

# MAJMA-UL-BAHRAIN

**Dr. Mridula Jha**

**Associate Prof., Department of History  
P.G.D.A.V. (Eve.), Delhi University, Delhi**

Majma-Ul-Bahrain was written by Dara Shukoh's<sup>1</sup> at the age of forty two in 1065 A.H. (i.e. 1657 A.D.). This writing represents the second phase of Dara Shukoh's creative writing period in which he was preoccupied in translations and syncretic interpretation of Hindu scriptures and alongwith it to an identification of the Hindu religious thought with the Islamic. In the introduction to *Sirr-i-Akbar*<sup>2</sup> he wrote that this spiritual quest, which took him in the direction of the comparative study of Hindu scriptures, began in 1641 when he was absorbed in understanding some 'marmuz' (mysterious symbolic) topics of Quran in the light of other scriptures like the old and New Testament.<sup>3</sup> At this juncture it seems that the urge to explore the Hindu religious thought began. Till now he was ignorant of the Hindu religious thought although its possible he may have already met some Hindu mystics and ascetics. He concept of Wahdat-al-Wujud (unity of being) was strictly based on the ideas expressed by Ibn-Arabi. But his later contact with yogis and sanyasis refined his understanding of Wahdat-ul-Wujud and he began interpreting them in a terminology understood by Hindus and Muslims alike. Majma-ul-Bahrain is an effort in a direction where he prepared a lexicon through which he brought forth an idea that the truth of divine unity is everywhere the same. Different religions may define and explain the terms differently but the ideas and the focal points are similar. It was the first attempt of its kind to reconcile the two apparently divergent religions.

It would not be out of place if we quote Dara Shukoh when he remarks in his *Majma-Ul-Bharain* that "this unafflicted, unsorrowing fakir, Muhammad Dara Shukoh, after knowing the truth of truths and ascertaining the secrets and subtleties of the true religion of the Suffis and having being endowed with this great gift (i.e. sufistic interpretation), thirsted to know the tenets of the religion of the Indian monotheists; and having had repeated intercourse and (continuous) discussion with the doctors and perfect divines of the (i.e. Indian) religion who had attained the highest pitch of perfection in religious exercises, comprehension (of God) intelligence and (religious) insight, did not find any difference, except verbal, in the way in which they sought and comprehended truth."<sup>4</sup>

Bikramajit Hasrat<sup>5</sup> while writing about *Majma-Ul-Bahrain* wrote that it is "poor in spirit, largely verbal and devoid of any deep insight or great spirituality..." Here one would not agree with Bikramajit Hasrat. Firstly, its not a philosophical discourse but a genuine effort to underline the similarity of basic ideas in two seemingly different religions. After having collected the views of two parties (Hindus and Muslims) he was of the firm opinion that the nuclei are similar and that's why he claimed that it is a collection of truth and wisdom of two truth knowing (Hak Shinas) groups.<sup>6</sup> Here one has to take into account that this tract was not meant for the 'theoreticians' of both these religions but for the 'two truth knowing groups' who could be very simple religious minded persons. So, the presentation of the subject matter has been set accordingly. Secondly, while disagreeing with Bikramajit Hasrat one would suggest that the time period in which this work was conceived and given shape has to be kept in mind. It was perhaps for the first time, as we don't find any other work of this nature, that an idea of comparing the technical terms of two religions occurs to a person. Keeping in mind the ethos of 17th century if such an idea occurs and one has the nerve to write. about it, then definitely it should be considered as a very bold step.

Thirdly, the hypothesis which he had set forth was very challenging in the manner that there was no literature available then which could have helped him to prove or disprove his hypothesis. The treatment of any subject matter which has not been dealt with previously becomes very tedious. The very idea in itself was 'novel' and one is pretty sure that had he not been a 'Prince' he would have never dared to take up this kind of idea.

Its almost impossible to pinpoint as to who were his ‘target readers’ when he wrote this work. At one place in the beginning of the pamphlet he declared that “I have put down these researches of mine, according to my intuition and taste, for the benefit of members of my family and I have no concern with the common folk of either community.”<sup>7</sup> It appears that-he was very well aware of the fact that this issue which he was dealing with, could annoy the conservative sections of both the communities, that’s why he remarked that it had been written ‘for seekers of truth.’<sup>8</sup> It is quite plausible that he wanted his syncretism to find favour with Hindus and with this in mind Majma-Ul-Bahrain was translated into Sanskrit under the title of ‘Samudra Sangam.’

Dara Shukoh quotes Khwaja Ahrar<sup>9</sup> as saying that “If I know that an infidel, immersed in sin, in a way, singing the note of monotheism, I go to him, hear him and am grateful to him.”<sup>10</sup> By this it appears that on one hand he is trying to make his position clear that even if he is undertaking this kind of a study it should not be taken otherwise, its mainly because of the Wahdat-Ul-Wujud (unity of being) that he is making an attempt to understand Hindu religious thought. On the other hand it seems that he is targeting the Ulema by saying that one should not be totally dismissive about the ‘other person’ or ‘other religion’ by labelling them a ‘Kafir’, but one should try to comprehend their point of view as they might have something very important related to Wahdat-Ul-Wujud (unity of being). His bent of mind was such that’s why he quotes great mystics having said that “Taswwuf (mysticism) is equity and (further) Tasawwuf is the abandonment of (religious) obligations.”<sup>11</sup>

Majma-Ul-Bahram begins with the Name of one who has no name or rather all names in reality are whose names. Dara divided his subject into some heads covering all the different aspects like the discourse on elements (Anasir), Senses (Hawass), Devotional Exercises (Ashghal), God’s attributes (Sifat-i-Allah-Ta’ala), Soul (Ruh), Air (Bad), four Worlds (Awalim-i-Arba’a) Sound (Awaz), light (Nur), vision of God (Ruyat), God’s names (Asmai Allah Taala), men of realization (Nubuwwat wa Wilayat), Brahmand, Directions (Jihat), Skies (Ashanha), Earth (Zamin), Divison of the earth (Kismat-i-zamin), world of Barzakh (i.e. interval between the death of a man and the resurrection), Resurrection (Qiyamat), Mukht (salvation), Day and night (Ruz wa Shab) and on the infinity of the cycles. The method adopted is to set forth the conception of the above, first according to one school or the other and then give the correspondence to it in the other, citing the technical terms in both. The ultimate authorities like the Vedas from the Hindu side and Quran from the Muslim side are often mentioned.

Firstly, he discussed the five elements called Panch Bhutas in Hinduism and Anasir in Islam, constituting the world of objects. In the same section, the process of the manifestation of the world from one principle of chid Akas which is permanent and there is no Quranic or Vedic verse testifying to its annihilation or destruction.<sup>12</sup> First appeared ‘Ishq’ (Love) which Dara equates with maya in the language of Indian monotheists. From Ishq (maya) jiv atman, the great soul was born, by which is understood a reference to the soul of Muhammad (further) to the ‘complete soul’ of the chief (of the faithful). This is described in Hindu Cosmogony as Hiranyagarbha and Avashtat.<sup>13</sup>

One feels that Hiranyagarbha, in Indian philosophy is not a prophet (real or living) to guide and inspire people but its rather a figurative name given to the aggregate of souls. Thus he has no importance as that of Prophet Mohammad. Secondly, it appears that in the metaphysical scheme of creation and dissolution in Islamic philosophy. Prophet Mohammad does not seem to have so much importance as Hiranyagarbha in Indian philosophy has. It appears that the comparison between Prophet Mohammad and Hiranyagarbha is not appropriate.<sup>14</sup>

In the second section, the five senses are discussed with their names, conception and function in the two schools. While discussing Sami’a (or the sense of hearing) is connected with ‘the great element’ (Unsur-i-Azam) namely maha akas, through instrumentality we hear sounds. And it is through the sense of hearing that the real essence is manifested to religious devotees (Ahi-i-Dil) only, while no one else can realize it. Such exercise is common to the Sufis and the Indian monotheists, the former naming it, Shaghl i-Pas-i-Anfas (the exercise of controlling the breath), and the latter calling it Dhun.<sup>15</sup> The inner senses

according to Islam are five called Mushtarak (common), mutakha-yyila (Imaginary), Mutafakkira (contemplative), Hafiza (Retentive) and Wahima (Fancying) but in the Indian system, however, they are four in number, budh, man, ahankar and chit and their collective name may be called antah Karan which may be looked upon as fifth.<sup>16</sup> Their functions are elucidated and their parallels in Islam are also pointed out. While explaining the inner senses, Dara deals briefly with the question of how the pure consciousness of the supreme being become conditioned into the knowledge of individual beings and a vedantic simile is given, of the silkworm becoming enveloped by the thing secreted by itself and the seed of a tree having produced a plant out of itself, enters the tree and remains in the branches, leaves and flowers of the tree. This way, he says that before the creation, our world was concealed in His self and His Holy Self is concealed in the world.<sup>17</sup>

The third section deals with the devotional exercises (Ashghal). It is quite remarkable that Dara mentions Ajapa, which is the highest form of meditation of the non dualistic type, practiced by the Advaitins,<sup>18</sup> which all the time, whether one is in wakefulness or sleep, goes on ceaselessly through the very process of breathing at every moment. The incoming and outgoing of breath have been interpreted in two word—the breath that comes out is called U (i.e. He) and the breath that goes in is named man (i.e. I) and their combination of “U manam” means “He is I.” The Sufis too practice this in these two words as Hu Allah (i.e. He is God)—Hu appearing while the breath comes in and Allah when it goes out.<sup>19</sup>

This subject had already been discussed by Dara Shukoh quite at length in his earlier pamphlet titled Risala-Haq-Numa. It is to be noted that this kind of meditation which points to the essential identity between man and God could be found in Indian and Sufi systems of thought. The followers of orthodox Islam who believe in an Eternal distinction between men and God can't practice this. That's why while talking about Ashghal Dara refers to Sufis only and not to Muslims as a whole.

In the fourth section Dara speaks about the attributes of God and compares the two qualities of Jamal (beauty) and Jalal (majesty) which encompass all creation with the Hindu triad whom Indian devotees name as tirmurat or Brahma, Vishnu and Mahesh who are identical with Jibrail, Mikail and Israfil of Sufi phraseology.<sup>20</sup> One feels that Dara could not handle this properly as he appears to be quite over-enthusiastic as far as showing the similarity between Brahma, Vishnu, Mahesh and Jibrail, Mikail and Israfil is concerned. This particular comparison appears quite far fetched.

In the fifth section Ruh (soul) which is explained with its common features in two schools. Ruha (soul) is two fold—Ruh-i-Jujal (common soul) and Ruh-i-Kulli (soul of souls i.e. supreme soul), which correspond to atma and Paramatma, the individual and supreme soul of Vedanta.

In the sixth and seventh section five live breaths (paran, apan, saman, Udan and Vayan) and the four worlds (Awalim-I Arba'a) have been discussed.<sup>21</sup> These four worlds had been discussed in detail in Risala-i-Haq-Numa as well. The equation in Vedanta of the worlds to the four states of consciousness, of waking, dreaming, sleeping and the state beyond is explained in terms of sufi conception.<sup>22</sup> The fifth world (alam-i-mithal) is also explained.

It appears that in Sufism these stages are very important as they can be instrumental in bringing a person closer to God, whereas in Indian religious thought the above said four worlds (Jagrat, Sapan, Sakhupat and Turya) do not have any meta-physical significance. They are considered as very ordinary state of the soul and one can never perceive them as something which may bring them closer to God.

In the eighth section Dara discusses Sabd and nad. The basic mystic syllable, the root of all creation OM, is given as corresponding to the 'KUN'<sup>23</sup> of the Sufis. Unmanifested sound, manifest sound and letters etc. are dealt with.

In the ninth section Dara deals with Nur or light. Dara quotes a Quranic verse “Allah is the light of the heavens and the earths,”<sup>24</sup> is called Jun Surup (Jyoti Swarup), Savaparakas (Svaprakasha) and Sapanparakas (Swanprakash) by the Hindus which (light) is always effulgent by the itself whether appearing

in the world or not. The Sufis have explained nur (light) by the word ‘munawwar’ (illuminated) and the Hindus have also explained in the same manner.

The Quranic verse cited on this point is, ‘Allah is the light of the heavens and the earth; a likeness of his light is as a niche in which is a lamp, the lamp is in a glass (and) the glass is as it were a brightly shining star, lit from a blessed alive tree, neither eastern nor western, the oil whereof almost gives light through fire touches it not—light upon light—Allah guides to His Light whom he pleases.’<sup>25</sup>

Naming himself a ‘Faqir’ he puts forward his ideas as to what he gathers from all this. “That lamp is lit” this applies to the light of the essence, while the ‘sacred tree’ (shajar-I Mubarak) refers to the self of the Truth, Holy and exalted is He, who is free from the limitations of the East and West. By Zait (olive oil) is meant ‘the great soul (Ruh-i-Azam), which is neither of eternity past nor of eternity to come, in the zait is luminous and resplendent by itself, for the reason that it possesses great elegance and purity, and does not require to be lighted.’<sup>26</sup> Lastly, he concludes by saying that the main purpose of all these verses is that God, the Most High and Holy, is manifest, with the Light of His Essence in elegant and refulgent curtains and there is no veil or darkness concealing Him.

The tenth section is on the vision of God (Ruyat). God’s vision can be realized either through inner eye or the outer eye. He opined that the vision of God whether in this or the next world with whichever eye (inner or outer) can’t be disputed or doubted whether they are believers in the Quran, the Vedas, the Book of David or the old and the New Testaments, that all have a common faith in his respect.<sup>27</sup> The view of some that God could be beheld in the next and not in this world is refuted by saying that the one who can’t behold Him here (i.e. in this world) will hardly behold Him there (i.e. in the next world). He reinforces this with a citation from the Quran “And whoever is blind in this, he shall (also) be blind in the hereafter.”<sup>28</sup> Beholding of God is of five kinds—first in dream with the eyes of heart, secondly; beholding Him with the ordinary eyes, thirdly, beholding Him in an intermediate state of sleep and wakefulness, which is a special kind of selflessness, fourthly, beholding Him in a special determination and fifthly, the culmination of beholding is in that state in which, irrespective of this world or the other, there is without spatial and temporal limitation, uninterrupted awareness of Him.<sup>29</sup>

The eleventh section deals with the names of God (Asmai Allah Taala). Terms applying to the impersonal and personal aspects in both the schools have been discussed. If knowledge is attributed to him the Indian divines designate Him as Chitan (Chetan), while the Muslims call him Alim (knowing). For Al Hak (thetruth) Indian divines have the word ‘anant’, for ‘Qadir’ (the powerful) they have ‘samarth’, for Sami (the hearkener) they have Saruta (Sarota) and for Basir (the beholder) they have ‘drashta’.<sup>30</sup>

Allah (God) is called Um (om) by the Hindus, Hu (he) they call sah and ‘Farishta’ (i.e. angel) as divata (devata) in their language. The ‘perfect manifestation’ (mazhar-i-alam) is called awtar (avatara) and wahi (Divine revelation) which dawns on the Prophets is called akas vani (akash vani) by the Hindus.<sup>31</sup>

The twelfth section deals with the Apostleship and saintship (Nubwwat wa Wilyat). Saints are classified into three classes, those who have had vision of the God through their external eye or internal eye, those who have received the divine sound or message, those who have seen or heard from some form of divinity.<sup>32</sup> Apostleship and saintship is of three kinds (a) Pure (tanzih) Apostleship (b) Resembling (tashbih) Apostleship and (c) combination of Pure & Resembling Apostleship. According to Dara, the Pure (tanzih) and resembling (tashbih) Apostleships, both have their difficulties, the former being too high for the people and the latter likely to lead the worshippers into all sorts of external things, a combined approach, mutually complementary is best, like the Apostleship of Prophet Mohammad. According to Dara this was the highest and loftiest stage of universality and perfection which was reserved for Prophet Mohammad.<sup>33</sup> He ends this section with the names of 51 most revered men of Islam according to his perception (in which his murshid Miyan Mir and mulla Shah have also been included) and one Hindu saint Baba Lal Bairagi has also been included.<sup>34</sup>

In the thirteenth section very briefly he has taken up the concept called 'Brahmand'. He wrote that neither its inclined nor joined towards anyone, its proportion to all is equal.<sup>35</sup> That's really an interesting observation about brahmand but unfortunately he has not elaborated upon this idea. Similarly, in the next section (i.e. fourteenth) he takes up very briefly about the directions (Jihat) and informs the reader that Muslim monotheists regard six directions in all whereas Indian monotheists reckon ten directions (dah disha).<sup>36</sup>

In the next section Dara takes up skies (Asmanha). According to Indians the skies are eight in number and Muhammadans regard this eighth one as 'Kursi' in their own phraseology. He informs the reader that the ninth sky which is called maha akas has not been included in the list of skies as it encircles all even the Kursi, the skies and the Earth in it.<sup>37</sup>

The next section is devoted to Eschatology. According to Indian monotheists after death, atma or soul, having left the body of elements, enters the body of 'mukt' which is called Sucham Sarir (sukma Sarira). On the basis of Karma, dharma and adharma, those deserving of Paradise will be taken to Paradise and those deserving of Hell to Hell.<sup>38</sup> He quotes a Quranic verse which conveys that there would be a session of 'Question and Answer' after death and similarly like that of Indian system, those deserving of Paradise will be taken to Paradise while those deserving of Hell to Hell.<sup>39</sup>

After this he compares the concept of 'Qayamat' and maha Parli (maha Pralaya) and to him this concept is almost similar in both the systems. When after the upsetting of the skies, the destruction of the heavens and the hells and the completion of the age of Brahmand, the occupants of Heaven and Hell (from hell if the Lord pleases then he may condone them and include with the 'mukts') will achieve 'mukti' (salvation) i.e. both will be absorbed and annihilated in the self of the Lord.<sup>40</sup>

This leads onto the conception of Mukti or Liberation according to the two paths. Three kinds of liberation are distinguished : Jivanmukti, liberation as a result of full knowledge while yet in an 'Embodied state in which one goes through his activities but is not affected by them. He should regard God as manifesting himself in all the stages and should look upon Brahamand, which the Sufis call Alam-i-Kubra (or, the Great world) and is the 'complete form' of God, as the corporal body of God.<sup>41</sup> Chiefly, he sees unity in all universe. Dara quotes Shaikh Saduddin Hummu'.<sup>42</sup>

"Truth is the soul of the world, the whole world the trunk.

Souls, angels and senses are the bodies.

The skies, the elements, the three kingdoms of nature (i.e. animal, vegetable and mineral) and the bodies—This is Monotheism and all else is device and artifice."

This quatrain reflects his firm belief in Wahdat-al-Wujud (unity of being). In the same vein he categories Indian pantheists like Vyasa<sup>43</sup> and others, having considered 'Brahmand', which is 'Alam-i-Kabir (or the great world), as one individual self, have accordingly described the different limbs of its (i.e. brahmand's) body. There is graphic picture of the cosmic being of whom every part of the universe is a limb but its not clear on what text or source Dara bases this long detailed account. A passage from the Quran is also quoted at the end of this description.

Second kind of liberation is Sarvamukti or the liberation from every kind of bondage, consists in absorption in His self. After the destruction of the sky, the earth, the Paradise, the Hell, the Brahmand and the day and the night, they will attain salvation by annihilation in the self (of the God).<sup>44</sup> The third kind of liberation is sarvadamukti, liberation at all time or Eternal liberation, in which the realized souls (Arifs) remain forever in the proximity of God in His Highest Heaven. The corresponding conception is pointed out in a passage of the Quran.

The last subject is Day and Night and time. He cites the imagery employed by the Prophet, of some saints seeking in the night a line of camels passing along without stopping each one laden with two boxes in each of which there was world like ours and in each such world there was Muhammad like him.<sup>45</sup> Dara interpreting this imagery says that the boxes stand for Universe, the ceaseless move of the line of camels stands for time and it means that worlds go on floating on the current of endless time.

In Hasanat-UI-Arifin which he penned just before Majma-UI-Bahrain one can find him quoting one of the aphorism of a Hindu ascetic Baba Lal Bairagi<sup>46</sup> where he declared that “Truth is not the monopoly of anyone religion.” One can say that this was the premise on which Majma-UI-Bahrain is based upon. It is a clear reflection of openness of Dara’s mind where he sincerely believes and tries to prove that the focal points are same, there’s no such major difference. Words may differ, terms may differ but the ideas around which human imagination revolves is one and the same. Like the conception of heaven and hell no one till now knows about this, no one knows as to what happens after death but it is remarkable that the description given in both the religions is quite similar. There is no denying the fact that sometimes Dara has gone too far and his ideas seem quite far fetched like when he equates Mikail with Vishnu. Israfil with Mahesh and Jibrail with Brahma. Similarly he equates the “complete soul of the chief (i.e. Muhammad) with that of Hiranyagarbha. As pointed out earlier that Hiranyagarbha in Indian religious thought is not a Prophet (real or living) to guide and inspire but its rather a figurative name given to aggregate of souls. Thus he has no importance as that of Prophet Mohammad.

Even with these limitations where he seems to have gone too far in his enthusiasm of showing every fundamental concept similar in both religions, one would like to conclude that this is a study undertaken to know more about the religion of ‘others’(Here by ‘others’ one means Hindus). One feels that generally speaking humans (majority of them) are very ignorant about ‘the other’. Here the term ‘other’ could include anything from that of ‘culture’ ‘state religion’ to anything upto human behaviour in its domain. One would like to argue that Dara Shukoh despite being a Prince was sensitive and sensible enough to explore the domain of ‘others’. He not only tried to comprehend Hindu religious thought with the help of Hindu Yogis and Sanyasis, moreover he compared various fundamental points of both the religions. He pioneered a field of comparative study of Hinduism and Islam which hitherto had been totally undiagnosed till now.

But its amazing that Dara was very well aware of the implications this kind of work would have on the orthodox sections of both the religions. At the time when he penned down this work he was a declared ‘heir apparent’, even then he was not under any illusion that this pamphlet would be welcomed by people at large. That’s why, perhaps, he wrote at the end of it that ‘it is the outcome of much painstaking and considerable research and is in accordance with my own inspiration, which, although you may not have read in any book or heard from anyone, is also in conformity with the two Holy verses of the Quran (which were mentioned by him earlier). Now if this (exposition) falls heavy on the ears of certain defective ones, I entertain no fear on that account: “Then surely Allah is self sufficient, above any need of the worlds.”<sup>47</sup>

One is left wondering after reading this pamphlet as to why Dara Shukoh dabbled into the domain of politics and bid for the throne even when he was so much preoccupied with the spiritual matters of this world. He was so engrossed in these matters that he could hardly equip himself in matters of statecraft. It seems that he had always visualized himself as seated above all these petty worldly affairs, then why he could not decide to carve out a separate niche for himself and not at all indulging himself in the struggle for the throne.

Here some may agree that Dara might not have anticipated that such a struggle would take place amongst the brothers. The counter argument to it would be that in the preceding Mughal history there had never been a single example where the transfer of power had been a smooth affair. Secondly, he was not foolish who might have underestimated the obvious superiority and military acumen of a person like Aurangzeb. Then the question arises why this ‘Sufi mystic’ (if we could possibly use this ‘nomenclature’) chose this path. May be by acquiring throne he wanted to achieve the kind of world which would be a replica of his ‘vision of perfect world’ where all human beings would be seekers of ‘truth’ only irrespective of their religion.

Destiny had something else in store for him. Contemporary European travellers like Manucci and Bernier<sup>48</sup> opine that it was Majma-ul-Bahrain which procured a decree from the legal advisors of Aurangzeb that Dara Shukoh had “apostatized from law and having vilified the religion of God, had allied himself with heresy and infidelity.” He was executed in the year 1659 A.D.

## References

- 1 Dara Shukoh (1615-1659) was the son of Shah Jahan (1628-1658) and Mumtaj Mahal. He was a prolific writer who wrote extensively on Sufism. He lost out to his brother Aurangzeb in war of succession (1658) and was executed by him in 1659.
- 2 *Sirr-i-Akbar* (the Great Secret) is a Persian translation of fifty Upanishads done by Dara Shukoh, completed in the year 1657 A.D. at Delhi.
- 3 Aziz Ahmad Op. cit. P. 192.
- 4 Dara Shukoh, *Majma-ul-Bahrain*, Edited by Mahfuz-ul-Haq, Asiatic Society, Calcutta, 1-edn. 1929 Reprint 1982, P.II.4.
- 5 Bikramajit Hasrat , *Dara Shukoh : Life and works*, 2nd Edn., 1982, New Delhi,P.216.
- 6 Ibid, P. II. 4.
- 7 Ibid, P. II. 4.
- 8 Ibid, P. II. 4.
- 9 A great Naqshbandi mystic, born in 806 A.H. and died in 895 A.H. He lived at Samarqand.
- 10 Dara Shukoh, Op. cit, P. II. 4.
- 11 Ibid, P. II. 4.
- 12 Ibid, P. II. 5.
- 13 Ibid, P. II. 5.
- 14 Pracyavani-Mandira (comparative Religion and philosophy series, vol II) A critical study, of Dara Shukoh’s *Samudra Sangama*, in two volumes by Dr. Roma Chaudhari and Dr. Jatindra Bimal Chaudhuri, P. 18.
- 15 Dara Shukoh, Op. cit. P. II. 7.
- 16 Ibid, P. II. 7.
- 17 Ibid, P. II. 9.
- 18 Followers of Shankaracharya, a great Indian philosopher who propounded the theory of Advaitavad .
- 19 Dara Shukoh, Op. cit, P. II. 9.
- 20 Ibid, P. II. 1
- 21 Ibid, P. II. 11.
- 22 Ibid, P. II. 12-13.
- 23 According to Muhammadan belief, the world owes its origin to the will of God which was expressed by the word Kun, or, Be. So runs the Holy verse : “Wonderful originator of the heavens and the earth; and when He decrees an affair, He only says to it, Be, so there it is.” (Quran, Chapter II : 117)
- 24 Quran, Ch. XXIV : 35.
- 25 Ibid, Ch. XXIV : 35.
- 26 Dara Shukoh, Op. cit, P. II. 16.
- 27 Ibid, P. II. 16.
- 28 Quran, Ch. XVII : 72.
- 29 Dara Shukoh, Op. cit, P. II. 18.
- 30 Ibid, P. II. 19.
- 31 Ibid, P. II. 20.
- 32 Ibid, P. II. 21.
- 33 Ibid, P. II. 22.
- 34 Ibid, P. II. 23.
- 35 Ibid, P. II. 30.
- 36 Ibid, P. II. 30.
- 37 Ibid, P. II. 30.
- 38 Ibid, P. II. 32.
- 39 Ibid, P. II. 32.

- 40 Ibid, P. II. 33.
- 41 Ibid, P. II. 34.
- 42 Saduddin Hummui was a great mystic and writer of superior works on Sufism. He died in 650 A.H.
- 43 Vyasa, a great (sage) a great Rishi who is said to have written the great epic called Mahabharata.
- 44 Dara Shukoh, Op. cit, P. II. 38.
- 45 Ibid, P. II. 41.
- 46 He has been discussed in detail in chapter (6)
- 47 Dara Shukoh, Op. cit, P. II. 40.
- 48 Bernier, Op. cit, P. 100-101.