limitations of this study. This article has focused primarily on the mainstream theological and jurisprudential currents in Islam (Shia and Sunni) and Christianity (Catholic and Protestant) and has not addressed the rich perspectives within the Eastern Christian (Orthodox) tradition, which views the concept of "sin" more as a "sickness of the soul" and "missing the mark" (*hamartia*). Likewise, an analysis of the Jewish

perspective, as the common root of these two traditions, could have added to the richness of the discussion. Therefore, future research could fill these lacunae. A study that undertakes a tripartite comparison of the concept of sin in the Orthodox, Catholic, and Protestant traditions, or a study that places the Islamic view alongside Jewish theology, would open new horizons in this field. Furthermore, an empirical study on how these theological concepts are understood and experienced by ordinary religious adherents in contemporary societies could be a valuable complement to textual and theoretical research.

References

* The Holy Quran

** The Holy Bible

Saint. A. (of Hippo). (1998). *Confessions*. Translated by Henry Chadwick. Oxford: Oxford University Press,.

Āmidī, ʿA. b. M. (1989). *Ghurar al-Ḥikam wa-Durar al-Kalim*. Edited by Sayyid Mahdī Rajāʾī. Qom: Dār al-Kitāb al-Islāmī.

ʿĀmilī, M. b. M. (1990). (al-Shahīd al-Awwal). *Al-Lumʿat al-Dimashqiyya fī Fiqh al-Imāmiyya*. Bayrūt: Dār al-Fikr.

ʿĀmilī, Z. b. ʿA. (1989). (al-Shahīd al-Thānī). *Al-Rawḍat al-Bahiyya fī Sharḥ al-Lumʿay al-Dimashqiyya*. Edited by Sayyid Muḥammad Kalāntar. 10 vols. Qom: Kitābfurūshī-i Dāvarī.

Aquinas, T. (1981). *Summa Theologica*. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. (5 vols). Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press.

Bukhārī, M. b. I. (2001). *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Edited by Muḥammad Zuhayr ibn Nāṣir al-Nāṣir. (7 vols). Beirut: Dār Ṭawq al-Najāh.

Calvin, J. (2008). *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers,.

Cassian, J. (2000). *The Institutes*. Translated by Boniface Ramsey. New York: Newman Press,.

Catechism of the Catholic Church. (2000). (2nd ed). Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.

Dhahabī, Sh. M. b. A. (1987). *Al-Kabāʾir*. Edited by Muḥyī al-Dīn Mustū. Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr.

Dunn, J. D. G. (1998). *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Evagrius. P. (1972). *The Praktikos and Chapters on Prayer*. Translated by John Eudes Bamberger. Collegeville, MN: Cistercian Publications.

Fayḍ al-Kāshānī, M. M. (1996). *Al-Maḥajjat al-Bayḍāʾ fī Tahdhīb al-Iḥyāʾ*.

Edited by ʿAlī-Akbar Ghaffārī. (8 vols). Qum: Daftar-i Intishārāt-i Islāmī,

Francis, P. (2013). *Evangelii Gaudium* (The Joy of the Gospel). Apostolic Exhortation. Vatican City.

Ghazālī, A. Ḥ. M. (1987). *Iḥyāʾ ʿUlūm al-Dīn*. (5 vols). Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifa, n.d.

Gregory the Great. (1844). *Moralia in Job*. Translated by John Henry Parker. (4 vols). Oxford: J.H. Parker.

Haytamī, I. Ḥ. (1987). *Al-Zawājir ʿan Iqtirāf al-Kabāʾir*. (2 vols). Beirut: Dār al-Fikr.

Ḥillī, al-Ḥ. b. Y. (1992). (ʿAllāma al-Ḥillī). *Qawāʿid al-Aḥkām fī Maʿrifat al-Ḥalāl wa-l-Ḥarām*. Qom: Muʾassasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī.

Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī, M. b. al-Ḥ. (1993). *Wasāʾil al-Shīʿa ilā Taḥṣīl Masāʾil al-Sharīʿa*. (29 vols). Qom: Muʾassasat Āl al-Bayt li-Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth.

Kulaynī, M. b. Y. (1986). *Al-Kāfī*. Edited by ʿAlī-Akbar Ghaffārī and Muḥammad Ākhundī. (8 vols). Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya.

Lange, Ch. (2016). *Paradise and Hell in Islamic Traditions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Luther, M. (2005). *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings*. Edited by Timothy F. Lull. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Majlisī, M. B. (1982). *Biḥār al-Anwār al-Jāmiʿa li-Durar Akhbār al-Aʾimmat al-Aṭhār*. 110 vols. Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī.

Mufīd, M. b. M. (1992). (al-Shaykh al-Mufīd). *Taṣḥīḥ Iʿtiqādāt al-Imāmiyya*. Edited by Ḥusayn Dargāhī. Qom: World Congress for the Millennium of Shaykh Mufīd.

Muslim. b. al-Ḥ. al-N. (n.d). *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Edited by Muḥammad Fuʾād ʿAbd al-Bāqī. (5 vols). Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī,. C. Christian Sources.

Muttaqī, al-H. ʿA. ʿA. (1981). *Kanz al-ʿUmmāl fī Sunan al-Aqwāl wa-l-Afʿāl*.

Edited by Bakrī Ḥayyānī and Ṣafwat al-Saqqā. Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla.

Narāqī, M. M. (1967). *Jāmiʿ al-Saʿādāt*. Edited by Sayyid Muḥammad Kalāntar. (3 vols). Najaf: Manshūrāt Jāmiʿat al-Najaf al-Dīniyya.

Nawawī, Y. b. Sh. (1972). *Al-Minhāj fī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj*. (18 vols). Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī.

Naysābūrī, M. b. A. F. (n.d). *Rawḍat al-Wāʿiẓīn wa-Baṣīrat al-Mutaʿiẓīn*. Edited by Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī Kharsān. Qom: Manshūrāt al-Raḍī.

Nūrī, Ḥ. b. M. T. (1987). (Muḥaddith Nūrī). *Mustadrak al-Wasāʾil wa-Mustanbaṭ al-Masāʾil*. (18 vols). Qom: Muʾassasat Āl al-Bayt li-Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth,.

Olson, R. E. (2006). *Arminian Theology: Myths and Realities*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic.

Saint. A. (of Hippo). (2000). *The City of God*. Translated by Marcus Dods. New York: The Modern Library.

Sayyid al-Raḍī. (1994). (compiler). *Nahj al-Balāgha*. Edited by Ṣubḥī al-Ṣāliḥ. Qom: Intishārāt-i Hijrat,.

Ṭabāṭabāʾī, S. M. Ḥ. (1996).. *Al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qurʾān*. 20 vols. Qom: Daftar-i Intishārāt-i Islāmī,

Ṭūsī, K. N. (1985). *Akhlāq-i Nāṣirī*. Edited by Mujtabā Mīnuvī and ʿAlī-Riḍā Ḥaydarī. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Khwārazmī,.

Ṭūsī, M. b. al-Ḥ. (1991). *Miṣbāḥ al-Mutahajjid*. Edited by ʿAlī-Aṣghar Morwārīd. Beirut: Muʾassasat Fiqh al-Shīʿa,.