CHAPTER I
The present chapter attempts at finding the Hindu understanding of Islamic Faith. The topic is divided into important themes like concept of God, prophet-hood of Muhammad (SAW), Quran as a divine revelation and the concept of life-hereafter.

Concept of God:

Islam as a religion propounds a monotheistic belief to its adherents. The basic scripture of Islam i.e. Quran is replete with verses describing God through His attributes and names. The very foundation of Islamic creed is based upon the sincere belief and confession in the pure unity of God. The Quran employs the Arabic word “Allah”, which is commonly translated as God.

Many Hindu Scholars have dwelt on the subject of the concept of God in Islam. These responses are varied depending upon the treatment of the subject by the author, particularly, the usage of the sources. The list of these scholars includes philosophers, historians, students of comparative religion, thinkers and scholars of Vedic religion as well as zealots of Hindutva and founders of propaganda literature. The present work records the works of personalities such as, M. N. Roy, Pandit Sunderlai, Nitin Vyas, M. K. Gandhi, Ram Shanker Srivastava, Swami Vivekanand and Ram Swarup. Their responses are varied; some have praised the
Islamic concept of God, its basic feature of monotheism, regarding it as the highest form of religion. While some others have found the common grounds between both the faiths and held that monotheism is not alien to the spirit of Hinduism. Whereas, some others have even regarded monotheism as the lowest form of religion, possessing nothing great in its essence, specifically in contrast with Hindu idea of monism. These varied responses clearly mark the distinct contrasts in the Hindu understanding of Islamic faith.

M. N. Roy Philosophically discusses that:

“Muhammad’s religion was rigorously monotheistic and as a Monotheism it was uncompromising, which outstanding characteristic won for it the distinction of the highest form of religion.” (Roy 1958:51)

According to the author, philosophically the idea of God is the foundation of religion. He regards Islam as the highest form of religion because it bases its idea of God on the conception of ‘creation out of nothing’, which all other religions lack and hence according to him converged in some or other forms of pantheism which he writes eventually logically liquidates religions as such. He says this is so because when God is identified with the phenomenal world, the idea of creation is disposed and if the world can exist by itself from eternity it is not necessary to assume a creator. Further he writes that without the function of creation, God becomes a non-essential conception. Roy’s idea of monotheism is that it
is a highly subversive theory, for if God can be above and beyond the world, then it can be without him altogether. He argues,

"Divinity of its founder is not the fundamental creed of Islam. And that distinction results from its strict monotheism." (Roy 1958:54)

He writes that the strict monotheism of Islam saved it from the credulities of theological contradictions. Also that when the divinity is attributed to Prophet then the original simplicity of faith is lost.

He Says.

"Islam as the most rigorous monotheistic religion closed the chapter of human history dominated by the religious mode of thought and by its very nature was open to unorthodox interpretations which eventually liquidated the religious mode of thought and laid down the foundation of modern rationalism." (Roy 1958:53)

According to the author, the original simplicity of Islamic faith had scope of great development. He argues that

"subject to the belief in one God, the Musalman had a practically unlimited latitude for this spiritual life." (Roy 1958:55)

And he points this resulted in the intellectual development made by the Muslims.

"The basic doctrine of Islam-'There is but One God'-itself makes for toleration." (Roy 1958:34)
He says Islam by declaring oneness of God, promotes oneness or unity of his creatures for those who worship differently, are in reality deviated and can be brought to the right way or tolerated until they are ready for redemption.

Pandit Sunderlal advocates the idea that the basic truths presented by all the religions are same. He comments on the Quranic term ‘Allah’ saying that

“in Rg Veda one of the names by which Iswara is styled is ‘Ilā’ which has its roots in ‘Il’ meaning to praise or to worship.” (Sunderlal 1957:5)

He suggests that the term Allah has in one style or another come to be applied to God right from the time of Rg veda. further he says that the Vedic

“Ekam Eva Advitiyam” is the same as “Wahdahu la Sharikalah” (Sunderlal 1957:5)

of the Quran meaning, “He is one, there is none to associate with him.”

He summarizes the concept of God in Islam as,

“God is one, He has no form and none is like him. He is the lord of all the worlds, and requites every one for what one does. To Him alone one must offer worship and to none else.” (Sunderlal 1957:144)

Nitin Vyas declares,
"Islam is the typical force of the conviction and belief in one supreme being wherein lies the fact of Muhammad’s originality." (Vyas 1982:76)

He finds the existence of one supreme power in Islam as a simple concept of divine government. The reason for this is the fact that it was experienced by Muhammad (SAW), a prophet and messenger from God, without holding him as the incarnation of the supreme power. He also cherishes the idea of ‘Tawheed’ by stating,

"Islam is a distinct and unique monotheism.” (Vyas 1982:77)

He argues that it is distinct and unique because there is nothing obscure in its teachings. He says that God is one being (dhat), He is also one in qualities (Sifat) and also one in action (amal). Furthermore, He not only rules the world but also transcends it. He praises this concept of God saying that,

"the unity of God has a deep underlying significance and it is not a mere dogma.”(Vyas 1982:144).

He consolidates this idea since God alone is the master of man’s destiny hence to equate the self or any other being with him is a sin. To make low desire for one’s good also amounts to a sin.

For M. K. Gandhi ‘Truth is God’ (Gandhi 1996:20) Where the word satya (truth) is derived from sat, which means ‘being’; Nothing is or exists in reality except Truth. He believed that all religions led to God. He posits
that ‘all faiths constitute a revelation of Truth, but all are imperfect, and liable to error (Gandhi 1996:20) He thinks that the Hindu philosophy,

“God alone is and nothing else exists”, is similar to the truth which is emphasized and exemplified in the Kalma of Islam (Gandhi 1996:41)

The other similarity according to him is that like Hinduism, Islam too has many names of God. (Gandhi 1996:40) His ideas and concepts of God are closer to those of Islam. For he says, he believed in absolute oneness of God. (Gandhi 1996:130) He also said that.

“I have always believed God to be without form.” (Gandhi 1996:47)

This idea of a formless God was so intense that he declared, that.

“My Rama, the Rama of our prayers is not the historical Rama.” (Gandhi 1996:100)

His definition of Rama is closer to Islam, for him.

“Rama is eternal, the unborn, the one without a second. Him alone I worship, his aid alone I seek.” (Gandhi 1996:100)

He acknowledges that

“Islam’s distinctive contribution to India’s culture is its unadulterated belief in the oneness of God.” (Gandhi 1970:V40,58)

Ram Shanker Srivastava believes in the synthesis of different faiths and religions so that the tide of modernization, which is sweeping away faith in spiritualization, can be stopped. He writes:
“Whatever God one worships, one worships the same supreme God.” (Srivastava 1974:27)

His idea of concept of God in Islam is, that God is very close and intimate with man: whenever any devotes wishes to unite with Him, He comes and identifies with him. (Srivastava 1974:161) He supports this view on the basis of certain Quranic Verses. Nevertheless, author paints an inappropriate picture of Islamic faith and creed when he writes,

“the illusion of God have disappeared in the modern times and people have Gods in ordinary individuals viz. Buddha, Christ and Muhammad, who became later on Gods for men.”(Srivastava 1974:51)

Here he elucidates that the old concept of God disappears since it looses the hold on people’s psychology. But since God is indispensable for the human life, thus new Gods are created and these Prophets, Messengers and seers become Gods.

Swami Vivekananda, a Vedantist, is of the opinion that,

“every religion is evolving a God out of the material man and the same God is the inspiration of all of them.” (Vivekananda 1994:VI,18)

that there is same God in all the religions. The differences in religion, rather contradictions in the various religions according to him are ‘only apparent’. He says that the contradictions come from the same truth adopting itself to the varying circumstances of different natures. The idea
of God in Islam according to him is without any complications. He opines that in Islam,

"God is God. There is no philosophy, no complicated code of ethics." (Vivekananda 1994:VI,482)

He notes that the Muhammad’s teaching was,

“Our God is one without a second, and Muhammad is the Prophet.” (Vivekananda 1994:VI,482)

He expresses the idea that religion that has held on to the idea of an extracosmic deity, that he is a very big man and nothing else no more stand on their feet; they have been pulled down. (Vivekananda 1994:VI,372) He envisages this on the basis of the ‘modern law of evolution’ (Vivekananda 1994:VI,372). For him

“Monistic is the highest stage, monotheism is a lower stage.” (Vivekananda 1994:V7,100)

He holds that imagination leads to the highest even more rapidly and easily than reasoning. (Vivekananda 1994:V7,100) In other words even if monotheism satisfies reasoning still it has to be considered as lower than monistic. He mentions that according to some, the God called Al-Lat afterwards turned into Allah of the Arabs. (Vivekananda 1994:V7,368) However in the same vein he says, the idea of an objective God is not untrue infact, every idea of God, and hence every religion, is true, as each is but a different stage in the journey, the aim of which is the perfect conception of the Vedas. (Vivekananda 1994:VI,331)
Ram Swarup’s view is in sharp contrast with the views of Roy.

According to him

“per se there is no superiority in Monotheism.” (Swarup 1984:223)

He writes,

“Muhammad’s Allah is a tribal god trying to be universal through jihad, conquest and forced conversions.” (Swarup 1984:195)

He supports his idea by giving the hadith, ‘Allah tells us that if a believer draw near Me by the span of a palm, I draw near him by the cubit......And if he walks towards me, I rush towards him.’ (Swarup 1984:195). He explains the phrase walking towards God as walking in enmity towards the polytheists, the infidels without giving any reason or proofs for this explanation. And finally he deduces that Muhammadan Kalimah (creed) is –

‘there is no god but Allah and Muhammad is the prophet of this godling.’ (Swarup 1984:195)

He supports the view that the concept of God in Islam is that of an exclusive god of Muslims. He writes,

“Allah is merciful too but his mercy extends to the believers only.” (Swarup 1992:105)

He supports his claim by quoting the hadith: ‘the Prophet said there would be among the Muslims with as heavy sins as a mountain, but Allah would forgive them and he would place in their stead the Jews and the
Christians.’ (Swarup 1992:106) Also that, ‘On the Day of Resurrection Allah would deliver to every Muslim a Jew or a Christian and say that is your rescue from Hell-fire.’ (Swarup 1992:106) He shares with the opinion of Saraswati that the Allah and the Shaitan of the Quarn, according to its own showing are alike. (Swarup 1992:107) He negates the theory that concept of God in Islam is superior to polytheism. He alleges that polytheism at least does not support the religious bigotry. He states,

“Paganism has multiple gods but believes in one humanity; semetic religions has one God but at least two humanities, believers on one hand and the unbelievers or infidels or heathens on the other.” (Swarup 1992:108)

He quotes that God has such attribute as.

“he is the God of wrath on those who do not believe in him and his prophets, he wreaks a terrible punishment-azab al azim, he is also a God of plenteous spoils’ – maghanim Kasirat. He tells the believers in the Quran, how he repulsed their opponents and caused them to inherit the land, the houses and the wealth of the disbelieveers and the land they had not trodden. (Quran:33:27) (Swarup 1992:105)

By quoting such verses he suggests that the Prophet employed theology in order to support such a concept of God, for without employing religion such ideas cannot last on people’s mind. He writes,

“the concept of God is much mixed up with man’s lower needs and nature and God is some times no more than a
glorified Pharaoh or Caligula. But such a God cannot last long unless this meaning is frozen and made enduring with the help of a theology.” (Swarup 1992:43)

Being a Hindu and believer of Yogic doctrine the author finds that the essence of God in Islam is altogether void of yogic spiritualism and hence is inferior. For he writes:

“prophetic God is not a yogic God; in fact he is hardly a spiritual being, he is a fanatic entity, an intolerant and hegemonic idea.” (Swarup 1992:110)

Reflections:

The authors have discussed monotheism in Islam and the significance of this belief in other areas of religion. Roy emphasizes that this concept of God opened the way for unconventional patterns of thought, which eventually led to rationalism. Moreover, according to him it provided the impetus for the intellectual developments too. The idea of ‘One God for all creation’ consolidated the human equality thereby promoting tolerance and accommodation for others. His inference that world can be without God on the premise that God is above and beyond it is jugglery of words. In reality the above postulate leads to the conclusion that it is not expedient for God that He must create the world, without which He will cease to be God. This would be constricting God’s power. The contrasting view of Swarup that monotheism divides humanity and is inferior to polytheism does not hold true. His theory that different
consequences of belief and disbelief in one God divided humanity is not reasonable. Moreover, this differentiation is peculiar to almost all religions including Hinduism. With its concept of ‘Swarg’ and ‘Narakh’ the similar consequences are maintained. Polytheism on the other hand has promoted hierarchy and has led to the cast system of utmost severity, in its most horrid form in India. Hence, if ever any concept of God that has led to division in humanity is polytheism and not monotheism.

Vyas perceives that to debase oneself either by holding others, as the master along with the Supreme Being of our destiny or by having low desires is the obvious ethical significance of monotheism. Vyas perceives this concept of God as the originality of Muhammad (SAW). The proposition that presents Muhammad (SAW) as the originator of Islam is obnoxious. He is been declared as the last of prophets coming from the chain sent by God in earlier times. He is not the first but declared in the Quran, Sūrah Ahzāb, V: 40 as the seal of prophets.

Sunderlal and Gandhi attempt at finding the similarity between Islam and Hinduism. Quran too envisages promoting the familiar teachings of other religions. The Glorious Quran clearly states in Surah Āli Imrān : 64.

"Say, O people of the Book! Come to common terms as between us and you... .... ..... ".

However, Srivastava’s idea of synthesis of religions goes against Islam’s ideal. The fundamental of Islam is that all the religions were sent by the
same God and hence carry same basic truth, similar to Vivekananda’s assertion; further what he calls as apparent contradictions in religion is explained as corruption and distortions in the Quran. Islam’s view is that every correct religion is true thereby claiming that true religion is one. The dogmatic forms acquired by various religions are not true religions of their prophets. This idea is beautifully sketched in the Glorious Quran.

"The same religion has He established for you as that which He enjoined on Noah—that which We have sent by inspiration to thee—and that which We have enjoined on Abraham, Moses and Jesus... ... ..." (Sūrah Shūrā: 13).

"Mankind was one single nation, and Allah sent messengers with glad tidings and warnings; and with them He sent the book in truth to judge between people in matters wherein they differed; but the people of the Book after the clear signs came to them, did not differ among themselves except through selfish contumacy... ... ... ... ..." (Sūrah Baqarah:213) consequently, with such corrupted forms of religions the synthesis would be unacceptable.

Gandhi’s understanding of Islamic creed as ‘God alone is and nothing else exists is not correct. The essence of Islamic creed is ‘there is no god besides one God’. Nonetheless, his personal belief of God can be regarded as the exact replica of Islam.
A sharp division exists about the godhood of prophet Muhammad (SAW). Whereas Roy and Vyas assume the denial of godhood to the prophet, Srivastava and Swarup posit that he overshadows God. Swarup and Srivastava do not give adequate evidences. Srivastava claimed that people created God out of the Prophets and Messengers and count Muhammad (SAW) as one of them. Which is foreign to the Islam’s belief. In fact his theory of creation of God oppose the God’s concept in Islam. Quran clarifies in Sūrah Ikhlās, 1-4 the attributes of God and regards Him absolute and eternal which makes the idea of God’s creation inconceivable. Moreover, the prophet’s share in godhood is emphatically rejected.

Quran declares, “Muhammad is no more than a messenger, many were the messengers that passed away before him.” (Sūrah Ālī Īmān: 144).

And he has been projected as a human whom Allah selected for His message. “Say thou: I am but a man like you. It is revealed to me by inspiration that your God is one God, so stand true to Him and ask for His forgiveness and woe to those who join gods with Allah.” (Surah Fussilat: 6)

The above attributes of God and Quranic assertions contradict the statements of Swarup and Vivekananda that God is a deity or godling of the Prophet. Vivekananda’s assumption that the Arabian tribal deity al-lat turned into Allah exhibits his in-competence on the grasp of Arabic
language and history. The Arabs never equated Allah—the Supreme Being with an inconspicuous tribal god al-lat. Al-lat was worshipped by the Thaqifites at Taif (Nu’mani 2004:83), whereas the idea about the Supreme Being or Allah was accepted by the entire Arabia.

“If indeed thou ask them who has created the heavens and the earth and subjected the sun and the moon (to His law) they will certainly reply, “Allah”, how are they then deluded away (from the Truth)?”

“And if indeed thou ask them who is it that sends down rain from the sky and gives life therewith to the earth after its death, they will certainly reply. “Allah”! Say “praise be to Allah”! But most of them understand not.” (Sūrah Ānkabūt: 61&63).

Srivastava stumbled in understanding the significance of union with God in sufi literature His contention that man can unite with God assumes uniting with God’s essence (dhāt). However, best authorities of sufism, like Ibn-al-‘Arābi claims that He is ‘fartherest than farthest’ from our perception. We cannot trace His essence (dhāt). He is known only through His attributes (sifāt) as revealed by Him to Prophet Muhammad (SAW). Moreover, Quran declares in Surah shūrā: 11, “There is nothing like whatever unto Him”-which practically makes uniting with God unattainable.

The authors also differ regarding the superiority to either monotheism or monism. While Roy, Vyas and Gandhi regard monotheism as the most
superior, Vivekananda declares monism is superior to monotheism. The only reason given by him is that it is easier to imagine, which however does not justify his claim. Compromising reasons for assuage is ludicrous and is unacceptable. His claim that Ultimate Truth is carried by Vedas and Islam’s concept of an objective God may not necessarily the only Truth, can also be one of the means of realizing the Truth of Vedas, is an attempt at accommodation. However his assumption that every religion is evolving God out of the material man is not applicable to Islam. Men cannot evolve God, however the evolution of religion by God can be considered plausible. For in any case if men evolve God then it is not Truth.

Swarup’s assumption that Allah tried to become a Universal God through Jihad and conversions and his evidences for the same are flawed. God’s attribute that He is in no need of people and is self-sufficient disvalues his claim. “O ye men! It is ye that have need of Allah but Allah is the one free of all wants, worthy of all praise.” (Surah fāṭir:15) Quran claims that even if the whole world will reject Allah, it will not frustrate Allah’s plan in least degree. The idea of self-sufficiency, supremacy and absoluteness of God is repeated so often in the Quran that this claim stands no credibility.

His objection that Allah is merciful for believers only is in consonance with His attribute of ‘adl or justice. He has perfection in each of His
attributes. He has the virtue of highest and perfect mercy and justice. He claims to reward those who do, good deeds and have belief and announces punishment for those who deny and violate His commands. Islam differentiates between the duties of a man towards God and towards God’s creatures. Allah has declared that a person who falls short in keeping up his duties that he owes to Allah i.e. (Huquaq-ul-Allah) may be pardoned; but He will not grant forgiveness for not fulfilling the rights of His creatures, unless the person who suffered injury grants forgiveness. His other argument that God will punish other people in exchange of believers is superfluous. Quran declares that no intercession or ransom that day will evade punishment. The Glorious Quran in Sūrah Anām: 164 says: “Every soul draws the meed of its acts on none but itself: no bearer of burdens can bear the burden of another.” Similarly Glorious Quran declares in Sūrah Yūnus : 54 “Every soul that hath sinned if it possessed all that is on earth, would fain give it in ransom, they would declare (their) repentance, when they see the penalty. But the judgement between them will be with justice and no wrong will be done unto them.” Similar message is repeated in Sūrah Rad : 18 His assumption that satan and Allah are alike is misreading of the Quranic narrations. Satan could disobey Allah not due to having equal powers with Him. Islam confirms free will and responsibility and avoids
extremes of cast iron determinism and an idea of chaotic free will. Humans and jinns are conferred with this limited free will along with a just bias through reason and spiritual faculties; hence if they err it will be a fault of theirs. Satan’s rebellion falls under this category and God will punish him too.

Swarup’s criticism that the God who has attributes of giving chastisement and spoils is a mere invention of Muhammad (SAW) to give credibility to his own ideas is a sweeping generalization not understanding the complete view of God’s concept in Islam.
Prophethood of Muhammad (SAW):

The belief and confession in the Prophethood of Muhammad (SAW) constitute the Islamic creed, next to belief in the unity of God in importance. He is the last and final messenger of God sent with a universal message-the Quran. Hindu understanding of prophet-hood in Islam gives several responses ranging from applause till posing him as an imposter. An important point to be noted here is that the concept of messengership is foreign to the Hindu belief, where, while a man can assumed to be the incarnation or even God in this world, but idea of a man being conferred with the office of prophethood is rare. The list of Hindu Scholars include T.L. Vaswani, Nishikanta Chattopadhyay, Tara Chand, M. K. Gandhi, M. N. Roy, I. Samanta, Valji Govindji Desai, Swami Vivekananda, Ram Shanker Srivastava, Pandit Mahadevashastri Divekar, J. G. Tiwari and Ram Swarup.

The famous historian T.L. Vaswami, finds the life story of Muhammad (SAW), his character and contribution to humanity filled with grace and beauty. For he says,

"I salute Muhammad as one of the world’s mighty heroes. Muhammad has been a world force, a mightly power for the uplift of many peoples." (Vaswani 1921:12)

He finds that the theory of European critics, where Mohammad’s ‘fits’ are regarded as ‘epilepsy’ is not the correct understanding. He shares the
opinion of Thomas Carlyle and declares: Muhammad was a hero and a
prophet. (Vaswani 1921:13)

Tarachand acknowledges Muhammad (SAW) as a messenger of God and
accolades him for his work and contribution. He writes,

"in him as in other deep religious mystics, religious fervor
was combined with intense practical sense and he became
not only the prophet of a new religion but also the leader and
creator of a new nation." (Tarachand 1976:50)

Nishikant Chattopadhyay in his treatise, ‘Muhammad- The Prophet of
Islam’, has mentioned that his sources for the life study were ‘Oriental
works’. He selected Thomas Carlyle and Herbert Spencer. On the subject
of prophetic office of Muhammad (SAW) he comments in these words:

"fierce struggle were followed by ecstatic visions and
cataleptic fits which were strongly suggestive of supernatural
influences.” (Chattopadhyay 1971:16)

He interrogates the theory that suggests the vision of Prophet as satanic
and fits hysterical on the premise that when the similar visions of other
prophet of Israel were regarded divine what makes prophet’s vision
otherwise. He further authenticates his idea by saying that Muhammad’s
prophethood was accepted by all his closed relatives, people who had
closely observed him in all possible human moods. This was a notable
fact, as it authenticates sincerity of his claim as a prophet. Finally he
testifies,
“I...admire in him the idea of complete manhood that he has vouchsafed to the history of the human species.... he fulfilled a greater variety of high and responsible function than any other Great Man in History.” (Chattopadhyay 1971:29)

For the author the genius of Muhammad (SAW) lies in his character of a noble man with full of strength and vitality and high and responsible functions.

M.K. Gandhi is of the opinion that it was the character of the Prophet that won a place for Islam in the world. He says,

“I became more than ever convinced that it was not the sword that won a place for Islam in those days in the scheme of life. It was the rigid simplicity, the utter effacement of the Prophet, the scrupulous regard for pledges, his intense devotions to his friends and followers, his intrepidity, his fearlessness, his absolute trust in God and his own mission. This and not the sword carried everything before them and surmounted every obstacle.” (Gandhi 1967:V25,127)

M. N. Roy observes,

“a scientific study of the psychology of seers reveals the fact that inspiration or any other religious experience is the result of a pathological state brought about either accidentally or purposely through prescribed practices.” (Roy 1958:50)

Though the author credits that the search of Muhammad was not inspired by cynicism, he very strongly believes that experiences of such kind always results from cerebral disorder. He suggests that fixed ideas may appear to take concrete form if the mind is focused on them excluding the
consciousness of other sensations. The author translates Prophet Muhammad’s research as an honest effort on the part of an ignorant man inspired by zeal. Further he writes that all religions are born under delusion. In his opinion it was the invention of Muhammad to regard a divine sanction to his experiences and the religion taught by him. Roy emphatically deduces that Muhammad had to invent a supreme God for the success of his mission. He writes,

“having conceived the idea of national unity, Mohammad realized that it could not be made acceptable to the warring Arabian tribes unless it were backed up with a supernatural sanction....The belief in the absolute sway of one supreme God can alone encourage people to revolt against the tyranny of a whole host of tribal deities. If the supreme God was not there he had to be invented.” (Roy 1958:48)

The author acknowledges the distinction of the Prophet, he says,

“Mohammad must be recognized as by far the greatest of all prophet, before or after him.” (Roy 1958:4)

He notes that his prophethood is an exception to others for he did not pretend to be the one by the performance of miracles. The author suggests that

“Muhammad was the Prophet not of the Saracen warriors but of the Arab merchants.” (Roy 1958:16)

According to the author, the very word ‘Islam’ which was invented by Muhammad implies peace, peace with God by accepting His unity and to
make peace on earth through the union of the Arabian tribes. And this peace was imperative for the Arabian Merchants and the success of the trade. Thus by introducing Islam he served their purpose. Since the author belongs to the idea of Marxism he tries to deduce that Islam’s ability and success in conquering the world lies in the genius of Muhammad, as national hero who ultimately employed the sanction of divine revelation to his theory. As he emphatically writes,

“Muhammad not only provided his own people with a platform of national unity, but armed the United Arabian Nation with a cry of revolt which found ready response from the oppressed and destitute masses in all the adjacent countries.” (Roy 1958:45)

Nevertheless, he maintains that this success was a heritage of history and neither the genius of Muhammad nor the divine revelation and credits the Prophet for recognizing this historical heritage. As he writes,

“the greatness of Muhammad was his ability to recognize the value of the heritage and make his countrymen conscious of it.” (Roy 1958:31)

He has employed all the possible vocabulary that can describe the greatness and genius of Muhammad (SAW). But he has emphatically denied any sanction of divinity or prophet-hood to his cause. For him Muhammad (SAW) played a very significant role in the history of the world but not as a messenger of God. For the author he is a genius hero.
Samanta, a Marxist appreciates and acknowledges the efforts of Prophet Muhammad (SAW) and his contributions in the sphere of social and political upliftment of the society. He says,

"the founder of Islam envisaged a classless society and fought tooth and nail for realizing the democratic idea and tried to achieve a socialism without bloodshed." (Samanta 1988:171)

He praises the Prophet and his course of action in fulfilling the mission of social and political justices. He tries to draw the similarity between the efforts of Karl Marx and the Prophet, and appreciates the Prophet's efforts in originating a bloodless revolutionary vision. He writes,

"Hazrat Muhammad thus envisaged a political society and its gradual transformation into a welfare state by the principal of mutual adjustment and co-existance without any bloodshed." (Samanta 1988:126)

Also, he opines

"Hazart Muhammad was a pioneer in the realms of revolutionary thought in an age of utter ignorance, superstition, feudalistic reactions and could create a new and vigorous power based on the policy of equal status for all his adherents which shook and dominated the world for a long time." (Samanta 1988:135)

The author supports his claim on the basis of reformation brought about by the Prophet through the institution of Zakat (poor tax) as well as the equal status to all the men and women in the society. He finds that Karl
Marx and Prophet were similar in identifying the main cause of all social evils but through adopting different means. Though the Prophet’s age was a thousand year before the advanced age of Karl Marx, yet according to the author, the Prophet can be regarded as the pioneer in his methodology. Hence unhesitatingly he remarks,

“If the ideas of Hazrat Muhammad were followed to the syllable by the believers then so many maladies in the socio-political spheres could have been remedied without hatred and violence.” (Samanta 1988:127)

His view about Muhammad (SAW) is similar to the views held by Roy in some degree. He also believes that in the course of history, the religious man in the Prophet receded to the background and the political one came out. (Samanta 1988:123) He deduces that though initially he preached the religion in the strictest sense of term but after his flight to Medina he transformed into the role of a statesman, since it was essential for the existence of Islam. Consequently, Muhammad (SAW) has been accorded with the title of the genius as he comments,

“Muhammad by his genius brought about a revolutionary change in the old tribal life of the Bedouins” (Samanta 1988:42)

The idea of the author is that religion was the necessity of Muhammad to achieve the temporal goals and hence he invented the entire conception of prophet-hood.
Valji Govindji Desai in his book "Glances at Islam" sketches the character of the Prophet. His teachings and character according to the author is based on sound ideas. He depicts the Prophet as saying:

"Prophet....was a believer in the doctrine of non-violence, forgiveness of injuries and returning good for evil." (Desai 1969:31)

However he is critical about the Prophet’s teachings concerning women.

Swami Vivekananda counts Mohammad as a prophet similar to Krishna, Buddha, Christ and Luther. He acknowledges their influence but is highly critical that they are not to be followed in the present scenario. He says,

"the great messenger of light, they are our great teachers our elder brothers. But we must go our own ways." (Vivekananda 1994:V1,484)

He assumes that these Prophets were of the noblest character and purity but their teachings and ideas were the result of their own thinking mind. He writes,

"that a prophet focuses on his own mind the thought of the age in which he is living and gives it back to mankind in concrete form." (Vivekananda 1994:V6,134)

He cites that Mohammedanism is the work of a single man a prophet and deduces that

"the teacher entirely swallows up or overshadows the principal." According to him the prophet should form secondary importance as compared to the ideals of religions. His opinion of Prophet Muhammad (SAW) is that "he was
the prophet of equality, of the brotherhood of man, the brotherhood of all Musalmans...there was no question of race, caste, creed, colour or sex.” (Vivekananda 1994:V4,133)

He writes,

“Mohammad, possessed of heavenly authority, proclaimed to fallen humanity the tidings of divine wisdom in their own unique ways.” (Vivekananda 1994:V4,130)

Also that,

“the Prophet Muhammad was against the priestly class in any shape.” (Vivekananda 1994:V4,446)

He emphasizes that the Prophet

“married quite a number of wives.” (Vivekananda 1994:V1,442)

This along with a word of caution that no-body has the right to judge the mysterious lives and ways of great men. He opines

“whenever a prophet got into super conscious state by heightening his emotional nature, he brought away from it not only some truth, but some fanaticism also, some superstition which injured the world as much as the greatness of the teachings helped.” (Vivekananda 1994:V1,184)

According to him this holds true even in case of Muhammad (SAW). The Prophet in his opinion stumbled upon because he was not a trained yogi and did not know the reason of what he was doing. He suggests that his inspirations at certain times were hallucination.
Ram Shanker Srivastava while comparing the various religions in his book, "Comparative Religion", mentions the cardinal points of Islamic faith and creed. He emphasizes the point that the Muhammad is considered as a human being even in Islam. He says,

"Muhammad has not claimed himself to be an incarnation or a son of God." (Srivastava 1974:172)

Moreover he says about the Prophet that

"he tried to convert people to Islam or to put them in subjugation and slavery." (Srivastava 1974:278)

Thus the author though gives the credibility to the Prophet in not assuming to give himself the position of a super-human, at the same time is highly critical of the ways of Muhammad (SAW) and his methodology.

Pandit Mahadevshastri Divekar in his book ‘New light on Islam’ sketches the life history and the mission of the Prophet Muhammad (SAW). For this objective, he has used sources in English language as he writes,

"it is chiefly adopted from books written in English." (Divekar 1943:2)

He says about the Prophet

"at first he had no great desire beyond establishing his own religion." (Divekar 1943:14)

Further he writes that the experiences of the Prophet after migrating to the city of Medina projected him as a person with

"boldness and fighting qualities of perseverance, courage, shrewdness." (Divekar 1943:14)
And as the one who

"correctly knew the weak points in the temperament of the
Arabs." (Divekar 1943:14)

He says, due to these reasons the Prophet became the ruler of Medina. He
finds the Prophet’s behaviour at the time of the conquest of Mecca
contrary to his preaching. (Divekar 1943:18) He opines that Prophet
although preached tolerance and charitableness to others, his act of
destroying the idols which were kept inside the Ka'aba is an act of
intolerance towards other faith. He quotes extensively from Sales work.
He credits the Prophet for his kind nature and behaviour, when he says,

"Paigambar was very simple by nature." (Divekar 1943:19)

The author finds a striking difference between the life of Muhammad
(SAW) and the founders of other faiths like Buddha, Guru Nanak,
Sankaracharya and Christ. He observes that all great men had to suffer at
the hands of their opponents but no one retaliated using a force. The
contrast

"on account of the pressure of his followers Muhammad
took a sword in his hand to offer resistance and he fought
battle after battle and completely defeated his opponents and
established his religion. Not only that but he established a
Kingdom also, and Mohammad himself became the religious
head." (Divekar 1943:20)

He holds that for any famous personality there is always two different
opinions found in the world. He says that for some, Mohammad was
virtue-incarnate. This is so because of his exemplary character and just social teachings. But some other calls him called as a person not in the habit of thinking with a cool-mind. He agrees with the latter opinion, for he says,

"if his preaching was like that, then the democracy would have dawned in the Muslim nation a thousand year earlier than it did in the Christian nation." (Divekar 1943:21)

The author quotes short passages from the works of Wells, Stobart and Hume in order to sketch the Prophet’s marriage and his account with his wives. And writes that

"apart from the opinions of the well-known authors regarding Prophet’s sensuality and the number of his wives, every thoughtful man should be inclined to show due respect to the Prophet for the revolution which he brought almost in his time." (Divekar 1943:23)

He regards the Prophet’s teachings to be appropriate for the barbarous and pagans of his time, but lacking in very high values and phenomena of this universe. As he writes,

"Muhammad did not discuss the variegated and curious human life, nor did he preach very too high moral principles to his followers." (Divekar 1943:24)

In conclusion of the analysis of the Prophet of Islam he deduces that it is not the Prophet but the barbarians and cruel followers of Muhammad (who) are mainly responsible for intolerant preaching in the Koran.
Ram Swarup doubts the Prophet’s call to Allah for he suggests that the Prophet in the guise of calling towards Allah was in reality building his own importance. As he writes,

“Allah and his Messenger rather Muhammad and his God.”
(Swarup 1984:2)

He goes further and suggests that Muhammad (SAW) indulged in acts contrary to norms of a religion. He consolidates this idea by citing instances when the Prophet (SAW) provided incentives to loyal and punishments to the lukewarm. He describes Prophet as a character in search of a role and one who wanted to reproduce in himself, the role of Moses and Jesus. (Swarup 1992:20) Implying that it was a deep and steady motive of “personal distinction,” on the part of Muhammad (SAW). He remarks,

“the whole prophetic spirituality whether found in the Bible or in the Quran is mediumistic in essence.... Man knows God through a proxy.”

He suggests that Muhammad (SAW) concocted the theory of the messenger of God, since in the eyes of his contemporary Jews and Christians it was not enough to be a messenger. He writes,

“Muhammad came at a time when it was not enough to be a prophet, he had to be the prophet.” (Swarup 1992:66)

He strongly supports the idea that Muhammad’s call was a plagiarisation of the Jewish and Christian religions. He writes,
“Muhammad followed an old model very well established in the Bible.” (Swarup 1992:21)

For the author, the very idea of Prophet-hood itself is deniable, not withstanding any concrete proofs. He claims that,

“most prophets have made their claims without trying to justify them.” (Swarup 1992:70)

He says that Islam has never raised serious questions about it.

Reflections:

Hindu understanding of Prophet-hood of Muhammad (SAW) as well as his life and works are constructed from the oriental works on his life. Consequently, the similar issues as raised by the oriental works are discussed.

With the exception of Swarup, the writes are unanimous in praising the character of the Prophet. Those who find faults with his teachings also eulogize his character.

Tarachand, Gandhi, Vivekananda and Srivastava regard him as God’s messenger. However, this assertion does not necessarily imply that they agree with all his claims and teachings. Moreover, this understanding of his prophethood in many cases is not consistent with Islam’s teachings on prophethood. For instance, the common Hindu view of equating Islam with Mohammedanism is one such example. Islam did not begin with Muhammad (SAW) but was the religion of Adam, Noah, Abraham Moses, Jesus and the hundreds of messengers who were sent in this
world. Also Islam never commands to worship Prophet Muhammad (SAW) making the understanding of Islam as Mohammedanism superfluous. Vaswani and Chattopadhyay emphatically refute that prophet’s claims were caused by epileptic fits. Others, like Roy, Vivekananda and Swarup regard him to be suffering from pathological cerebral disorder.

Epilepsy is a sudden and recurrent disturbance in the mental function or movement of the body or both. Its symptoms include complete or partial loss of consciousness, accompanied by muscular spasms or convulsions or by more complex behaviour. 70% of patients suffer their first attack before the age of 20 and in some type of epilepsy attacks diminish as the patient enters adulthood. (The New Encyclopaedia Britannica 1994: Vol: 4, 525). An analysis of Prophet’s life, character, work and contributions reflect his genius and wisdom, a trait that can scarcely be exhibited by a person after an epileptic fit. Patients under such fits, cannot even produce a coherent speech, in contrast, Prophet did not just speak words of wisdom but was a model and able leader who achieved astounding results.

Vivekananda’s understanding of Islam and even Hinduism and his comments on prophet-hood carry serious defects. His assertion of making Krishna and Buddha as prophets is alien to the doctrines of Hinduism.
Bhagwat Gita represents him as an incarnation of God and not as a prophet. Similarly, for from calling Buddha a prophet his followers have propounded that he even rejected God. However a few Muslim scholars make the assertion that Krishna and Buddha are prophets. They opine that Quranic proclamation: “and there never was a people, without a warner having lived among them (in the past)” (Surah Fatir: 24).

“and to every people a guide. “(Surah Ra’d: 7) indicate that God must have sent His prophets to India. Consequently Rama, Kirshna and Buddha may have been God’s prophets, presenting the truth of one true Religion.

Few scholars have interpreted that Dhu al Kifl who has been mentioned in the following verses could be Buddha.

“And (remember) Ismail, Idris, and Dhu al Kifl, all (men) of constancy and patience. (Surah Anbiya: 85) “And commemorate Ismail, Elisha, and Dhu al Kifl: Each of them was of the company of the Good.” (Surah Sad: 48).

Luther was a socio-political reformer and even his own followers never called him God’s Prophet.

Vivekananda’s contention that the Prophet was a great man but his teachings are not relevant to be followed in recent times raises an important question of validity and university.
If the message he carried was universal in significance then the insistence on not following his teachings is a mere obduration. Moreover, his conclusion that own minds instead of prophet’s teachings must be followed creates more problems than providing an appropriate solution. His understanding that prophet’s teachings are product of their own minds too exhibits his unawareness of the Quranic percept that Prophets convey only God’s massages.

Quran records about the Prophet: “None does he say (aught) of his (own) Desire. It is no less than inspiration sent down to him.” (Surah Najm:3-4).

His charge that prophets convey certain credulities and fanaticism in their teachings cannot be substantiated. Prophetic teachings by definition are based on true, unadulterated and universal message, without any injury.

“No falsehood can approach it from before or behind it, it is sent down by one full of wisdom, worthy of all praises.” (Surah Fussilat: 42).

“Allah has revealed (from time to time) the most beautiful message in the form of a Book, consistent with itself, (yet) repeating (its teaching in various aspects)…..” (Surah Zumar: 23).

Roy, Samanta and Swarup analyze in their own way the life of the Prophet and conclude that he was an imposter. However, what divides this assumption further is the view that whether he sought the stamp of divinity for the welfare of the people or for his personal gains.
The hypothesis that Prophet was an imposter is inconsistent with historical records of his life. An imposter fabricates in order to accomplish certain aspirations, which could be wealth, fame or power. An analysis of his life reveals that if these were his ambitions then it was offered to him at a very early stage of his mission. It is recorded that Utba ibn Rabi'a came to the Prophet with a message from the Qurash, “Say Muhammad”, asked he, “what is it you should like to have? Would you be the chief of Makkah, or get married into a high family, or do you desire stores of gold and silver? We are prepared to go all lengths, even that Makkans should live as your subjects, only if you concede to refrain from this activity. (Numani 2004:149). His denial of this bargain and acceptance of a difficult path make clear his interest.

He suffered at the hands of his own people only because of his mission, who otherwise had held him in high esteem earlier, only because of his mission. The people who conferred on him the titles of Al-Amin and Sadiq, grew such hatred against him that a few even planned to assassinate him.

Contrary to reaping wealth and comfort, he lived through more difficult times after he began with his call to Islam. He had often scarcity of food and lived in a humble quarter. He maintained this simplicity even when he acquired victories. Even at the time of his death he had no possession
or wealth. Power too is acquired for the luxuries and comfort, but not in his case.

The proposition that Prophet sought for a divine stamp for the success of his mission of Arab unity or success in trade is no more than a hypothesis having serious defects. There are no evidences to support the view that he promoted Arab nationalism. It is a western assertion. Islam enjoins universalism and does not differentiate people on the basis of their caste, colour, country or gender. Glorious Quran propounds principles that can hardly be interpreted as promoting Arab nationalism. It records: “O mankind! We created you from a single pair of a male and a female and have divided you into nations and tribes, so that you may recognize each other and the most honoured of you in the sight of God is the one who is the most righteous....” (Surah Al-Hujrat: 13) On the contrary prophet’s call to Islam amongst his people resulted into divisions within families and tribes.

Similarly, the Prophet’s tribe had already acquired a great leap in their trade and merchandise before prophet began with his call. Contrary to their claims Prophet and his companions suffered many social and financial set back.

Srivastava, Divekar and Swarup criticize his certain teachings. They borrow the idea of Prophet’s transformation from a messenger of God at Mecca preaching peace into a statesman and king at Medina from the
oriental writings. Most often Christian Orientalists analyzed Prophet’s life and works under the shadow of Jesus’s life and works. Christianity too promoted difference in the spiritual or religious and worldly pursuits. On such faulty premise they concluded Prophet Muhammad (SAW) as a person who assumed two contrasting roles in his life.

Interestingly, Roy’s assertion that Prophet’s ideas were delusions or inspirations of a psychic disorder as well as that he was an intelligent and genius individual who constructed an idea of God for the success of his mission are contradictory. For a person cannot be wise and foolish man at the same time.

Swarup’s understanding that Islam preaches a mediumistic theology can be rejected on the basis of the Quranic verses.

“When my servants ask thee concerning Me, I am indeed close to them: I listen to the prayer of every supplicant when he calleth on Me....” (Surah Baqarah: 186).

“It was We who created man, and We know what dark suggestions his soul makes to him: For We are nearer to him than (his) jugular vein.” (Surah Qaf: 16).

Comments on Prophet’s marriages by a few scholars are expressed with predilections, presenting him as a licentious man. However, a careful study of his life, the causes of his marriages and the effect of those marriages on the society disproves the charge on him. Monogamy as a
pattern is a recent phenomena in certain parts of the present world. Historical records and even religious scriptures of other religions present polygamy as an accepted custom and norm. The religious figures of the Semitic as well as Hindu epics are often polygamous. The charge on the Prophet merely on the basis of polygamy is a prejudiced assertion. A closer look at the life of Prophet and his marriages manifest his wisdom and he shines out as an exemplary model in capacity of a husband for all his followers. His marriages were valuable from socio-political and spiritual dimensions. He created a strong bond with his closed companions by marrying their daughters. He married few women as a gesture of kindness towards sincere Muslim women who were widowed and in certain cases divorced earlier and had suffered hardships due to their belief. His marriages assisted in the propagation and consolidation of Islam by knitting people of several tribes in relationships thereby creating an avenue for the message of Islam to be conveyed. Some of his marriages helped in ending enmity between the tribes in an effective way. Besides, his wives or Mothers of believes, who were trained under his personal supervision were great source of Islamic learning. Both men and women benefited from them and they played a special role in the training and education of women.
Contrary to the supposition that he married for pleasure, he did not marry in the later part of his life, when he was at the highest level of success and victory. Besides, he remained with an older and twice widowed woman in the prime of his youth and refused any kind of bargain, even when he was given a chance to marry women of his choice by his opponents, in the early period of his mission. These historical facts about his marriages disproves in more then one way that these alliances were not made out of sensual desires.

The discussion shows that each one of them has analyzed prophet-hood of Muhammad (SAW) through the lens of their own worldviews. The distinct feature that emerges is that his character has been praised by majority of the authors including these who have criticized him for his teachings.

**Quran as a Divine Revelation:**

The majority of Hindu scholars accept the contributions and influences of Quranic teachings, but its divine sanction and nature is a debatable matter to their majority, with the exception of a few scholars who acknowledge it as a divine revelation, whereas some others regard its teachings to be beneficial for humanity but lacking in Gnostics ideas. At the same time there are others who very out rightly reject any contribution of Quran to the richness and goodness of humanity and claim it to be nothing more than the work of an unintellectual man. These varied opinions sometimes
contradictory, depict several arrays of understanding and reading of Quran. Most of these scholars read Quran from secondary sources.

Bhagwan Das notes,

"in the Quran, the fact is emphasized over and over again that it is Allah who is speaking through the lips of Muhammad." (Das 1939:219)

Pandit Sunderlal has an approach of synthesis in studying the Quran and the Gita. He had drawn many similarities between their teachings. This entire endeavour according to him will serve to come closer to each other’s ideologies and teachings. He acknowledges the contributions of Quran, as he writes:

"Quran rooted out from Arab life a good many of their poisonous vices such as drunkenness, gambling, ṭuṣūry and the burying alive of female children." (Sunderlal 1957:101)

He elucidates,

"Quran lays its special emphasis on two things. One is faith, the other is good deed or righteous activity." (Sunderlal 1957:146)

The author’s view of religion is to seek for spirituality, which according to him is the same in all the religious scriptures particularly in the Gita and the Quran. He considers the Quran to be of divine origin similar to the divine nature of Gita. Listing out the features of the Quran, he says,
“there is one stupendous difficulty which one feels in the reading of the Quran... they are not arranged chronologically.” (Sunderlal 1957:98)

Though he makes it plain that this difficulty arises only in the case where the order and time of revelation has to be found. Moreover, according to him only a casual reader of the Quran who is not well versed in Arabic experiences it.

Tarachand philosophically deduces that

“the Mecca Suras mainly and the Medina Suras, occasionally are charged with deep religious devotion and ascetic feeling.” (Tarachand 1976:51)

So much so that he regards the Quran and the life of Muhammad (SAW) as

“the original sources of sufism.” (Tarachand 1976:50)

He presents several verses of the Quran to prove his claim. He suggests an idea of evolution in the genesis of Islam as well as the other Indian religion. He claims that starting with the Quran, Muslim enjoining the religion of action,

“passed the stage of rationalism to devotional and emotional religion.” (Tarachand 1976:88)

Ram Shanker Srivastava asserts that,

“Quran is the speech of God. As Mohammad was illiterate the Islamic scripture has not been derived from other holy books. It contains the highest revelation of God.” (Srivastava 1974:173)
Roy acknowledges the life and efforts of the Prophet in social and political reformations, but has not considered him to be a man who received the prophetic office from God. Hence, the Quran is also not seen from the point of view of being a divine revelation. He writes,

“\textit{The Koran was not the work of an intellectual and hence contains some crude ideas and phantastic speculations.}”
\textit{(Roy 1958:51)}

In his opinion these credulities are so severe that it almost have overshadowed the role of Islam as a contributor in the history of human progress, if the laws of Islam were not so upright. He further writes:

“\textit{the crudilities of the Koran did not prevent its basic idea from flourishing into all its revolutionary consequence.}”
\textit{(Roy 1958:53)}

He notes,

“\textit{the law of the Koran revolutionized social relations.}” \textit{(Roy 1958:18)}

Pandit Mahadevshastri Divekar observes that Quran taught the great truths of all the times. He lists them as

“\textit{brotherhood, tolerance, mono-theism and a feeling of social order.}” \textit{(Divekar 1943:19)}

At the same time he finds a contradiction in various teachings of the Quran especially with respect to idol-worshippers, the Kafirs, the oppressors and the women. He quotes extensively from the Quran. He urges that a compromise must be mapped out between the contradictory
dictums. For those Quranic commands, which according to the author preach, contrary to the great truth he suggests to Muslims

"they should realize that they might have been fit for the past circumstances but they are not relevant to the present circumstance." (Divekar 1943:21)

J. G. Tiwari is of the opinion that Quranic commandments and communications were nothing but

"mainly repeated recitals from the Old Testament." (Tiwari 1987:17)

Whereas Suhas Majumdar regards Quran as

"canonical scripture par excellence," (Majumdar 2001:18)

Ram Swarup opines that the Quran is feverish in tone, it threatens and promises; it does not elucidate but merely lays down and prescribes. It does not deal with the heavenly order of the Gnostic traditions but with the hereafter. He further writes,

"the Quranic verses are reputed to have come from a mind in trance but that itself gives them no true spiritual validity." (Swarup 1984:244)

According to Suhas Majumdar it is difficult to find any doctrine of Islam in a coherent manner in the Quran. He writes,

"every Islamic tenet is spread over the 6000 and odd versus of the Koran in a desolate, haphazard manner." (Majumdar 2001:9)

He further elaborates,
“the Koran does not discuss a single Islamic tenet systematically and in conformity with the arrangement of its chapters.” (Majumdar 2001:10)

The reason for this incoherency and haphazardness according to him is because Allah revealed it to the Prophet without any logical sequence during the 23 years of his prophetic career.

**Reflections:** The writers with a religious leaning and interest like Das, Sunderlal and Srivastava regard Quran to be from God, thereby accepting its divine origin.

Sunderlal’s attempt of finding synthesis between the two religions through scriptures is a commendable effort. Roy, Divekar, Tiwari, Swarup and Majumdar reject the association of any divine-element with the Glorious Quran. However, they too assume different propositions with respect to the Quran.

Tarachand’s finding of a difference in the devotional essence in the Meccan and Medinian Surahs is inconsistent. This observation exhibits an unawareness of the author about the nature and content of the Holy Quran. It must be borne that the principles of the Quran have remained similar throughout; those declarations and prohibitions which were promulgated in Medina, even those were prescribed in the Meccan period along with the appeal to human nature, carrying utmost devotional significance.
For instance, although the prohibition of intoxicants finally in Surah Maidah: 90 came in Medina, the disliking and restrictions towards it were made in Meccan period. A glance at both these places in the Quran disproves. Tarachand’s assertions.

Surah Baqarah: 219 records: “They ask these concerning wine and gambling. Say: in them is great sin and some profit for men; But the sin is greater than the profit..... thus doth Allah make clear to you His signs: in order that ye may consider (their bearings) on this life and the hereafter..... and if Allah had wished, the could have put you into difficulties: He is exalted in power, wise.”

Surah Nisa: 43 records: “O ye who believe! Approach not prayers with a mind befogged” ends with the reminders of Allah’s mercy ever ready to encompass believers “for Allah doth blot out sins and forgive again”

Both these vries remind the reader of God’s mercy, concern and come from this creation. The final prohibition in Surah Maida:90 is proclaimed along with a reminder that this prohibition is to save believers from their enemy.

“O ye who believe! Intoxicants and gamblings, (dedications of) stones, and (divination by) arrows are an abomination of satan’s handi-work, eschew such (abominations), that ye may prosper.”
“Satan’s plan is (but) to excite enmity and hatred between you, with intoxicants and gambling, and hinder you from the remembrance of Allah, and from prayer: will yet not then abstain?”

A self-explanatory example, which gives an important ruling with the essence that it must be shunned since it, hinders one from remembering God and developing the devotion.

The other appropriate example from the Quran, where pure legal matters are explained by appealing to the devotional aspect is from Sūrah Nisa: 7–9. These verses deal with distribution of inheritance to the relatives with justice.

“From what is left by parents and those nearest related there is share for men and a share for women, whether the property be small or large – a determinate share. But if at the time of division other relatives, or orphans, or poor are present, feed them out of the (property) and speak to them words of kindness and justice. Let those (disposing of an estate) have the same fear in their minds as they would have for their own if they had left a helpless family behind, let them fear Allah, and speak words of appropriate (Comfort).”

The matters of legal formalities are explained with a touching reminder, enough to appeal the human nature. These instances clearly make Tarachand’s claim that Meccan Sūrah’s are mainly and Madnian Sūrahs are occasionally charged with devotional significance baseless. Moreover
these examples from the Quran discredit Swarup and Majumdar's contention that its whole emphasis is on mere legal matters.

Another opinions expressed by Das, Majumdar and Swarup is about the arrangement of the Glorious Quran. The Charges concerned either with its chronology or chapterisation or repetition are all experienced due to incomprehension its nature. In the first place, Quran is not a historical narration where it is necessary to maintain the chronological order of its events. Quran is a Wahi or revelation from God sent onto the Prophet through angel Gabriel in a span of approximately Twenty three years. The purpose of Quran is authorized several times. This purpose is to 'act as a reminder' or to be a 'Tazkir' in general for humanity. For this end, Quran applies the Technique of "Tasreef" which is elucidation and explanation in variety of ways. This methodology employs repetition though of a different kind. The repetition are of themes and not of its contents, where one theme is explained in several arrays. This, however, is not a defect. On the contrary it is a mark of its literary richness and eloquence and is considered or inimitability and wondorous value of the Holy Quran. As Quran records: "We have explained (things) in various (ways) in this Qur'an, in order that they may receive admonition, but it only increases their flight (from the Truth)!") (Surah Al Isrā': 41)

="We have explained kind of similitude: but man is in most things in detail in this Quran for the benefit of mankind energy contentious." (Surah Al
This recurrence is in consonance with the motive and inherent feature of the Quran. Moreover, God sends His revelation through Prophets who are not mere dispatch riders but are entrusted to educate, explain and inculcate their teachings. The essential duties of a Prophet is described in more than one place.

"It is He who has sent amongst the unlettered a messenger from among themselves, to rehearse to them His signs, to sanctify them, and to instruct them in scripture and wisdom." (Surah Al Juma: 2).

Consequently the context, explanation and details of Quran are taken from Prophets life. Mujumdar's assertion that Islam's teachings are scattered in Quran lacks this basic understanding. It is imperative for the appreciation of Islam to take into consideration Quran as well as the life of the Prophet. To look for context and clarification by neglecting the Prophets life would be a futile exercise.

Majumdar blames Quran to be incoherent in its style and arrangement. Nevertheless, chapterisation is just one way of arranging a book; Quran on the other hand has division of \( S\u{00f0}rah-an \) Arabic word meaning enclosure on fence. The arrangement of \( S\u{00f0}rah \)s too was revealed to the Prophet. This arrangement is most appropriate and in consonance with the purpose of the Glorious Quran.

Roy finds credulities in the Quran which in his opinion were glossed and covered by the upright laws of Islam. This remark emerges as a
peculiarity of Roy, i.e. to contradict his own contention. Evidently, the credulities can never qualify upright and finer laws.

Divekar charges contradictions in its teachings and cautions the reader to be selective in accepting the teachings of Quran Interestingly. Quran presents the very contradictions as a falsifying test for itself, challenging to produce contradictions in it.

"Do they not consider the Quran (With care)? Had it been from other then Allah, they would surely have found therein much discrepancy." (Surah Nisā': 82).

Tiwari’s assertion that Quran is plagiarized from old and New Testament is an often repeated charge of Orientalists. The reason for this accusation is the similarity of themes and prophets of these scriptures. The allegation as well as the reasoning behind it carries no credibility. Quran explains that there were several messengers and prophets that were sent since Adam and (AS), some are mentioned by name and others are not “Of some messengers We have already told thee the story; of others we have not.” (Sūrah Nisā’: 164).

“We did aforetime send messengers before thee: oof them these are some whose story we have related to thee, and some whose story We have not related to thee.” (Sūrah Ghāfir: 78).

Prophet Muhammad (SAW) is the last and final messenger of the chain of messengers. (Sūrah Ahzab: 40). The source being similar the basic
principles of this message has remained similar, however, the laws derived from these principles were constituted differently for them. Since the source of all the divine revelation is one God, it is imperative that there must be a similarities.

Swarup’s contention in not accepting it as a divine revelation is the absence of Gnostic ideas. On the contrary, Tarachand claims to find the Quran as a source of mysticism in Islam.

The authors assume varied opinions on this important article of Islamic faith. Their views about the Quran could be regarded as the most important indicator of their views about the perception of Islam.

Following is the list of partial as well complete translation of caused out by Hindus


Pandit Kailash Nath with the assistance of Imam-ud-din Ramnagari, (prepared) hindi version of Maulana Sadar-ud-din Islahi’s Urdu
translation of the Quran. Jamat-e-Islami, Rampur published only first

Bhartendu Harish Chandra – well-known poet of Hindi language had
started the Hindi translation, and published some parts in Magazine
‘Harish Chand’, however it remained incomplete (Azami 2002:156).

In 1994 Vinod Chand Pande – Ex Cabinet secretary, Government of
India, translated Quran (Azami 2002 :156)

Kanhayya Lal Lakhdani’s translation of 415 pages was published – 1882

Supreme Court Advocate, Dham Prakash wrote “Pavitr. Quran Darshan”
– a poetic Hindi translation of the Quran, published in 2000. (Azami

Prem Nath has translated verses from Quran and Vedas in his Gujarati

Vinoba Bhave prepared a selection of Quranic verses from the original
Arabic “the Essence of Quran.” This material was prepared in (his mother
tongue) Marathi after studying Quran for twenty-five years. He grouped
the verses under appropriate captions to highlight the Message of the
Quran. Later it was rendered into English and the English translation of
Quranic verses were adopted from the Glorious Quran by Mr.
Muhammad Marmaduke pickthall. His objective in writing this book was
to create harmony (Vinoba 1962:2) According to him, in the age of
science, he prepared it to contribute to helping human beings understand each other better. So that persons from different traditions internalize in themselves the virtues of one-another. (McDonough 1994: 120).

He has the taken topic such as: 1) The book introduced, 2) God, 3) Devotion, 4) The Devotee and the unbeliever, 5) Religious Faith, 6) Moral Disciplines, 7) Man and his nature, 8) Apostle, 9) Initiation in the mysteries.

"Bhave’s method was to select those passages from the Quran that made sense to him as a basis for moral life in the modern world, and to omit those passages that did not serve that function (Mc Donough 1994: 122).

Concept of Life-hereafter:

Islam envisages the concept of accountability on the Day of Judgment as one of its basic articles of faith. The Holy Quran and traditions of the Prophet Muhammad (SAW) explain in detail the coming of this ‘Day of Judgment.’ It further elucidates the description of paradise and hell. Ram Shanker Srivastava, Nitin Vyas, M.N. Roy, Champat Rai Jain, Ram Swarup and Swami Dayanand Saraswati have commented on the concept of life-hereafter in Islam. There treatment is based on the verses of the Quran and the narrations of the Prophet (SAW), A few of them have taken into account the sufi doctrine of accountability quoting passages of the sufi poets and mystics.
The perception of the life-hereafter and its description are found to be varied. Whereas, some declared it to be a place of justice, others found it to be an occasion of favoritism to the believers. A few of them have declared that the paradise is nothing but the place of fulfilling the lower-desires of man.

Ram Shanker Srivastava explains that,

“In the Islamic conception, the soul and body are laid to rest in the grave till the final and universal resurrection of all the dead person take place. God finally destroys this world in one stroke and brings to life all the dead person from the beginning of creation to the day of resurrection. Everyone is then resurrected and judged on the Day of Judgment. Some go to heaven and some to hell.” (Srivastava 1974:127)

He supports his claim quoting the writing of Abdul Ala Maududi from his book, ‘Life after Death’, where he has noted

“The present system of the universe, which was created in accordance with physical laws will be at one stroke; and it will be replaced by another world where the earth, the heavens and all other things will then resurrect all men who were born from the beginning of creation down to its end, and will make all of them appear before Himself at one time. The records of all the deeds of individuals, communities and mankind at large, will be there without the slightest error or omission. Also there will be complete reports of the effects and consequences of all human actions in the material world; and all the generations of men affected by them will be
present in the witness box. Every particle affected in any way by the deeds or words of men will tell its own story.”

The author further explains that,

“The complete record of the moral and immoral actions of every individual is placed before God on the day of Judgment. God measures the virtues and vices of an individual. Those persons who have suffered on account of others then speak about their suffering. Even those who were very powerful in the world are judged on that Day and duly punished. God is unsparing in punishment. No one intercedes for others. Those who remain unpunished in the world are punished there. Some go to heaven and some are condemned to hell till eternity. Though God is merciful and forgiveth much, He is strict in punishment.” (Srivastava 1974:128)

He quotes these verses of holy Quran (as evidence): “Whatever of misfortune striketh you, it is what your right hands have earned. And He forgiveth much.” (XLII:30).

Also, “And guard (yourselves) against a day when no soul will in aught avail another, nor will compensation be accepted from it, nor will intercession be of use to it; nor will they be helped.” (II:123)

The author deduces that,

“The virtuous persons go to Heaven and have everlasting pleasures but the wicked and evil persons are eternally tortured in hell.” (Srivastava 1974:128)

He quotes the verses from the Quran:
"And God inviteth unto the abodes of peace, and guideth whom He pleaseth into the right way. For those who do good is excellent reward and superabundant addition of it; neither blackness nor shame shall cover their faces. These are the inhabitants of paradise; therein do they abide forever. But those who have wrought evil shall receive the reward of evil equal there unto; and shame shall cover them (for there will be none to protect them against God) as though their faces were covered with a piece of the night of profound darkness." (X:23-27).

The author observes that,

"God is the owner of the Day of Judgment. He makes the faces of the virtuous white and blackens the faces of the immoral persons." (Srivastava 1974:129)

He then quotes the verses of the Quran:

"On the day (some) faces will be whitened and (some) faces will be blackened; and as for those whose faces have been blackened, it will be said unto them: Disbelieved ye after your (profession of) belief? Then taste the punishment for that ye disbelieved. As for those whose faces have been whitened, lo! in the mercy of Allah they dwell for ever."

(III:106-7).

"Lo! The Day of Decision is a fixed time, A day when the trumpet is blown, and ye come in multitudes,
And the heaven is opened and becometh as gates;
And the hills are set in motion and become as a mirage."
Lo! hell lurketh in ambush,

A home for the rebellious.

They will abide therein for ages.

Therein taste they neither coolness nor (any) drink,

Save boiling water and a paralysing cold:

Reward proportioned (to their evil deeds).

For Lo! they looked not for a reckoning;

They called Our revelations false with strong denial." (LXXVIII:17-29).

"Lo! the righteous verily will be in delight.

And lo! the wicked verily will be in hell;

They will burn therein on the Day of Judgement,

And will not be absent thence." (LXXXII:13-16).

The author observes that,

"God guides the faithful and the righteous persons. But He also misleads those people who are wicked, and who worship false gods, deities, idols and images. Those who do not worship Him are punished, but those who want guidance from Him will get it." (Srivastava 1974:130)

He notes the Quranic verse: "God guideth whom He will; and He best knoweth who will yield to guidance." (XXVIII:56).

"Many will He mislead and many guide; but none will He mislead thereby except the wicked." (II:24).
"When they went astray, God let their hearts astray, for God guideth not a perverse people." (LXI:5).

He clarifies that,

"The guidance of God is available only to those who follow Him. Such persons are not subject to fear and suffering."

(Srivastava 1974:130)

He quotes: "Lo! Allah changeth not the condition of a folk until they (first) change that which is in their hearts; and if Allah willeth misfortune for a folk there is none that can repel it, nor have they a defender beside Him."

He observes conclusively that,

"Those who ascribe partners unto Allah suffer in hell for ever." (Srivastava 1974:130)

He quotes from the Quran: "And on the Day We gather 'them together. We shall say unto those who ascribed partners (unto Allah): Where are (now) those partners of your make belief." (VI:22).

The author asserts that,

"There is no redeemer or saviour who can save the sinner from punishment. Whereas in Christianity, Christ died as a substitute for others, takes the punishment of men upon himself and saves the humanity from suffering, in Islam everyone suffers for his own deeds. The wicked men are resurrected with black faces. They become, after resurrection, blind, deaf and dumb." (Srivastava 1974:130)
He quotes from the Quran: “While as for him whom He sendeth astray, for them thou wilt find no protecting friends beside Him, and we shall assemble them on the Day of Resurrection on their faces, blind, dumb and deaf; their habitation will be hell whenever it abateth, We increase the flame for them.” (XVIII:97).

The author comments that,

“The wicked persons who were strong enough and remained unpunished are tortured in hell. The virtuous men who pass away from the world unrewarded enjoy prosperity and happiness. After the resurrection, God does justice and gives due reward to all.” (Srivastava 1974:131)

He supports his claim by giving the verses: “And guard (yourselves) against a day when no soul will in aught avail another, nor will compensation be accepted from it, nor will intercession be of any use to it; nor will they be helped.” (II:23).

“And we set a just balance for the Day of Resurrection so that no soul is wronged in aught. Though it be of the weight of a grain of mustard seed, We bring it. And We suffice for reckoners.” (XXI:47).

The author explains that,

“the record of each action of every person remains with Him, and He will take proper action on them.” (Srivastava 1974:131)

He quotes the verses: “We shall roll up the heavens as a recorder rolleth up a written scroll. As we began the first creation, We shall repeat it.”
(It is) a promise (binding) upon Us. I.o! We are to perform it.” (XXI:104)

The author opines that,

“The deeds of every one which have been recorded in Heaven will be tied to each one’s neck. God will show the Book of Deeds to the individuals concerned.” (Srivastava 1974:131)

He supports with the verse: “And every man's augury have We fastened to his own neck, and We shall bring forth for him on the Day of Resurrection a book which he will find wide open. (And it will be said unto him): Read thy book. Thy soul sufficeth as reckoner against thee this day.” (XVII:13-14).

The author explains the details of the Heaven, and the Hell.

He assumes that,

“The salvation and the summum bonum of an individual consists in one’s attainment of Heaven, in which one’s sensuous and sexual desires find the fullest fulfillment. One has in the paradise, rivers, sweet breeze, milk, honey, wine, women and eternal youth. One gets the fullest satisfaction of one’s sensual and sexual desires in the Garden.” (Srivastava 1974:132)

He quotes from the Quran passages describing the delights of Paradise.

“In the Gardens of delight,

On couches facing one another;
A cup from a gushing spring is brought round for them, White, delicious to the drinkers,

Wherein there is no headache nor are they made mad thereby.

And with them are these of modest gaze, with lovely eyes, (Pure) as they were hidden eggs (of the ostritch).” [XXXVII:43-49]

Also, “Attired in silk and silk embroidery, facing one another. Even so (it will be). And We shall wed them unto fair ones with wide, lovely eyes.

They call therein for every fruit in safety.

They taste not death therein, save the first death.

And He hath saved from the doom of hell,

A bounty from thy Lord. That is the supreme triumph.” [XLIV:53-57].

“Therein they will be given armlets of gold and will wear green roles of finest silk and gold embroidery, redlining upon thrones therein. Blest the reward, and fair the resting place.” [XXVIII:32].

“They and their wives, in pleasant shade, on thrones reclining, theirs the fruit (of their good deeds) and theirs (all) that they ask.” [XXXVI:55-56].

“And give glad tidings (O Mohammad) unto those who believe and do good works; that theirs are Gardens underneath which rivers flow; as often as they are regaled with food of the fruit thereof, they say: This is what was given us aforetime; and it is given to them in resemblance. There for them are pure companions; there for ever they abide.” (II:25).
The author asserts that,

"There will be no death in Heaven for everyone will have eternal life. Everyone becomes like angels or divine beings. There is peace, tranquility and fellowship with God in Heaven. There, in the Garden, is not only the fulfillment of all sensuous and sexual desires in Paradise, but the companionship of man with God is also achieved in it for ever. The Heaven is, therefore, a spiritual place of one's communion with God. Only the pious and spiritual persons reach there." (Srivastava 1974:134)

The author supports this explanation by quoting from the work of, Syed Ameer Ali, where he said:

"... to show the depth of spirituality in Islam, and the purity of the hopes and aspirations on which it bases its rule of life: "O thou soul which art at rest, return unto thy Lord, pleased and pleasing Him, enter thou among My servants, and enter thou My garden of felicity." (LXXIX:27-30).

The author also quotes the explanation given by Dr. Shaikh Muhammad Iqbal in his book, 'The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam' where he objects to explaining the passages of Quran literally. The description of heaven and hell in the Quran, according to him, is allegorical in nature.

Dr. Iqbal conceives that

"heaven and hell are not places or localities, they manifest the states of mind. Everyone has the experience of heaven or hell in one's life. Some persons have their lives full of
torture and frustration and some have full joy and success in the world. According to Iqbal, those persons who have not been able to fulfill their desires, goals and aspirations remain frustrated and suffer hellish torture in life. Those who are successful receive heavenly pleasures in this world. The heaven and hell are conditions of human life in the world, wherein some live in suffering and some in joy.”

The author comments that,

“We observe that Dr. Iqbal develops his own religious thought far different from the orthodox Islamic precepts and beliefs.” (Srivastava 1974:134)

The author explains,

“The Sufi sect of Islam also drifts away from the primitive Quranic view. In its absolutistic and pantheistic conception, Sufism conceives that salvation is a condition of absorption of the soul in God. The utter surrender of the soul to God brings its identity and oneness with Him. The duality of the soul and God ceases for ever and the former merges in the latter in the state of its salvation.” (Srivastava 1974:135)

The author conclusively asserts that,

“that orthodox and the literal interpretation of Quran shows that salvation is the realisation of Heaven, and for that alone one must lead the virtuous life in the world.” (Srivastava 1974:136)

Nitin Vyas observes that,
"the soul and the body rest in the grave till the final and universal resurrection. By a stroke, God destroys the world and all the dead souls regain their life." (Vyas 1982:185)

He asserts that,

"God will judge the man in the context of His revealed message. He rewards and punishes men according to their deeds. Still the punishment is only therapeutically in nature and not for any revengeful reason. After this period of punishment is over, man attains salvation." (Vyas 1982:186)

Champat Rait Jain observes that,

"Muhammadanism does not nowadays approve of the doctrine of transmigration of souls, but the Maulana of Rum has laid down:

"Before this body, lives have been spent!
Before cultivation, fruits have been ‘borne’!"

The only means that the soul has before this time also sown the seed (works) and tasted of the fruits." (Jain 1975:I,154)

The author comments that,

"there is no beginning of the soul; Life is without a commencement, and has existed from before the beginning of a beginning.” (Jain 1975:I,154)

He supports his argument by giving the verses of the Mathnavi of Maulana Rumi, he writes,

"Like grass, often have I germinated!

Seventy times seven hundred bodies have I put on!

Dying from the inorganic, I became vegetable:
Passing out of the vegetable, I put in an appearance in the animal kingdom!

Leaving the animal kingdom, through death, I became man!

Why, then, should I fear that, by death, I shall diminish!

In the next rush I shall die as man

To grow the feathers and wings of Angels!

Next time when I shall soar away from the

Realm of Angels

What is beyond the mind that I shall become!

Then when I have killed out my (lower) self,

I shall be told: All things are perishable except God's Being!"

The author notes that,

“the resurrection of the dead on the Judgement day is an allegorical myth.” (Jain 1975:1,158)

The author on the authority of Mr. Khaja Khan’s work on ‘Studies on Tasawwuf’ elucidates,

“it will be when a man shall have attained the attributes of God, that is to say, that the rising of the soul from the category of the dead and its obtainment of Godhood constitute the resurrection.”

The author asserts that,

“Man should consider himself as being on a journey and should look upon the hereafter as his home. A journey is full of discomfort, but peace and happiness are for him who will
put his best foot foremost and seek the ease of life at home. The duration of life is apparent, and obviously cannot be compared with that to be enjoyed in salvation. It is not strange if a person puts himself to trouble and undergoes sufferings for a year to qualify himself thereby to enjoy happiness for a decade. Then, what is surprising in one’s undergoing hardships for a hundred years to enjoy happiness for a hundred thousand years, nay, for all eternity?” (Jain 1975:II,187)
M. N. Roy finds the religion of Islam a historical necessity. He then explains that Islam not only promised the blessings of a brilliant paradise, but also inspired its followers to the conquest of this world. He then emphatically declares that,

"the Paradise of the Arabian Prophet was nothing but an ideal of the life of happiness and enjoyment to be attained in this world." (Roy 1958:44)

Bhagwan Das remarks that,

"Svargas, narakas, lokas, bhuvanas; jannats and jahannums, bahishts and dozakhs, arsh-es and ard-s, lauhas and tabaqas; paradise and purgatories, heavens and hells of higher and lower levels, and subtler and grosser planes of matter; are affirmed by all religions. They are subjective as well as objective; in us and also outside; as joy and woes in us, parts and jails outside us." (Das 1939:199)

Ram Swarup discusses the Day of Judgment (Qayamat) and the Last day (yaumu’l-akhir), and describes it as an indispensable prop of Muslim theology.

He quotes the Hadith regarding the signs of the arrival of the Last Day:

"When you see a slave woman giving birth to her master – that is one sign; when you see barefooted, naked, deaf and dumb as the rulers of the earth – that is one of the signs of Doom. And when you see the Shepherds of the black camels exult in buildings – that is one of the signs of Doom."

The author deduces from this hadith that,
“when the poor and the deprived inherit the earth, that is the 
end of it according to Muhammad.” (Swarup 1984:8)
The author cites the Hadith, “Muhammad tells us that on this day, Allah, 
“will gather people” a “bridge would be set over the hell and I and my 
ummah would be the first to pass over it.” The author reminds that, 
“unbelievers, of course, will be thoroughly miserable on this day.”
He asserts that 
“on this day, no other prophet or savior will avail except 
Muhammad.” (Swarup 1984:9)
He supports his claim by giving the tradition; ‘People will come to Adam 
and say: “Intercede for your progeny.” He will reply: “I am not fit to do 
this, but go to Ibrahim, for he is the friends of Allah.” They will go to 
Ibrahim, but he will reply: “I am not fit to do this, but go to Moses, for he 
is Allah’s Interlocutor.” They will go to Moses, but he will reply: “I am 
not fit to do this, but you go to Jesus, for he is the Spirit of Allah and His 
word.” They will go to Jesus; and he will reply: “I am not fit to do this; 
you better go to Muhammad.” Then they will come to Muhammad, and 
he will say: “I am in a position to do that.” He will approach Allah, and 
his intercession will be granted.’ (377).
The author further narrates the Hadith, where Prophet had reported saying 
that “seventy thousand persons of [my] Ummah would enter Paradise 
without rendering an account (418)” and Muslims “would constitute half 
the inhabitants of Paradise.” (427). The author then interrogates,
“considering that unbelievers, infidels and polytheists are strictly kept out, and that the entry of Jews and Christians also is prohibited, one wonders who will be the other half of the population of Paradise.” (Swarup 1984:9)

The author explains as to how this special intercessory power was acquired by Muhammad and gives the hadith: “There is for every Apostle a prayer which is granted, but every prophet showed haste in his prayer. I have, however, reserved my prayer for the intercession of my Ummah on the day of Resurrection.” (389)

The author asserts that, “When the disbelieves are being hurled into the Fire, Muhammad will not intercede even when he knows that no other intercession would avail.” (Swarup 1984:10)

The author narrates the tradition of the Prophet: ‘Muhammad tells us that he “stood upon the door of Fire [Hell] and the majority amongst them who entered there was that of women.’ (6596). On the other hand, “amongst the inmates of Paradise, women will form a minority.” (6600). He quotes that: Prophet said, “I had a chance to look into Paradise and I found that majority of the people was poor.” (6597). The author opines that, “the poor fare better at Muhammad’s hand,...If they so wish, the communists can claim Muhammad as their own, though
Paradise may be no more than an “opiate” of the poor.”

(Swarup 1984:197)

The author finds it to be a more balanced distribution of Allah’s blessings, that, “Allah rewards the non-believer in this world and the believer in the hereafter” (6740). But a little further he suggests that its not a fair deal but a cheating. As he further clarifies that,

“what are all the pleasures of the earth compared to even one distant feel of the hellfire? Nothing.” (Swarup 1984:199)

The author presents the description of the Paradise by questing the Hadith, “In Paradise, there is a tree under the shadow of which a rider of a fine and swift-footed horse would travel for a hundred years without covering the distance completely.” (6784).

He further quotes a hadith depicting the happiness of the inhabitants of Paradise, they will say to Allah, “Why should we not be pleased, O Lord, when thou hast given us what thou hast, not given to any of thy creatures?” (6787).

He deduces that,

“the pleasure of seeing others denied paradise is in fact greater than the pleasure of seeing even one’s own self rewarded.”(Swarup 1984:201)

The author notes that,

“It is not God’s grace that wins salvation but... the intercessory power of His last Prophet.” (Swarup 1984:202)
He quotes the traditions: “None amongst you would attain salvation purely because of his deeds.” “Observe moderation in your doings, he advises: but if you fail, try to do as much as you can do and be happy for none would be able to get into paradise because of his deeds alone.”

The author then narrates in detail the beauties of Paradise. The themes discussed are number of slaves, number of Houris, see-through garments which paints the Paradise as a place of sensual pleasures at its peak. He mentions that male will be having female-maids and Houris in Paradise but “the females are denied the analogous reward.”(Swarup 1984:206) Similarly he also narrates the traditions explaining Hell and the Hell-fire.

He mentions that, the fire we know here on earth is only – “one-seventieth part of the fire of Hell” He further gives a tradition that, “There would be among them those to whom Fire will reach upto their ankles, to some up to their knees, to some up to their waists, and to some up to their collar-bones”.

By giving the descriptions of paradise and hell-fire, he shows the misery of the unbelievers.

Swami Dayanand Saraswati’s book titled ‘Satyarth Prakash’ translated in English as Light of Truth devotes its XIV Chapter on “(the doctrine) of Mohammedan religion.”

The author gives a detailed commentary on a few selected verses from the Quran. He deals with the concept of Judgement, Day of Judgement,
Paradise and Hell in great detail. These details exhibit that his book is a piece of polemic.

The author quotes the verse:

"But bear good tidings unto those who believe and do good works that they shall have gardens watered by rivers; so oft as they eat of the fruit thereof of or sustenance, they shall say, this is what we have formerly eaten of; and they shall be supplied with several sorts of fruit having a mutual resemblance to one another. There shall they enjoy wives subject to no impurity, and there shall they continue forever." (II:24).

The author comments on these verses that,

“The paradise as described in the Qoran is in no respect better than this world because the same sort of things that are obtainable here are to be had there; the only exception being that men here die and are born again, whereas this is not the case with them in paradise, the women also here do not continue to live for ever, whereas in paradise they do so. We should like to know how these poor women pass their days till the day of judgement? Of course it will be alright if the Mohammeden God extends His helping hand to them and thereby they manage to pass their days with comfort. Tut! Tut! Tut! But this goes to show that the paradise of the Mohammedans justly resembles the Golok and the temple of the Gosaeens of Gokal wherein women are valued more than men. Similarly in the temple of God (paradise) women are valued and loved more than men by God. They live forever
in heaven but not men. How can this arrangement last unless God desires it? The Mohammedan God is surely in danger of falling in love with these women!!" (Saraswati 2003:655)

The author questions the concept of accountability in the hereafter. He refers to the verse:

"Dread the day wherein one soul shall not make satisfaction for another soul, neither shall any intercession be accepted from them, nor shall any compensation be received, neither shall they be helped." (II:48).

The author then interrogates,

"should we not dread the present? One should dread evil doing on all days. If it be true that no intercession will be accepted, how can this statement be reconciled with the belief of the Mohammedans that they will go to paradise through the intercession of the Prophet? Does God help only those who are in paradise and not those who are in hell? If it is so, God is not free from prejudice." (Saraswati 2001:657)

The author notes the verse:

"So God raiseth the dead to life, and showed you his signs, that peradventure ye may understand." (II.67).

He then asserts that,

"If God raised the dead to life (in the past), why does He not do so now? Will they all remain lying in their graves till the day of judgement? Is your God on tour in these days (that He cannot find time to administer justice)?" (Saraswati 2003:658)
The author continues and refers to the verse:

“They shall never continue to be the companions of paradise (II.75).” He asserts that,

“As the soul is finite, its deeds – good or bad – cannot be infinite. It cannot, therefore, be sent to an everlasting hell or heaven....If there is one judgement day for all souls, their virtuous and sinful acts must be equal. Human deeds being finite their fruits – reward or punishment – cannot be infinite....One should like to know if God was sitting idle before creation and will do the same after the day of judgement. These are all childish things, because God is ever active and awards every reward or punishment in proportion to the nature and amount of its virtuous and sinful deeds. Hence what the Qoran Teaches (on the subject) is not right.” (Saraswati 2003:659)

The author refers to the verse:

“These are they who purchase this present life at the price of that which is to come: their torment shall not be lightened, neither shall be helped.” (II.80).

The author interrogates,

“Can God ever act so jealously and malevolently? Who are those whose sins will be remitted or who will be helped? If they are sinners whose sins will be remitted without any punishment being inflicted on them, then God’s justice will be destroyed. If their sins will be remitted after they have undergone punishment for them, the men referred to in the
verse will have also to suffer punishment for their sins. But if the remission of sins refers to those men who are pious, they by virtue of their pious life have no sins to be remitted, what will God remit then? One naturally infers from this that whoever uttered these words was not an enlightened person. In fact, the righteous and the unrighteous should be awarded reward-happiness or punishment – sorrow and suffering. - According to the nature of their deeds – virtuous or sinful.” (Saraswati 2003:660)

Author notes the verse of the Quran:

"Say: shall I tell you of better things than those prepared for those who fear God in His presence? There shall be gardens, beneath whose pavilion the rivers flow, and in which shall they continue to show for ever, and women of stainless purity and acceptance with God; for God regardeth His servants." (II.12).

He deduces from this verse that,

"Now is it paradise or a brothel? Should we call such a Being (as described in the Qoran) God or a libertine?... Where the women that live in paradise born here (in this world) and then went there, or were they never born at all? If they went there from here, why were they allowed to enter paradise before their husbands? Why did God violate His law of judging all persons on the last day for the sake of those women? On the other hand, if they have got their husbands with them, how ill God manage to provide the
faithful with women when they enter paradise? Why does He not keep also men forever there in paradise just as He keeps women?” (Saraswati 2003:669)

The author refers to the verse:

“Verily, God will gather the hypocrites and the infidels all together in hell. (IV:139).”

He then questions,

“What proof is there that the Mohammedans will go to heaven and the non-Muhammedans to hell?” (Saraswati 2003:675)

The author discusses the verse, “He will pardon whom he pleaseth and chastise whom he pleaseth. He gave you what never before had been given to any human being. (V:21,23). He elucidates that,

“Just as Satan leads whoever he likes into sin, even so does the Mohammedan God. This being the case, it is God alone who should go to heaven or hell, for (according to the Mohammedan scriptures) He is the doer of all deeds- good or evil. The soul is not a free-agent (and hence it is not responsible for its actions), just as it is the commander of an army who is responsible for whatever it does, in the matter of protecting some and killing others, under his orders and not the army.” (Saraswati 2003:676)

The author refers to the verse: “That he might make proof which of you will excel in work- And if thou say ‘After death ye shall surely be raised
again, the infidels will certainly exclaim', This is nothing but pure sorcery". (XI:9, 10)

He exclaims that,

"When God has to examine works, He is not omniscient. And if He does raise people after death, are we to think that those who are raised are condemned for an indefinite period to wait for a settlement of their fate? Again, is it not opposed to His own Divine law to raise the dead? Is it possible that God should compromise His Godhead by infringing His own law?" (Saraswati 2003:684)

He notes the verse: "For them! The gardens of Eden, under whose shades shall rivers flow: decked shall they be therein with bracelets of gold, and green robes of silk and rich brocade shall they wear, reclining them therein on thrones. Blissful the reward! And a pleasant couch! (XVIII:30)"

He asserts that,

"Indeed! What a fine place is the paradise described in the Qur'an! It has gardens, ornaments, clothes, cushions, and pillows for affording pleasure to those who live therein. A wise man will, on reflection, find that the Mohammedan paradise excels in nothing except injustice which lies in the fact that the soul will have infinite enjoyment or infinite suffering for actions which are finite. Besides, infinite happiness will appear to them infinite misery, even as if a person goes on eating sweet things for a long time, they begin to taste like poison to him. Therefore, the belief that
the soul is reborn after having enjoyed the bliss of salvation
till the Grand Dissolution (of the universe) alone constitutes
the true doctrine." (Saraswati 2003:690)

The author from the verse: "And who, I hope, will forgive my sins on the
day of Judgement." (XXV.80), concludes that,

"If God forgives sins and dispenses justice on the last day,
He will be a sinner and a promoter of sin. If he does not
forgives sins, it cannot but be said that this teaching of the
Qoran is false." (Saraswati 2003:696)

The author notes the verse: "God produceth creatures, and will hereafter
restore them to life: then shall ye return unto Him. And on the day
whereon the hour shall come, the wicked shall be struck dumb for
despair. And they who shall have believed, and wrought righteousness,
shall take their pleasure in a delightful meadow." (XXX10,11,14...).

He observes that,

"If God ordains creation twice and not thrice, He must be
sitting idle before the first creation and after the second, and
will lose all vitality after creating the world twice. If the
sinners are struck dumb with despair on the day of
judgement, so much so good, but we hope that this verse
does not mean that all except the Mohammedans will be
branded as sinners and struck dumb with despair... If the
Mohammedan paradise consists of residence in a garden and
adornment of the body, it is just like this world. In that case
it is necessary that gardeners and goldsmiths should be there
or God should do their work. Again, if some denizen of
paradise gets a smaller number of ornaments, he might commit theft and be hurled down into hell. If it be so, the doctrine of eternal heaven would be falsified.” (Saraswati 2003:698)

The author discusses the verses:

“*And the trumpet shall be sounded again, and behold they shall come forth from their graves, and hasten unto their Lord.*”

“And *their hands shall speak unto us, and their feet shall bear witness of that which they have committed.*” (XXXVI: 50,63,80).

He exclaims that,

“How absurd! Can the feet ever give evidence? When there was none else except God, to whom did he issue the command and who heard it and what came into existence? If there was nothing else at that time, this statement is false and if there was something else, then the statement that there was nothing else except God must be thought to be false.” (Saraswati 2003:703)

The author then describes the gifts and beauties of the paradise in detail.

“A *cup shall be carried round into them, filled from a unruffled fountain, for the delight of those who drink; And near them shall lie the virgins of paradise, refraining their looks from beholding any besides their spouses, having large black eyes, and resembling the egg of an ostrich covered with feathers from the dust.*” (XLIII: 44, 45, 48,57).

He deduces that,
"The Mohammedans cry that it is a sin to drink wine on this earth but in their paradise streams of wine flow. It is good that Mohammedans have rendered some service to the cause of temperance here, but they have been more than compensated for this abstinence in paradise. So many women have been allotted to each man there; he would find it difficult to fix his affections on one. The place must be afflicted with maladies. If the dwellers have got bodies, they must die and if they have got no bodies, they cannot gratify their lust. What then is the use of a paradise?" (Saraswati 2003:704)

The author refers to the verse:

"Gardens of perpetual abode, the gates where-of shall stand open unto them. As they lie down therein, they shall there ask for many sorts of fruits, and for drink; and near them shall sit the virgins of paradise, refraining their look from beholding any besides their spouses, and of equal age with them." (XXXVIII: 49, 50,51).

He elucidates these verses in the words that,

"If there are gardens and orchards in paradise as stated in the Quran, they neither have existed from eternity nor can they remain there for ever, for the things which result from the combination of elements, did not exist before that combination and will surely cease to exist after Dissolution. When these things will disappear from paradise, how can the dwellers live there forever? The very fact that the Arabs have been promised cushions, cushioned seats, pillows,
fruits and drinks proves that Arabia was not in affluent circumstances at the time the Muhammadan religion was founded. It was for this reason that Mohammad entrapped the poor people into his net by holding out to them such temptations.

Perpetual happiness cannot reign where women are to be found. Where did these women come from? Are they dwellers of paradise or have they been imported? If they have been imported, they will surely go back and if they permanently dwell there, what were they doing before the day of resurrection? Were they idling away their lives?”

(Saraswati 2003:705)

The author then refers to the verses:

“On coaches inwrought with gold and studded with stars reclining on them face to face: Aye-blooming youths go round about to them, with goblets and ewers and cup of flowing wine, their brows ache not from it nor fails the sense: and will such fruits as shall please them best, and with flesh of such birds, as they shall long for and theirs shall be the Houris with large dark eyes, like pearls hidden in their shell (LVI: 15-22).

“And on lofty beds of a rare creation have we created the Houris and we have ever made them virgins dear to their spouses, of equal age with them (LVI: 31, 33).

The author poses the question:

“Do the inmates of paradise always keep idle, reclining on their pillows, or do they ever do anything? If they keep
sitting idle, they could not properly digest their food, which must produce disease and thus carry them early to their graves. But if they do any work, they must be earning their livelihood in paradise after the fashion of mortals here. What is there then to distinguish paradise from this world? Of course nothing... If those boys always live in paradise, their parents as well as their fathers-and-mothers-in-law must also do the same. This means that it must be a big colony there wherein diverse kinds of disease are bound to prevail on account of the accumulation of the night soil and other kinds of filth.

If (as asserted) they eat fruits, drink water out of tumblers and quaff wine out of wine-cups, why would not they be subject to head-aches, and indulge in unbecoming expressions? If it be a fact that they surfeit themselves there with fruits and with the flesh of birds and beasts, they are sure to be afflicted with various kinds of disease and suffering. There must also be slaughterhouses as well as butchers shops in paradise and bones must be scattered here and there. Verily, it is hard to sufficiently praise the Muslim paradise! It seems as if it is even superior to Arabia! Of Course when they become inebriate by free indulgence in meat and wine in paradise, they must stand in need of beautiful girls and handsome youths, otherwise the potations might affect their brains, and thereby transform them into raving maniacs! It is right that there should be a sufficient number of beds to accommodate so many people in paradise. Of course it stands to reason that there should be youths in paradise when God has created virgins there. But we are told
that the virgins in paradise are destined to be united to those male mortals who repair to paradise from this world. What about those male youths then who perpetually dwell in paradise? God has kept reticent as regards their marriage; will they also along with the virgins be surrendered to their candidate-mortals from this world? God has thrown no light on this point, and it must be regarded as a great omission on His part. If women in paradise are united to men of the same age, it is not right, since the male should always be twice as old as the female or even older. So much regarding the Mohammedan paradise. As regards the Mohammedan hell, its inmates will have to feed on \textit{(thohar)} Euphorbia nereifolia [This means that there are thorny trees in hell bearing thorns], and drink hot water. Such then are the sufferings they will be afflicted with in hell.” (Saraswati 2003:712)

The author referring to the verse:

"Aye, blooming youths round among them, when thou lookest at them; thou wouldst deem them scattered pearls.

With silver bracelets shall they be adorned and drink of a pure beverage shall the Lord give them.” (LXXVI: 19,21).

He writes,

“Well Sir, Why are boys of pearly complexion kept there? Cannot those in paradise be satisfied with being served by grown up men, and their desires being ministered to by women? It would not be at all surprising if the unnatural crime, which some of the most wicked people commit with
boys, had had its origin in this verse of the Qoran. And why is in paradise partiality shown to some of the inmates by providing them with servants? This must afford pleasure to the served and be of a source of misery to the servants? And if God fills their cups with wine for them, He is more like one of their servants. What does His greatness and glory then consist in? And do women become pregnant in paradise as the result of sexual intercourse with men and do they give birth to children? If they do not, the sexual connection is useless, and if they do, whence do those souls come? And why are they born in paradise without having worshipped God (on the earth)? If they are born there without believing in the true religion, they enter paradise without having deserved it.” (Saraswati 2003:716)

The author refers to the verse:

“They shall have meet recompense. 
And the cups are full. 
Ruh and the angels shall be ranged in order.” (LXXVIII, 25, 32, 36).

He questions,

“If the dead are judged according to their deeds, what did Houris, angels and boys of pearly complexion do to deserve perpetual residence in paradise? When they will drains whole cups full of wine, will they not become intoxicated, and fight with each other?” (Saraswati 2003:717)

Referring to verse: “And thy Lord shall come and the angels rank on rank. And hell on that day shall be brought there.” (XXXIX: 23, 24).
He interrogates:

"Does the God of these people, like a Police inspector or a commander, parade His forces? Is hell like an earthen pitcher that it can be carried anywhere? If it is so small, how will it be able to contain countless prisoners?" (Saraswati 2003:718).

**Reflections:** The authors have multifarious views about the concept of hereafter. The issues mainly discussed are God’s forgiveness, punishment; intercession; Day of Judgement; resurrection and the description of heaven and hell.

There is difference of opinion amongst the authors about the details of heaven and hell in the Quran. Srivastava, Vyas and Das find it factual. In contrast, Roy and Jain regard it to be allegorical. On the other hand, Swarup and Saraswati disparage the entire concept. Most of the authors have quoted verses from the Quran, a few have even sighted hadith. However, they lack a complete understanding and knowledge of the philosophy of hereafter and related issues to it. Most often incompetence in the full understanding has resulted into erroneous conclusions.

Srivastava’s discussion has come very close to the Islamic notion of hereafter. His extensive usage of Quranic verses and the materials from the works of Maudoodi, Ameer Ali and Allama Iqbal is creditable. But, his certain assertions are tenuous. His explanation that body and soul are laid in the grave is wrong. Only the body is laid in the grave and soul is
separated from the body at the time of death. Quran records: *Say “the angel of Death put in charge of you will (duly) take your souls, then shall ye be brought back to your Lord.”* (Sūrah Sajdah:11). The salvation of believers consists in the attainment of pleasure of God as he suggested in the realization of heaven, which is a place of spirituality. Quran insists that for God alone one must lead virtuous life. *“Say truly my prayer and my service of sacrifice, my life and death, are (all) for Allah, the Cherisher of the worlds.”* (Sūrah An‘ām: 162).

Contrary to his assertion, communion or merging with God is alien to Islamic doctrines. Not a single Sufi believes in the complete union or merger with God. Concept of salvation in Islam includes the bliss of soul and body granted by God in a different form, which will never merge in the self or dhāt of God. Quran suggests that, there will be a new order, an entirely changed conditions, set by God in the hereafter. *“One day the earth will be changed to a different earth and so will be the heavens, and (men) will be marshaled. Forth, before Allah, the one, the irresistible.”* (Sūrah Ibrahīm: 48).

Although he has shown that God is unsparing in punishment, but here too, a differentiation between Huquq-ul-Allah (the rights of God) and Huquq-ul-Ibad (the rights of God’s creatures) must be maintained. God may spare any lacuna in His rights but any wrong inflicted on his
creatures will never be pardoned, unless who suffered injury is ready to forgive.

*Once while he was describing the superiority of martyrdom in the way of Allah. A man enquired the Prophet (SAW) that if I die in Allah’s way will all my sins be forgiven. Prophet (SAW) replied: Yes: if you die in Allah’s way while you are constant, expecting rewards from God, face the enemy and are not callous: after a while Prophet asked: What did you ask? He repeated his question and Prophet replied the same answer with an addition that “except for debt (for Allah will not forgive that) and Gabriel informed me this now. (Tirmudhi, Book of Jehad). This hadith shows that Allah Chooses not to forgive a martyr for not fulfilling Huquq-ul-Ibād (Siddiqui 2004:207).

Similarly, he has shown that there will be no intercession Nonetheless, God will grant intercessory powers to whom He pleases. “None shall have the power of intercession, but such one as has received permission (or promise) from (Allah) most gracious.” (Surah Maryam: 87)

A similar message in surah Najm: 26 “How many so ever be the angels in the Heavens, their intercession will avail nothing except after Allah has given leave for whom he pleases and that he is acceptable to Him.”

So also that, the arrangement is not such that some will enter Havens and some to hell; the majority of men and jinn will be sent to Hell. “Many are the Jinns and men We have made for Hell; they have hearts wherewith
they understand not, eyes wherewith they see not, and ears wherewith they hear not, they are like cattle—nay more misguided; for they are heedless (of warning)” (Surah Araf: 179).

Islam’s idea of God’s forgiveness is parallel to the Christian and Hindu ideals of forgiveness, which assumes that God being forgiving must pardon every sin and mistake and must also, grant certain atonements. Notwithstanding, Islam presents that God’s forgiveness and mercy will take account from the sinners and rebels, those who have inflicted affliction on others and have caused hurt and loss. Gods’ mercy and forgiveness is not a refuge for wicked. Incomprehension of this concept leads to many wrong conclusions, where justice is overlooked in the name of mercy.

Many authors criticize satisfaction of human desires in heaven. Here again lies the conflict of Islam and other religion’s viewpoint towards human desires. Hindu conception regards human desires as baser qualities and an impediment in the growth of a human, so it exhorts, these to be shunned altogether. However, Islam never condemns these human desires; its only concern is moderation in actualizing these desires. Infact Quran acknowledges that it is engrained in the human nature to love and desire for the life and its riches, with a caution that it must be considered a mataā or implements alone.
"Fair in the eyes of men is the love of things they covet: women and sons; heaped up hoards of gold and silver; houses branded (for blood and excellence) and (wealth of) cattle and well tilled land. Such are the possessions of this world’s life; but in the nearness to Allah is the best of the grals (to return to)." (Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 14). Moreover, the baser desires of animal instinct too if attained in accordance with God’s commands is considered as a virtue and is rewarded. In a long hadith, narrated by Abu Dhar, Prophet said: in your sexual relations there is a Sadaqa. "The companions said:" O Messengers of Allah, is there reward for one of us when he satisfies his sexual desire? The Prophet (SAW) said: "Don’t you sec, if he had satisfied it with the forbidden would there not have been a sin upon him?" They said” “Why, yes!’ He said:” In the same way when he satisfies it with that which is lawful there is for him in that a reward." (Al. Albaani: p 17).

Since these desires are not evil per se, God promises to give them as rewards in heaven. Infact, the appeal to humans can be made in this way alone. For, an offer of those rewards alone can be foretold which are known to them.

Srivastava’s discussion on allegorical nature of heavens and hell is praiseworthy, he rightly concluded that the interpretation of heaven and hell as metaphors is a not an established opinion.
Vyas too assumed that body and soul are laid in grave; however, soul is transferred to "Alam-e-Arwah" at the time of death.

Jain’s postulates are refutable. It is accepted by all Sufi silsilas and Ulema that sent has beginning, at is created by Allah, which is termed as Amr or command of God. "Verily when He intends a thing, His command is "Be" and it is." (Surah Yāsīn : 82) Quran elucidates at various places that God created the physical body and then breathed His own spirit in the man. “He began the creation of man with (nothing more than clay); And made His progeny from a quintessence of the nature of a fluid despised; But He fashioned him in due proportion, and breathed into him something of His spirit...” (Surah Sajdah: 7-9). His insistence on the transmigration of soul from the poetry of Rumi is not creditable. Rumi’s poetry cannot be taken as evidence to prove an Islamic point of view. Jain did not collaborate the evidences from Quran or the Sunnah of the Prophet. Besides, Rumi’s work is criticized by the orthodox ulemas too. His understanding that man can attain Godhood is also not correct. It is not Godhood that man is asked to aspire for; it is the pleasure of God that must be achieved in the end.

“Allah well-pleased with them, and they with Allah: that is the great salvation.” (Surah Mā’idah: 119)

So also, the resurrection of the dead on the Judgment day is not an allegorical myth. Quran employs several similitudes, examples and
incidences to bring home the fact that the body will be resurrected on the last day. This theme is explained in several ways in the Quran.

Say, “He will give them life who created them for the first time.” (Sūrah Yāsīn: 79).

"Man says, “What! When I am dead shall I then be raised up alive?” But does not man call to mind that we created him before out of nothing? (Sūrah Maryam: 66-67).

"O mankind! If ye have a doubt about the Resurrection, (consider) that we created you out of dust, then out of sperm, then out of a leech like clot, then out of morsel of flesh, partly formed and partly unformed, in order that we may manifest (our power) to you; and we cause whom we will to rest in the wombs for an appointed term, then do we bring you out as babes, then (foster you) that you may reach your age of full strength; and some of you are called to die, and some are sent back to the feeblest old age, so that they know nothing after having known (much), and (further), thou seest the earth barren and lifeless, but when we pour down rain on it, it is stirred (to life), it swells, and it puts forth the every kind of beautiful growth in pairs." (Sūrah Hajj: 5). In point of consideration, this constitutes one of the important themes of the Quran, which has been adequately proved in the Quran.

Roy’s opinion that paradise is enjoyment to be attained in this world is baseless, paradise as enjoined by the Quran is a place that must be
qualified for through fulfilling God’s commands. “Those who believe and work righteous deeds – from them shall we blot out all evil (that may be in them), and we shall reward them according to the best of their deeds.” (Sūrah ‘Ankabūt: 7) Similarly Das’s conception of regarding heaven and hells as subjective and objective is ambiguous.

Swarup’s premise that God gives harsh punishment to the unbelievers is the result of incomprehension of the concept of forgiveness in Islam. Forgiveness if granted to wicked would be an injustice to the righteous. Quran interrogates: “Is then the man who believes no better than the man who is rebellious and wicked? Not equal are they.” (Sūrah Sajdah: 18) therefore, if they are not equal how can their treatments in the hereafter be equal?

In postulating his opinions on such faulty premise, he overlooks the fact that no one is forced to be an unbeliever of God. Anyone can qualify for the reward by attempting to attain its requirements. He refuted his own interpretation of a hadith that Islam views poor deprived with contempt. This hadith is referring to unworthy and not poor people. This hadith implies that when vanity will be more popular and unqualified instead of upright people will hall the affairs, then the hour will come.

His comment that, Salvation is won by the intercessory, power of last prophet and not by God’s grace is flawed. A famous tradition narrated by Ibn Hurairā notes that: Allah’s Messenger (SAW) said: “The deeds of
anyone of you will not save you [from the (Hell) Fire].” They said: “Even you (will not be saved by your deeds), O Allah’s Messenger!” He said: “No, even I (will not be saved) unless and until Allah bestows His mercy on me. Therefore, do good deeds properly, sincerely and moderately, and worship Allah in the forenoon and in the afternoon and during a part of the night and always adopt a middle, moderate, regular course whereby you will reach your target.” (Muhsin Khan 1984: V8, 313)

Similarly, it is intriguing where could Swarup find the see-through garments mentioned in Quran?

His assertion that unlike men, no analogous reward for women are stated in the Quran, lacks complete view of rewards in the hereafter. The analogous reward for women is not mentioned in keeping with the social etiquettes of times. The bashfulness of women can be seen in this statement of Aisha (R.A) (Hadith) that the permission of a girl for marriage will be sought for her silence, since it was against the custom for women to express their affirmation.

Nonetheless, the reward of fulfillment of all wishes and desires are mentioned. “Verily the companions of the garden shall that day have joy in all that they do.

They and their associates will be in grooves of (cool) shade, reclining on thrones (of dignity) (Every) fruit (enjoyment) will be there for them, they shall have whatever they call for.” (Surah Yásin: 55-57). Also, “And we
shall remove from their hearts any lurking sense of injury." (Surah A'raf: 43)

Besides all these enjoyment, there will not be any vain discourse "No frivolity will they hear therein, nor any taint of ill." (Surah Waqiah:25).

Saraswati failed to differentiate between physical and metaphysical realms. He imposed the physical laws of nature on to the metaphysical events and has come to wrong conclusions. His work is polemical and thus examines the other religion sometimes with bias and often with prejudice. At times, he tried to enforce the concepts of Hindu religion on Islamic teachings for instance, his remark that men in this world die and born again is a Hindu concept, that he tried to find in Islam.

His following remarks are not in conformity with Islamic traditions

1. Women remain idle till Judgment Day in Paradise
2. Women are more loved in Paradise than men.
3. God falls in love with the women of Paradise
4. Since believers are exhorted to be careful for the Judgment Day, they should not be cautious of the present.
5. God is not free from prejudice.
6. God was idle before creation and will be the same after it also.
7. God is libertine and paradise a brothel.
8. Women in Paradise were allowed to enter before their husbands.
9. Soul is not responsible; God controls all the deeds so God must be punished.

10. It is inappropriate for God to raise deads on Judgment Day.

11. God has to examine work and proofs, therefore he is not omniscient.

12. By forgiving sins, God promotes sins.

13. Gardeners and Gold-smith to construct the garden in Paradise.

14. People may commit theft in heaven.

15. Wine, multiple number of women will create maladies in paradise.

16. Perpetual happiness cannot reign where women are to be found

17. Presence of slaughter houses and butchers in Paradise

18. Misery for the servants of Paradise.


20. The unjustified entry of houses, angles and boys of pearly complexion in heaven


He lacked complete information of the concept of bless and enjoyment in heaven. He omitted the essential fact that heaven is a place of reward and not of action, thereby stumbled in understanding the verses of the Quran. As Quran records clearly in Sūrah Nisa: 124, “If any do
deeds of righteousness – Be they male or female – and have faith, they will enter Heaven, and not the least injustice will be to them."

His charge that there cannot be infinite reward and punishment for finite deeds, skipped the concept of accountability. Islam presents this life as a test for the hereafter. "He who created the Death and life, that He may try which of you is best in deeds." (Surah Mulk: 2) consequently success on failure after a test is logical and acceptable sequence.

Another charge that too has left out this concept is that God helps those who are in heaven and not those who are in hell. Quran at several places have described the events of future in past tense. This is an accepted style of eloquence in order to show the certainty of future events. Saraswati failed in understanding this basic rule of Arabic language and concluded wrongly that deads were resurrected in past in this very world.