Radu Iliescu, Prophet Muhammad, avatar of divinity, ( integral text )

I agree that the Prophet Muhammad is very difficult to understand for a European, be he a Christian dedicated to theology ( let alone a modern ). Most find this, and whether it is limited to comparing Jesus to Muhammad, either they simply do not understand and are so proud of their incompetence that they make no effort to overcome it, but in both situations it is from beginning to end outside the problem.

I said that for a Christian ( how to say ... practitioner and studio, not sociological, I am not interested in painted crows ) the figure of the Prophet Muhammad is difficult to understand starting from the comparison with Jesus Christ. And this, unfortunately, because the latter's understanding is not easy either, he may be a familiar figure, but unfortunately he has been associated for some hundred years with a certain harmful exegesis. Starting to a large extent from Protestants, to which is added a certain flair of the Catholic / Orthodox clergy, Jesus is more and more seen as a cool teenager and quite high, who went to the gang with the apostles to tell people to be cool too and to let it soften with sins, and even sat at the table with parachutes and valutists, because, why not? these were already cool and casual,there was no need for any change in them. It's just that in the end this funny guy was martyred by some adults who pervertedly calculated events, a kind of avant-in-law on lettres, who were not light enough to notice that such a cool guy was necessarily divine in his own way. As a result “ good God ” ( other heresy of wide circulation! ) he made the naughty hippie the coolest guy in this part of the galaxy, and he gave the eternal worries of Hollywood and the World Bank to those who crucified him.As a result “ good God ” ( other heresy of wide circulation! ) he made the naughty hippie the coolest guy in this part of the galaxy, and he gave the eternal worries of Hollywood and the World Bank to those who crucified him.As a result “ good God ” ( other heresy of wide circulation! ) he made the naughty hippie the coolest guy in this part of the galaxy, and he gave the eternal worries of Hollywood and the World Bank to those who crucified him.

Let us abandon this foolish humor to approach the doctrine of avatars in Hinduism, which contains the necessary landmarks in this particular matter. We resort to this because any event must be introduced into the class to which it belongs, and no matter how much we like to believe that we are unique, Christianocentrists, God had mercy on all nations and sent messengers to all. The simplest definition of the notion of avatara is that of “ descent ” of God on earth, of the incarnation of Being in the immediate plan of the mundane, of incarnation. Between an avatara and God the relationship is neither competitive nor of absolute identity ( God alone being Absolute, and no one or nothing else ), nor of dualism: is the relationship between drop ( precise quantity, locable ) and water ( substance ).This is what those of the Holy Fathers who said that Christ is God, but God is not Christ, also meant. The latter must be seen from two angles, first that of Joseph's son and Mary, a carpenter from Nazareth born in Bethlehem, as all those of his time [ knew him, those who knew of the birth of a virgin were still quite a few ]; then as an wrinkled Verb descended among men. His dual nature must never be overlooked: if Jesus had not been human, he would not have prayed in the Garden of Gethsemane for a change of crucifixion; if he had not been divine at the same time, he could not have said what he said. Those who saw in him only the carpenter of Nazareth rejected his message, those who on the contrary saw in him only the divine nature reached the sinister heresies,who denied for example the physical suffering on the cross ( because it is absurd to imagine that the uncaught God could fit into a human body, just as it is inconceivable for God to endure any pain or suffering ).

That being said, it is good to know the fact, too easily forgotten by theologians of the last hour, that all divine attributes can be divided into two seemingly distinct groups. The first includes everything related to the Majesty of God ( “ jall ” in Arabic ), the second is His Beauty ( “ ”. Majesty includes the necessary aspects, severity, justice, while Beauty synthesizes mercy, generosity, compassion and other analog qualities. These qualities are not absolute, because nothing makes the Absolute a competitor, so mercy is limited by justice, rigor of generosity, severity of compassion - and each other. God being out of all excesses, his qualities make up a perfect balance. This idea is found in all religions,for example in Shiva Hinduism ( the one who destroys ) and Vishnu ( the one who builds ) are the two aspects of Atman ( must be a three-parallel European orientalist in order to imagine that they are different gods, or even “ ” anthropomorphized in the Greek-Latin manner ).

So given that God has two aspects, one rigorous and one compassionate, it is normal for his avatars to be like him, endowed with two seemingly opposite fetuses ( and this explains why Jesus is depicted in some early icons with two faces, like Janus Bifronus ). However, the Absolute being unique as God is unique, his avatars do not recompose him to the same perfect extent ( if this were possible, then indeed the multiplicity of the divine would be possible and we could no longer speak of one God ). And it is not about helplessness here, nor about bad will, but about the contact that the Being has with manifestation. The latter being polymorphic and relative, “ the descent ” of the divine must take on the clothes of a common measure, otherwise the meeting would not take place in any form.The paradox of our relationship with God is that we are enormously far away and incredibly close. For this reason, avatars also wear paradoxical clothes, like the carpenter Jesus, who could be touched and betrayed with a kiss, but impossible to contemplate in the glory of Mount Tabor. Or Moses, the stuttering pastor who carries the Tablets of the Law with him. Or Muhammad, who tells the first Muslims: “ Act for this world as if you should live a thousand years, and for the other as if you were dying tomorrow." Or Muhammad, who tells the first Muslims: “ Act for this world as if you should live a thousand years, and for the other as if you were dying tomorrow." Or Muhammad, who tells the first Muslims: “ Act for this world as if you should live a thousand years, and for the other as if you were dying tomorrow."

Things already seem to be more precise. It is clear that we can no longer claim that two avatars are identical, it is clear that the necessary-compassion dosage cannot be encountered twice in the same formula ( the existence of two identical things in the universe is not imaginable other than as a form of heresy that denies Universal Possibility, so the divine Infinity ). All we have to do is analyze some peculiarities and try to see if Muhammad is still an avatar or just a successful fraud ( we could make a pretty reasoning simple to reject this assumption, but we prefer to go through less cold types of argument first, and expose it somewhere towards the end ). And for that it's good to take a look at other avatars, and where do we find the most complete collection if not the Hindus?

Let's say a few things briefly: Rama, Vishnu's seventh avatar, to whom Ramayana is dedicated, killed Ravana, the king who kidnapped his wife, Sita. Nowadays, the killing of Ravana is celebrated by Hindus under the name of the feast Vijaya Dashami. Was Rama a killer? Is a crime celebrated? Not. It was the rigorous face of God exercising divine justice.

In the case of the sixth avatar, Parashu-Rama ( or Rama with the ax ), it is explicitly said that he learned all the fighting techniques from Shiva ( in other words, that from the rigorous front of God ). Among his feats, recorded in Ramayana and Mahabharata, there is the killing of Katarveerya-arjuna and his army ( the destruction of the kshatriya revolt ) and the rupture of one of Ganesha's fangs ( the elephant-faced one ). However, it should be noted that, unlike Rama and Krishna, this avatar ( considered a second-class avatar, avesha avatar and no maha avatar ) is not revered.

Balarama, Krishna's brother, who is after the Hindus the ninth avatar of Vishnu ( according to the Buddhist the ninth avatar is Buddha ), is depicted in Hindu iconography with a plug ( protector of farmers ) and a ... bag. And not as an element of decoration, but because he was a teacher of a snowdrop for Duryodhana from the Kauravas and Bhima people from Pandavas. And, as any skill is required and put into practice at one point, Balarama, the last known avatar, used his club in the very battle between Kauravas and Pandavas. Balarama is equally the author of Ihtihasei Bhagavata Purana, text for Kshatriya use.

By far, however, the most complex avatar is Krishna, perhaps the most powerful in Hinduism, known by many names and heroes of many writings and legends ( among which the best known are Ramayana, Mahabharata, Bhagavata Purana and Gita Govinda ). Among her deeds “ immoral ” can be listed: the killing of Putana ( the demonic babysitter who wanted to poison him through the milk from her breast ); the burning with Arjuna of the Khandava forest – without a doubt a great ecological disaster of its time, which led to many losses of human and mammalian lives; the battle with the Pandavas clan for the throne of Hastinapura, against his brother Balarama, who took part in the Kauravas clan after a long neutrality ( the Kurukshetra war ). He is accidentally killed by a hunter,and his death marks the end of the Dvapara-yuga era and the beginning of Kali-yuga ( in which we are now ). Like Rama, this avatar is adored in Hinduism even today.

Here that together with Muhammad, in addition to Jesus we can list the Indian avatars: Rama, Parusha-Rama ( or Rama the one with the ax ), Balarama and Krishna. Let's not stop here. The Jews also had at least three great avatars: Moses, David, and Solomon. The first was the instrument by which divinity descended the plagues on Egypt, one more sinister and bloody than another. Also through it was decimated the Egyptian army in the Red Sea, which became a unique marine cemetery. We don't risk making estimates, but how many tens of thousands of people died then? Many ... But we know precisely that when he returned with the Tablets of the Law and saw the Jews dancing around the golden calf, he was not a Democrat either, he did not say anything like “ vox populi ”, he did not appeal to tolerance either, but he killed, says Torah, like three thousand men. Genocide? Not to mention,but severe measures where extreme decay justifies them, by virtue of the least evil. The sin of idolatry is so great that the surgical removal of those touched by it preserves the health of others. David and Solomon, who in their lives have known the war and campaigned, there is no point in talking, they are well known.

Here is now a list of the greatest avatars: Jesus, Buddha, Rama, Parusha-Rama, Balarama, Krishna, Moses, David, Solomon. They are harvested from both Semites and Aryans. The painting is far from complete, we have limited ourselves to the most famous, and it is easy to imagine that a huge number of avatars are added to them, with impact “ local ”. But even so, we can see that almost all played political roles and were ( and ) warriors – exception: Jesus and Buddha. Almost all left texts written by them – exception: Jesus, Parusha-Rama. Almost all had many followers and died in ancient times – exception: Jesus ( who was crucified in his youth ). Almost everyone showed even at a time in their lives the rigorous face of God – exception: Buddha, who showed ONLY the compassionate face.Almost all have renovated the political power, put in the light of the sacred – exception: Jesus, Buddha. However, Muhammad did all this: he played a very important political role and was forced to be a warrior ( he being, through education and practice, a merchant ), wrote a revealed text ( The Qur'an ) and its life and sayings are subject to Sunna ( collection of hadiths ), had followers and died in ancient times, after illustrating both the compassionate face and the rigorous face of God. He was, therefore, an avatar of divinity.wrote a revealed text ( The Qur'an ) and its life and sayings are subject to Sunna ( collection of hadiths ), had followers and died in ancient times, after illustrating both the compassionate face and the rigorous face of God. He was, therefore, an avatar of divinity.wrote a revealed text ( The Qur'an ) and its life and sayings are subject to Sunna ( collection of hadiths ), had followers and died in ancient times, after illustrating both the compassionate face and the rigorous face of God. He was, therefore, an avatar of divinity.

It is interesting to dwell on the main difference that is perceived between Jesus and Muhammad, that of the exercise of divine rigor and sacred wrath. As for forgiveness and the relationship with enemies, Jesus said, as is well known: that we must love our enemies, pray for them, and turn our left cheek when we were slapped on the right cheek. The Prophet Muhammad said in a hadith that a Muslim must love the one who loves God, and hate the one who hates God. Are the two positions irreconcilable? It is easy to see that in fact the position is the same, only the perspectives differ.

Jesus addressed the individual-individual interaction and externalized exactly what was missing then in Israel: heat and holiness. Absolutely correctly, reaching the state of holiness presupposes the abandonment of the ego, and identification with the divine Self. The Christian who is on the path of holiness must endure the illusory deeds of earthly existence, and focus on eternity within us. Loving his enemies, he loves God in fact. I do not think that anyone could, on the basis of these words, conclude that Jesus intended to make us, if we find a crime, bring the killer a new victim. And this detail could not be retained, because it was already well established in the Law of Moses, an exotherism which Jesus never questioned: “ I did not come to change the Law, but to fulfill it.” It was not the outer vessel that questioned it, but its emptying, which was to be “ fulfilled ”, re-filled with the spirit that no longer lived ( we generally speak ) in Judaism.

But Muhammad's injunction concerns the relationship between what follows God's way and those who are in opposition to this ( not in a different way! Islam knows and recognizes that the roads to God are formally multiple and essential, as God is Unique ), so collectivities. The individual putting the community before him manifests himself hostile to everything that could corrupt him.

We can ask ourselves if Jesus ever showed his rigorous side against those who harm the community. Yes, of course he did, and the best known example is the whipping of merchants who had made currency exchange offices in the Temple. It is exactly the episode that confuses those who like to see in Jesus a “ cool boy ”. There would also be a very hostile attitude against the Pharisees, who represented the camp of the literalists in Judaism, and whom Jesus called “ those who do not walk in the way, but he does not leave others ”, and elsewhere: “ like graves, cleaned on the outside but full of rot on the inside ”. They are not really reconciling words, and they were not received like praises even then…

I can't help but end the walk among the avatars with a simple observation: the fact that it was in the logic of Christ's function to act as he did and not otherwise, as well as in the logic of Rasûl's mission to do exactly what he did and nothing else, it is proven by the very fact that they chose to do what they did and not otherwise. A Christ who was confiscated from his sterile political activity would have been only a local rebel of the Roman Empire, and we would not have spoken of Christianity today. A Rasûl that would have let itself be “ taken by the press ” by rival factions would have been a simple diliman that no people lacked. The best proof of the need for a type of action of an avatar ultimately lies in the action itself.

Jesus Christ lived in an Orthodox religion, revealed by God, but which perpetuated the form ( correct! ) to the detriment of the essence. His role was to restore the essence. There was the problem and there he acted, it made no sense to be trained in a sterile struggle with the Roman Empire, which would have answered only the pride of a few individuals so penetrated by the fact of being “ the chosen one ” that they had forgotten why they had been chosen. In fact, Jesus and the Jews fought the Empire, each in his own way: the Jews triggered the insurrection and lost and were scattered in the diaspora, because their struggle conceived only the material level, immediately, according to their capacity as a fallen skill. As for the avatar Jesus –, he placed his first disciple in the Eternal City and, as he understood, conquered the world.

On the other hand, Muhammad lived in a place and time when doctrinal meanings were lost, through a decline that also involved the exoteric level, and the restoration had to be done primarily here ( but also inside, of course ). The political action was the only one able to allow the spread of the good example and to protect it, starting with the generosity shown to the defeated and with the Qur'anic adage: “ There is no need for coercion in religion, The truth is imposed on itself! ” If it had crossed his mind to be robbed, it would have been like a shout in a – cauldron, only he would have heard it. Jesus' disciples were able to spread the word unhindered through the Empire, because there was a minimum of physical security they needed. However, the Arabs in the Peninsula in chapter “ civilization ” suffered the most,the Sahaba ( companions of the Prophet ) would have died to a large extent due to the lack of security that existed in the particular conditions of the world in which Muhammad lived.

I was saying somewhere in the beginning that “ All we have to do is analyze differences and try to see if Muhammad is still an avatar or just a successful fraud ” and more we say that this problem can be rejected even at the level of well-stranded logic. I will do it by resorting to a reduction to the absurd: to admit that the Prophet Muhammad was an epochal fraud, I should also agree on the consequences of ( either all three or one of them ):

1 ) that he was a poet of genius ( The Qur'an is an opera that at a purely formal, stylistic level, exceeds the expectations and escapes all comparisons, and that's what too many arabizers say to overlook ), corroborated with a great politician ( laid the foundations in a quarter of a century for an empire that the Romans realized in a few centuries ), a great military chief, as well as a civilizing discoverer ( who is really Greek or Romanized today? Arabization, 13 centuries away, is almost the same! ). In other words, I would have to admit that I am in front of a great poetic and military genius, but who is also a big liar. Absurd.

2 ) that he built a text on which hundreds of thousands of pages of exegex, metaphysics, philosophy, reflection were written, in other words, he produced a text that has passionate and passionate about brilliant minds, but which has no intrinsic value. In other words, I should admit, whether a lot of very smart people get ecstatic in the face of nonsense, whether a liar and mentally handicapped man could produce a very intelligent text. Absurd.

3 ) Finally, I should admit that 1.3 billion people, my contemporaries, live in great error, and that they are so stupid that they have not yet come out of it. At the same time, I should admit that I am extremely intelligent, because I can make the finding in advance. But the intelligence award should be shared with all who think like me, that is, all non-Muslims. The falsity of this point of view is also easy to prove, being obvious the fact that it is based on a sentimental premise. Absurd.

Given that 1 ), 2 ) and 3 ) lead to absurd solutions, it must be accepted, according to the method, that the premise [ Muhammad is not an avatar ] is false. The truth is that a traditional civilization cannot be founded on a lie, and centuries of scholars cannot be wrong and at the same time come to wisdom. Q.e.d.

Now that things have been clarified, let's “ translate ” your question:

1 ) If Muhammad was indeed God's messenger, why didn't he behave according to the patterns I have in mind about this role? In other words: why are things as they are and not according to the criterion I impose through prejudice?

Or

2 ) Why does God manifest does not maintain his objective condition in the general subjective framework as well? In other words: why does it have the goodwill to adapt to our low reception capacity?

Or

3 ) Why God asks me for an effort to understand what it is about, and it doesn't just come like a huge red parrot, to see all the black man on white ( or red on white, finally )? In other words: why are things complicated and not simple?

I think I have already answered these questions.