THE

AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT

IV

THE SPLIT.

BY

MUHAMMAD ALI, M.A., LL.B.,

Author of an English translation of the Holy Qur-an with commentary, the Principles of Islams, etc.

1918.

LAHORE.

Coloured Printing Press, Rang Mahal, Lahore.

PREFACE.

THIS is the fourth tract of the series of tracts on the Ahmadiyya movement, and it deals with the division in the movement, which was brought about on the death of Maulvi Noor-ud-Din on the 13th March 1914, though the seed of it was sown, as the following pages will show, about three years earlier. I have been compelled to deal with this internal difference in a separate tract, as a great misconception prevails as to the true reasons of the split which is due, not to a desire to work separately, but to far-reaching differences on the cardinal principles of the religion of Islam. M. Mahmud, a son of the founder of the movement, who is the present head of the Qadian section of the community, began to drift away from the basic principles of the Islamic faith about three years after the death of the Promised Messiah, going so far as to declare plainly that the hundreds of millions of Muslims, living in the world, should be no more treated as Muslims. He has laid down the basis of creating a breach with Islam itself, seeking to lay with the Ahmadiyya movement, which was a movement strictly within the circle of Islam, foundations of a new religion altogether and forcing it to take the direction which St. Paul gave to Christianity after Jesus Christ. A large number of the educated members of the community, who had the moral

courage to dissent openly from the erroneous doctrines taught by him, perceived the great danger to the whole community, when after the death of the late Maulvi Noor-ud-Din a particular clique in the community succeeded is raising M. Mahmud to headship at Qadian without any general consultation, and at once rallied round the true doctrines of the Promised Messiah, and after in vain trying for over a month and a half to keep up the unity of the movement, formed themselves into a separate Society, known as the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, on the 2nd May 1914, which is now earnestly working for the propagation of Islam. The important work which is being done at Woking where nearly two hundred, mostly influential, Europeans have joined the ranks of Islam, and the bringing out of a complete translation of the Holy Qur-an in the English language with the text and a commentary, are both due to the activities of the members of the Lahore section, and the propagandic work of the Anjuman is making progress by leaps and bounds.

MUHAMMAD ALI.

LAHORE:

AHMADIYYA BUILDINGS;

6th January 1918.

GENERAL REMARKS.

WRITING in May 1906 in the *Review of Religions* I opened my description of the Ahmadiyya movement with the following words:

"The Ahmadiyya movement stands in the same relation to Islam in which Christianity stood to Judaism. By Christianity here is meant, not Christianity as it is preached or practised now, but the Christianity which Islam represents to be the true religion taught by Jesus Christ. The chief characteristic which distinguished Christianity from all other sects of Judaism was the acceptance of Jesus as the expected Messiah of the Hebrews in whom all the hopes and prophecies of Israel were fulfilled, and the chief characteristic which distinguishes the Ahmadiyya movement from all other sects of Islam is its acceptance of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the founder of the movement, as the Promised Messiah and Mahdi of the Muslims in whom all the hopes and prophecies of Islam concerning its future triumph and greatness are fulfilled."

It was impossible for me to realize then that the resemblance between the Ahmadiyya movement

and Christianity was destined to be established on a much wider basis than the single characteristic of the acceptance of a Messiah. Time has moved fast and the few years that have elapsed since the death of its founder show signs of a change in the teachings of the Promised Messiah similar to the change brought about in the religion of Christ after his death. Attempts are being made to introduce novel doctrines into the simple teachings of the promised Messiah, and I therefore deem it my duty to warn the Ahmadis of the turn which it is being sought to give to the movement. If the necessary steps to check the growth of the new doctrines are not taken in time, the result may be as disastrous as it was in the case of Christianity which within about three hundred years went over entirely to the new doctrines of which the foundation was laid by St. Paul, and though Christ taught, as the holy Qur-an tells us in plain words, that God was one and he himself was only a servant of God, yet all Christendom to-day believes that Christ was one of the three persons of Godhead.

The holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, plainly warned his followers against the ways of the Jews and the

Christians, and there seems to be no doubt that his prophetical eye had clearly seen that the appearance of a Messiah among the Muslims would give rise to two parties among them, similar to the Jews and the Christians. There is a saying of his accepted as true by both Bukharee and Muslim, the two most reliable authorities on reports, which runs as follows: "You shall surely follow the ways of those before you every inch, so much so that if they entered the hole of a lizard (*lacerta caudiverbera*), you shall follow them." The report adds that on being questioned whether he meant that they shall follow the ways of the Jews and the Christians, he remarked: "Who else?" It is necessary to remember that the particular point which brings the Jews and the Christians into contrast with each other is the person of Christ, regarding whom both these people have been guilty of a grave error though each took a view quite opposed to the other. The Jews opposed their Messiah with all the available resources and as a nation they opposed him most severely and treated him most cruelly. Their rabbis and pharisees denounced him and rejected his message and prosecuted him in the courts of law and brought him to the very door of death. They charged

him with teaching blasphemous doctrines and laying claim to godhead. Both the charge and the answer are remarkable as casting light on the true teachings of Christ and their corruption by his very followers (see John ch. 10):

"31. Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him.

"32. Jesus answered them, many good works have I showed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me.

"33. The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.

"34. Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, ye are gods?

"35. If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken;

"36. Say ye of him whom the father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I say, I am the son of God."

In these few verses Jesus clears his position. The charge against him was that being a man he made himself a Gd. Had he been a claimant of divinity, his answer would have been simple: He

was not a man but he was one of the three persons of Godhead and had come for their deliverance. But what does he say instead? He says that before him those who received the word of God were called gods though they were only men. The reference is to Psalms 82 : 6, "I have said, ye are gods, and all of you are children of the Most High." In these words did David speak of the Judges. Similarly in I Ch. 22 : 10 Solomon is spoken of in these words : "He shall be My son and I will be his father." In Ex. 4 : 22, Israel is spoken of as "My son, even My firstborn." Yet this was no blasphemy. How could it be then blasphemy if Jesus, "whom the father hath sanctified" and whom God had "sent into world" was called a son of God. Mark that the only claim he makes is being sent into world, *i.e.*, he is a messenger of God. The meaning is clear. Mortals before him were called gods though they were not actually gods. To call them gods was only true in a metaphorical sense. It was in this, that is, a tropical sense, that he was called the son of God and hence there was no blasphemy in the use of that word. It was equivalent to saying that if in a figurative sense it was correct to speak of pious men as gods and sons of God, the use of the epithet son of God

for him could not be objectionable on similar grounds. The answer settles the point conclusively that it was only figuratively, that is, in a sense diverted from its proper or original sense, that Jesus applied to himself the words son of God, in the same sense in which others before him were called even gods. They were not actually gods, and so he too was not actually a son of God.

But this clear answer did not satisfy the Jews and they persisted in charging him with blasphemy, in saying that he actually claimed to be the son of God. Such was the position of the Jews with regard to Jesus Christ. But what course did his friends or followers take? To-day we find the whole Christian world rejecting the explanation given by Jesus Christ along with his enemies the Jews. They do not take Jesus Christ to be the son of God in the sense in which pious men before him were called gods or sons of God, that is, in a tropical sense, but take him actually for the son of God, for the second person in a godhead of three persons. The Jews ascribed to him a claim to Divinity out of spite and to show that he deserved death for the blasphemy he uttered; the Christians did the same out of excessive love for him; and both parties failed to grasp the true significance of the words

which he had himself explained as being metaphorical. The Jews were guilty of *tafrít*, *i.e.*, fell short in their duty towards Jesus Christ, denouncing him without caring to realize the metaphorical significance of his words, and the Christians were guilty of *ifrát*, i.e.. exceeded the due bounds, in actually taking him for a god, out of excessive love for him.

Evidently, then, the holy Prophet was referring to these two characteristics of the two people when he told the Muslims that they shall follow the ways of the Jews and the Christians. And history indeed has repeated itself in this case. The advent of the Promised Messiah among the Muslims has given rise to two parties exactly corresponding to the two parties mentioned above. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad did not say that he was actually a prophet. On the other hand, when he laid claim to Messiahship, he clearly stated over and over again that the advent of Jesus Christ in person was impossible because no prophet could appear after Muhammad who was the last of the prophets, being a prophet *of all ages and all nations*. Yet, he stated, that as the holy Prophet had said a *Muhaddas* (i. e. a person spoken to by God though not raised to the dignity of a prophet) could

appear among the Muslims and that he himself was a *Muhaddas*. And as the *Muhaddas* was spoken to by God he could be spoken of as being granted a *juzwi* or *naqisah nubuwwat* i. e. a partial or an imperfect prophethood. But this clear statement was misrepresented by the Maulvis and it was given out by them that the Mirza sahib actually laid claim to being a prophet. A *fatwa* of *kufr* was accordingly prepared against him and without caring to ponder on what he said, the Maulvis from one end of the country to the other set their signatures and seals to the *fatwa* of *kufr*, declaring Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and those who followed him to be unbelievers outside the pale of Islam, whose society was to be shunned, who were not to be allowed to pray in the mosques, and whose very corpses could not be admitted to Muslim graveyards. An excitement was thus made to prevail against the Promised Messiah which had never prevailed against any *Mujaddid* (a reformer appearing among the Muslims, not being a prophet, such a reformer being promised at the commencement of every century by the holy Prophet himself). He tried to calm down this excitement by again stating clearly that he did not claim to be a *prophet*, but that he simply claimed

to be a **Muhaddas*, and that no prophet could appear in the world after Muhammad, but all his assurances couched in the most definite and clear language fell on deaf ears, and those opposed to him persisted in their false charge until the masses were led away into a wrong course, labouring actually under the misconception that the Promised Messiah claimed to be a prophet. But he did not despair and continued to write in volume after volume that the appearance of a prophet after the holy Prophet Muhammad was impossible and that his own prophethood was the imperfect prophethood of a *Muhaddas*.

The Promised Messiah died in 1908 and soon after his death, opposition to him began to mellow down, his own verbal assurances in 1908 in big respectable gatherings in Lahore immediately before his death going a long way to remove the misconception spread by the Maulvis. Yet only six years had elapsed, when his own son, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, misled into a wrong belief by some youthful members of the community, began to promulgate the doctrine that Mirza Ghulam

*See Izala-i-Auham pp. 421, 422: "Question. He (i.e. The Mirza sahib) has laid claim to being a prophet in *Fat-hi-Islam*. Answer. There is no claim to prophethood but a claim to being a *Muhaddas*, which has been put forward by the command of God.'

Ahmad was actually a prophet, that he was in fact the *Ahmad* spoken of in Jesus' prophecy referred to in the holy Qur-an in 61 : 6, and that all those Mnslims who had not entered into his *bai'at* formally wherever they might be living in the world were *kafirs*, outside the pale of Islam, even though they may not have heard the name of the Promised Messiah and that the confession of the Unity of God and of the apostleship of the Prophet Muhammad did no more serve the purpose of bringing non-Muslims into the circle of Islam which it had served for the last thirteen centuries. A number of the followers of the Promised Messiah have accepted this novel doctrine and thus out of excessive love for their master, they have raised his dignity as did the Christians aforetime raise the dignity of their Messiah to Godhead. What the Maulvis said out of spite and to bring the Promised Messiah to disgrace, is now, alas, upheld by a section of his followers, and the case resembles exactly the case of Jesus Christ, thus fulfilling the words of the holy Prophet who had said that the Muslims should follow the ways of the Jews and the Christians.

It may be added here that the Promised Messiah was very explicit in stating that the word

prophet regarding him in some of his revelations or in a certain report was to be taken figuratively not literally. He stated this repeatedly in clear words. Though his very first explanation should have set all doubts at rest, yet he continued to explain this point over and over again, so much so that even in one of his latest writings we find it stated explicitly: "I have been called a *prophet* by Allah in a figurative sense, not in a real sense" (*Haqiqat ul Wahy, Ar. Supplement*, p. 65). Jesus when blamed for calling himself a son of God did not say explicitly that the expression was not to be taken literally, though what he stated clearly amounted to this, but the Muslim Messiah was very explicit. Yet strangely enough foes and friends treat the words of the two Messiahs alike and insist upon taking the use of the word *son of God* in the one case and that of the *prophet* in the other literally, though the former do it out of excessive hatred and the latter out of excessive love.

While, therefore, the present dissension in the movement is a naturally matter of regret to all well-wishers of it, it is a matter of great satisfaction that this dissension has taken the turn which brings about only more clearly the fulfilment of the prophecy relating to the advent of Jesus Christ in the

person of the founder of the Ahmadiyya movement, and makes the truth of the prophetic announcements of the holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, only shine the more vividly. That a party of the Muslims should have denounced and persecuted Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as the Jews denounced and persecuted their Messiah, and that a party of his followers should have unduly exaggerated his dignity by taking figurative words in a literal sense as the Christians unduly exaggerated the dignity of Jesus Christ is sufficient to show that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was the promised Messiah of the Muslims as Jesus was the promised Messiah of the Jews.

Though these novel doctrines have been brought into prominence with the dissension of 14th March 1914 and thus have largely occupied the attention of the Ahmadiyya community during the last three years, the first glimpse of them may be traced to a somewhat earlier date. At present the name of M. Mahmud stands associated with their growth but it was really another young man, now thrown into the background, on account of the prominent position occupied by M. Mahmud as the head of a great section of the Ahmadiyya

community, who was the first exponent of these doctrines. Zahiruddin, a clerk in the canal department at Gujranwala, apparently first conceived the idea of promulgating the doctrine of the *nubuwwat* (prophethood) of the Promised Messiah and his writings containing these doctrines may be dated as far back as 1911. The first of these writings is entitled *Nabi Ullah ka Zahur* or the Appearance of the Prophet of God which was finished in April 1911, and must have been written towards the close of 1910 or in the early months of 1911. This is a book of over 120 pages and the writer tries to prove in it that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was a *nabi* (prophet) in the strict terminology of the Muslim law, and that Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, was not the last of the prophets as believed by the Muslims but that prophets shall continue to rise after him. Much notice of this book does not seem to have been taken by the Ahmadiyya community. But probably the contents of this book or some other leaflet on the same subject were brought to the notice of the late Maulvi Nur-ud-Din sahib, then head of the Ahmadiyya community, and after some correspondence between Zahir-ud-Din and the Maulvi sahib, an announcement was made by the latter in the

paper *Badr*, dated 11th July 1912, to the effect that as Md. Zahirud Din was promulgating new doctrines he was not to be considered as having any connection with the Ahmadiyya community. The following are the concluding words of this announcement: "Therefore in accordance with his writing I inform my community that Md. Zahir-ud-Din entertains other beliefs than mine..... and he is firm in his own beliefs, therefore I have no connection with him, nor has my community any concern with him." This announcement was followed by another issued in the *Badr* dated 1st August 1912 according to which Md. Zahir-ud-Din having repented sincerely of his beliefs was forgiven. But the repentance was not a long-lived one.

A second part of the book was published on the 20th April 1913. It was a small pamphlet of 12 pages entitled *Ahmad Rasul Ullah Ka Zahur*, i.e., the Appearance of Ahmad, the Messenger of God. It is in this pamphlet that the basis of a new *kalimah* or formula of faith was first laid. The doctrine had in fact been promulgated before this and the pamphlet is a reply to the Ahmadis who blamed Md. Zahir-ud-Din for the erroneous beliefs which he was circulating and the essence of which was that he considered the Muslim formula of faith

la-ilaha illa Allah-u Muhammad-ur Rasul-Ullah-i (there is no god but Allah and Muhammad is the Messenger of God) to be supplanted by a new formula *la ilah-a illa-Allah-u Ahmad Rasul Ullah-i* (there is no god but Allah and Ahmad is the Messenger of God), by Ahmad being evidently meant Mirza Ghulam Ahmad sahib. The reply was nothing but an admission of what was alleged; and the new formula of faith in a slightly altered form appeared on the title page of another leaflet forming a supplement to the first, issued a few days later. The last page of this new handbill shows that the Ahmadiyya community under the directions of its head again cut off connection with Md. Zahir-ud Din, and though the reason given apparently was his being a claimant of *khilafat* or headship of the community, but as he never made such a claim, a fact borne testimony to by himself on the same page, the actual reason was no doubt the promulgation of these new doctrines. But notwithstanding the odium in which Zahir-ud-Din was held by the Ahmadiyya community as a whole, the doctrines promulgated by him were not directly refuted, probably because it was thought that they would die a natural death.

An indirect refutation of these false doctrines

may however be met with in the saner views which found expression in the newspapers of the community and in the books. A controversy had taken place in 1909 at Rampur between the Ahmadis and their opponents, represented on the one side by Syed Muhammad Ahsan of Amroha, the veteran follower of the Promised Messiah, and on the other by Maulvi Sana Ullah ot Amritsar. A report of this controversy was brought out by Syed Muhammad Ahsan in December 1909 under the title of *Sittah Zaruriyyah* (i. e. *the six essential principles*), on p. 67 of which we find the significant heading: "Discussion relating to partial prophethood in subordination to complete prophethood." Under this heading he showed that "by following the holy Prophet one can be granted partial prophethood in subordination to complete prophethood for helping the cause of the religion of Islam." Later on, the same learned old man wrote an article in the monthly paper *Tashhizul Azhan* edited by M. Muhmud under the heading "Prophethood among the followers of Muhammad," in which he showed that the only prophethood which could be granted to Muslims was *nubuwwat-i-juzwi* or partial prophethood. Besides the learned exposition of this doctrine by the old sage of Amroha,

articles continued to appear in the Badr newspaper from the pens of different contributors in which it was shown that by the use of the word *prophet* regarding the Promised Messiah was meant only the partial prophethood which could be granted to a Mujaddid.

While the activity of Md. Zahir-ud-Did was manifesting itself in the circulation of these doctrines, M. Mahmud had taken up another point, *viz.*, the question of the *kufr* of those who did not formally accept the *bai'at* of the Promised Messiah. His views on this question appeared in April 1911 in the monthly paper *Tashhizul Azhan* of which he was the editor. As already shown, Zahirud Din had just then finished his *Nabi Ullah ka Zahur* and M. Mahmud evidently based his doctrine of *kufr* on the doctrine of *nubuwwat* taught by Zahir-ud-din. The heading of his article was: "A Muslim is only he who accepts all those appointed by God." This article, it is stated in the preface, was shown to the Maulvi Nur-ud-Din sahib but in what sense he understood this article is clear from a later announcement issued by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din and signed by the Maulvi sahib. In this announcement by the Khwaja it was explained that

the article written by M. Mahmud could be accepted only if it was interpreted as signifying that those who did not accept the Promised Messiah were only deniers of, or unbelievers in, the Promised Messiah and not actually outside the pale of Islam, for in that case the article would be opposed to the plain teachings of the Promised Messiah. This announcement was endorsed by Maulvi Nur-ud-Din, the head of the community, and the matter was set at rest by this final pronouncement on the topic.

Towards the end of the life of the Maulvi Nur-ud-Din, however, the question again came into prominence. Circumstances had arisen towards the close of 1913 which made M. Mahmud once again announce that he regarded the whole Muslim world as unbelievers and outside the pale of Islam. This announcement was made at a special meeting of *Ansar Ullah* (the party which M. Mahmud had gathered around himself in the time of Maulvi Nur-ud-Din), convened during the annual gathering of the Ahmadiyya community in December 1913. The announcement reached the ears of Maulvi Nur-ud-Din who was then in the first stage of pthisis which soon brought his life to an end. Some of his *fatwas* allowing Ahmadis to

pray after other Muslim *imams* were also found fault with by M. Mahmud, though he himself had in the pilgrimage which he performed in 1912 followed one of these *fatwas*, and performed the prayers in congregation after the Muslim imam at Macca, and so had all those Ahmadis who went to Mecca to perform the pilgrimage during this time. Matters were thus brought to a crisis while Maulvi Nur-ud-Din who so ably guided the community lay on his death-bed. He was unable to take up the pen and he therefore asked me to enlighten the Ahmadiyya community on this important question. He gave me some hints and even warned M. Mahmud in plain words that he had not realized the true significance of the question of *kufr* and *Islam*. Accordingly I wrote a small pamphlet which was read out to the Maulvi Nur-ud-Din by myself, and he approved of the views expressed therein. This pamphlet however could not be published within his life time though the copyist had written it during his last days. Thus Maulvi Nur-ud-Din had done his duty before he breathed his last, but M. Mahmud paid not the slightest heed to his sane and broad views and insisted upon calling the whole Muslim world as *kafir*, and the result has been the great

dissention which has rent the movement for over three years.

As I have said above, it was not M. Mahmud who originally brought into prominence the questions that the Promised Messiah was a new prophet and that the prophecy of Jesus referred to in 61 : 6, the original of which may be met with in the fourteenth and sixteenth chapters of John, was fulfilled not by the advent of the holy Prophet Muhammad but by the appearance of the Promised Messiah, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, but later events have singled him out as the champion of these novel doctrines, the exposition of which has been the chief aim of his life since he was recognised a leader by one section of the Ahmdiyya community. But it is a fact that all his followers do not profess the novel doctrines. They accepted him as a leader under several misconceptions and many of them are now openly averse to the doctrines he is teaching. The grand old man of this movement after the late Maulvi Hakim Nur-ud-Din, Maulvi Syed Muhammad Ahsan of Amroha, the oldest and the most learned living companion of the Promised Messiah, who was one of the adherents of M. Mahmud in the disenssion of March 1914, issued a handbill on 24th December

1916 declaring that M. Mahmud was not fit for the position to which he had been elected as he was misleading the community into false doctrines. The following extract from his announcement will be read with interest :—

"And I fear that if I remain silent while I see doctrines being propagated against the beliefs of the Promised Messiah and which are occasioning a great mischief in Islam, I shall have no excuse before God; and according to a saying of the holy Prophet, 'he who remains silent (when it is necessary) to speak the truth is a dumb devil'; and I also fear that my silence may mislead others; therefore only to seek the pleasure of Allah and fearing the time when I may have to answer this in His presence I make this announcement that :

"Sahibzada Basheer-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad on account of his persistence in false beliefs is in my opinion utterly unfit to be the *khalifa* or head of the followers of the Promised Messiah; and therefore, I depose the Sahibzada from the *khilafat* which was only a matter of choice and was not political; and thus am free in the sight of Allah and before the public of the responsibility which lay on me; and in obedience to the injunction that there is no obedience to the creatures in

disobedience to the Creator and in accordance with the Divine injunction that 'My covenent does not include the unjust, (Al-Qur-an 2: 124) I give publication to my being free (of the responsibility), and I apprise the Ahmadiyya community that the following beliefs of the Sahibzada are the occasion of a serious discord in Islam, to stand up against which is the first duty of every true Ahmadi; *viz.*,

"1. That all followers of the Qiblah, professing *kalimah* (the formula of faith), are unbelievers and outside the pale of Islam.

"2. That the Promised Messiah is a perfect and real prophet not a partial prophet or a *Muhaddas.*

"3. That the prophecy relating to Ahmad is only for the Promised Messiah and not for the holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him.

"This difference of beliefs is not an ordinary difference; it is an attack on the pure principles of Islam and amounts to deserting the teachings of the Promised Messiah. I also inform my friends that the falsity of these beliefs is borne testimony to by the majority of the trustees appointed by the Promised Messiah; because of the twelve living

trustees appointed by the Promised Messiah (two having died) seven have openly declared their aversion of those (novel) doctrines, and among the remaining five too, one most probably does not accept the beliefs of the Sahibzada."

The learned Syed is not the only man who has renounced the *bai'at* of M. Mahmud. Numbers of educated Ahmadis did the same before him, and these declarations have been published in the *Paigham-i-Sulh* issued by the Ahmadiyya Anjuman-i-Isha'at-i-Islam of Lahore. But besides those who have made public their renunciation of M. Mahmud's *bai'at* on account of the false doctrines which he is trying to introduce into the Ahmadiyya community, other educated members are now realizing the great error into which the community is being led and their dissatisfaction with the doctrines taught is becoming more and more pronounced every day. But there is one step which M. Mahmud took in the beginning and by which he has succeeded in keeping his section of the community in the dark. Being brought up within the circle of the admirers of his father he contracted the narrow views which fall to the lot of young men brought up under similar circumstances, who have little opportunity to get a thorough know-

ledge of the world. Unfortunately he was only a young man of eighteen when his venerable father died. This narrow-mindedness has displayed itself not only in his relations with the Muslims in general whom he outright denounces as being *kafirs* (disbelievers), not even excepting the hundreds of millions who living in far and distant lands have never heard of the Ahmadiyya movement or the name of its founder, but the same contraction of views appears in his relations with the Ahmadis, who, an account of the erroneous doctrines taught by him, do not accept him as the *khalifah*. Hence we find him condemning even such Ahmadis as *fasiq* (transgressors), and this is the step by which he has succeeded in keeping his community in the dark. He has prohibited his followers from having any intercourse with the members of the other section, so much so that they are forbidden to take food at their tables or to have a friendly conversation with them or to read any literature issued by them. Thus his followers are generally ignorant of the arguments which are being given against the novel doctrines which he is teaching, and being ignorant they think that his teachings are not different from those of the Promised Messiah. But as the veil is being removed and light is being thrown on the

points at issue, many are getting inwardly dissatisfied while others are openly showing their aversion to the errors into which he led them.

I shall now take the three doctrines which M. Mahmud is promulgating and which are opposed to the teachings of the Promised Messiah. I take first the question whether Ahmad was not a name of the holy prophet Muhammad and whether the prophecy of Jesus relating to the appearance of a messenger named Ahmad was not fulfilled by the advent of the holy Prophet. I give it precedence over the other questions both because the idea that the prophecy of the advent of the messenger named Ahmad was fulfilled by the appearance of the Promised Messiah seems to have been the nucleus about which the doctrine of his prophethood was formed, this being the first question brought into prominence by M. Mahmud after the dissension of 1914, and because it illustrates how it was after the death of the Promised Messiah that these doctrines grew up. To make this point clear I would refer the reader to M. Mahmud's own admission made in the *Anwar-i-Khilafat* on p. 21 in the following words:—

"When I heard this in the beginning from the *first khalifah*, I did not at first accept it and many

discussions were held about it. But when I pondered over it, Almighty God expanded my breast concerning it and He granted me conclusive arguments and shining proofs and I accepted the idea."

This shows clearly that he had not heard any thing about this doctrine in the life-time of the Promised Messiah, but that it was after his death and in the time of the first *khalifa* that he changed his old views for the new ones. I may add here that the allegation concerning the first *Khalifah* is absolutely wrong. It was not the first *khalifah*, but Zahirud Din, the author of *Nabi Ullah ka Zahur*, from whom he had taken up these ideas, and the first *khalifah* had even gone so far as to pronounce an order of excommunication against Zahir-ud-Din on account of *his beliefs*. The admission clearly shows that the basis of the novel doctrines was laid after the death of the Promised Messiah, and this is a point of utmost importance in this discussion.

—: o :—

WAS AHMAD NOT A NAME OF THE HOLY FOUNDER OF ISLAM?

Soon after being recognised the head of the Qadian section of the Ahmadiyya community, M. Mahmud, following the earlier example of Zahir-ud-Din, began to preach through his lessons on the Qur-an, notes of which were published in his newspaper *Al Fazl*, that Ahmad was not a name of the holy Founder of Islam and that therefore the prophecy of the advent of Ahmad referred to in the holy Qur-an 61 : 6 was not fulfilled in his person, and that both the name and the prophecy belonged to Mirza Ghiulam Ahmad, the founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement. Stray notes relating to this subject continued to appear in the newspapers, but as the subject was fully discussed by M. Mahmud in his address to his section of the community in the annual gathering held at Qadian in December 1915, I would give quotations from that address, which was later on published in the *Anwar-i-Khilafat* after revision by him as acknowledged in a footnote on p. 18 of the volume. As some of his disciples are under the wrong impression that M. Mahmud does not deny Ahmad being a name of the holy Prophet I shall first have to quote some passages from the book bearing on this subject.

The question is introduced on p. 18 of the book in the following words:—

"Although I intended to speak on other subjects, but on account of the present dissension in the movement I think it necessary to speak a few words on two questions regarding which difference of opinion is held and these I take first.

"The first question is whether Ahmad was a name of the Promised Messiah or that of the holy Prophet, and whether the verse of the chapter entitled the Ranks (61) in which good news has been given of a messenger named Ahmad relates to the holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, or to the Promised Messiah.

"My belief is that this verse relates to the Promised Messiah and that he alone is Ahmad, but as against this it is alleged that Ahmad was the name of the Holy Prophet, and that to call any one else Ahmad is derogatory to him. But the more I think the greater does my conviction grow and I hold the belief that the word Ahmad occurring in the Holy Qur-an relates only to the Promised Messiah."

Again on p. 17 we find :—

"And this does not mean that the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon

him, was not Ahmad. He was Ahmad and certainly so but Ahmad was his attribute not his name. . . . But notwithstanding this it is not lawful to say that Ahmad was a name of the Holy Prophet."

Then follow arguments. Summed up briefly they are as follows: That the Holy Qur-an does not speak of the Holy Prophet being Ahmad, that there is no report showing that Ahmad was his name, that the name Muhammad, and not Ahmad, occurs in the *Kalimah* and in the *azan*, that the companions never addressed him by that name, and so on. How did then the name Ahmad come to be applied to the holy Prophet as his proper name? This question is not answered in the *Anwar-i-Khilafat* but an answer to it is met with in an earlier writing called *Al-qaul-ul-Fasl* and the reader will find the explanation very interesting:

"Therefore you should make further investigation about these references so that you may know how unreliable and untrustworthy are these reports which were fabricated simply to avoid the objection of the Christians (who said) that you (i. e., the Muslims) say that the prophecy of Ahmad is contained in the Gospel but the name of your Prophet was not Ahmad" (p. 30).

It is a pity that it never occurred to the writer of these lines that no Christian in the world ever said that Ahmad was not a name of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and both names Muhammad and Ahmad have been recognised by friend and foe. But M. Mahmud is very severe upon those who recognise Ahmad to be a name of the Prophet, so much so that he plainly states that such men do not deserve to be called believers. Here is what he writes on p. 24 of the *Anwar-i-Khilafat:*

"People had an excuse so long as the truth had not come, but now that facts have shown that by Ahmad is meant a servant of the Holy Prophet, persisting (in the false belief) is not the way of the believers."

And again on the same page, he says:—

"Does not one who considers this prophecy to have been fulfilled in the person of the Holy Prophet charge the Qur-an with making a false statement that while the name Muhammad is written in the Gospel, the Qur-an mentions the name Ahmad. Let such a one consider on what dangerous ground does this act of his make him stand, and to fulfil his own whim he calls the Holy Qur-an as well as the holy Prophet a liar."

These statements show that in M. Mahmud's

opinion no one can remain a Muslim who entertains the belief that Ahmad was a name of the holy founder of Islam or that the prophecy referred to in 61 : 6 was fulfilled by his advent. A difference with him on this point amounts to calling the holy Qur-an and the holy Prophet a liar, and therefore those of his disciples who still believe that Ahmad was a name of the holy Prophet and that the prophecy relating to the appearance of Ahmad was fulfilled in his person are, according to the verdict of their new master, guilty of giving the lie to the holy Qur-an and the holy Prophet.

Was Ahmad not a name of the holy Prophet? No one in the world, neither a friend nor a foe, ever uttered such words. Hirschfeld indeed has in his "New Researches" recently denied that the holy Prophet bore originally either the name Muhammad or Ahmad, and thinks both forms to have been adopted later but he does not do this on the basis of any historical testimony but simply to establish a new theory. I cannot say whether M. Mahmud took up the idea from Hirschfeld, but there is no doubt that his theory like that of Hirschfeld has not the least historical testimony in its support. It is not sufficient at this late

date simply to say that the holy Prophet did not originally bear this or that name, for if a simple statement is sufficient to discredit all historical testimony, one might as well say that the holy Prophet never existed at all. And if it is madness to make the latter statement, the denial that the holy Prophet bore the name Muhammad or Ahmad cannot be characterized otherwise.

The name Ahmad occurs in the Holy Qur-an itself and the Holy Book makes it plain that the messenger who bore the name Ahmad had made his appearance at the time of the revelation of this verse. Here are the words:—

"And when Jesus son of Mary said: O Children of Israel, surely I am the apostle of Allah to you, verifying that which is before me of the Torah and giving the good news of an Apostle who will come after me, his name being Ahmad; but when he came to them with clear arguments, they said: This is clear enchantment." (61 : 6.)

How strange that even such clear words are perverted! The prophesied apostle is here clearly stated to have already made his appearance—but when he *came* to them (Ar. *já'a hum*)—when this verse was revealed, but according to this new theory, he had to come thirteen hundred years after

the revelation of this verse! And what is the argument? The preterite is occasionally used in the Arabic language to denote the future when great certainty of the befalling of an event is to be indicated, but there must always be circumstances entitling us to take a word in other than its original sense. There may be exceptions to rules but the exception is not the rule. The preterite may be used to denote the future but that does not mean that we can always take the past tense for the future. There must always be some circumstance entitling us to take a word in a tropical sense, otherwise words would lose their significance. For instance, the holy Qur-an speaks of a Prophet like Moses having been sent, and uses the past tense (see 73:15 which says, 'Surely We have sent to you an Apostle..... as We sent an apostle to Pharaoh,' the word *arsalná* used in the original being in the past tense). Would it be a sane interpretation to say that the words meant that a prophet like Moses shall be sent, because the preterite may in exceptional cases indicate the future. And thus interpreting the Holy Qur-an, one might as well say that Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, had not yet appeared, nor had the

Holy Qur-an been revealed. In fact adopting this rule of interpretation anything might mean anything.

Thus the Holy Prophet's name Ahmad clearly occurs in the Holy Qur-an. The burden of proving that Ahmad was not a name of the Holy Prophet but simply an attribute, lies on him who asserts it. The name does occur in the Holy Qur-an and the word of God does speak of him as having already appeared, and he who denies it must show on the basis of the Holy Qur-an or any reliable report that Ahmad *was not* a name of the Holy Prophet. To shelve this insuperable difficulty by the simple assertion, for which not the shred of an argument exists, that by *he came* is meant *he shall come* is not in the least honourable. What must be shown is this that the holy Qur-an or some reliable report denies that Ahmad was a name of the Holy Prophet, but to say nothing of these two unimpeachable sources, no one in the world, neither friend nor foe, has ever denied that Ahmad was a name of the Holy Prophet.

Next we come to reports of the highest authority, and fortunately here we have the clearest testimony that the Holy Prophet himself gave Ahmad as one of his names. The report in which this

Prophet's saying is mentioned is accepted by both *Bukharee* and *Muslim*, and it runs thus: "I heard the Holy Prophet say, mine are five names, I am Muhammad and I am Ahmad and I am *Al-Máhi* (the Obliterator) by whom God will obliterate unbelief, and I am *Al-Háshir* (the Gatherer) at whose feet the people shall be gathered and I am *Al-'A'qib* (the last comer) and *Al 'A'qib* is he after whom is no prophet." The first narrator is Jubair, a companion of the Holy Prophet. The report does not stand alone but there are many others speaking of the name Ahmad. As for the report quoted above, it is alleged that as the last three names are simply attributive titles, so is also Ahmad, but this argument would deprive the Holy Prophet even of the name Muhammad. The distinction in fact is clear, the last three names are all preceded by the definite article *al* (the), but not so Muhammad and Ahmad, and an explanation is given for every one of the last three names, but no explanation is given for Muhammad and Ahmad, showing that these two are treated further as proper names of the Holy Prophet. Notwithstanding this if any one should say that *Al-Máhi* or *Al-Háshir* or *Al-'A'qib* was a name of the Prophet, no Muslim would deny it. Any person may have a name other than that

given to him by his parents. For instance, the prophecy relating to the birth of Jesus is announced to Mary in the following words: "O Mary, surely Allah gives you good news with a word from Him of one whose name is the Messiah, Jesus son of Mary" (3:44). Now, as every body knows, the parents gave the child only the name Jesus, yet it would be foolish to deny that the Messiah or Christ was a name of the founder of Christianity. Just as when Jesus is spoken of, and every body understands that the founder of Christianity is meant, so when *the Christ* or *the Messiah* is spoken of although it is preceded by the definite article *the* (Ar. *al* in *al-Masíh*), yet there is not the least doubt in the mind of a hearer that the person spoken of is the founder of Christianity. In the same manner, *al-Màhi*, *al-Háshir* and *al-'A'qib* are the names of the Holy Prophet, but *Muhammad* and *Ahmad* enjoy further the honour of being proper names because they are not preceded by *al*. I need not lengthen the discussion by citing other reports giving the name Ahmad.

I would now turn to lexicons. In the first place is the *Tajul Arus* which discussing the words *Muhammad* and *Ahmad* under the root *hamd* says: "And they are the most excellent of the names of

the Holy Prophet, and no one is known to have been named Ahmad before the holy Prophet, excepting what is related of Khizr, on whom be peace, that his name was this." The *Lisan-ul-'Arab*, another voluminous lexicon, writes: "And Muhammad and Ahmad are of the names of our Master, the Mustafa, the Apostle, of God, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him." The *Mufradat* of the famous Imam Raghib has the following: "And as to the word of God, 'And giving the good news of an Apostle, who will come after me, his name being Ahmad,' *Ahmad* points to the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, by his name and his deeds, (the significance being) that he shall be found to be one praised in his morals and in all matters relating to him; and the word *Ahmad* has been particularly chosen in what Jesus, on whom be peace, gave the good news of, to make it plain that he (*i.e.*, Ahmad) shall be a greater Praiser than he and those before him."

It will be seen that all the lexicons agree that Muhammad and Ahmad are both the names of the Holy Prophet. That is sufficient testimony as to Ahmad being a name of the Holy Prophet, for a dictionary must always be our greatest authority

on the right application of a word, and when the best dictionaries of the language agree that Ahmad was a proper name of the Holy Prophet, and mention Ahmad along with Muhammad, thus giving the two names a distinction above all other names, no sensible person would think of starting a theory which is condemned by the simplest form of evidence.

Let us however turn to other authorities. We will take the *seerats*, i.e., lives of the Holy Prophet. Ibn-i-Hisham is the earliest authority on this point, and he mentions the name Ahmad several times. For instance, he cites a number of verses* speaking of the Bani Nazeer in which the name Ahmad occurs three times. A little further on he quotes a number of verses speaking of the battle of the Ditch and the name Ahmad occurs here too, the name Muhammad not occurring so often. I quote the last mentioned verse here:

"So that, by God, we may help Ahmad until
"We are the sincere servants of truth."

I need not here refer to other authorities all of which agree in stating that Ahmad was a name of the Holy Prophet.

---

*These are not the verses of Abu Talib regarding whose authenticity doubts have been entertained.

All authorities on reports also agree that Ahmad was a name of the Holy Prophet. Similarly all those who have commented on the great collections of reports accept Ahmad to be a name of the Prophet. As an example of the first I have already quoted *Bukharee*; as an example of the second I may quote the *Fat-hul-Bári*, the most well-known commentary of Bukharee which also quotes another famous Imam. Commenting on *Bukharee* which mentions the saying relating to the five names already quoted under the heading "What has been reported as to the names of the Holy Prophet" and then quotes the verses of the Qur-an which contain the names Muhammad and Ahmad, the author of the *Fat-hul-Bári* says: "As if he (i.e., Imam Bukharee) points to the fact that these two names (i.e., Muhammad and Ahmad) are the most famous of his names, and the more famous of these two is Muhammad. And it is related that he was named Ahmad because it is a proper name based on an attribute..... 'Ayaz says that the Apostle of God, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, was Ahmad before he was Muhammad as it happened externally for his name Ahmad occurs in the previous sacred books."

The most wonderful thing about this whole discussion is that in advancing the new theory M. Mahmud has made statements for which not the least ground exists. I have already referred to one such statement in which M. Mahmud has made the absolutely false allegation that reports speaking of the Prophet being named Ahmad were fabrcated by the Muslims to avoid the objections of the Christians who said that the prophecy relating to the advent of Ahmad as given in the Gospels could not be applied to the Prophet of Islam because Ahmad was not his name. It is to be regretted that without quoting the objection of a single Christian he has been so daring in laying the charge of fabricatian against the Muslims. That Ahmad was not a name of the Prophet is an idea which never entered into the heart of any one in the world before the present controversy began. Another baseless allegation is the following statement occurring on p. 30 of his *Al-qaul-ul-Fasl*: "If you consult their books, the best commentaries are devoid of this subject. They have written either that this was a prophecy of the attribute of Ahmadiyyat.....or they have written that the fact is this that on the heavens his name was Ahmad." To show the baselessness of this allegation

I am compelled to refer to some of the well-known commentaries, all agreeing in the one point that *Ahmad* is an *'alam* or a proper name of the Holy Prophet. I take first the *Ruh-ul-Ma'àni* which commenting upon 61 : 6 where the name Ahmad occurs, says : "And this grand name is *a proper name* of our Prophet Muhammad, and this is borne out by the verse of Hassan, 'God blesses the blessed Ahmad and so do those who are around His throne of Majesty and the pure ones." Another famous commentator Abu Hayyan says : "It is related that the disciples (of Jesus) said, 'O Messenger of God, will there be a people (*an ummat*) after us?' He said, 'Yes, the followers of Ahmad, on whom be peace and blessings of God, (they shall be) philosophers, learned men, virtuous, God-fearing'.....and Ahmad is a *proper name* derived from the aorist....." I will quote one more commentary, the *Fat-hul-Bayán* which commenting upon the words *his name being Ahmad*, occurring in 61 : 6, says : "This is our Prophet, peace and the blessings of God be upon him, and this is a *proper name* derived from an attribute." Thus it will be seen that all the best commentators are agreed that Ahmad was a proper name of our Holy Prophet.

It is clear from this that the holy Qur-an, the sayings of the Holy Prophet, verses compiled by the companions of the Holy Prophet, the historians, the collections of reports, the commentators, the great imams, the learned and the laymen, nay friends as well as foes, are all agreed that Ahmad was a proper name of the Holy Prophet in the same manner as Muhammad.

During the thirteen hundred years that have elapsed since the birth of Islam, there has not been a single person in the whole world who should have denied that Ahmad was a name of the Holy Prophet, and as the question is really of a historical nature, it is not open to any one to start a theory quite opposed to historical evidence of the strongest nature. Coming to our own days, I may cite two great writers, the one a friend and the other a foe, who both state that Ahmad was a name of the Holy Prophet. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan writes in his "Essays on the Life of Muhammad": "Abdul Muttalib gave the name of Muhammad to the child, while Amena gave that of Ahmad, in obedience to the command of an angel who had appeared to her in a dream, thus accomplishing the prophecies both of the Old and the New Testament." Sir William Muir, speaking of the name

Muhammad, says: "Another form is Ahmad, which, having been erroneously employed as a translation of the Paraclete in some Arabic versions of the New Testament, became a favourite term with Muslims, especially in addressing Jews and Christians, for it was (they said) the title under which the Prophet had been in their books predicted."

I have already stated that M. Mahmud has confessed in his *Anwàr-i-Khiláfat* that he changed his belief in relation to the prophecy of Ahmad after the death of the Promised Messiah, and that confession is in fact a sufficient testimony that the Promised Messiah was not guilty of the outrage to reason and history which M. Mahmud is offering in propounding his new theory. But strangely enough, notwithstanding the plain confession, it is alleged that the views now advanced by M. Mahmud were the views of his holy father. It is an absolutely false charge against that great sage of the age. Not once did it escape his pen in the thousands of pages that he has written that Ahmad was not a name of the Holy Prophet. On the other hand his writings are full of references to the two names of the Holy Prophet, Muhammad and Ahmad. I would content myself with

quotations from two books. In the *Najm-ul-Huda*, printed in three languages, he writes :—

"And may peace and the blessings of God be upon His Ummi Apostle whose name is Muhammad and Ahmad. These two names of his are such that when the names were presented to Adam, these two were presented before all others, for in the creation of this world these two names are the ultimate object, and in the knowledge of God they are the most excellent and the foremost. And it is on account of these two names that the Holy Prophet stands first among the prophets of the world." (p. 2.)

In the *I'ja-zul-Masih* he devotes about twenty five pages to the discussion of the two names, Muhammad and Ahmad, of the Holy Prophet, and repeatedly speaks of these two names being given to him by God Himself. I will quote a few passages:

"And he named our Prophet Muhammad and Ahmad as He named Himself the Beneficent and the Merciful (*Ar-Rahman* and *Ar-Rahim*)" (p. 99).

"So God named him Muhammad and Ahmad and did not give these two names to Jesus, nor to Moses," (p. 105.)

"So God named him Muhammad, hinting to

the quality of belovedness in him, and named him Ahmad, pointing to the quality of love in him" (p. 105.)

"And there is no doubt that our Prophet was named Muhammad when God intended that he should make him beloved in His sight and the sight of the righteous; and in the same manner he named him Ahmad when the Holy one intended that he should make him a lover of His own person and lover of the faithful Muslims" (p. 106.)

"And for this reason was he made Muhammad and Ahmad by the Lord of the worlds" (p. 114.)

"So on account of this God named him Muhammad and Ahmad.....so he is the best of those who are praised and the best of those who praised."

I do not think such overwhelming testimony would leave any doubt in the mind of any sane person as to the fact that the Promised Messiah looked upon Muhammad and Ahmad as two names of the Holy Prophet, and while he speaks of them conjointly times without number, he never once makes the distinction that while Muhammad was a name, Ahmad was not a name but simply an attribute. The theory started by M. Mahmud thus stands condemned on every ground. Moreover it

should be noted that the Promised Messiah speaks of the two names, Muhammad and Ahmad, as being given to him by God Himself. And it appears from certain reports that both the names Muhammad and Ahmad were made known in a vision, and thus it was God who gave these two names to the Holy Prophet. When therefore the Promised Messiah says that God named the Holy Prophet Muhammad and Ahmad, he refers to the vision. Both names may have been revealed in a single vision to the mother or in different visions. There is a number of reports which shows that the angel had appeared to the Holy Prophet's mother telling her to name the child Ahmad and there is also one which shows that the child was to be named Muhammad. It was on account of this that the child received both the names Muhammad and Ahmad, the first, as Sir Syed Ahmad Khan suggests, from the grandfather and the second from the mother.

I would now bring this subject to a close as I think more than sufficient evidence has been produced on this point. I may add, however, that the two names are derived from the same root *hamd*, and according to some they are only two different forms expressing the same significance, *the most*

praised. But the more correct view is that *Ahmad* means *one who praises most* and *Muhammad* means *one who is praised most*, and each is necessarily a counterpart of the other, because the greatest praiser of God would necessarily be himself most praised in the world. And it is a fact that no one in the world has praised God like the holy Founder of Islam, and any one who opens any page of the Qur-an at random will bear testimony to this, and therefore it was necessary that he should have received the name Ahmad even before he received the name Muhammad, because he became the most praised only after being the greatest praiser. And the name Muhammad therefore became the more famous, because it was through that name that his glory was to shine out in the world in full brilliance.

As to the argument that if Ahmad had been a name of the Prophet, the *kalimah* (the Islamic formula of faith) would have contained that name, or that at least it would have been lawful to read *Ahmad is the Apostle of Allah* instead of *Muhammad is the Apostle of Allah*, it is queer logic. It is a sign of the wonderful unity of Islam that the whole of the Muslim world is agreed in all principles of importance. Look to the Qur-an for

instance. What a wonderful unity prevails in the whole Islamic world with respect to it. There were no doubt certain readings allowed by Divine revelation, but no written copy of the Qur-an substitutes any of these readings for the original words. The *kalimah* is the one pillar of the Islamic faith and to allow any variations in it would be to destroy the unity of that faith. We know that the Holy Prophet was a Prophet (*nabi*) as well as an Apostle (*rasul*), but the *kalimah* adopts *Muhammad-ur-Rasul-Allah* i. e. Muhammad is the apostle of Allah, and not *Muhammad un Nabi Ullah* i.e. Muhammad is the prophet of God. And because the word *nabi* does not occur in the *kalimah* nor is it lawful for us to make such a change, are we entitled to draw the conclusion that Muhammad was only an apostle and not a prophet? If that conclusion is not right, what logic is there in drawing a similar conclusion from the absence of the word Ahmad. In fact, these words are taken from the Holy Qur-an and they are marked by the Prophet's stamp and no one has any right to change them. We can neither substitute Ahmad for Muhammad, nor prophet for apostle. And indeed if such liberty had been allowed, M. Mahmud would

have found in it a very strong argument of the legality of substituting a new *kalimah* of the promised Messiah! I have already stated that there is one clear reason why the name Muhammad has been adopted in the *kalimah*, because that is the name which is expressive of the great and transcendant glory of the Holy Prophet, and Divine wisdom had ordained that the Prophet's glory shall be ever sung in the world as he had sung the glory of God.

2. WAS THE PROPHECY OF JESUS RELATING TO THE ADVENT OF AHMAD NOT FULFILLED BY THE APPEARANCE OF THE FOUNDER OF ISLAM?

Based upon the denial of the name Ahmad for the Holy Prophet is the theory that the prophecy of Jesus Christ referred to in 61 : 6 was not fulfilled by the appearance of the Holy Prophet. The evidence produced above therefore really destroys the very foundation of that theory and no further discussion is needed on this point. The prophecy spoke of the advent of a messenger whose name shall be Ahmad, and as the Holy Prophet bore the name Ahmad. therefore the prophecy was clearly fulfilled. But even if we

suppose for the sake of argument that Ahmad was not a name of the Holy Prophet and that it only expressed an attribute, the prophecy was still fulfilled by his appearance. M. Mahmud gives three reasons why the prophecy is not applicable to the Holy Prophet if it is not proved that Ahmad was a proper name of his:

"Therefore the apostle named Ahmad, whose advent is foretold in this verse cannot be the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him. Yet if all the signs which pertain to the apostle named Ahmad had come to pass in his time, then no doubt we could say that what is meant by the name Ahmad in this verse was an apostle possessing the attribute of *Ahmadiyyat* or being Ahmad, for when all the signs were fulfilled in him, what reason was there to apply it to another. But this is not the case as I shall prove later on.

"Another case would have been this that in the prophecy relating to Ahmad there had been any word on account of which we could not have applied it to any one else.....

"Thirdly, notwithstanding that the Holy Prophet's name was not Ahmad, there could have been a reason in applying this prophecy to him if he had himself said that he was the Ahmad spoken

of in this verse. But reports do not show this ..... There is no mention in any report that the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, applied this verse to himself".

Therefore if any of these three propositions is disproved, the case falls to the ground even without proving that Ahmad was a proper name of the Holy Prophet. Before dealing with these propositions, however, I would refer the reader to another point which settles the question. The statement in the Holy Qur-an is to the following effect:

"And giving the good news of an apostle who will come after me, his name being Ahmad, but when he came to them with clear arguments, they said, this is clear enchantment".

Now the words translated *his name being Ahmad* are *ismu-hu Ahmad*, and the word *ism* which has been translated as meaning a *name* conveys that significance primarily, but is applied sometimes to a word denoting an attribute. It is this circumstance that enables the originator of the new theory to escape scrutiny, for where it suits his purpose, he takes the word *ism* as meaning a *name*, and when such a significance is opposed to his interest, he rejects it and asserts the meaning

to be an attribute. But if it simply rests on our choice to give what significance we like to a word, why should we not take the word *ism* as meaning an attribute in the prophecy quoted above, and the prophecy of Jesus would therefore run thus:

"And giving good news of an apostle who will come after me, his attribute being Ahmad". M. Mahmud at least can have no reason to question the correctness of this significance, and thus the whole of his discussion relating to the *name* Ahmad proves abortive. And the statement that *ism* in the prophecy means an attribute and not a name finds support from the fact that prophecies do not generally contain names, and the particular prophecies of Jesus Christ to which reference may be possibly suggested in these words do not contain any name at all. As M. Mahmud admits that the attribute of being Ahmad (*i.e.* a praiser of the Divine Being) was manifested in the highest degree in the Holy Prophet, it is clear beyond all doubt that a prophecy speaking of an apostle possessing the attribute of being *Ahmad* was fulfilled in the advent of the Holy Founder of Islam.

The most powerful argument of M. Mahmud against the application of the prophecy to the

Holy Prophet is that we do not meet with any report in which it should have been stated that the Holy Prophet had said that he was the Apostle spoken of in such and such a verse. But this is a clear fallacy. Such a statement would have been needed if the words of the Holy Qur-an had left any doubt on the point. But the words are clear which show that the Apostle whose advent was prophesied had already made his appearance when the verse was revealed, for the prophecy is immediately followed by the statement: "But when he came to them with clear arguments they said, this is clear enchantment". The verse says clearly that the prophesied Apostle had already made his appearance, and we do not stand in need of further assurance from the lips of the Holy Prophet that he was the prophesied apostle of that verse. And even if such clear statements of the Qur-an cannot be accepted unless there is a saying of the Holy Prophet that such and such a prophecy was applicable to him, we shall have to give up the idea of the fulfilment of a single prophecy of the previous books in the person of the Holy Prophet.

I will make this clear by an example. The Holy Qur-an refers to the prophecy of Deut.

18 : 15-18 in the following words: "Surely We have sent to you an Apostle.....as We sent an Apostle to Pharaoh" (73 : 15).

The likeness of the Holy Prophet to Moses is clearly hinted at here; but do we find any report, authentic or unauthentic, reliable or unreliable, in the whole collection of reports according to which the Holy Prophet claimed to be the prophet spoken of in this verse of the Qur-an. And if we may be at liberty to misconstrue the Qur-an as M. Mahmud has done, we might as well say that as the preterite sometimes denotes the future, the words *inna arsalna*, translated as meaning *we have sent*, mean *we shall send*, and that therefore the like of Moses had not yet appeared but that he shall appear in the future. Such examples could be multiplied to any extent but I refrain from this useless task.

It is clear from the above that when the Holy Qur-an itself makes a point clear beyond the shadow of a doubt, no saying of the Prophet is needed. The Qur-an says plainly that the prophesied Apostle had come and been called an enchanter, what need is there for the Prophet to say that he is the Apostle whose advent is foretold in such and such a chapter of the Holy Qur-an.

But fortunately we have on this point the clearest proof demanded by the originators of this theory. I have already quoted a saying of the Holy Prophet, part of which runs thus: "I am Muhammad and I am Ahmad". Now the Qur-an quotes a prophecy speaking of the advent of Ahmad and a highly authentic report quotes the Holy Prophet as saying "I am Ahmad." He must be an extraordinarily dull-brained man who cannot understand from this that he was the prophesied Ahmad. Ahmad shall come, says the prophecy; "I am Ahmad" says the Holy Prophet. Is it still doubtful that he applied the prophecy to himself? It is for this clear reason that the great *Bukharee* not only mentions that report speaking of Ahmad being a name of the Holy Prophet when commenting upon the verse containing the prophecy (see *Bukharee's* commentary on the chapter *As-Saff*), but when he mentions the same report through a different channel in another chapter entitled "the Names of the Holy Prophet", he quotes the verse containing the prophecy relating to Ahmad's appearance as a preliminary to the saying "I am Muhammad and I am Ahmad", thus pointing very significantly to the connection between the verse of the Qur-an (61 : 6) and the

saying of the Holy Prophet. Thus there is in this case a clear statement from the lips of the Holy Prophet himself that he was the Ahmad spoken of in 61 : 6.

Another report not only confirms the conclusion already arrived at, but settles the point still more conclusively. According to this, the Holy Prophet said: "I am the prayer of my father Abraham, and the good news given by Jesus and the vision of my mother". It is not difficult to see what is meant by these words. In the first place he calls himself the *prayer* of Abraham. This evidently refers to the prayer spoken of in the Holy Qur-an which runs thus: "Our Lord! raise up in them an Apostle from among them who should recite to them Thy communications and teach them the Book and the wisdom, and purify them" (2 : 129). There is a prayer of Abraham in the Holy Qur-an for a prophet to be raised among the Arabs, and the Holy Prophet simply says that he is the prayer of Abraham and the conclusion is evident that the reference is to the words of 2 : 129 quoted above. Again he calls himself "the good news given by Jesus", and it is equally easy to see the reference. Jesus had given "the good news of an Apostle

who will come after me, his name being Ahmad" and evidently when the Holy Prophet said that he was *the good news given by Jesus* he referred to these very words. While all the prophets are spoken of as having foretold the advent of the Holy Prophet, Jesus alone is spoken of as giving *the good news* of his advent. The reason is not far to seek. Jesus was the last of the national prophets (i. e., prophets raised for the regeneration of a single nation), and therefore while those who went before him could only be said to have foretold of the advent of the great world-prophet, Jesus gave the *good news* that the time of his advent had now come, and the world was about to see the approach of the golden era of the universal brotherhood of man and the blotting out of all national and tribal distinctions. Others could only point to his coming in the far future but Jesus could well give the good news that he for whom the world had waited so long was now coming. Hence also it is that Jesus uses the words *min ba'di*, i.e., after me, because no other prophet had to make appearance after him except the one of whose advent he gave the good news. This is therefore the most conclusive evidence that the Holy Prophet even directly applied the

prophecy to himself.

Another important point in this connection is whether the signs of the advent of the promised messenger are met with in the Holy Prophet. It should be borne in mind that these signs are not given in the Holy Qur-an which merely refers to the original prophecy of Jesus. The whole discussion therefore turns upon the one point to which prophecy is reference contained in the words of the Qur-an? The Muslims have been unanimous in claiming that the reference in 61 : 6 is to the prophecy of the Paraclete contained in the 14th and 16th chapters of John, and no one has ever questioned the truth of this. The Christians have always contested the claims of the Qur-an by holding that by the *paraclete* was not meant Ahmad but the Holy Ghost which came upon the disciples of Jesus on the day of Pentecost.

Let us then see if the Muslim claim is true. Referring to the name Ahmad, Sir William Muir says: "Another form is Ahmad which having been erroneously employed as a translation of the Paraclete in some Arabic version of the New Testament, became a favourite term with Muslims." Who made this Arabic version which rendered the

Paraclete as Ahmad? Certainly it was not a Muslim but a Christian. That it was done erroneously is the excuse of Sir William Muir, and every zealous Christian would offer the same excuse. But that excuse cannot in any way benefit the Christians. Here we have the admission of an opponent of Islam that Paraclete was rendered as Ahmad in Arabic by some Christian translators of the New Testament, and this admission should set at rest the controversy between the Muslims and the Christians. The Paraclete is therefore no other than Ahmad, and it is to this that a reference is found in a saying of the Holy Prophet in which is contained the statement that "my name in the Gospel is Ahmad."

The point on which a decision had to be arrived at was this, whether the prophecy referred to in the Holy Qur-an in 61 : 6 is the same as that met with in John where the Paraclete is spoken of? I think that that point is sufficiently established. We would now consider if the Holy Qur-an has in referring to the prophecy of Jesus mentioned any peculiarity of tnat prophecy. It would be seen that four words have been chosen which speak of the four characteristics of the prophecy. In the first place, it is not stated to be a

mere prophecy but it is characterized as *good news*; secondly, it is a prophecy relating to the appearance of a *rasúl* or Apostle; thirdly, that Apostle must come *after* Jesus; and fourthly, his name or his distinguishing characteristic would be that he is Ahmad or the greatest praiser of the Divine Being in the world.

We shall now take these four characteristics. How would Jesus' prophecy be a good news? In the prophecy of his second advent he only speaks of the coming of great disasters, terrible earthquakes, world-wide wars, pestilences and famines. Now these are clear *warnings*, *not good news*, and therefore the prophecy of the second advent could not be called good news. But in the case of the Paraclete there are many clear statements showing that his advent shall indeed be a good news for the world. In the first place Jesus must depart but the Paraclete must "abide with you for ever." That is indeed a good news. The reference in abiding for ever is clearly to the permanence of his law. Again, Jesus is unable to teach all things but the Paraclete "shall teach you all things," that is, he shall give the world a perfect guidance. That too is good news. Similarly the other characteristics of the Paraclete

all show that his coming shall be a source of great good news for the world. Hence the statement about his advent as good news for the world singles him out to be the Paraclete, while the words can have no reference to the prophecy of second advent which is all a warning.

The second characteristic is that he shall be a *rasúl* or an Apostle. M. Mahmud says that if the prophecy had contained any such word as should have been inapplicable to any but the Holy Prophet, the prophecy would have been regarded as fulfilled by the advent of the Founder of Islam. I say the use of the word *rasúl* (apostle) in the prophecy fulfils this requirement, for the Holy Prophet being the last of the apostles according to the plain teachings of the Holy Qur-an, the word could not have been applicable to any one coming after him. Moreover a *rasúl* or apostle is he who brings some great Divine message to the world. Now the prophecy of the second advent of Jesus is not attended with any statement as to the message he shall bring, but the prophecy of the Paraclete speaks plainly of the comer as teaching all those things which even Jesus could not teach, thus plainly showing that he was to deliver some great message to the world which should bring all the

previous messages to perfection. Hence the mention of the word *rasúl* in the prophecy in the Qur-an clearly points to the fact that it contains a reference to the prophecy of the Paraclete and not to that of the second advent of Jesus.

The third characteristic is that Jesus is made to say that the promised Apostle shall come "after me," and it is clear that the whole history of the human race is silent as to the appearance of any apostle after Jesus Christ except the Holy Prophet Muhammad. Why should have Jesus Christ used the words *after me* at all. If he had simply said that an apostle would come, as the prophecy of Moses said that a prophet like him would be raised, his meaning would still have been clear, for a prophecy does refer to some future event, and no body would have supposed that the promised prophet should come before him. Why did he then say that an apostle would come after him? The conclusion is evident that he was referring to the prophet who should come next after him. The prophecy of Moses only said that a prophet would be raised, not that a prophet would be raised after him, and hence a number of prophets appeared after Moses who did not fulfil the prophecy. But Jesus prophesied that the promised Apostle would

appear *after him*, and hence it was necessary that the Apostle who appeared in the world next after him should be the promised Apostle. And the origin of these words is also met with in the prophecy of the Paraclete for it is there said that Jesus must go away in order that the promised one should come, and the Qur-an thus here again makes it plain that it is referring to the prophecy of the Paraclete.

The fourth characteristic is that he is called in the prophecy Ahmad or the greatest Praiser of the Divine Being. The prophecy of the Paraclete is again clearly referred to in this word, for it is in that prophecy that the Promised one is spoken of as doing the work which no prophet before him had done. Every prophet of God was a praiser of the Divine Being in that he led people into the ways of truth and thus established the praise of the Divine Being, but *Ahmad* meaning *the Greatest Praiser* clearly indicated that he would make truth perfect and lead people into the ways of goodness into which no prophet before him had ever been able to lead. And when Jesus describes the Paraclete, he attributes to him the same work for he says that "he shall teach you all things", which is explained in the Bible commentary in the follow-

ing words: "He shall teach you all things, *i.e.*, all saving truth which it is necessary for you and your successors to know. Those who confine the Christian religion to the words of Christ recorded in the Gospels, are here reproved" (Dummelow, p. 800).

Again the Paraclete is spoken of thus in John 16 : 13 ; "Howbeit, when he, the spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth.....and he will show you things to come." The words *all truth* are here again explained as meaning *all that is necessary to the salvation of souls.* Both these descriptions of the Paraclete clearly point him out as the greatest advocate of Divine Unity on earth, and they signify exactly what the word Ahmad signifies. These descriptions are moreover applicable to only the Holy Prophet Muhammad who proclaimed that he brought a perfect religion for humanity, while no other man has ever advanced that mighty claim.

Thus a consideration of the four characteristics which are met with in the prophecy as quoted in the Holy Qur-an clearly shows not only that the prophecy referred to here is that regarding the advent of the Paraclete, but also that the prophecy was fulfilled in the person of the Holy

Prophet of Arabia. How has M. Mahmud then dared to deny the fulfilment of the prophecy in the Holy Prophet of Arabia in the face of such facts? I have already quoted his words, admitting that he had heard something from the late Maulvi Noor-ud-Din which made him change his former belief. I know that Maulvi Noor-ud-Din never held the view that the prophecy relating to the advent of Ahmad was not fulfilled by the appearance of the Holy Prophet or that Ahmad was not his name, but it is useless to enter into discussion as to his views on the point. Strangely enough while admitting on the one hand that he changed his views after the death of the Promised Messiah, he at the same time assures us that he "found it written thus in the books of the Promised Messiah" (*Anwar-i-Khilafat* p. 21). How strange that during the life of the Promised Messiah he entertained a belief quite opposed to his writings! Was he indeed ignorant of what was written in those books at that time? If not, why did he retain a belief opposed to that of the Promised Messiah? And if he was indeed ignorant even of the writings of the Promised Messiah, his views on questions relating to the Promised Messiah must be accepted with the greatest hesitation, indeed they

can have no value at all. But this is in fact a false assurance. It is *not* thus written in the books of the Promised Messiah who sincerely believed, and gave expression to his belief, that Ahmad was a name of the Holy Prophet and that the prophecy referred to in 61 : 6 was fulfilled by his advent. M. Mahmud really misinterprets the words of the Promised Messiah, and intentionally follows the error into which the opponents of the Promised Messiah fell. The passage which was misunderstood by the opponents occurs in the *Izála-i-Auham*, the first writing in which he explained his position in Islam as being that of a *Muhaddas* and plainly denied that he was an Apostle. That passage runs thus :

" And that the comer is called Ahmad points to his being a like, for Muhammad is a *jaláli* name (*i.e.*, one expressing glory) and Ahmad is a *jamáli* name (*i.e.*, one expressing beauty), and Ahmad and Jesus are one on account of their *jamáli* significance. It is to this that there is a reference in " And giving good news of an Apostle who will come after me, his name being Ahmad." But our Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, was not only Ahmad but also Muhammad, *i.e.*, the possessor of both *jalál* and *jamál*

(*i.e.*, glory and beauty). But in the last days in accordance with prophecy the single Ahmad who possesses also the attribute of Messiahship has been sent " (p. 673).

It is evident that in this passage the Promised Messiah speaks of the Holy Prophet as being Ahmad as well as Muhammad and therefore he does not deny his being Ahmad. All that he says is that prophecy points to the coming of one who shall have only the (*jamáli*) attribute of being Ahmad. By *prophecy* here is not meant the prophecy contained in 61 : 6 but the prophecy of the advent of a Messiah in the last ages, for it is these prophecies that the Promised Messiah discusses before the passage quoted above. He refers to the verse of *istikhláf* (*i.e.*, 24 : 55 which promises the raising of successors to the Holy Prophet like the successors that were raised among the Israelites) and draws from it the conclusion that it was necessary that just as the last successor of Moses was one who came not with the sword but with peaceful doctrines, not to establish kingdom but to establish religious truth, it was necessary that at about a similar distance of time a successor should be raised to the Holy Prophet who should receive the same name as was given to the successor of

Moses, and employ the same means as were employed by the successor of Moses and then he adds:

"Therefore when the Holy Qur-an has plainly stated that the chain of successorship in Islam shall in its rise and decline and with regard to its *Jalálí* and *Jamálí* attributes totally correspond with and be similar and like to the Israelite chain of successorship, and it has also stated that the Ummi Arab Prophet is the like of Moses, it has thus been stated in a conclusive and certain manner that in Islam as the head of the Divine Khalifas (i.e., the *mujaddids*) is the like of Moses and he is the commander-in-chief of the Islamic propaganda and the King and the first sitter on the throne of glory and the source of all blessings and the great progenitor of his spiritual off-spring, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, so the last of this propaganda on account of the perfect resemblance which he bears, is that Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, who out of this people has been given the attributes of the Messiah by the command of the Lord, and the command, 'We have made you the Messiah son of Mary', has made him actually the same". (*Izala-i-Auhám*, p. 672, 673).

All that the Promised Messiah said was therefore this that prophecies promised the advent of

one in the last ages who should be like Jesus only the possessor of *Jamál* and that therefore it was for this reason that the promised one was called Ahmad (that being the name by which he was addressed in one of the Divine revelations received by him) because Ahmad signified one who possessed *Jamál*, and that there was a hint to this in the verse which gave the good news of the advent of Ahmad, for though the Holy Prophet was Ahmad, he was also Muhammad. Speaking of himself he simply says that there is a hint (an *ishárah*) in the verse to his advent, not that it speaks plainly of his advent.

That this was the significance of the words in the *Izala-i-Auham* is made clear by his later writings. The *Aina-i-Kamálat-i-Islam* is his next publication and in that book he writes:

"While the evidence of the Messiah is thus written in the Holy Qur-an that 'I give the news of an Apostle who will come after me, (i.e., after I am dead) and his name will be Ahmad'. Therefore if the Messiah has not yet passed away from this physical life, it necessarily follows that our Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, has not yet made his appearance, for the text proclaims in open words that when the

Messiah shall pass away from this physical life, then shall the Holy Prophet make his appearance in this world" (p. 42). Here then it is plainly stated that the prophecy referred to in 61 : 6 was fulfilled by the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad and since this writing is later than the *Izala-i-Auhám*, the words of that book must be interpreted in such a manner that they should not be opposed to the plain writing of a later date. The words were however misinterpreted by his opponents and he was charged with denying the fulfilment of the prophecy in the person of the Holy Prophet. Answers to this false charge were written by his followers but I would refer to one from his own pen which was published in a writing published some ten years afterwards. Refering to 61 : 6, the verse under discussion, he writes :

"And the significance of this verse is that when the promised Mahdi whose name on heaven is metaphorically Ahmad shall make his appearance, then the Holy Prophet who is the actual holder of this name shall bring about his *Jamáli* manifestation in the person of him who is Ahmad only tropically. This is what I had written in my book, the *Izála-i-Auhám* before this, viz., that I partake in the name Ahmad with the Holy

Prophet, and on this the ignorant Maulvis as is their habit raised a clamour".

Here the meaning of the words is explained by the writer himself, and it is plainly admitted that the actual holder of the name Ahmad is the Holy Prophet and that the Promised Messiah partakes in the fulfilment of the prophecy only by way of *majáz* or *zill*. The question was again taken up in the *I'ját-ul-Masih* which was published in February 1901, and in which the whole question is discussed in such words that not the least doubt would be left in an unprejudiced mind. After speaking of the two names of the Holy Prophet, Muhammad and Ahmad, the words having been quoted already, the Promised Messiah says :

" And one of these two names belongs especially to one period and the other to other period .....God intended that He should make the Muslim nation to inherit these two names by way of *zill* (reflection) so that they may be as recurring blessings for this people.....so he made the companions and those who followed them a manifestation of the name Muhammad in conditions of glory and beneficence and gave them triumph and helped them with successive favours and he made the promised Messiah a manifestation of the

name Ahmad and he raised him in conditions of beauty and mercy.....for the name Jesus and the name Ahmad have a unity in nature and a correspondence in disposition and from their very nature indicate beauty and the giving up of fighting, and as for the name Muhammad it is a name of supremeness and glory, and both these are as *zill* (reflection) of the (Divine names) Beneficent and Merciful" (pp. 107, 108). The same subject is continued further on p. 111 :

"So while the companions inherited the name Muhammad from Allah, the great giver, and they manifested the glory of God and they killed the tyrants like cattle, even thus did the Promised Messiah inherit the name Ahmad which is the manifestation of mercy and beauty, and God chose this name for him and for those who follow him and become as it were his off-spring. So the Promised Messiah along with his followers is a manifestation from God for the attribute of mercy and Ahmadiyyat."

Now these two quotations along with those given from the same book under the first heading make the position of the Promised Messiah clear as daylight. The Holy Prophet had two names, Muhammad and Ahmad, the first expressing glory

and the second, beauty, the first requiring open triumph of Islam and the Muslims, and the second requirng its triumph by signs and arguments. We are further told that these two names found their manifestation in two different periods, the name Muhammad being manifested through the companions of the Holy Prophet and the name Ahmad being manifested through the Promised Messiah and his followers. The companions are for this reason called the *zill* (reflection) of the name Muhammad, and the Promised Messiah *and his followers* are called the *zill* (reflection) of the name Ahmad. The companions did not actually become Muhammad by being the manifestation and *zill* of the name Muhammad; nor does the Promised Messiah along with his followers actually become Ahmad by being manifestation and *zill* of the name Ahmad. The whole thing is put in a nutshell here and the significance is clear as daylight and only a perverted mind could read in these words a denial of the name Ahmad and of fulfilment of the prophecy relating to the advent of Ahmad in the person of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. The Promised Messiah is absolutely clear of the charge. His later writings do not contain any reference to the prophecy of 61 : 6 but

in his speeches, reported in the newspapers, the subject is put with a lucidity, the clearness of which would be palpable to the very blind. Mufti Muhammad Sadiq, who now follows his Khalifa in denying the fulfilment of the prophecy in the person of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, is responsible for reporting the following speech in Al-Hakam dated 31st January 1901:

" The Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, had only two names, Muhammad and Ahmad. The great name of the Holy Prophet is Muhammad as the great name of God is Allah.....the name Ahmad of the Holy Prophet is that which Christ has mentioned (when he says) he will come after me, his name being Ahmad. The words *after me* show that he must come after Christ without interruption, i.e., there shall be no other prophet between him and Christ .....Moses spoke of the name Muhammad of the Holy Prophet for he himself was a *Jaláli* prophet and Jesus spoke of his name Ahmad as he himself was a *Jamáli* prophet. As our propaganda is also *Jamáli*, therefore the name *Ahmadi* has been given to it" (p. 11).

The Promised Messiah has also made it plain that Ahmad was the same as the Paraclete. It

was really to give expression to his views that an article was written in the Review of Religions in 1902 in which it was shown that *Fárqaleet* (or Paraclete) meant one who distinguished between truth and falsehood. An objection to this was brought to the notice of the Promised Messiah, it being alleged that Ahmad was not the same as the Paraclete. The following answer is noted in the Badr newspaper dated 21st November 1902:

"It is not necessary for us that we should show that very word in the previous books.....It is possible that there was some other word which meant Ahmad. In the *Lisanul-Arab* it is written that *Fárqleet* is composed of *fáriq*, meaning *one who separates* and *leet* meaning the *devil*.....and Ahmad means one who praises most. Who is then greater than he who removes every kind of devilishness by means of the doctrine of unity? To become *fárqleet* (Paraclete) it is necessary to be Ahmad. Ahmad is he who does away with the devil's part in this world and establishes the majesty and glory of the Divine Being. The significance of Paraclete in other words is Ahmad".

In the face of such clear pronouncements it would be bare-faced calumny to say that the

Promised Messiah denied the Holy Prophet's name being Ahmad or that he denied the fulfilment of the prophecy of 61 : 6 in the person of the Holy Prophet. And thus the doctrine as forcibly propounded by M. Mahmud and fathered on the Promised Messiah, that Ahmad was not a name of the Holy Prophet and that the prophecy referred to in 61 : 6 was not fulfilled by his advent, is condemned by the writings of the Promised Messiah as well as the Holy Qur-an, the sayings of the Holy Prophet and the concensus of opinion of the whole Muslim nation from the companions of the Holy Prophet down to our own time, and I appeal to the good sense and moral courage of the Ahmadiyya community to denounce these false doctrines with one voice before they take root like the false doctrines attributed to the first Messiah.

——: o :——

FINALITY OF PROPHETHOOD.

The next innovation which is sought to be introduced into the Ahmadiyya movement after the death of its founder is the doctrine of his prophethood. The first question that is to be solved in this connection is whether or not prophethood was brought to a close in the person of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. If Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, was the last of the prophets, then no prophet can appear after him; and if prophets must continue to appear among his followers as they rose before his advent, then the whole Muslim world has unanimously adhered to a false belief for the last thirteen hundred years. It is a question therefore of the utmost importance and requires the serious attention of every true Muslim. The question of the finality of prophethood is a question of prinicple, while the question of the prophethood of the Promised Messiah is only an off-shoot of this wider question. If prophethood was brought to a close in the person of the Holy Prophet Muhammad as has been the unanimous belief of the whole Muslim world, then the Promised Messiah cannot be a prophet, otherwise he, and not the founder of Islam, would be the last of the prophets, and if the door is still open, not only the

Promised Messiah but a thousand other prophets may arise, and united Islam be divided into a thousand camps each with its own prophet at its head, and the illustrious founder quite thrown into oblivion in this anarchy.

Before dealing with the question of the finality of prophethood it is necessary to show that M. Mahmud openly holds the doctrine that thousands of prophets shall appear after the Holy Prophet Muhammad. Speaking of believers in the doctrine of the finality of prophethood he says in his *Anwar-i-Khilafat :*

"Likewise they say that however much a person may advance in virtue and goodness, nay even surpass many prophets in righteousness and piety, may attain the utmost knowledge of God, but God will never make him a prophet, never raise him to that dignity. Their thinking thus is due to not assigning to Allah the attributes due to Him; otherwise to say nothing of one prophet, I say there shall be thousands of prophets, and a person who rises to the dignity of prophets like John can become a prophet. They question the prophethood of the Promised Messiah, on whom be peace, but I say, *even now* there can be a prophet " (p. 62).

"But if a sword is placed on both sides of my

neck and I am told to confess that no prophet shall come after the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, I will say to him, you are a liar, a very great liar; prophets can appear after him, they will certainly appear" (p. 65).

Similarly, in his earlier work, the *Haqiqat-un-Nubuwwat*, M. Mahmud writes:—

"This is love (for the Prophet) which compels me to show the falsity, so far as it is in my power, of the doctrine of the finality of prophethood..... To say that the appearance of prophets after the Holy Prophet is entirely shut off means that the Holy Prophet deprived the world of the grace of prophethood, and that after his appearance God shut off this favour. Now consider whether according to this doctrine the Holy Prophet appears to be a mercy for the worlds or the opposite of it—we seek refuge in Allah from this. If this doctrine is admitted, it would mean that he came as a sort of curse to the world and any one who thinks so is accursed and rejected (of God)" (pp. 186, 187).

It is clear from these quotations that M. Mahmud entirely rejects the doctrine of the finality of prophethood and denounces all those who hold the Holy Prophet Muhammad to be the last of the

prophets as *la'nati* and *mardúd* (accursed and rejected). Therefore it is necessary to devote serious attention to this question, and we will first see what is the teaching of the Holy Qur-an on this point.

From the Qur-an it appears that all the prophets raised before the Holy Prophet were sent to particular nations and their message was, therefore, only for the people for whose regeneration they were raised. In no case was the message of a prophet meant for the whole world, and it was also therefore not meant to abide for ever in the world. The needs of different people in the infancy of mankind required particular directions for their use and it was never meant that all those directions should ever continue to guide humanity. Hence also it was that every prophet's book suffered more or less corruption. But with the advent of our Holy Prophet, we observe a great change brought about in the work of prophethood. The day of the national prophets was over, and with the advent of Muhammad had dawned the era of the world-prophet. He was commanded to make the proclamation: "O people! I am an apostle of God to you all." His message was for the whole world, *i.e.*, for all countries and all ages. He was

the prophet of the Arabs and the non-Arabs, the prophet of his own time and the prophet of the future. His message was therefore neither limited by considerations of place nor by those of time. He was to be the *one* prophet of the world, *the Prophet* indeed. And the great purpose to be served was the unity of the whole human race. National prejudices were to be for ever swept off, and hence was laid the basis of a brotherhood which had *humanity* for its watch-word. The message given was of such a comprehensive nature that it could satisfy the needs of all nations and all ages, and therefore no need was left for a new message. And if there was to be no new message, neither could there be a new messenger. The previous books had suffered corruption and therefore also new messages were needed in spite of them, but the Holy Qur-an was not to suffer corruption. Hence the Qur-an was *the one Message* for all nations and all ages, and Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, *the one Messenger* of the whole world to the day of judgment.

All that has been stated above is clearly stated in the Holy Qur-an. A study of all the sacred books of the world leads us to the conclusion

that no book claims to have been revealed for the guidance of the whole human race except the Holy Qur-an. Another equally important conclusion to which a perusal of the sacred history leads us is that, besides the Qur-an, no sacred book claims to have been made perfect or to have perfected the religious requirements of the world. But both these distinctions are claimed by the Holy Qur-an in the plainest words. It says plainly "Say, O people, I am an Apostle of God to you *all*;" and it says: "This day have I made perfect your religion for you and made complete My favour to you." Jesus Christ is the last of the national prophets, and we find him plainly stating not only that he had not been sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, but also that he had many things to say which his followers could not bear but that when the Paraclete came he should teach them all truth. The fact is then undeniable that truth had been revealed to different nations through their prophets partially, and it was revealed in its perfection only at the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. Hence when truth was completely revealed, no prophet was needed to reveal any further truth.

What follows logically from the various

statements made in the Holy Qur-an regarding the distinctive characteristics of the Holy Prophet is also stated clearly when the Holy Prophet is called *Khátam-un-Nabiyyín* or the seal, or the last, of the prophets. The word *Khátam* means both a *seal* and the *end* (see Lane's Lexicon). As the object of the Qur-an was to state not only that prophethood was brought to a close but also that it was brought to perfection, therefore it has adopted a word which carries the combined significance. In fact, it is clear that the very perfection of prophethood in the holy person of our Prophet marks him out to be the last of prophets and bars the way to the raising of further prophets, just as the perfection of Law in the Holy Qur-an renders it the last Book and bars the way to the revelation of further books. Law was brought to perfection in the Holy Qur-an, and prophethood was brought to perfection in Muhammad, and therefore as the Qur-an became the last of the revealed books, Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, became the last of the prophets of the world.

M. Mahmud's argument which contradicts these plain words of the Holy Qur-an is fallacious. He says that if the door to prophethood was barred

by the advent of the Holy Prophet, he was a curse to the world, not a mercy. If there is any truth in this argument, then M. Mahmud must believe that the Qur-an came as " a curse " for the world, for it bars the way to the revelation of further books. He accepts the Qur-an to be the last of the Books, without entertaining the idea that by barring the way to further revelation of books it becomes a curse to humanity, yet he dares utter the words that if Muhammad is accepted to be the last of the prophets, he becomes a curse to the world by barring the way to prophethood. And yet how clear it is that prophets were needed to bring guidance to the world, so that when guidance was made perfect, no need was left for the appearance of a prophet. What was required has been given to us by the Holy Prophet and the Holy Qur-an, and hence we neither stand in need of another prophet, nor in need of another book. The whole truth has been revealed, and it has been preserved from corruption, and therefore following that truth and the example of the Holy Prophet, we can hold our communion with the Divine Being and walk in the ways of righteousness.

Sayings of the Holy Prophet are even clearer and the Holy Prophet plainly spoke of himself as

being the last of the prophets. The following report is accepted by both *Bukharee* and *Muslim* and is therefore of the greatest authenticity: "Sa'd son of Abi Waqqas reported that the Apostle of God, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, said to Ali, You stand to me in the same relation as Aaron stood to Moses except that there is no prophet after me." These words of the Holy Prophet himself should be sufficient to settle the whole question. It is the duty of a Muslim to bow his head without the least hesitation before the judgment of the Holy Prophet. Here are his very words, recorded in the most reliable works. He tells Ali that he cannot be a prophet because there is no prophet after him. If as M. Mahmud says there were to be thousands of prophets after the Holy Prophet, why did he speak those words to Ali? We are sometimes told that the Holy Prophet only negatived the appearance of a prophet with a book after him, but this saying shows clearly that he negatived even the appearance of a prophet without a book. In fact, it is simply illogical to speak of a prophet without a book. What would be a messenger without a message? Anyhow the saying negatives absolute prophethood for, if the appearance of a prophet were

possible, Ali should have been such a prophet. But as Ali was not a prophet, it is clear that no prophet can appear after the Holy Prophet.

Another saying of equally high credibility and accepted by *Bukharee* and *Muslim* runs thus: "And surely there shall be among my followers thirty liars, everyone of them asserting that he is a prophet and I am *Khátam un nabiyyín* (the seal of the prophets), there is no prophet after me." According to this saying, any one laying claim to prophethood after the Holy Prophet must be a liar. Here the phrase *Khátam un nabiyyín* is also explained as meaning, *there is no prophet after me*, i.e., he is the last of the prophets of the world.

Another saying of very great authenticity is recorded in the *Bukharee*: "My likeness and the likeness of the prophets before me is the likeness of a person who built a house and he made it beautiful and made it complete except the place of a brick of the corner. So people began to go round about it and to wonder at him and to say: Why have you not placed this brick? He (i.e., the Prophet) said, So I am that brick and I am the seal of the prophets". This saying also explains the meaning of the word *khátam-un-nabiyyín*, for it likens the raising of prophets to the building of

a house and compares the Holy Prophet to the corner-stone of that house, so that the house was almost complete before his appearance, and there was no place but that of the corner-stone. If thousands of prophets had yet to appear, as M. Mahmud teaches, the Holy Prophet ought to have told us that thousands of bricks were yet wanting to complete that house. But there is no room here for any prophet after the corner-stone has been placed, unless that corner-stone, or some other brick already there, is first taken out and thrown off.

Now these reports of the highest authority give us three of the most clear sayings of the Holy Prophet, proving beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Holy Prophet looked upon himself as the last of the prophets. Such clear testimony of such high authority can be obtained on very few points, but where it may be obtainable, a Muslim can have no choice but to bow before it and give up his individual opinion if it is opposed to the word of the Prophet. Many other reports corroborating this testimony could be cited but I wish to be as brief in this discussion as possible. I may, however, quote one more report, according to which the Holy Prophet, said: "Had there been a prophet after me,'Umar would have been (one.")

According to another report still, the Holy Prophet said that he had six characteristics distinguishing him from other prophets, one of which was that he was the last of the prophets.

All these reports have been handed down to us by the companions of the Holy Prophet, and hence it is clear that the companions all accepted the finality of the prophethood of the Holy Prophet. There is not a single companion who can be shown to have entertained a belief against this ; nor is there a single report, however weak or unreliable it might be, stating that prophets would continue to appear after the Holy Prophet. Some of M. Mahmud's supporters cite the 35th verse of the seventh chapter of the Holy Qur-an in support of the contention that prophets must continue to appear after the Holy Prophet, but their choice of this verse is quite out of place. The verse runs thus : " O children of Adam ! if there come to you apostles from among you relating to you My communications, then whoever shall guard against evil and act aright— they shall have no fear nor shall they grieve." Here it would be seen that after Adam's trial, the children of Adam are addressed, and there is no doubt that apostles came to the children of Adam, and every nation

and every country and every age had a prophet, but then this chain of prophets was according to the Holy Qur-an brought to a termination by raising a prophet for all ages. So this verse in no way shows that prophets shall continue to appear after the Holy Prophet.

Secondly, if this verse promises the continuance of the raising of prophets to the children of Adam, there is another which in similar words promises the continuance of the coming of guidance. It runs thus: "So surely there will come to you a guidance from Me, then whoever follows My guidance, no fear shall come upon them, nor shall they grieve" (2 : 38). Here too the children of Adam are accosted after Adam's trial, and the similarity of the words of the two verses shows that with the coming of apostles the coming of guidance is also promised, and if the one must continue, the other cannot cease. But strangely enough, M. Mahmud holds that guidance would not come after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, because it was revealed in perfection in the the Holy Qur-an. But I ask, if guidance has ceased to come solely because it was made perfect in the Qur-an, does not the same reason apply to the discontinuance of the coming of apostles?

Prophethood, it is admitted by him, was made perfect in the person of Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, and if perfection of guidance is a bar to the coming of fresh guidance, perfection of prophethood is a bar to the coming of fresh prophets.

Thirdly, it must be borne in mind in the same connection that the verse speaking of the coming of apostles includes all kinds of apostles, if there are indeed more kinds than one, therefore it is quite illogical, on the part of those who have started the theory of the continuance of the coming of apostles, to say that such apostles shall come as bring no fresh law. The words of the verse do not allow any such limitation to be placed on it. If prophets must continue to appear under this verse, they must also possess new laws.

I have already said that the companions of the Holy Prophet all unanimously accepted the finality of the prophethood of their master, as a large number of reports shows, while there is not a single report stating that prophets shall continue to appear after the Holy Prophet, nor is there a single companion who should have been known to have entertained

such a belief. I do not here mention the name of the companion who speaks of the Messiah, who would appear among the Muslims, as a prophet of God, according to one version of a single report, for that report can have no bearing upon the principle of the coming of prophets. The report of Nawas bin Sam'an relates a prophecy, the significance of which shall be dealt with elsewhere; it does not interfere with the finality of the prophethood which is a principle enunciated in the clearest words in the Holy Qur-an as well as the sayings of the Holy Prophet. When a principle is once established, a solitary incident or a prophecy must be interpreted subject to the principle: it cannot violate the principle. Nor do I think there is any need of discussing the words attributed to 'Ayesha, for which we have not the least evidence as to who the narrators of those words are, and therefore there is not the least evidence that 'Ayesha spoke those words. But even if she did, they do not in any way cast a doubt upon the doctrine of the finality of prophethood. The words, as recorded in the dictionary of reports known as the *Majma'-ul-Bihar* without giving the chain of narrators

through whom those words were received, are as follows: "Say, the seal of prophets and do not say, there is no prophet after him." The words apparently mean only this that the phrase *seal of prophets* is a more comprehensive one than the statement, *there is no prophet after him.* I have already shown this in the beginning in explaining the word *khátam* which is the word used in the holy Qur-an. *Seal of prophets*, or rather its Arabic original *khátam-un-nabiyyín*, conveys a double conception, the conception of perfection and the conception of finality. Therefore that intelligent lady, if she spoke those words, meant nothing more than this that in stating a doctrine of the faith, the more comprehensive words of the Holy Quran must be preferred to the explanatory words of the report which necessarily referred to only one aspect, i.e., the finality of prophethood. If any other meaning is sought to be given to these words which is opposed to the clear words of a large number of the sayings of the Holy Prophet, the attempt is doomed to failure because it is opposed to the primary rules of interpretation.

Thus I have shown that the doctrine of

the finality of prophethood is based on the clearest and strongest testimony, derived from the Holy Quran and the sayings of the Holy Prophet. I have also shown that the companions of the Holy Prophet held the same belief, and I may now add that every Muslim to whatever sect he may belong has, during the last thirteen hundred years, held the belief that prophethood was brought to a termination in the person of the Holy Prophet Muhammad.

——: o :——

METAPHORICAL USE OF THE WORDS PROPHET AND APOSTLE.

As would appear from what I have stated above, a prophet in the strict terminology of the Islamic law is one to whom the Divine will is revealed, being the guidance which he brings to men. It is for this reason that guidance being made complete by the Holy Prophet, no new prophet is now needed for the world, and Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, thus remains *the prophet*, the prophet of all ages as he is the prophet of all nations. In fact, that question may be decided on the simple consideration whether or not the Holy Prophet is the prophet of all ages as he is the prophet of all nations? If he is, then as no prophet could appear in a nation after the Holy Prophet was raised for the regeneration of mankind, so no prophet can appear after him, for if one did, he and not the Prophet Muhammad would be the prophet of the age in which he appeared, and thus Muhammad's prophethood would not be for all ages. But though the office of the prophet is not any more needed, the gift of prophecy has not been withheld from the followers of the Holy Prophet. The distinction must be

clearly understood. The prophet was actually needed to make known to men the Divine will which was revealed to him. The making of prophecies simply has never been held to be the business of a prophet in the strict terminology of the Muslim law. Prophecy is really a kind of miracle, and the office of the prophet is not to show miracles but to make known guidance to men. The miracles are granted to a prophet as corroborative testimony of his truth, so that when he is seen as displaying power or knowledge which is not granted to the ordinary man, he may be recognised as one who holds communion with the Divine Being. Prophecy is a miracle in this sense, and prophecy is simply needed to show that the man holds communion with God, while the object of God in raising a prophet is simply this that he may point out truth to men and make known to them the Divine will. Hence the gift of prophecy is granted even to non-prophets, and the Holy Quran not only mentions several instances of this among the followers of the former prophets but also promises in clear words that this gift shall be granted to the followers of the Holy Prophet Muhammad.

Among the formers, revelation, we are told, was granted to the mother of Moses, and this is related in clear words: "And We revealed to Moses' mother, saying, Give him suck, then when you fear for him, cast him into the river, and do not fear, nor grieve; surely We will bring him back to you and make him one of the apostles" (28 : 7). And so strong was the conviction of Moses' mother that this was the word of God that she actually cast him into the river, and the Divine promise was fulfilled. The mother of Jesus is also spoken of as having received a revelation: "And when the angels said, O Mary! Surely Allah has chosen you and purified you and chosen you above the women of the world. O Mary! keep to obedience to your Lord and humble yourself and bow down with those who bow down.....When the angels said, O Mary! Surely Allah gives you good news with a word from Him of one whose name is the Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, worthy of regard in this world and the hereafter, and of those who are made near to Allah" (3 : 41-44). This revelation is a very long one and is continued further on, and it is full of prophecies of great importance. These two instances will suffice to show that the gift of prophecy was granted to non-prophets even

among the Israelites, for both Moses' mother and Mary the mother of Jesus were admittedly not prophets in the strict sense of the word.

Similarly, the gift of prophecy is promised to the righteous among the followers of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, although they do not become *prophets* by receiving that gift. Thus the Holy Quran speaks of the truly faithful : " They shall have good news in this world's life and in the hereafter " (10 : 64). And again: "As for those who say, Our Lord is Allah, then continue in the right way, the angels descend upon them, saying, Fear not, nor be grieved, and receive good news of the garden which you were promised. We are your guardians in this world's life and in the hereafter " (41 : 30, 31). And more plainly still : " These are they into whose hearts He has impressed faith and whom He has strengthened with an inspiration from Him " (58 : 22). All these verses plainly speak of inspiration being granted to the faithful, of angels descending upon them and giving them comfort, of good news relating to the future being given to them.

The sayings of the Holy Prophet may also be quoted as showing that the gift of prophecy is promised to the faithful among his followers. I

take the following from the *Bukharee*, the authority of which is incontestible: "The Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, said, Surely there were among those before you, among the Israelites, men who were spoken to (by God) though they were not prophets, and if there is one among my followers, it is 'Umar." Here then we are plainly told that every man who is spoken to by God is not necessarily a prophet. On the other hand, promise is given in plain words that among the followers of the Holy Prophet there shall be men who shall be spoken to by God though they shall not be prophets. And why is 'Umar particularly mentioned? Because there is another saying of the Holy Prophet which I have already quoted: "Had there been a prophet after me, 'Umar would have been one." The two sayings read together make it clear that 'Umar had the gift of prophecy though he was not a prophet.

Another very reliable report also recorded in the *Bukharee* promises the continuance of the gift of prophecy even in clearer words. The Holy Prophet said: "There remains nothing of prophethood except *Mubashsharát*." Asked what is meant by *Mubashsharát*, he said: "The good

visions." Other reports are recorded in one of which it is stated that the Holy Prophet said: "The vision of a true believer is one-fortysixth part of prophethood." Now these reports show clearly that the part of prophethood which is called *Mubashsharát*, and which really means *prophecies of the future*, shall be granted to the true believers.

Thus both the Holy Qur-an and the sayings of the Holy Prophet are unanimous in declaring that while, after the Holy Prophet, no one shall be raised to the office of prophethood, there shall be men among the Muslims who shall be spoken to by God and receive the gift of prophecy. This gift is in its lowest form a vision which is declared to be forty-sixth part of prophethood. And I have already stated that prophecy is granted as corroborative testimony of the truth. Thus it will be seen that those who receive the gift of prophecy acquire a certain resemblance with prophets. Hence there is also a saying of the Holy Prophet which speaks of the learned men from among his followers as "the like of the prophets of Israel." For these reasons, those who receive the gift of prophecy may metaphorically be called prophets

though they *are not prophets* in the strict terminology of the Islamic law.

Are we right in speaking of such persons as metaphorically prophets as receive the gift of prophecy from God? It is asserted that there is no authority in the Holy Qur-an or in the reports for such a liberal use of the word. But it should be borne in mind that no authority is in fact needed for using a word metaphorically. Men have been called gods metaphorically in sacred literature, and the phrase son of God was also a metaphor, but unfortunately the Christians have taken it for a reality, a mistake which is now being followed by M. Mahmud and his party. The very word metaphor is a guarantee that the use of the word in this sense does not convey the significance of the original. And the word apostle which carries almost the same significance as the word prophet has been used metaphorically in the Holy Qur-an itself. Thus in the thirty-sixth chapter of the Holy Book (vv. 13-19) the *messengers* spoken of were, according to all commentators, not messengers in the strict sense of the word, for these were the disciples of Jesus. Hence the word *prophet* may be metaphorically applied to one who receives the gift of prophecy in an eminent degree.

USE OF THE WORD PROPHET CONCERNING THE PROMISED MESSIAH.

It was just in this metaphorical sense that the Promised Messiah made use of the word *prophet* concerning himself, *viz.*, as the recipient of the gift of prophecy; and to be clear I may quote one of his latest writings, the *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, in which he thus speaks of himself: "And I am called a prophet by God by way of metaphor, not in the real sense" (p. 64, Supplement in Arabic). But more of this hereafter. The question of paramount importance is, why did he call himself a prophet at all even by way of metaphor? What particular need had he for doing so? Could he not avoid the use of the word, so that the misconception which is now proving so harmful to the cause of Islam and to the cause of the Ahmadiyya propaganda itself should have never occurred?

To understand this necessity, we must resort to his very first pronouncement on the subject which occurs in the *Tauzih-i-Maram*, his first writing after the claim to Promised Messiahship. I will quote his own words:

"If objection be raised here that as the Messiah was a prophet, his like should also be a prophet, the first answer to this is that our

lord and master has not made prophethood a necessary condition for the Messiah to come. On the other hand, it is clearly written that he shall be a Muslim, and shall be subject to the Law like ordinary Muslims, and he shall not go further than this that he is a Muslim and the *imam* of Muslims. Besides this, there is no doubt that I have appeared as a *Muhaddas* (one spoken to by God though not a prophet) for this people, and the *Muhaddas* is in one sense a prophet, though he does not obtain perfect prophethood, but partially he is a prophet, for he possesses the eminence of being spoken to by God and unseen matters are revealed to him, and his revelation is kept safe from the interference of the devil like the prophets and the apostles, and the essence of the law is made manifest to him, and just like prophets he appears as one commanded, and like prophets it is binding on him that he should proclaim himself aloud, and any one who denies him is to a certain extent deserving of punishment and the meaning of prophethood is only this that the above-mentioned characteristics should be met with in him.

"And if it be objected that the door to prophethood is closed, and the revelation which

the prophets received has had a seal set on it, I say the door to prophethood is not absolutely closed nor is the seal set on revelation in every way; rather the door of revelation and prophethood is partially open for this people always, but it should be borne in mind with great care that this prophethood which shall always continue is not perfect prophethood, but as I have already said it is only a partial prophethood, which, in other words, receives the name of *Muhaddasiyyat* and which may be attained by following the perfect man who possesses all the excellences of perfect prophethood, *i.e*, the person of admirable qualities of our lord and master, Muhammad Mustafa, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him." (2nd edition, p. 9).

I have given this lengthy quotation to clear the position of the Promised Messiah, but before proceeding further I think it necessary to supplement it by an other explanation in the *Izala-i-Auhám* which runs as follows :

" And as for the Messiah that has passed away, it has been clearly stated that he was a prophet, but the Messiah to come has been called an *ummati*, (*i.e.*, a follower of a prophet) as the saying '**your** *imam* from among you' shows. And in the

saying, 'the learned from among my followers are like the prophets of the Israelites,' a hint has been given as to the coming of the like of the Messiah; so that according to this the Messiah to come on account of being a *Muhaddas* is metaphorically a prophet" (p. 349).

"I do not lay claim to prophethood but to *Muhaddasiyyat* which claim has been put forward by the command of God. And what doubt there is in this that *Muhaddasiyyat* also possesses a strong offshoot of prophethood.....If this is looked upon as prophethood metaphorically or if it is taken to be a strong offshoot of prophethood, does this mean laying claim to prophethood"? (p. 422).

"Yes, it is true that the Messiah to come has also been spoken of as a prophet, but he has also been called a follower; nay, it was foretold that he shall be from among you, O followers (of the Prophet), and he shall be your *imam*; and not only has his being a follower been expressed in words, but it has also been practically shown that like the followers of a prophet, he shall only be a follower of the word of God and of the sayings of the Holy Prophet, and he shall solve the difficult and intricate religious questions by *ijtihád*, (*i.e.*, investigation

of the law, or the working out of a solution of any difficulty in the law, by means of reason and comparison), not by prophethood, and shall say his prayers after others. Now all these hints show clearly that he shall not actually possess the qualification of perfect prophethood. Aye, a defective prophethood shall be found in him which is in other words called *Muhaddasiyyat* and possesses one aspect of the different aspects of perfect prophethood. So the fact that he has been called a *prophet* as well as a *follower* points to the clear conclusion that he shall possess both aspects, the aspect of prophethood and the aspect of being a follower, as it is necessary in a *Muhaddas* that both these aspects should exist " (pp. 532, 533).

These quotations would show the reader that the Promised Messiah was confronted with the great difficulty that on the one hand, the Holy Quran and the sayings of the Holy Prophet were conclusive as to the finality of prophethood in the person of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him; and on the other, reliable sayings of the Holy Prophet spoke of the advent of the Messiah who was a prophet, and in one report

(that of Nawas bin Sam'an as accepted by *Sahih Muslim*), the Messiah to come was even spoken of as a prophet. What was to be the solution of the difficulty? If a prophet appeared after the founder of Islam, he could not be spoken of as the seal of the prophets. Yet there were authentic sayings speaking of the advent of the Messiah who was a prophet. The Muslim theologians never tried to solve the difficulty, and really they had no need to solve it. But when the prophecy came to fulfilment it became necessary that the difficulty in connection with the appearance of a prophet after the last of the prophets should be solved. And the quotations given above are a clear solution of the difficulty. That the Holy Prophet was the last of prophets was a principle upon which was laid the basis of the unity of Islam, and a principle could not be violated for the sake of having a prophecy fulfilled literally. On the other hand, the prophecy had to receive an interpretation which should make it tally with the principles laid down. This is what the Promised Messiah did. He did not think of violating the principle of the finality of prophethood, nor did he entertain the idea of rejecting the sayings of the Holy Prophet foretelling

the advent of the Messiah, but he interpreted the latter in such a way as to make it subject to the principle laid down. A prophet could not appear in the real sense of the word but a *Muhaddas*, *i.e.*, a non-prophet spoken to by God and receiving the gift of Divine prophecy, could metaphorically be called a prophet. So he interpreted the word *prophet* occurring in a single report metaphorically, and as I have already shown, the metaphorical use of a word in such a case where strong resemblance is borne to the original is permissible. And he stuck to this position to the last. I have quoted both his first and last writings and I may here add a passage from the *Siraj-i-Munir*, a writing of the middle period, showing that he always used the word *prophet* in connection with his name in a metaphorical sense :

" We admit and hold that in the real sense of prophethood neither a new nor an old prophet can appear after the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him. The Holy Quran is a bar to the appearance of such prophets. But in a metaphorical sense Almighty God may speak of 'an inspired' servant of His as a prophet or as an apostle.

Have you not read the reports in which the words apostle of the Apostle of God occur? Why is it then prohibited to God that He should use the word apostle metaphorically.....I say repeatedly that the words apostle, messenger and prophet no doubt occur in my revelations from God, but they do not carry their real significance. And as these words do not carry their actual significance, so the name *prophet* by which the Promised Messiah is mentioned in reports does not convey the real significance of that word. This is the knowledge which God has given me" (p. 3).

That the word *prophet* has been used by the Promised Messiah concerning himself in a metaphorical sense is clear from the quotations given above. There are, however, two more points of view of the use of this word. The one is that literally a prophet is one who makes a prophecy and hence he uses the word prophet for a prophecy-maker. This use of the word is altogether different from its use in the strict terminology of the Islamic law, as he himself writes in the *Arba'ín* No. 2 where commenting upon the word *rasul* (apostle) occurring in one of his revelations, he says in a foot-note:

"These words are by way of metaphor, just as in a report the word *prophet* has been used concerning the Promised Messiah. It is evident that he whom God sends is His messenger and a messenger is called *rasúl* in Arabic, and he who makes known news of the future receiving information from God is called *nabi* (prophet) in Arabic. The significance according to Islamic terminology is different. Here only the root meaning is taken" (p. 18).

This he has explained in his writings repeatedly, and quotations may be multiplied to any extent but I will finish with one more taken from a letter written on the 17th August 1899 published in Alhakam:

"And the word *nabi* (prophet) and *rasúl* (apostle) are only used tropically and metaphorically. In Arabic lexicology, *risálat* means *being sent*, and *nubuwwat* means *the stating of hidden truths and deep significances*..... But as in the terminology of Islam, the meaning of prophet and apostle is this that they bring a perfect law, or abrogate some commandments of a previously existing law, or are not called the followers of a previous prophet and have connection with God independently of any prophet, therefore one ought to be very

cautious so as not to understand the same significance here."

The other point is that in the Sufi terminology there is a stage in spiritual progress known as *fanâ fir-rasúl*, the significance of which is that a man so completely follows the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace be on him, that he retains no desire of his own, losing as it were his own self in the Prophet. When a man attains to this stage, all difference between him and the Prophet whom he follows is said to disappear. The Promised Messiah claimed to have attained to this stage and therefore in the Sufi terminology he spoke of himself as Muhammad and Ahmad and as a prophet and apostle, nay even as *khátam-un-nabiyyín* or the seal of prophets. This in Sufi terminology is known as *barúz* or manifestation of the characteristics of one person in another. This is the point of view which he adopts in *ek ghalti ka izala* and other writings where he speaks of himself as a perfect *barúz* of the Holy Prophet and adopts His very names and titles as he says:

"For the picture of *barúz* cannot be complete until it possesses the excellences of the original in every aspect. Therefore as prophethood is an excellence

in the prophet, it is necessary that that excellence should also be made manifest in the *barúz*..... Therefore in this case it is evident that as on account of *barúz* when one is called Muhammad and Ahmad there are not two Muhammads and Ahmads, so being called a prophet in the capacity of *barúz* it does not follow that the seal of the finality of prophethood is broken, for the person who is a *barúz* is at one with the original."

In spite of this, he clearly prohibited the use of the word *prophet* concerning himself as it gave rise to misunderstanding. For instance, a controversy on the use of the word prophet was brought to a close in 1892 by a manifesto signed by witnesses, from which I take the following quotation :—

"When from the beginning, in my intention which God knows best, this word *prophet* does not carry its real significance but signifies only *Muhaddas*.....what excuse can I have to state this word in another form for the conciliation of my Muslim brethren? That other form is that they should understand everywhere the word *Muhaddas* instead of *prophet*, and look upon this (*i.e.*, the word prophet) as cancelled."

Later on he wrote for the guidance of his own

followers in his letter, dated 17th August 1899, published in Alhakam :

"There are many such revelations in which the word prophet or apostle occurs concerning me, but he is mistaken who thinks that by this prophethood and apostleship is meant actual prophethood and apostleship by which a man is called the giver of a law. Rather the word *apostle* only means *one sent by God* and the word *prophet* only means *one giving out a prohecy* obtaining kowledge from God or making known hidden significances. But as such words which are used only metaphorically create a dissension in Islam, and the consequences are very grave, therefore these words should not be used by my followers in their ordinary conversation and daily parlance, and it should be believed with true faith of the heart that prophethood has been brought to a termination in the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him."

Again he writes in *Alwasiyyat* published in December 1905, speaking of the prophethood of Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him :

"Therefore all prophethoods have been brought to a close in this prophethood and thus

it ought to have been, for every thing which has a beginning has also an end. But this prophethood of Muhammad does not fall short of imparting its grace to others, nay, the grace it imparts is far greater than the grace of all prophethoods. Following this prophethood makes a man attain to God very easily, and following it the love of God and the favour of being spoken to and addressed by God are granted in a much greater degree than they were granted before. But the perfect follower of it cannot be called a prophet only, for this is derogatory to the perfect prophethood of Muhammad " (p. 10).

PROMISED MESSIAH'S BELIEF IN THE FINALITY OF PROPHETHOOD.

What has been said above is sufficient to show that the Promised Messiah justified the occurrence of the word prophet in his revelations and in a report concerning his appearence by the explanation that it was used metaphorically, otherwise a prophet in the real sense of the word could not come. The question in fact which decides this controversy finally is, whether the Promised Messiah believed in the finality of the prophethood of the Holy Prophet, or whether, like M. Mahmud, he believed that thousands of prophets would appear after him. This is a question to which only one answer can be given from the writings of the Promised Messiah and that answer is that he was highly jealous of the finality of the prophethood of Muhmmad, so much so that he wrote in the *Izala-i-Auham* that should Gabriel even once bring down revelation of prophethood after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the seal of finality would be broken :

"It is evident that should the coming of revelation be supposed even once, and Gabriel should bring but one sentence and then be silent,

still this is opposed to the finality of prophethood; for when the seal of finality is broken, and the revelation of apostleship begins to come down, then it is the same whether the revelations are a few or many. Every wise man can understand that if God is true to his promise, and the promise which has been given in the verse *Khátam-un-nabiyyín*, and which is made very explicit in the reports, that after the death of the Holy Prophet Gabriel has for ever been prevented from bringing down the revelation of prophethood, if all these things are true and right, then no one can come as an apostle after our Holy Prophet" (p. 577).

This book, the *Izala-i-Auham*, is full of statements like this in which the greatest stress is laid upon the finality of the prophethood of Muhammad. In one place it is even stated that should a prophet appear after our Holy Prophet, nothing shall remain of Islam. Other books following it lay stress upon the same point. He also accepts that the verse speaking of the seal of prophets is explained by the saying "there is no prophet after me" (*Hamamat-ul-Bushra* p. 20).

An attempt has been made by M. Mahmud to lead people into the false belief that the Promised Messiah had changed his views concerning the

finality of prophethood in the year 1901, but there is not a grain of truth in it. I give below some quotations from books written after 1901. I have already quoted *Al-Wasiyyat* which was published in December 1905 where it is plainly stated that "in this prophethood there is an end of all prophethoods and thus it ought to have been for that which has a beginning has also an end". These are very plain words showing that the Promised Messiah believed that prophethood ended with the Holy Prophet. I take next the *Mawahib-ur-Rahman* published in 1903 in which he writes :

"And God speaks to and addresses his *auliyá* (friends) among this people and they are given the appearance of prophets but they are not really prophets, for the Qur-an has made perfect the need of the law" (p. 66). This quotation is very conclusive. Here we are told that Divine revelation is granted to the righteous among the Muslims, and they are given even the appearance of prophets but they are not actually prophets. But it is in the reason given that a decisive verdict is contained on the finality of prophethood. The reason for their not being actually prophets is that the Qur-an has made the

law perfect. Now that reason stands equally in the case of all Muslims; and no one who believes in the perfection of the Qur-an can claim prophethood. Men receive revelation and they are given the appearance of prophets but they are not prophets, for the Qur-an is perfect. It follows from this that such persons would have been prophets if the Qur-an had not been made perfect. In other words, a prophet could only arise among the Muslims if the Qur-an had been imperfect, but as it is not, no one can actually be a prophet.

But I may add that even the *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy* contains express words showing that the Promised Messiah believed in the finality of the prophethood of Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him. This is one of his latest writings and here we are told in the Arabic Supplement:

"And prophethood has been cut off after our Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him.....except that I have been called a prophet by the tongue of the best of men.....and God does not mean anything by my prophethood except being spoken to (by Him) frequently, and the curse of God be on him who intends anything beyond this.....And surely

our Apostle is the last of the prophets, and with him is cut off the propaganda of apostles ; so no one has the right to claim prophethood substantially after our Holy Apostle and nothing remains after him but abundance of revelation..... and I have been named a prophet by God by way of metaphor not in a real sense" (pp. 64, 65).

This quotation is alone sufficient to settle the controversy. Here the propaganda of apostles is plainly stated to have been cut off, and prophethood is also stated to have been cut off, and what remains after that is being spoken to by God, which shows clearly that merely being often spoken to by God is not prophethood, for here we are told that while prophethood has been cut off, being spoken to by God remains, thus showing clearly that the two are not identical, and that the mere abundance of revelation does not raise a person to the dignity of prophethood.

There is one quotation which, by suppressing its concluding words, has often been put forward in support of the new doctrine that thousands of prophets would appear after the Holy Prophet Muhammad. On p. 97 of the *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*,

the Promised Messiah writes:

"For God made the Holy Prophet the possessor of seal, *i.e.*, He gave to him a seal to impart excellences to others as has not been given to any other prophet. Hence he was called the seal of prophets, *i.e.*, by following him the excellences of prophethood are obtained, and his spiritual direction gives (to men) the shape of prophets, and this power of holiness has not been granted to any other prophet. This is the meaning of the report 'The learned men from among my followers are like the prophets of Israel.'.....The followers of Moses and Jesus had, generally speaking, no *auliya* (saints) among them, and if rarely there was one such among them, he may be treated as null." (p. 97).

This quotation shows what the Promised Messiah meant when he spoke of a seal being given to the Holy Prophet for the transmission to his followers of the excellences of prophethood. All this is explained by the saying of the Holy Prophet that learned men among his followers were like the prophets of Israel. The significance is therefore clear: he meant that not prophets, but learned men who resembled prophets, would appear among his followers, and this was the significance

of a seal being given to the Holy Prophet for the transmission of prophetical excellences, which continuing to the day of judgment so increased the number of *men like prophets* among his followers that among the followers of previous prophets such men were as nothing compared with them. This is what he calls the *zilli nubuwwat*, (*i.e., reflected prophethood*) that is to be met with among the Muslims to the day of judgment as he writes on p. 28 of the *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*:

"For substantial prophethood has been brought to a close with the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, but *zilli nubuwwat* (*reflected prophethood*) which means the receiving of revelation by the grace of Muhammad, that shall remain to the day of judgment, so that the door to the perfection of men may not be closed, and so that this sign may not be obliterated that the resolution of the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, has desired that the doors of being spoken to by God should remain open."

Here we have the *zilli nubuwwat* or (*prophethood as reflected in a follower of a prophet*) clearly explained by the Promised Messiah himself. It is not actual prophethood but it is the same

gift of receiving Divine revelation by faithfully following the Holy Prophet that makes the learned men *like prophets.* The Promised Messiah has explained this point with a clearness which does not leave the least doubt, and the man who holds that thousands of prophets would appear after the Holy Prophet intentionally perverts his clear writings on the point.

Before concluding I may, however, refer to *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy* p. 391 which is often cited to upset all that is written in hundreds of places elsewhere. There we find the following words:

"In short, in this abundance of Divine revelation and matters relating to the unseen I am an individual chosen in particular and all the *auliyá* and *abdál* and *aqtáb* (i.e., the great Muslim saints) that have passed away before me, were not granted this abundance, therefore I have been chosen particularly to receive the name of prophet."

That he received the name of prophet metaphorically, *not in a real sense,* is further on stated in the same book in the supplement which I have already quoted more than once. Therefore even this quotation does not entitle us to call the Promised Messiah a prophet unless we use the word

metaphorically. And it is not difficult to understand what is meant by his being chosen in particular to receive the name of prophet, for there he is speaking of the prophecy regarding the advent of the Promised Messiah in which occurs the word prophet which is not spoken of any other personage among the Muslims. Thus we have before the words quoted above: "Now let it be known that in the reports of the Holy Prophet it has been foretold that from among the followers of the Holy Prophet a person shall be born who shall be called 'Isa (Jesus) and son of Mary, and be given the name of a prophet, i.e., he shall have the gift of being spoken to by God in such abundance, and so largely shall matters relating to the unseen be made known to him as cannot be revealed to any but a prophet" (p. 390).

Why that word *prophet* occurs concerning the Promised Messiah, and what the significance is that is to be attached to it, has already been explained. All that is necessary to state here is that the word prophet occurs in a report in which occur also the words 'Isa (Jesus) son of Mary, in which it is stated that he shall appear on the eastern minaret of Damascus, which goes on to tell us that he shall appear in two yellow

mantles, with his hands on the shoulders of two angels. If all these names and descriptions are metaphorical, why not the word *prophet*? Even if the Promised Messiah had not written that the word prophet in that report was to be taken metaphorically, we had no other choice, for every single word of that report is metaphorical. And strangely enough, the word prophet does not occur concerning the Promised Messiah in any other report in the numerous prophecies concerning his appearance except in this report, not a single word of which can be interpreted otherwise than metaphorically. Stranger still, this very report as accepted by *Tirmazi*, though narrated by the same first narrator Nawas bin Sam'an who is the first narrator of *Muslim*, omits the word prophet altogether.

But besides all these considerations we have the plain words of the Messiah himself that the word prophet in that report is to be taken metaphorically, and not in the real sense of the word. As the quotation has been given above I need not repeat it.

ARE ALL NON-AHMADIS UNBELIEVERS?

The full force of the new doctrines taught by M. Mahmud would be felt by a Muslim in the strange announcement according to which all Muslims except the Ahmadis are really non-Muslims. So strange and paradoxical does the announment—the Muslims being non-Muslims—appear that hardly any body would believe that a sane person could make this statement, but this is the actual consequence of the new doctrine taught by M. Mahmud relating to the prophethood of the Promised Messiah. Nor are we left to draw that inference on our own account, for the doctrine that all those who have not entered into the *bai'at* of the Promised Messiah are outside the circle of Islam, i.e., non-Muslims, has been openly and incessantly preached by M. Mahmud for a number of years, and so persistent is he that he openly declared in a meeting of his friends convened in December 1913 that he would rather die than forsake the preaching of the doctrine which taught that all those who were not Ahmadis were *kafirs* pure and simple, absolute unbelievers outside the circle of Islam, with whom all relations such as saying their funeral prayers, intermarriages, etc., were to be shunned in the same manner as in

the case of non-Muslims. In other words the duties which a Muslim owes to a Muslim according to the plain teachings of the Holy Qur-an and the reports of the Holy Prophet, an Ahmadi Muslim does not owe to his Muslim brother. Here then a dissension has been created in Islam, the like of which has not been experienced by this religion of unity—of the unity of God and the unity of humanity—during the thirteen hundred years since its birth. And were it not for this grave consequence of the doctrine of the prophethood of the Promised Messiah, that doctrine would have passed off as an innocent heresy which might have been left alone to die a natural death. But the serious dissension to which it gives rise requires every true Muslim, and every Ahmadi must be a true Muslim, to raise his voice against this mighty insult to the holy religion of Islam. It not only divides the camp of Islam into two, which in principles has remained completely united for the last thirteen hundred years, but lays the basis of further divisions, which, if they should find their way into Islam, must result in the shattering of its unity to pieces. But Almighty God would never allow Islam to see that disastrous day for which M.

Mahmud is so earnestly longing.

It is necessary to explain first in a few words what has been said above. M. Mahmud's argument for declaring the Muslims to be infidels is this that as a new prophet has appeared in the world, therefore those who do not believe in that prophet are unbelievers, for it is only belief in the latest prophet that can bring a man within the category of Islam. Therefore while the appearance of the Promised Messiah as a prophet divides the camp of Islam into two parties, each thinking the other to be outside the pale of Islam, the appearance of the thousands of prophets which M. Mahmud believes must yet appear would hopelessly divide Islam into thousands of camps, each thinking the other to be non-Muslim. And just as the millions of Muslims who are even ignorant of the name of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the new prophet of the age according to the doctrine of M. Mahmud, have become *kafirs* simply because a prophet has appeared in India, even the Ahmadi followers of M. Mahmud are not safe from being turned into *kafirs* because a prophet might appear in Africa of whom they know nothing, just as their African brethren know nothing of the Promised Messiah. Indeed so hideous

is this doctrine that it is an insult to the sane reader to offer a rejection of it, but as M. Mahmud tries to attribute it to the Promised Messiah, I deem it my duty to show that that great reformer of the age never thought of preaching this hideous untruth for a moment. He is absolutely clear of the charge.

Because the Promissed Messiah is a prophet, we are told, therefore all those who have not entered into his *bai'at* are *káfirs*. M. Mahmud may be right or wrong, but the question I ask is, did the Promised Messiah even once say or write those words? Do the thousands of the pages of his diaries and writings but once contain the statement that *he being a prophet* those who did not enter into his *bai'at* were *káfirs*. If he never made that claim even once, is it not a hateful guilt to attribute that doctrine to him? Hundreds of times did he speak and write on questions of *Kufr* and *Islam*, but not once did those words escape his tongue or pen. How cruel then to declare to the world that he was responsible for teaching a doctrine which he never dreamt of!

How did then the question of *kufr* arise in connection with the Promised Messiah at all? When he first claimed to be the Promised Messiah,

the Maulvis exerted themselves to their utmost in pronouncing him *a káfir* because his claim clashed with their cherished doctrines which were really opposed to the Holy Qur-an and the sayings of the Holy Prophet. In their *fatwás*, however, they were not content with declaring him a *káfir* but advised the Muslims to cut off all their connections with him, just as M. Mahmud is doing today with respect to those who do not follow the Promised Messiah. The Promised Messiah gave no answer to these *fatwas* except that he went on assuring the public that the charges on which he was declared a *káfir* were absolutely false, that he did not claim to be a prophet, nor did he deny the existence of angels or miracles and so on. But these assurances had no effect, and it became clear that the Maulvis intentionally persisted in declaring a Muslim to be a *kafir*, notwithstanding that he repeatedly explained that he did not swerve a hair's breadth from the principles of Islam. Now there is a saying of the Holy Prophet according to which if any one calls his Muslim brother a *káfir*, the *kufr* reverts to himself. It was about four years after his claim to Promised Messiahship that an opponent asked him to have a *mubáhala* with him (i. e., praying for the destruction of the

party in error). The Promised Messiah's reply was that though his opponent might call him a *kafir*, yet as he looked upon his opponent as a Muslim, he could not pray for his destruction. But when at last it became manifest that the opponents quite unjustly persisted in calling him a *kafir*, the Promised Messiah wrote that after that he was entitled to treat those opponents as *kafir* who declared him to be a *kafir* or impostor, in accordance with the saying of the Holy Prophet. This is all that the Promised Messiah has ever said, viz., that *kufr* reverted to those who declared him to be a *kafir* or impostor and to this he stuck to the last, never going against this principle.

It is not necessary for me to explain why the saying of the Holy Prophet makes *kufr* revert to him who declares a Muslim to be a *kafir*. The Holy Prophet had laid the basis of a great brotherhood and he did not like that such dissensions should exist in this brotherhood as should destroy the unity of Islam. Hence it was necessary to have a safeguard against the creation of such dissensions. But the only safeguard could be the infliction of some punishment on the person who should dare to violate the unity of the Muslim brotherhood. Thus a person who called

a Muslim brother a *kafir* did not deserve to be called a member of the brotherhood and hence the words of the Holy Prophet that *kufr* reverted to him who called his brother Muslim a *kafir*.

That the Promised Messiah went no further than this is evident from his latest pronouncement. He was at Lahore in May 1908 when about two weeks before his death Mian Fazl-i-Husain, Bar.-at-Law, put to him the question whether he called the Muslims *kafir*. The conversation is thus recorded in the Badr newspaper dated 24th May 1908:

"Mr. Fazl-i-Hussain said that if all non-Ahmadis were called *kafir*, sthere remained nothing in Islam.

"(The Promised Messiah) said: 'We do not declare anyone to be outside Islam unless he himself becomes a *kafir* by calling us *kafirs*. It is not perhaps known to you that when I first claimed to have been charged by God, Maulvi Abu Said Muhammad Husain of Batala prepared a *fatwa* with great effort in which it was written that I was a *kafir*, etc.....Now it is accepted on all hands that anyone who calls a believer a *kafir* himself becomes a *kafir*."

Further on, it is again affirmed in clear words:

"He who does not call us a *kafir*, we do not call him a *kafir* at all." It would be seen from this that the Promised Messiah never declared a single Muslim to be a *kafir*. As against this certain words in the *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy* are produced where it is written:

"It is strange that you consider him who calls me a *kafir* and him who denies me two different kinds, but in the sight of God they are one kind; for he who denies me does so because he holds me to be an impostor, but God says that a fabricator against God is the greatest of all *kafirs*.....therefore when in the sight of one who calls me an impostor I have fabricated against God, in this case I am not only a *kafir* but the greatest of *kafirs*, and if I am not an impostor, then undoubtedly the *kufr* reverts to him." (p. 163). It would be seen that this statement in no way applies to all those who do not accept the Promised Messiah, but only to the rejectors who denounce him as an impostor. For instance, it does not apply at all to those non-acceptors of the Promised Messiah who have not heard of him at all, nor to those who regard him as a good Muslim; in fact, it does not apply to any one who does not consider him an

impostor, *i.e.*, one fabricating revelations to deceive people. It would be seen that the only reason which he has again and again given for calling any one a *kafir* is either that such a person calls him a *kafir* or that he calls him an impostor. Nowhere has he once said what M. Mahmud attributes to him that those who did not accept him were *kafirs because he was a prophet.*

Further proof of what has been said here is met with in the *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy* itself where we find him thus accusing his opponents for bringing false charges against him, one of which is that they charged him with declaring the Muslims *kafirs* :

" Again consider this falsehood that they bring this charge against us that we have declared two hundred million Muslims to be *kafirs*.....Can any Maulvi or any opponent or any *sajjada nashin* give proof that we first declared these people to be *kafirs.* If any leaflet, or manifesto or pamphlet was published by us before their *fatwa* of *kufr* in which we declared our Muslim opponents to be *kafir*, they should bring it forward ; otherwise they should think how dishonest it is that they themselves call us *kafir* and then charge us with having declared all the Muslims to be *kafirs.*

How offending is this great dishonesty and lie and false charge" (p. 120).

Again, relating to those who have not heard even the name of the Promised Messiah whom M. Mahmud considers to be *kafirs* along with the bitterest abusers, he writes in the *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*:

"Dr. Abdul Hakim Khan in his pamphlet *Al-Masih-ud-dajjal* lays this charge against me that I have written in my book that any one who does not accept me, even if he does not know my name and even if he is in a country where my invitation has not reached, even then he shall be a *kafir* and go to hell. It is entirely a fabrication of the said doctor; I have not written so in any book or announcement of mine. It is his duty to bring forward that book of mine in which this is written" (p. 178).

The plainest statement regarding this is however contained in the *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub* which was published in 1902. The incident arose out of a case in which both Maulvi Muhammad Husain of Batala and the Promised Messiah signed an agreement, the former undertaking not to call the Promised Messiah a *kafir* or liar in future, and the latter giving the same undertaking with regard to Maulvi Muhammad Husain.

Reference to this is contained in the *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub* on p. 130 in the following words:

"The third aspect of the fulfilment of the prophecy of 21st November 1898 is this that Mr. J. M. Douie, late Deputy Commissioner and District Magistrate, Gurdaspur district, in his order dated 24th February 1899 made Maulvi Muhammad Husain sign the agreement that he would not call me anti-Christ and *kafir* and liar in future ..... And he promised standing in the court that he would not call me a *kafir* in any assembly, nor give me the name of anti-Christ, nor would he proclaim me a liar among the people. Now consider after this agreement the fate of his *fatwa* (of *kufr*) which he had prepared by (travelling all over the country) going so far as Benares. If he had been in the right in giving that *fatwa*, he ought to have given this answer before the Magistrate that as he (the Mirza Sahib) was a *kafir* in his opinion, therefore he called him a *kafir*, and as he was a *dajjal* (anti-Christ), therefore he called him a *dajjal*, and as he was certainly a liar, therefore he called him a liar, particularly when I, by the grace of God, still adhere to those very beliefs, and shall do so to the end of my days, which Muhammad Husain gave out

to be words of *kufr*. What honesty is this then that from fear of the Magistrate he destroyed his own *fatwas*.....It is true that I have also signed that notice, but I am under no blame by signing it in the sight of God and the just, nor is this signature a cause of my disgrace, for it is my belief from the beginning that no one can become a *kafir* or *dajjal* on account of denying my claims; aye, he would be going astray and erring from the right path."

This is plain enough. Not only he never said that as he was a prophet therefore those who denied him were *kafirs*, but he held *from the beginning* that no one could be a *kafir* on account of denying his claims. A footnote is added which lays further stress upon this point:

"This is a point worth remembering that to call a denier of one's claims a *kafir* is the right of those prophets who bring a law and new commandments from God, but as for the inspired ones and *Muhaddasin* other than the givers of law, however great their dignity in the sight of God, and however much they may have been honoured by being spoken to by God, no one becomes a *kafir* by their denial."

Such a clear statement from the pen of the

Promised Messiah should have set all doubts at rest; for to hold that the Promised Messiah when he published these views did not really entertain them is to hold him in meaner estimation than even Maulvi Muhammad Husain. If it was disgraceful on the part of the latter to sign an agreement contrary to his belief for fear of punishment, it was much more disgraceful on the part of the Promised Messiah to assure people that he did not look upon his deniers as *kafirs* while he actually did so. Would this not be declared as the meanest attempt to deceive the public? I do not think any one who calls himself an Ahmadi would take that view of the character of the Promised Messiah.

Even if the Promised Messiah had not left these plain statements in his writings, his practical life was a sufficient guarantee that he did not look upon a mere denial of his claims as *kufr*, nor did he regard those who had not entered into his *bai'at* as *kafirs*. Khwaja Ghulam Farid of Chachran, the spiritual leader of the Nawab of Bahawalpur, held the Promised Messiah in great honour, though he never entered into his *bai'at*. Now according to the verdict of M. Mahmud, published in his monthly, the *Tashhizul-Azhān* for

April 1911, "even he who from his heart believes him (*i.e.*, the Promised Messiah) to be true, and does not deny him even with the tongue, but he postpones *bai'at* is looked upon as a *kafir*" (p. 141), Khwaja Ghulam Farid should be ranked as a *kafir*, but the Promised Messiah speaks of him in terms of great respect in his book the *Siráj-i-Munír*, as "a man of truth", as "one who receives light from God", as "one helped by the Holy Spirit" (p. e. supplement) and he addresses him as "one matchless in truth and purity" (p. g.).

M. Mahmud lays down some rules for the guidance of his community which are entirely opposed to the writings of the Promised Messiah, and this is due to his calling the Muslims *kafirs*. For instance, one of the rules laid down is that in no case shall an Ahmadi say the funeral prayers of another Muslim, however nearly he may be related to the dead person. But when the Promised Messiah was questioned about it, he gave his judgment in the following words:

"Being asked whether it was lawful to offer prayers for the dead persons who had not joined this propaganda, the Promised Messiah replied, if he was an opponent of this propaganda and

abused us and thought of us in an evil manner, do not offer prayers for him, and if he was silent and was in a middle position, it is lawful to offer up prayers for him but the *imam* should be from among you" (*Fatawa Ahmadiyya*, dated 18th April 1902).

Later still, when questions were put to him on this point, he directed the writing of replies in almost identical terms, the words of one letter being: "Funeral prayers may be offered for an opponent who did not resort to abusing". He also wrote letters to that effect with his own hand, and all this is admitted by M. Mahmud in his *Anwar-i-Khilafat*:

"Again, there is a question as to the funeral prayers of a non-Ahmadi. Here it is said we are confronted with the difficulty that the Promised Messiah gave permission in certain cases to offer prayers. There is no doubt that there are some references which lead to this conclusion and there is also a letter to this effect on which I shall ponder, but the practice of the Promised Messiah is against this".

M. Mahmud says that the practice of the Promised Messiah was opposed to his *fatwas* and his letters. There is not the least truth in this

statement. Evidence has been produced on oath of some of the most pious members of the community that the Promised Messiah himself offered up funeral prayers for others than his disciples. But the question is, did M. Mahmud ever ponder on these *fatwas* and on that letter and did he announce the result to which deep thought on that point had led? Nearly two years have passed away since he uttered these words and he has been repeatedly asked to declare the result of his pondering but there is no reply.

He has given a *fatwa* against the *fatwa* of the Promised Messiah and now he is silent, though he had promised to speak on that point. But what can he say? He knows well that he has given a judgment contradicting the judgment of the Promised Messiah because he believes the Muslims to be *kafirs* while the Promised Messiah never entertained that belief. He, therefore, now desires to keep his followers in the bliss of ignorance.

Another point relating to practical life is the question of having marriage relations with other Muslims. M. Mahmud gives them the same position as the law of Islam gives to non-Muslim possessors of scriptures, but he can not produce a single word from the Promised Messiah in support

of this *new* law. It is true that the Promised Messiah enjoined his followers so far as possible to have marriage relations among themselves, the object being the strengthening of the ties which united the community. But he never thought of altering the Islamic law, nor did he ever declare that the giving of an Ahmadi girl in marriage to other than an Ahmadi Muslim was illegal. On the other hand, he sanctioned the marriage of an Ahmadi girl, the daughter of one of his trusted and intimate friends, Dr. Khalifa Rashid-ud-Din, and the sister-in-law of M. Mahmud himself, with a non-Ahmadi boy, a relative of the mother of the girl, towards the end of his life, and the marriage sermon was given by the late Maulvi Nur-ud-Din, M. Mahmud himself taking part in all the principal functions. If the marriage was illegal, why did the Promised Messiah allow it? And if M. Mahmud held the same belief then as he holds now, why did he take part in the marriage ceremony? This shows clearly that all the novel doctrines which M. Mahmud is now introducing into the Ahmadiyya movement were formed after the death of the Promised Messiah.

The third point in practical relations with other Muslims is the question of saying prayers after

an *imam* of another denomination. Here, too, as M. Mahmud looks upon the Muslims as *kafirs*, it is illegal according to him to say prayers after other than an Ahmadi *imam*. It is true that the Promised Messiah was compelled to prohibit his followers from saying prayers after other *imams* when opposition to the Ahmadiyya movement grew very severe, and *fatwas* had been issued by the Maulvis stating that the Ahmadis should not be allowed to enter the mosques and their corpses should not be buried in Muslim grave-yards. Had the Promised Messiah prohibited Ahmadis from saying their prayers after other than Ahmadi *imams* at the time when he laid claim to Promised Messiahship, we would have been entitled to draw the conclusion that he thought it illegal for his followers to say prayers after the others considering the latter to be *kafir*. But it is a fact that long after his claim, he himself used to say his prayers after other *imams*, and it was not until about ten years after the claim to Promised Messiahship that he prohibited his followers from following other *imams*. In fact, it was not a matter of choice, but a step of the utmost urgency for the welfare of a small community that suffering persecution

of every kind had assembled around him. It was a sort of a defensive measure for the Ahmadiyya community which could not have prospered until it was separated from its persecuting co-religionists.

The measure regarding the prohibition of saying prayers after other than Ahmadi *imams* was, as I have said, introduced when the Maulvis persisting in their *fatwas* of *kufr* against the Promised Messiah instilled the poison of malice into the public mind against the Ahmadiyya movement. The masses, accustomed to follow their Maulvis and their *pirs*, did not care to distinguish the truth from the falsehood for themselves and implicitly believed in the truth of what their religious and spiritual leaders said. Hence though he treated them as Muslims, allowing even the funeral prayers to be said for them, he did not think it proper for his followers to say their prayers after their *imams* making an exception in favour of men who separated themselves from those Maulvis and *pirs* who declared the Promised Messiah to be a *kafir*. The conversation which he had with Mr. Fazl-i-Husain at Lahore from which I have already quoted throws light on this point as well. When the Promised Messiah declared emphatically that he

did not at all call those *kafir* who did not call him a *kafir*, M. Fazl-i-Husain asked him what was the harm in saying prayers with such Muslims who did not call him a *kafir*. The answer to this question was as follows :—

"A believer is not bit from the same hole twice! We have experienced well that such people are in fact hypocrites. Their condition is this that in (our) presence they say 'We bear no opposition to you,' but when they are alone with their leaders they say, 'We were mocking with them.' So until those people make a public announcement that they look upon the members of the Ahmadiyya community as believers, nay, that they consider those persons *kafir* who call them (*i.e.*, the Ahmadis) *kafir*—in that case I will to-day order my followers that they say their prayers along with them. We are the followers of truth; you cannot compel us outside the law of Islam."

This answer shows clearly that the Promised Messiah prohibited prayers after only such *imams* as either openly declared him a *kafir* or mixed themselves up with such persons. But if a person, who was already mixed up with the Maulvis who declared the Promised Messiah to be a *kafir*, openly separated himself from them and treated

the *fatwa* of *kufr* against a Muslim in the manner in which the Holy Prophet's injunction required it to be treated, then the Ahmadis could say their prayers after him. Similar words are contained in a letter, dated the 17th March, written in reply to a representation by some Muslims as to one of his followers not saying his prayers with them:

"As generally the *Mullas* of this country, on account of prejudice, have declared us *kafirs* and have written *fatwas*, and the other people are their followers, therefore if there are such people that they make a public announcement for the sake of clearance that they are not followers of the Maulvis who have given *fatwas* of *kufr*, then it is allowed to say prayers with them."

Other quotations to the same effect may be multiplied to any extent, but the two given above are sufficient for our purpose. The reason of not saying prayers with others is the *fatwa* of *kufr*, against the Promised Messiah; if he had not been declared a *kafir*, or the *fatwa* had been taken back when he had given public assurance that he was a true believer in the Muslim articles of faith, the question of not saying prayers after other *imams* would never have arisen. And even

now prayers may be said by an Ahmadi after a Muslim who practically separates himself from the givers of the *fatwa*. It can be easily concluded from this that prayers may be said by Ahmadis after other than Ahmadi *imams*, when necessary, in countries where the *Ulama* have not declared the Promised Messiah to be a *kafir*. Such was, in fact, the judgment given by the late Maulvi Hakim Nur-ud-Din who succeeded the Promised Messiah in the leadership of the community. He allowed the saying of prayers after other than Ahmadi *imams* in Arabia, Africa and England, and the Ahmadis who have performed the pilgrimage did say their prayers after such *imams* there, M. Mahmud himself being one of them.

The present position of the Ahmadiyya community in the matter of saying prayers after other *imams*, in accordance with the orders of the Promised Messiah, which however do not form any amendment of the Islamic Law, is this, that where there is a sufficient number of Ahmadis, generally it is in the interests of the community to have their own *imam* to lead prayers, but prayers might be said when necessary after other *imams* in countries whose *Ulama* generally have not given or do not recognise the *fatwa* of *kufr*,

or in a country like India where generally the *Ulama* have declared the Promised Messiah to be *kafir* after such men as make a public announcement to the effect that they consider him to be a Muslim, and in accordance with the saying of the Holy Prophet consider such persons to be in error as have issued *fatwas* to that effect. This latter condition was put in a simpler form by the late Maulvi Nur-ud-Din who, on being questioned by Maulvi Fazal-ud-Din of Kharian (Punjab) regarding the saying of prayers after other than Ahmadi *imams*, gave the following reply :

"Those who are not hypocritical and who really entertain a good opinion, are excusable to a certain extent. You may say prayers after them having first made an *istikhárah*."

This letter was written on the 25th of February 1910, and the writer of it adheres to the spirit of the orders of the Promised Messiah, though a different method has been suggested to arrive at the conclusion whether a certain person actually entertains a good opinion about the Promised Messiah or only makes a show of it hypocritically. If we refer to the reply given to Mr. Fazl-i-Husain by the Promised Messiah in May 1908, we will find

that even the Promised Messiah required an announcement simply as a safeguard against hypocritical assurances. Maulvi Nur-ud-Din suggested the adoption of a different method to arrive at the same conclusion which is no doubt simpler than the first. It is a fact that the attitude of the Muslim public in general towards the Ahmadiyya movement has greatly changed since the assurances given by the Promised Messiah immediately before his death in May 1908 in respectable gatherings at Lahore, and were it not for the novel doctrines of M. Mahmud which are again widening the gulf, the Ahmadiyya movement to-day would have cleared off most of the prejudice which prevails against it.

Before bringing this to a conclusion, I would appeal to the Ahmadis to think over these questions with a cool mind and to study the writings of the Promised Messiah. Is it not strange that M. Mahmud to-day puts exactly the same interpretation on the writings of the Promised Messiah as the strongest opponents of the movement put upon them in its early days? When the Promised Messiah first announced his claim, the opponents said that he denied the fulfilment of the prophecy relating to the advent of Ahmad in the person of the Holy

Prophet, that he claimed to be a prophet and that he taught a new religion. All these charges were immediately declared to be false, but the Maulvis gave out that he was really deceiving them by using vague words to escape incrimination. If what M. Mahmud teaches to-day is right, then indeed the Maulvis were in the right, and the great service that M. Mahmud has thus done to the Ahmadiyya movement is that he has proved that the Maulvis, who opposed the Promised Messiah and declared him to be a *kafir* first on account of his claim to prophethood, and a deceiver afterwards in denying that he claimed to be a prophet, were in the right. For the Maulvis said that the Mirza Sahib himself claimed to be Ahmad and that he denied that the holy Prophet Muhammad was the Ahmad whose advent was foretold by Jesus, and the Promised Messiah and his followers denied these charges; but now M. Mahmud says that it is written in the writings of the Promised Messiah that he himself, and not the Holy Prophet Muhammad, was the Ahmad prophesied by Christ. If M. Mahmud is right, then indeed the opponents of the movement were also in the right, and the Promised Messiah and his followers were only deceiving them and the public. Again, when the

Promised Messiah announced his claim, the Maulvis who opposed him said that he claimed to be a prophet and that therefore he was a *kafir*; the Promised Messiah wrote and stated under oath that he did not lay claim to prophethood but that he claimed to be a *Muhaddas* and that a *Muhaddas* could be metaphorically called a prophet, that his prophethood was the reflected prophethood (*zilli nubuwwat*) of a follower and not actual prophethood, a partial prophethood which signified only the revelation to him of certain prophecies and deep significances of the words of the Qur-an, and not the perfect prophethood of a real prophet, a partial or metaphorical or reflected prophethood recognised under different names by the *Ulama* of the *ummat*; he even signed an agreement stating that the word prophet might be obliterated from his writings and the word *Muhaddas* substituted for it; the Maulvis said that he was deceiving the public by the use of the words partial (*juzwi*), metaphorical (*majazi*), and reflected (*zilli*), and that he really claimed to be a prophet; M. Mahmud now says that the Promised Messiah was in fact a real and perfect prophet, that his prophethood was not the partial prophethood of a follower but the

perfect prophethood of a prophet. If M. Mahmud is in the right, then the opposing Maulvis were also in the right throughout and the Promised Messiah was actually deceiving the public and giving false assurances under the cloak of vague words. What an irony of fate that to make him a prophet, he is to be recognised as a deceiver first!

But the gravest of all the consequences of the teachings of M. Mahmud is that in recognising the truth of these doctrines, the Promised Messiah is to be accepted as the teacher of a new religion altogether, not of Islam as it was taught by the Holy Prophet Muhammad. The basis of the religion taught by the Holy Prophet Muhammad is the simple formula of faith *la ilaha illa-Allah-u-Muhammad-ur-rasul ullah*, i.e., there is no god but Allah and Muhammad is the Apostle of Allah. When a non-Muslim accepts Islam, he has to confess his faith in the above formula. This formula is, therefore, the basis of the religion of Islam, the foundation on which the superstructure of Islam is erected, and for the last thirteen hundred years it has served that purpose. But according to M. Mahmud no one can now enter Islam who simply professes his faith in that formula; a new prophet has arisen and faith in

him only can make a man enter into the circle of Islam. Even those old Muslims who professed the formula of faith have been turned, bag and baggage, out of the circle of Islam. Therefore, according to M. Mahmud, the very basis of the faith of Islam which he preaches has been changed. And if the foundation is gone, the superstructure cannot remain. Therefore the Islam he preaches is altogether a different faith from the Islam which has been preached for the last thirteen hundred years. To give an illustration, we are told by M. Mahmud that just as after the appearance of the Holy Prophet Muhammad faith in Jesus Christ and the earlier apostles did not avail, so now after the appearance of a prophet, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, faith in Muhammad and the earlier prophets does not avail. Is it not clear from this that just as Islam supplanted Christianity, the new Islam of M. Mahmud supplants the old Islam of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, though it might contain the old law? Could heresy go beyond that?

It is time our brethren should ponder on these matters, and rally round the true doctrines of the Promised Messiah before the false doctrines gain a prevalence, as the false doctrines attributed

to the first Messiah gained ground and a great part of the world was involved in an error which is almost the gravest of religious errors. In the same manner these novel doctrines of M. Mahmud will be the cause of the gravest dissension in Islam if they are not checked in time. I hope the good sense of the community will come to the rescue of the movement.

THE END.