THE LAST PROPHET

by

MAULANA MUHAMMAD ALI

مَا كَانَ مُحَمَّدٌ أَبَا أَحَدٍ مِّن رِّجَالِكُمْ وَلَٰكِن رَّسُولَ اللَّهِ وَخَاتَمَ النَّبِيِّينَ ۗ
وَكَانَ اللَّهُ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عَلِيمًا ﴿٤٠﴾

"Muhammad is not the father of any of your men, but he is th Messenger of Allah and the Seal (last) of the Prophets. And Allah has full knowledge of all things" (The Qur'an 33:40)

Translated by

MAULANA S.M. TUFAIL

Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishā'at-I-Islām
Delhi – Bharat

www.aaiil.org

First Urdu Edition	1915
First English Edition	1981
Second Revised Edition	1998

The *Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam* (Ahmadiyya Association for the Propagation of Islam) was founded at Lahore, Pakistan, in 1914 by the prominent followers of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Saheb. It exists to promote a liberal, tolerant and peaceful picture of Islam, as found in the Holy Qur'an and the life of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (Peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). It has published a vast quantity of highly-regarded literature on Islam in various languages, and has branches and members in several countries all over the world.

A WORD OF THANKS

We are thankful to Brother Kalam Azad Muhammad (Trinidad) for revising this edition and Sister Nadara Khan also from Trinidad for going through the proofs.

—Publishers

Printed by:
M.K. OFFSET PRESS
1397, Churiwalan Delhi (India)

CONTENTS

CHAPTER — IV

THE SAYING OF HAZRAT A'ISHAH

CHAPTER — V

FINALITY OF PROPHETHOOD AND THE FOUNDER OF THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT 66

CHAPTER — VI

MIAN SAHIB EXPLAINED *KHĀTAM AL-NABIYYIN* AS THE LAST OF THE PROPHETS IN 1910 83

FOREWORD

The *Last Prophet (Ākhiri Nabī)* by the late *Maulana* Muhammad 'Ali, is a historical document which shows how the present-day controversy about the cessation, or continuance of prophethood after the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) had grown. Although the late *Maulana* had written an exhaustive treatise on the subject, namely, *An-Nubūwwat fi'l Islām*, in 1915, (seven years before the publication of *Ākhiri Nabī*), some important issues were left undiscussed, as the basic arguments of the upholders of the continuity of prophethood after the Holy Prophet, were still taking shape in their minds.

A simple issue was gradually turned into a complicated one and at times arguments for the sake of argument were advanced. Even hypothetical references were forced into the service of someone's own avowed preferences and theories. The most unfortunate part of the story was that passages were quoted, out of context and incomplete, to lend support to one's views. New meanings were introduced into various terms, setting aside the common usage and the testimony of the lexicons of the Arabic language. Weak and unauthentic traditions were given prominence and preference over authentic ones, while the latter were misinterpreted to lend support to the former, thus violating all the principles of the interpretation of Tradition.

Ākhirī Nabī by the late *Maulana* Muhammad 'Ali is not very well known as only one edition of the book was published in 1922, and it appears from the contents that he wrote the book in a rather short time. Detailed references of books and articles mentioned therein were not cited. It was taken for granted that

the names of many scholars and their works were already known to the reader. This may have been true at that particular period of time but when this work is translated into another language, many of the points need elaboration. Full references of the texts quoted are indispensable for those who would like to make a deeper study of the subject. I have tried to fill in the gap by providing necessary references and explanations in the footnotes. On certain points I have dealt with the subject in a separate supplement added at the end of each chapter.

My original plan was to make a comprehensive analysis of arguments and counter-arguments on the subject, but the state of my health did not permit me to do so. I have to complete and revise some of the manuscripts which have remained unpublished so far and these also need my full attention. I have, however, contented myself at this stage dealing with some of the most important aspects of the issue.

Without unnecessarily overburdening the discussion, the whole question of prophethood is simple to understand. The Holy prophet Muhammad is *Khātam al-Nabiyyin*, Seal of the Prophets (The Holy Quran, 33:40). The word *khātam* means a seal, or the end part or portion of a thing. This word also indicates a deeper signification than the word *khātim*. It expresses *finality* combined with *perfection* of prophethood in the Holy Prophet, along with a continuance, for ever, of certain blessings or excellences of prophethood for the righteous followers of the Holy Prophet.

One of the blessings of prophethood was that God spoke to his people (men and women) though they were not prophets. According to the Holy Qur'an, Prophet Moses' mother, the disciples of Jesus, and Mary and Joseph, who were not prophets, were spoken to by God. The Holy Qur'an and the Hadith talk of believers becoming the recipients of good news (*mubashshirat*). According to a reliable hadith, Hazrat 'Umar was spoken to by God although he was obviously not a prophet.

(Full discussion and references will be found in the text of the book.)

When we look at the writings and sayings of some of the saintly figures in Islamic history we find a long chain of persons who believed in, or were bestowed with, the blessings or excellences of prophethood.

A few names are given below:
Imam Ahmad Hanbal
Imam Rāghib al-Asfahānī.
Imam Ghazāli
Shaikh 'Abdul Qādir Jilāni
Imam Qurtabi
Muhiyyud Din Ibn al-Arabi
Maulana Jalāl-ud-Din Rūmi
Imam Hajar 'Asqalāni
Imam 'Abdul Wahāb Sha'rāni
Mujaddid Ahmad Alf Thāni of Sirhind
Khwājah Mu'in-ud-Din Chisti
Qazi Nasir-ud-Din al-Baidāwi
Imam Fakhr-ud-Din Rāzi
Shah Waliullah Muhāddath of Delhi
Sayyid Muhammad Ismā'il Shaheed.

Members of the Qadian section believe that the blessings of God (referred to in the *Hadith* as a part of prophethood) should also be styled as real prophethood. This, is obviously not correct.

That is the main issue of contention between the two sections of the Ahmadiyya Movement. The view of the Qadian section of the Ahmadiyya community is that prophets are of three kinds:

1. Those who bring a new Divine Law, such as Moses or the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him).

2. Prophets who bear no new Law, but follow some of the existing laws. However, their prophethood is an independent grace which they attain directly and not through following another prophet. Examples of such are David, Solomon, Zacharias, Yahya and Jesus.

3. 'A prophet, who is neither a Law-giver, nor has been graced directly with prophethood, independent of allegiance to the former prophet. His prophetic attribute is a reflection of his preceptor-prophet, and is a gift bestowed on him through his grace and is a glimmer of his light.'[1]

The leader of the Qādiān section asserts that this is the true meaning of the term *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn*, i.e. that by following the Holy Prophet, prophets will be made in future.

Thus, according to the fore-going statements, the door of the first two categories of prophethood is closed but that of the third category is open.[2] A detailed discussion of all these points has been made by *Maulana* Muhammad 'Ali in his book *An-Nubūwwat fi'l Islām*. In the *Last Prophet*, he has taken particular note of the so-called 'prophethood of the third category'. This is not a prophethood in reality but a part of prophethood, (part cannot be the whole); it is the receiving of good news, or acquiring the excellences of prophethood, by following the Holy Prophet; it is a blessing of being spoken to by God; it is prophethood in the metaphorical or literal sense or a reflection or shadow of prophethood. In whatever way one wants to look at it, it is not prophethood in the real sense of the Holy Qur'an and Islamic terminology. This is where lies the basic difference between the two sections of the Ahmadiyya Movement.

Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmūd Ahmad, leader of the Qadian section, rightly or wrongly, thought that the weight of evidence from the Holy Qur'an, Hadith and sayings of the Imams lay on his side but a close study of his arguments reveals the astounding fact that he had nothing substantial in his hand. The Qur'anic verses were misinterpreted; weak or unauthentic traditions were quoted; passages from the writings of the Muslim Imams were taken out of their contexts and interpreted at will. An edifice grew which was very shaky in its foundation.

Seeing this tragedy happening before his eyes, the late *Maulana* Muhammad 'Ali tried to rectify the situation and he concluded his arguments thus:

'In short, all these reports clearly indicate that only one meaning of the expression, *Khatam al-Nabiyyin*, was known to the Holy Prophet and his companions — that there would be no prophet after him. And *Mian Sahib's*[3] contention is that these meanings are wrong and the true meanings are those the trace of which, strangely enough, is not found during the last thirteen hundred years — either in any tradition of the Holy Prophet, or in any utterance of any other companion or *Imam*' (Chapter IV, p. 57).

And he further stated:

"The true and real basis of our faith is the Holy Qur'an and the Tradition (*Hadith*), but I have cited all those other testimonies as conclusive proof against him. And my final demand from him is that he should bring out even a solitary authority from the *Hadith*, lexicons and sayings of the *Imams* in support of his meaning about the term *Khatam al-Nabiyyin* (Chapter V, p. 79).

It need not be mentioned here that this demand remains unfulfilled up to the present time.

Whatever interpretations, dubious, fallacious or hypothetical, that *Mian Sahib* gave, his disciples kept on the same track, repeating parrot-like whatever he had said to justify his stand by trifling and puerile arguments. The subject became the source of an unending controversy.

The late *Maulana* Muhammad 'Ali kept on warning Mian Sahib and his Jama'at, sometimes gently, sometimes harshly, that the dispute and the discord were in their initial stages and the schism could be breached as it had not yet reached an irreversible point, but his appeals went unheeded.

A new belief about the concept of prophethood, which has sent deep shock-waves throughtout the Muslim world during the last sixty years or so, has taken firm root in the hearts of the members of the Qadian section. In spite of all the outward vindication of the new-founded belief, the hard fact remains that they have strayed far away from the teachings of the Holy Qur'an, the Hadith, other *Imams* and even from the clear exposition of the Founder of the Movement. A great damage was done to the cause of the Ahmadiyya Movement which itself had arisen as a movement for the onward, progressive march for a rational and united Islam. Only God knows how long it will take to get this damage repaired.

The late *Maulana* Muhammad 'Ali's contribution in this respect is of vital importance. He is the only person in the history of Islam who has dealt with this issue in a clear and lucid manner.

In rendering this work into English I have tried to be as faithful as possible to the original text. Literal translation at places would not have made sense, so I have given the main substance of the argument. The subject-matter is controversial and in case of doubt or dispute, the original text should therefore be consulted. As for any mistake or ambiguity, the translator should be held responsible and not the author. As it is not easily possible that the readers would have ready access to

the works referred to in the book, several passages have been quoted in their original.

I hope this humble effort on my part may clarify many disputed points on the subject and make us truly believe in the Last and Perfect Prophet, Muhammad, whose blessings will continue among his true followers till eternity.

Maybury, Woking,
Surrey, England.
6th November, 1982.

S.M. Tufail

INTRODUCTION

How full of sublime wisdom is the belief that the Holy Prophet Muhammad is the Last Prophet for the whole world, under whose banner all peoples will gather. So said the Holy Prophet:

> "I am the gatherer; under my unique leadership the people would be gathered together."[4]

The early stages of mankind resembled the life of a child. According to the needs of the time, God raised prophets among different nations and societies of the world so that He might educate and guide them in relation to their particular needs. When that condition which resembled the adulthood of man had improved, a perfect guidance of righteousness was granted to mankind through the agency of the Holy Prophet. This needed no further modification and would extend to the end of time. Previously, the world was enveloped by a dark night and God, in His grace, lighted lamps of prophethood here and there and in the fullness of time appeared the Universal luminous sun in the person of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, as "an inviter to Allah by His permission, and as a light-giving sun."[5]

No other lamp, either new or old, was needed in the presence of this ever-luminous light in the world. The unity of mankind, which is one of the two great objectives of Islam[6], cannot be established unless all the people in the world rally under one banner; there may be thousands of followers but the Master should be one. However, if in God's communication the words *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* (the last of of the Prophets) have been used, He has, in His grace, manifested its truth abundantly

in history. Even after the lapse of thirteen hundred years the world has not been able to produce great persons who could bring about a moral and spiritual revolution in the world as the Holy Prophet did. This fact has been admitted even by the opponents of Islam. Thus God's word, based on a complete and perfect wisdom and duly vindicated by history, is shining like the sun in its noon-day glory.

I humbly request both Muslim groups, some believing in the reappearance of an old prophet, and the others believing in the advent of a new one, that they should reflect conscientiously on the proposition that the true greatness of Islam is bound up with the fact that only one Prophet should be the guide of the world. We have no need for any book after the Holy Qur'an, nor any prophet after Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). Our God is one, the Messenger is one and the Book is one.

رضينا باللّٰه ربا وبالاسلام دينا وبمحمد نبياً

"We are content with Allah as the Lord and with Islam as the religion, and with Muhammad as the Prophet."

لا اله الا اللّٰه محمد رسول اللّٰه

"There is but one supreme God and Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah."

Ahmadiyya Buildings,
Lahore
16th December. 1922.

Muhammad 'Ali

CHAPTER 1

THE QUESTION OF PROPHETHOOD AND MIRZĀ MAHMŪD AHMAD

For a long time I wished that Mirzā Bashir-ud-Din Mahmūd Ahmad[7] should himself take up his pen on the basic question of prophethood. I kept on writing to him to do so, but he never paid me heed. In this connection, after writing the first volume of *Haqiqat al-Nubūwwat* (March 1915 C.E.) he promised to write its second volume but he never fulfilled this promise. He has broken his silence now by submitting a statement in a court at Gurdaspur. I am extremely happy at this gesture, because the whole dispute, in principle, can now easily be settled. If, according to the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith, the Holy Prophet Muhammad is the Last Prophet and no prophet can appear after him except that someone should use this term by way of metaphor or simile, or, if there is no definite proof of the closure of the door of prophethood after the Holy Prophet being the Last Prophet, then undoubtedly a person can become a prophet.

The point of dispute

The issue which needs to be solved, is brief and simple. Both of us, that is to say, Mian Sahib and I believe that the words *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* have been used in the Holy Qur'an about the Holy Prophet. The whole discussion, now, is only about the true nature of their meanings. According to Mian Sahib, the meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* is a person by following whom, prophets will be made in future. According to

me, it means the Last of the Prophets. Mian Sahib has asserted that the meanings he has offered, have been mentioned in the Arabic lexicons exactly in the same manner as stated by him; that is, he has not given any interpretation of his own at all and that these words do not mean Last of the Prophets in the lexicons. Thus, the words of his statement (in the Court) published in his paper *Al-Fazl* are as follows:

> "The meaning of this term has always been rendered thus. We do not give any interpretation to it; on the other hand, these are the meanings given to it in the lexicons. Some people also render *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as the Last of the Prophets but in the dictionary, "last prophet" is not the meaning of this term" (*Al-Fazl*, June 26/29, 1922).

The meaning according to Arab usage

For the sake of argument I accept that, according to Mian Sahib's new interpretation, the lexicons reflect Arab usage. He has, however, agreed to show, without any additional interpretation of his own, that his meanings are clearly supported by Arab usage. As against this, I also claim that I would positively show the clear meaning of these words in the Arabic idiom. That the meaning of the term *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* is the Last of the Prophets will be discussed by me in three sections.

Firstly, that this meaning is mentioned in the Arabic lexicons or in Arab usage. Secondly, Arabs have an expression of *Khātam al-Qaum* (similar to *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn*) which is only used in the sense of *ākhir al-qaum*, the last of the people. The expression *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* should also be understood in the same light. Thirdly, the word *khātam* was used among Arabs in the sense of being "last".

Mian Sahib has also admitted that:

> "A lot of knowledge of the Arabic usage has been received by us from the books of lexicons."

The sources of Arabic usage

Apart from this, whatever little knowledge is obtained, which he has put forth as evidence in his support, is derived from the commentaries of *Kashshāf* and Abū Hayyān, or the commentary entitled *Fath al-Bayān* in which a saying of Abu 'Ubaidah is mentioned, and his sayings are generally recorded by the author of *Lisān al-Arab*. Thus, according to Mian Sahib, this little bit of knowledge is also obtained by either the authors of lexicons or from the commentators. Besides that, Mian Sahib has not put forward any other authority, such as from the poetry of the pre-Islamic days. Therefore, in our present controversy, we have to finally depend on books of lexicons and commentaries of the Holy Qur'an and I will quote them *verbatim* without adding my own explanation. Let me reiterate my position. I will not say that the lexicons give a certain meaning which actually means so and so. I will only quote the acutal words of the lexicons. And Mian Sahib has already made a tall claim that the meanings given by him have always been found in the Arabic dictionaries, without any explanation of his attached to them. I hope he would not say that the lexicons give a certain meaning, which actually mean so and so.

The meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* in lexicons

First I would deal with the lexicons and later with commentaries. The meaning of the words *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* in lexicons is given as follows:

1. *Taj al-Arūs*[9] : *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* means the last of them (prophets).

2. *Lisān al-'Arab*:[10] *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* means last of them (prophets) and *Khātam* has also been recited in place of *Khātim*.

3. *Al-Mufradāt fi-Gharib al-Qur'ān*:[11] *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* for the reason that he brought prophethood to an end *i.e.*, completed it by his appearance.

4. *Majma' Bihār al-Anwār*:[12] *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* with *fatha* (i.e. *Khātam*) is a noun and means the last of the Prophets.

But *Mian Sahib* would not care about these testimonies. He writes:

> "And the question is from where have these meanings been derived by the authors who have explained these words thus? The reply to this question is that, at first, they rendered *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as the last of the Prophets according to their belief, and then they put their belief in writings in their books."

But Mian Sahib did not unravel the knot by his strange logic, that when in the Arabic idiom the word *khātam* did not mean last at all, how this belief could come to be generally accepted; that is, who invented the creed that *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* meant the Last of the Prophets, or was this creed introduced by the companions of the Holy Prophet after his death? Were they ignorant of the Arabic idiom? As has been asserted by Mian Sahib, there was only one meaning of this term; that is, he, by following whom prophets will be made in future. Then, who introduced the belief of the Holy Prophet being the last of the prophets? I hope Mian Sahib's sharp wit would certainly solve this problem, that the meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as the Last of the Prophets was so common before the lexicologists compiled their lexicons that they also accepted this meaning without giving much thought to it. Mian Sahib's exaggerated imagination does not stop here. He goes on to state: "This, too, is not inconceiveable, that after hearing that this verse meant the Last Prophet, some people started using these words in that sense."

If we let our imagination run loose like that, we may also say that the Holy Prophet did not exist in the world at all but some people introduced this belief first and gave it publicity through the Holy Qur'an and later the historians also recorded

in their books all those events relating to the life of the Holy Prophet! I do not really know where Mian Sahib's fantasies will ultimately lead him. But as conclusive proof against him, I quote, in addition, a reference from a lexicon compiled by a Christian, apart from four most authentic lexicons aforementioned, to prove that Christian lexicologists have also rendered *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as the Last of the Prophets.

If Muslims, according to their particular creed had accepted a wrong meaning, on what basis did a Christian accept this meaning?

5. Lane's *Arabic-English Lexicon*[13] which comprises eight volumes says: "Both *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* and *Khātim al-Nabiyyīn* in the Holy Qur'an mean the Last of the Prophets (33:40)."

What Mian Sahib says is that if the lexicologists have given the meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as the last of the Prophets, then they have only expressed their own views about it, as this term did not exist before at all. Thus how could there exist a meaning of this term? He writes:

> "Now you ponder over the words *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn*, whether they are a technical expression (*istilah*) or an idiom (*muhawarah*). If you accept them as an idiom, it has to be admitted that, before the Holy Prophet, all unbelievers used the words *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* and it was their idiom that when the word *khatam* was joined with the word *nabi*, they, (the unbelievers),. would necessarily render it as the Last Prophet and this is obviously wrong. And if this idiom even became accepted by Muslims after the revelation of the Holy Qur'an it could not have any effect on the meaning of the Holy Qur'an because care should be taken in explaining the meaning of someone's speech that it should be rendered according to the idiom prior to that particular period."

The expression *khātam al-qaum*

It seems Mian Sahib's opinion on every subject is an authority! His opinion should also be considered an authority on the principles of lexicology. But he never paid any attention whatsoever to the fact that I had already quoted an Arabic idiom on the basis of which the meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* has been rendered as the Last of the Prophets. I draw his attention again to the point.

The evidence of these two authentic lexicons shows that the idiom *khātam al-qaum* already existed among the Arabs and they rendered it as the last (person) of the people which was also the meaning of *khātim al-qaum*. Most probably Mian Sahib would not dare to say that lexicologists invented this idiom on their own in support of their previously held belief.

If some thought is given, what else could *khātam al-qaum* denote except the last of the people? By any stretch of the imagination it could not mean that the people had made a seal and had kept it somewhere. If *khātim al-qaum* means the last of the people and not the seal of the people, then this expression is clear evidence about the meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as the Last of the Prophets. Now there is only one point left. Does the word *khātam* on its own, mean the last in the lexicons or not? Mian Sahib writes:

> "If you look at the meaning of *khātam* in an unbiased manner and that of *nabiyyīn* separately in the lexicons then you will realise that there is no lexicon at all which does not mention seal as the meaning of *khātam*."

***Khātam* means last**

Mian Sahib perhaps does not remember now that his claim was not that *khātam* also means a seal. What he claimed was that *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* did not mean the Last of the Prophets. So when he was advised to look at the meaning of *khātam* and *nabiyyīn* separately he should have said: "there is

no dictionary at all which gives 'last' as the meaning of *khātam*." Further, his claim was that *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* did not mean the Last of the Prophets, and therefore, according to him, no book of lexicon could render *khātam* as LAST. ON THE CONTRARY, I ASSERT THAT there is no great lexicon which has not stated the meaning of *khātam* as the last. Firstly, I mention the names of dictionaries compiled by Muslims, although Mian Sahib gives preference to the ones written by Christians.

1. *Taj al-Arūs: wal khātamu min kulli shayin 'āqibatuhū wa ākhiratuhū ka-khātima-tihi wal khātamu ākhiril qawm*; and *khātam* is the end of every thing and its last portion as its end, and *khātam* is the last person of the people as *khatim*.'

   In the same book *khātam, khātim, khātām, khaitām, khītām, khatm, khātiyam* have been considered synonymous.

2. *Lisān al-Arab*: Two statements have been mentioned above. Besides those, the meaning of *khitām* has been given as the last and thereafter it has been mentioned: *al-khātimu wal-khitāmu mutaqāribāni fil ma'-nā il-laa innal khātamul ismi wal-khitāmi al-masdiru*, that is, the meanings of *khātam, khātim* and *khitām* are similar and there is no difference except that *khātam* is a noun and *khitām* is an infinitive noun.

3. *Qāmus of al-Firozabādi:* After listing that *khātam, khātim, khātām* etc. are similar in meaning, it has been explained at the end, *wa min kulli shayin 'aqibatihi wa akhratihi ka-khātimatihi wa akhirul qawmi kal-khātim*, that is, the end or the last portion of everything is its *khātimah* (end) and also the last of the people as *khātim*.

4. *Mukhtār al-Sihāh: wal khātamu bil-fat-hit tā-i wa kasrihā wal-khitām wal-khātāmu kulluhu* that is, *al-khātam* with *fatha* and *kasrah* on *tā* and *khaitām* and *khātam* all mean the same.

5. *Muntahā al-Arab:* While explaining *khātim*, it is said: *Khatamu bil fat-hi mithlihi,* that is, *khātim* means the end of everything and its termination; and the last of the people and *khātam (ta* with *fatha)* also means the same.

6. *Sihāh al-Jauhari: al-khatamu wal-khātimu bi-kasrit tā wal-khaitām wal khātām kullihi, that is, khātam, khātim, khitām and khāitām* all mean the same thing.

Muslim lexicologists may have been influenced by their creed but what about the Christian lexicologists. They also express the same view, as follows:

7. *Aqrab al-Muwārid: al-khātimu, wal-khātamu, wal khatam akhirul qawm wa ma yūda-u' 'a-lat tīnatihi wa-aqibatihi kulli shayin*, that is, *al-khātim* and *al-khātam* mean a finger-ring, the last person of the people, and also the seal and the end of everything.

8. *Arabic-English dictionary* by Salmon: *khātam* and *khātim* mean the same.

9. *Arabic-English Lexicon* by Edward Lane: *khātam:* the end or last part of a thing.

Evidence by Mian Sahib

Inspite of all this weighty evidence from the lexicons, Mian Sahib submits a statement in the Court that the meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyin* is not the Last of the Prophets and later instead of apologising for his mistake, he writes an article (in *Al-Fazl)* that in Arab usage *khātam* does not mean "last". And what proof does he have in his favour? Three statements

appearing in some commentaries, the commentaries which were considered untrustworthy by him to the extent that by accepting their authority even the lexicologists themselves had become unreliable. Is this the path of righteousness? On the one hand, the evidence of the lexicologists is rejected because they quote references from the commentaries, and on the other the evidence of those very commentaries is put forth against the lexicologists in support of his views!

As a matter of fact, the evidence from the commentaries does not even support Mian Sahib. The author of *Kashshāf* has, no doubt, stated that *khātam* means a seal, but he has not denied the other meaning. However, if he has not mentioned it, how could this be construed as his denial of the other meanings? The most that can be said is that it is one person's knowledge of it and that he did not know the other meaning of that particular word. And if this is to be the standard of research that if a particular meaning of a word is not given in a dictionary the meanings found in other dictionaries of the same word are not acceptable, then the Arabic lexicologists should feel proud of the profound scholarship of Mian Sahib! His reasoning is different from the rest of the world! According to him, if *khātam* was used in the sense of last in the Arabic language, Zamakhshari and Abū Ubaidah must have known about it; and because Zamakhshari did not know of it, therefore this word did not mean last. How did Zamakhshari attain to this status, when Mian Sahib has not given a single reference from *Asas*, the dictionary compiled by Zamakhshari? Why have *Tāj al-Arūs* and *Lisān al-Arab* been rejected? Only because *khātam* there means "last"!

Commentaries on *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn*

See also *Madārak al-Tanzīl* where after stating the meaning of *khatam* as a seal it has been mentioned clearly — *ākhiru-hum la yanbā'u aha-dum ba'duhū*, that is, the last prophet after whom there would be no prophet. Thus, in *Kashshāf* by Zamakhshari, although *khātam* means a seal,

nevertheless, *Khātam al-Nabiyyın* according to him decidedly means the Last of the Prophets as has been mentioned at the same place; *fa-in qulta kaifa kāna ākhirul anbiyā-i*; that is, if he had said so, then how is he the last of the prophets?

The saying of Muhammad ibn Hayyān on the subject has been given even less consideration by Mian Sahib. Like the author of the commentary *Kashshaf*, he also accepts the reading of *khātam* (with *fatha* on *tā)* and states distinctly: *inna-hum bihi khutimū nabiyyin fa-huwa kal khātimi wat-tābi-i 'la-hum*, that is, prophets have come to an end with him (the Holy Prophet), thus he is like a seal and signet for them. Because when a seal is set on something it means that nothing can enter therein. Whatever meaning is given to the *hadith* about the Holy Prophet being the last brick of the palace of prophethood is applicable to the word seal.

Then he writes: *wa man zahaba ilā anna al-nubūwwata mukhtasabatun lā yanqatiu' . . . fa huwa zindīqun yajibu qatlahū* that is, and he who holds the belief that prophethood could be acquired and has not been terminated ...is a heretic and deserves death.

Thus Muhammad ibn Hayyān also renders *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as the Last of the Prophets and nothing else. It is, however, Mian Sahib's fanciful thinking that, after accepting the meaning of *khatam* as a seal, the meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* becomes somewhat different. It is true that Abū Ubaidah, from among the three persons, is singular in his approach on the point because he does not accept the reading of *khātam* (*tā* with *kasrah*), but he does not say that the reading of *khātam* makes any difference in the meaning of the word. Even his views do not help Mian Sahib in any way, and at the same place in *Fath al-Bayān* a saying of Hassan is recorded:

> "*Khātam* is that by which something is terminated. Thus, the meaning is, that God has terminated prophethood with him and so there is no prophet after him."

Again, Ibn Jarīr, one of the great lexicologists, writes:

"The meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* (*tā* with *fatha*) is that he (the Holy Prophet) is the last of the prophets."

Similarly it is reported in the Commentary of al-Baidāwi:

"*Akhiru-hum al-lazi khutima-bihim au khatamū-bihi 'alā qira-ti Āsimun bil-fathi,* that is, the last of them who brought them (prophets) to an end or in the reading of *Āsim* with *fatha* means with whom prophets were brought to an end."

Thus, whether we accept *khātam* as meaning the last or a seal, in both cases the lexicologists agree that it means the last of the prophets and in his court statement Mian Sahib deals with the term *Khātam al-Nabiyyin* and not with the word *khatam.*

Meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* by Mian Sahib

As compared with this vast number of testimonies from lexicons and commentaries, it is a great audacity for a person to say that *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* does not mean the Last of the Prophets in the Arabic language and that all people, at first, accepted something as a matter of their belief and later introduced the same meaning to these words. If this is the case, then it should also be explained when these meanings were invented and when and how this creed spread in the East and the West, and on what basis the first person who explained *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as the Last of the Prophets render these words in this manner? For, since Mian Sahib says that this was not the Arabic idiom, then, someone, as intelligent as he is, must have been born and he invented "last" as the meaning of *khātam* and the other popular view, known throughout the world, that it meant one who makes prophets in the future, went into complete oblivion so that no sign and trace of it is found in the Arabic usage and the lexicons at all. Mian Sahib has made the religion a child's play, a precedent which is difficult to find. It bewilders me at times, how it could come to one's mind that *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* never meant the Last of the

Prophets, and that such a meaning could never be adopted in accordance with Arabic usage. Perhaps Mian Sahib's predecessor had such a powerful influence over the people in by-gone ages that the true meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn*, very clear according to the Arabic idiom, without the need of any interpretation, that is, the maker of other prophets — was blotted out from the hearts of people in such a way that if it was not brought to life again by Mian Sahib, nobody would have ever known about it!

Listen, O servants of God! If you really fear God, and I know you do, then why do you not ponder for a moment, after divorcing yourself from this *peer-parasti* [15], as to which Arabic dictionaries have given these alleged meanings of Mian Sahib's without any interpretation on his part? Or have they been mentioned in *Kashshāf* by Zamakhshari, who is now considered to be a great lexicologist by Mian Sahib, or has Abū 'Ubaidah given these meanings, or are they found anywhere in the commentary of Abū Hayyān? These were the testimonies which Mian Sahib produced from the lexicons. But none of them has supported his views. If any of them has, let a reference be quoted from his works.

The significance of the 'Seal of the Prophets'

No doubt the expression has been rendered as the "Seal of the Prophets", but the Muslim theologians and the great scholars of lexicology have taken the Seal of the Prophets to mean only the Last of the Prophets. Which dictionary gives the meaning of the "Seal of the Prophets" as that by following whom future prophets will be made? Mian Sahib, in his statement, said that he would not give any other explanation to these words but, as a matter of fact, he has out-witted all the interpreters of the world. If this is not an interpretation, but a clear statement, how strange it is that such a clear statement remained hidden from the eyes of Muslim lexicologists during the last thirteen centuries. And if someone had noticed it, his name should be pin-pointed, from among the lexicologists, who

had understood these words in this sense — and if this cannot be done, what is the use of telling such a blatant falsehood that the meanings rendered by him are found in lexicons without any additional interpretation? If these alleged meanings of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* cannot be shown (from any lexicon), let him then show the same from Arabic usage, that the meaning of *khātam al-qaum* is: a nation by following whom another nation is made. Remember, Mian Sahib's assertion is that these meanings are found in the lexicons. If he can show them even from one lexicon or somewhere in the Arabic idiom, I will withdraw all the references produced from nine lexicons and so many other commentaries in support of the view that *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* means the Last of the Prophets.

CHAPTER II

THE MEANING OF *KHĀTAM AL-NABIYYĪN* IN THE HADITH

After the Arabic lexicons, I put forth the evidence of the Hadith on the subject and expect that Mian Sahib will also produce the testimony of the *Hadith* to support his views. As a matter of fact, the *Hadith* has preference over the lexicons, because the true explanation of terms used by the Holy Qur'an can only be given by the Holy Prophet. However, I have taken the testimony of the lexicons first because that is the basis of Mian Sahib's statement in the Court. In that statement it has been denied that the expression *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* means the Last of the Prophets. I had requested Mian Sahib to quote a reference from the *Hadith*, (apart from what he had said from the lexicon) and as he had also quoted one *hadith*. I will therefore throw light on the subject from the *Hadith*.

To make the issue clear once again, let me refresh the mind of the reader, that according to Mian Sahib, *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* means a person by following whom prophets will be made in future. According to me, these words mean the Last of the Prophets. If the Holy Prophet had himself explained the meanings of these words, then every Muslim should immediately accept them. First of all, to support my version I shall list those traditions on which there has been *ijma'* (consensus of opinion) among the *Ummah*.

Those who have rejected this consensus of opinion are either those liars who, sometime in the history of Islam, made a

claim to prophethood, or at present, it is Mian Sahib (who is advocating such views). I also want to point out right in the beginning that I am not going to quote all the traditions because these have been compiled and published by *Hazrat Maulana* Syed Muhammad Ahsan[16] in reply to which Mian Sahib has so far kept quiet. In this booklet Maulana Muhammad Ahsan has quoted forty traditions the number of which may go up to eighty-nine if we take into consideration the various ways of reporting them. I need not repeat all these reports. Anyone interested may read that booklet *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn*.[17]

Ibn Kathīr, who has written his commentary only on the basis of the Holy Prophet's traditions, writes:

> "This verse of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* is clear proof that no prophet will come after him, ... and there have been continuous reports on the subject, recorded by a body (*jamā'at*) of the companions of the Holy Prophet."

Let me reproduce below a few of these traditions:

(i) "It is reported from Abu Hurairah (may Allah be pleased with him), that the Messenger of Allah (may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), said: My likeness and the likeness of the prophets before me is the likeness of a person who built a house, made it beautiful and made it complete, except the place of a stone in the corner. So people began to go round it and to wonder at him and say: Why have you not placed this stone? He (*i.e.* the Holy Prophet) said: I am that stone and I am *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* (the Seal of the Prophets)."[18]

This *hadith* has been mentioned in *Sahih* of *al-Bukhari*, *al-Muslim, Imam Ahmad, Nasā'i* and others with a slight difference in words but the sum and substance is the same. In some, the Holy Prophet is reported to have said that in the edifice of prophethood there was only one place left for a brick and he was that brick; and in some reports the words, '*I am*

Khātam al-Nabiyyīn', and in some others that 'prophets have been brought to an end with him', have been added.

(ii) "The Day of Judgement will not be set up unless some tribes of my *Ummah* have joined the polytheists and unless they have started worshipping idols. And surely there shall be among my followers thirty liars, every one of them asserting that he is a prophet, but I am *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* (the Seal of the Prophets), There is no prophet after me."[19]

This hadith is also a unanimously accepted one.

(iii) "Surely messengership and prophethood have been cut off. There will neither be a messenger after me nor a prophet. His saying of this became hard on people, so he said: *Mubashshirāt* (good news) will be left."[20]

(iv) "Prophets used to administer among the Israelites. When a prophet died another prophet became his successor. But there will be no prophet after me. Soon there will be *khalīfahs* and they will be many."[21]

(v) "There is nothing left of prophethood except *mubashshirāt* (good news)."[22]

(vi) "I am Muhammad and I am Ahmad and I am *al-Māhī* (the one who obliterates) by which God, the Most High, will help me efface unbelief; and I am *al-Hāshir* (the gatherer) — at whose feet people will be gathered, and I am *al-Āqib* (the one who comes last) after whom there is no prophet."[23]

(vii) "I have been given superiority over prophets in six things .... Prophets have come to an end with me."[24]

(viii) "It is reported from Sa'd, son of Abī Waqqās, that the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings of Allah 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."[25]

(ix) "Had there been a prophet after me it would have been 'Umar."[26]

Summary of the Reports

For the sake of brevity I will not quote the other reports. In these nine reports, which are found in the most authentic books of Hadith, the Holy Prophet has been described as the last prophet from different angles. In the first hadith, prophethood has been compared with a mansion whose last brick or the corner-stone is the Holy Prophet, and the addition of the words *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* shows what the true meaning of these words is, that is, the Holy Prophet is the last brick of the edifice of prophethood. In the second hadith, the person who lays claim to prophethood after the Holy Prophet has been declared a liar. In this report also, the significance of the words *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* has been explained by *la nabiyya ba'di* (there is no prophet after me). In the third report, it is mentioned that messengership and prophethood have been cut off. In the fourth, it has been indicated that among the Israelites a prophet was raised after another prophet but in the *Ummah* of the Holy Prophet no prophets shall appear but only *khalifahs*. The fifth report mentions that only a part of prophethood is now left and that is the receiving of good news (*mubashshirāt*). From among the names of the Holy Prophet, *al-Āqib* has been mentioned as one of those names in the sixth hadith, and the Holy Prophet himself explains that *al-'Āqib* — the one who comes last — is the one after whom there is no prophet. In the seventh hadith, the termination of prophethood has been stated as one of the reasons for his superiority over other prophets. In the eighth, the Holy Prophet's relationship with 'Ali has been described as Aaron's to Moses — although Aaron was a prophet and 'Ali in his status, was like Aaron, yet 'Ali could not become a prophet because there was no prophet after the Holy Prophet. In the ninth report, it has been mentioned that if

there was a possibility of someone becoming a prophet after the Holy Prophet, it would have been 'Umar, because he did possess the excellences of prophethood but still he could not become a prophet.

The subject of the finality of prophethood has been discussed in the Traditions in an excellent way. Anyone who calls himself a follower of the Holy Prophet cannot deny the fact that all these reports explain the words *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as the Last of the Prophets in a clear and explicit manner.

One Report against the Testimony of Forty

Now let us see how Mian Sahib, who advocates a new creed in the world concerning the continuity of prophethood after its termination, demolishes the clear-cut conception of the finality of prophethood. To lend support to his views, he has only cited one hadith and has given it the heading: *The voice of the Holy Prophet against this consensus of opinion.*

Is it not strange that from among these forty authentic traditions Mian Sahib's ears did not hear the voice of the Holy Prophet? But he did hear one voice. This is not the Holy Prophet's voice but his own. Mian Sahib is one of those persons who see a mote in another's eye but cannot see the beam in their own, who strain at a gnat but swallow a camel. If Mian Sahib did care about the Holy Prophet's voice, why did he treat with contempt these reports in which it was frequently and clearly stated that no prophet could appear at all after the Holy Prophet? His example is exactly that of a person who said that from among the commands of the Holy Qur'an he remembered one command: *kulū washrabū* (eat and drink)[27] and from among the prohibitions: *lā taqrabus salāh* (go not near prayer).[28]

If the testimony of the forty traditions could be done away with just by one *hadith*, and this *hadith* has been rejected and criticised in its subject matter as well as in its way of

transmission, then perhaps Mian Sahib would consider the whole of the Holy Qur'an unprotected because in support of his view he may find one *hadith* in *Sahih* of *al-Muslim*, that a particular *sūrah* consisting of two hundred verses was read by the companions but later on they remembered only one verse.[29] And again, he will have to give up the belief in the death of Jesus Christ because he may find a report or so contrary to this view in a book of hadith. I fail to understand how Mian Sahib can save himself by catching at straws like that. Out of *Haqīqat al-Wahy*, which comprises about six hundred pages, Mian Sahib does not seem to know anything else apart from pages 148 and 391. And had he scant knowledge of this book, he might have seen the following principle also laid down in it:

> "The sign of allegorical (verses) is that, by accepting their (literal) meanings which are contrary to established principle, catastrophe is caused and they also go against other verses which are great in numbers. Contradiction is not possible in God's Communication. Therefore, whatever is few must be subjected to the large in quantity."[30]

The quoting of a hadith, however unauthentic it may be, may please Mian Sahib's disciples, but what sort of answer will he give to God, the Most High, for having made a plaything of religious doctrines. Forty authentic, clear and explicit reports have been put before him and he does not hear "the voice of the Holy Prophet" in any of them but when he found an unauthentic report which served his own purpose and to which he gave his own distorted interpretation, strangely enough it became the voice of the Holy Prophet against the consensus of opinion. If someone else were guilty of such crime what kind of verdict would Mian Sahib pass against him? I hope he would weigh himself on the same pair of scales!

"Had Ibrahim lived he would have become a true prophet"

Now I will take up the evidence of Mian Sahib with regard to the hadith quoted in *Ibn Mājah*. After the funeral service of his son Ibrahim, the Holy Prophet is reported to have said: "If Ibrahim had lived he would have become a true prophet."[31]

The first question, if I may repeat, which arises here is, has it solved the meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn*, the point under discussion? Has this hadith established that the expression *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* means that prophets will in future be made by following the Holy Prophet? If not, and certainly not, then what is the use of quoting this hadith? Mian Sahib should have brought forward that voice of the Holy Prophet against the consensus of opinion, that would have indicated the correctness of his interpretation. Secondly, this report is not authentic. It has only been quoted in *Ibn Mājah* and not in any other book of Hadith. From among its reporters is Abū Shibāh· Ibrahim who is considered unreliable in the matter of reporting *hadith*. It is the height of insolence to quote such a weak report against the most authentic sayings of the Holy Prophet. Thirdly, the actual meaning of this *hadith* should be considered. Mian Sahib himself admits that the whole sentence is conditional (because of the presence of "if" — *lau* in the *hadith*), but he would like us first to agree to a rule which is only the result of his own imagination: "Something which is not possible in its nature cannot even be mentioned conditionally."

The greatest difficulty in replying to Mian Sahib's writings is that without paying heed to anything he keeps on making one rule after another. His disciples would not have the courage to ask him where that rule is to be found. Mian Sahib and his disiciples must have used the expression "for the sake of hypothetical argument" or "on the supposition" several times in their writings. But when Mian Sahib made the statement that 'when something which is not possible in its nature cannot even

be mentioned conditionally,' the disciples became dumb-founded as well, and do not have the courage to question his authority. The Holy Qur'an says about the Holy Prophet:

> "Say, surely I fear, if I disobey my Lord, the chastisement of a grievous day."[32]

Was it possible, according to Mian Sahib, for the Holy Prophet to disobey his Lord?

> Again: "If thou associate (with Allah), thy work would certainly come to naught."[33]

Was it possible for the Holy Prophet to indulge in polytheism (*shirk*)?

> "Say then: Had the Compassionate a son, I would have been the first of his worshippers."[34]

Is it possible for God to have a son?

> "And: If there were in them (earth and heaven) gods besides Allah, they would both have been in disorder."[35]

Is it possible that there should be two gods? The words of the hadith are similar in construction to the words of this verse of the Holy Qur'an. As has been mentioned in the verse that it is not possible to have disorder in the universe, similarly the existence of two gods is not possible. As it was not possible that another prophet would appear after the Holy Prophet, similarly Ibrahim's not remaining alive was not possible. I wish Mian Sahib had even given some consideration to the point that the Holy Prophet uttered these words after the death of his son Ibrahim. Had he said such words when Ibrahim was alive then it could be said that the word *lau* (if) was conditional in the sense of *in* (if). But as the hadith clearly indicates that he uttered those words after Ibrahim's death, when it was established that Ibrahim's remaining alive was itself an impossibility, then, as a matter of course, his becoming a

prophet was likewise an impossibility. To derive a meaning of his own choice from this hadith, Mian Sahib has described the word *lau* merely as conditional although it is also used for negation (*imtina'*). Shall we then accept the meaning of this hadith in such a manner that it stands in conformity with the other hadith on the subject, or shall we give it such a meaning that will cause us to throw reports of the highest standard in the waste-paper basket? Fourthly, *Ibn Mājah*, just before this hadith, has listed a saying by 'Abdullāh ibn Abū Aufā:

> "He said: He (*i.e.* Ibrahim) died while he was a child and if it was destined that a prophet should come after the Prophet Muhammad then he would have remained alive, but there will be no prophet after him."[36]

This shows that the words in the report by Abū Shi'bah have not been properly preserved. Moreover, this second version has also been recorded in *Al-Bukhārī*, which shows that this is the authentic version.

Wilful concealment of truth

Mian Sahib knows it very well that the reports relating to stories (*qasas*) have not been preserved so carefully as the reports connected with doctrines of faith and action. Thus to depend on a hadith of a rejected (*matrūk*) reporter and lay undue emphasis on that, and to give a meaning to it contrary to the meanings of other reports, cannot be called an exercise of judgement (*ijtihād*) but only serving one's own self-interest. A person can genuinely fall into an error and his argument can also be mistaken, but here the testimony of forty reports of high standard has been set aside on the basis of a rejected reporter (Abū Shi'bah). This is against the honest exercise of judgement. Imam Nawawī has called this hadith presumptuous and a calumny against the Holy Prophet, and Ibn Abdul Bar (a famous Imam of Hadith) has rejected it[37], and apart from this, as has been discussed before, one of its reporters is not reliable. In short, this is an unreliable hadith, and there are other reports

which indicate that if it were destined that a prophet should come after the Prophet Muhammad, then his son would have remained alive, which clearly shows that no prophet can appear after the Holy Prophet. Besides that, the hadith in its present form goes against several authentic and continuous traditions. Mian Sahib has wilfully concealed the truth by singling out this report and giving his own meaning to it, ignoring the other authentic and continuous reports.

I have said above that the hadith under discussion is not authentic. Even if it is accepted as true, the meaning is clear: that is, it was neither decreed that there should be a prophet after the Holy Prophet, nor that Ibrahim should remain alive. In support of this meaning I have cited above a report both from *al-Bukhārī* and *Ibn Mājah*,[38] and have also quoted a verse of the Holy Qur'an: "If there were in them gods besides Allah, they (earth and heavens) would both have been in disorder,"[39] and have pointed out that *lau* (if) has been used for negation. Moreover, no meaning can be ascribed to this single hadith which goes contrary to the forty authentic traditions. The meanings advanced by Mian Sahib also go against another hadith where the Holy Prophet is reported to have said:

> "If there had been a prophet after me it would have been 'Umar."[40]

How could both the statements by the Holy Prophet be correct? On the one hand he is reported to have said, "Had there been a prophet after me it would have been 'Umar"; and on the other, "Had Ibrahim lived he would have become a true prophet." If Ibrahim could become a prophet, had he remained alive, why could Umar not become a prophet, because he did remain alive? If it is said that prophethood runs in the family, like inheritance, then why did the Holy Prophet use such words about 'Umar? Thus if there was any possibility of Ibrahim's remaining alive and becoming a prophet, then 'Umar would certainly have become a prophet because he remained alive.

After accepting this hadith about 'Umar as true, Mian Sahib once gave the following reply, which perhaps he does not remember now: "If immediately after the death of the Holy Prophet a prophet was needed to take care of his followers, as it was needed after Moses, then Hazrat 'Umar would have been promoted to the station of prophethood. However, as the Holy Prophet was going to depart from his people, after giving them such a perfect training that would surpass the nation of Moses in virtue and righteousness, therefore, there was no immediate need for the appointment of a prophet."

When would Ibrahim have become a prophet?

The question is, had Ibrahim remained alive, would he have become a prophet immediately, (i.e., after the death of the Holy Prophet), which was not called for according to Mian Sahib, or after the appearance of the Promised Messiah because (according to Mian Sahib) no prophet was needed for thirteen hundred years? Perhaps it would be said in reply that Ibrahim died because immediately after the Holy Prophet, no prophet was needed. But would the sky fall if we believe, that, as there was no need of a prophet at all after the Holy Prophet, therefore Ibrahim died? If this hadith indicated the possibility of the continuity of prophethood then, that possibility was of the coming of a prophet immediately — and this did not happen. Now, it is up to Mian Sahib to decide that when no prophet was immediately needed at all after the Prophet Muhammad, why did the Holy Prophet utter those words?

This is, thus, the testimony of the Hadith. On the basis of one weak report Mian Sahib wants to reject all the Holy Prophet's Traditions, the authenticity of which he cannot himself deny.

In short, against the doctrine of the Holy Prophet's being the Last Prophet or the meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* being the Last of the Prophets, Mian Sahib has not an iota of evidence in his favour and he wants to destroy the rock on which stands

the belief of the whole *Ummah* that the Holy Prophet is the Last of the Prophets. And the strangest point is that even in this hadith the meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* is not the same as advocated by Mian Sahib. Just by quoting a weak hadith Mian Sahib cannot justify his stand. He can vindicate his position when he can list, if not forty, but only four reports and if not four, then, at least one report — if not a report then at least a saying of a companion of the Holy Prophet — that *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* meant a person by following whom prophets will be made in future. But let Mian Sahib remember that he may turn over and over the pages of books till the Day of Judgement, yet he will not be able to find the weakest report or even a fabricated one in support of his meaning. And unless he puts forth such a tradition, his far-fetched interpretation of the other authentic traditions, or his disregard of them completely, is in fact a sheer mockery of religious doctrines. Let him ask all his assistants to make a search for a hadith that will support the meaning given by him to *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn*, [41] before he opens his mouth about the other authentic traditions of the Holy Prophet, otherwise he should worry about his own faith, that in pursuit of his own theories he is intentionally throwing the words of the Holy Prophet behind his back in a most insolent manner.

CHAPTER III

VIEWS OF COMPANIONS OF THE HOLY PROPHET AND OTHER MUSLIM THEOLOGIANS

After this, Mian Sahib has put forward a few references which he claims are testimonies of the Ulema of the *Ummah*. They are: Mulla Ali Qari, Muhy-ud-Din ibn-i 'Arabi, Imam 'Abdul Wahāb Sha'rāni, Mujaddid Alf Thāni, Mirzā Mazhar Jānjanān and Maulawi Muhammad Qāsim Nānotawi. Apart from these, from among the Companions of the Holy Prophet, he has quoted in his support references from the sayings of Hazrat 'Ā'ishah, Hazrat 'Alī and Hazrat Munīrah ibn Sha'bah. And at the end of all this he has mentioned the name of the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement. According to Mian Sahib, all these elders did not believe that the Holy Prophet was the Last Prophet.

Alas, I am forced to reiterate that Mian Sahib did not even try to establish from the sayings and writings of these persons allegedly supporting his views, that *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* meant a person by following whom prophets will be made in future. Even for the sake of argument, if we admit that all these elders denied the Holy Prophet Muhammad's being the Last of the Prophets (and this is, of course, not true), even then, this does not support the meaning given by Mian Sahib to the expression *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn*. He could not bring out as much evidence as Christians do in support of their belief in the Trinity and Atonement. Mian Sahib may not be deceiving himself, but certainly he is deceiving his disciples, when he says that these elders also believed that God raised prophets

directly in the beginning and now prophets will be made by the Seal of the Prophet Muhammad. This is such a thought that has not occurred to any Muslim so far and as Mian Sahib has not produced from the Islamic literature of the last thirteen hundred years a single piece of evidence to support his view, this only confirms his dependence on hearsay.

Now I will discuss the views of the Muslim elders as quoted by Mian Sahib, one by one.

Mullā 'Alī Qārī

Let us first of all take the testimony of Mullā 'Alī Qārī from *Maudū'āt Kabīr*. Mian Sahib has quoted this part:

> "Had Ibrahim lived and become a prophet, similarly, had 'Umar become a prophet, they both would have been from among the followers of the Holy Prophet as Jesus and Khidr and Ilyās. Thus this is not against the Word of God regarding *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* because the meaning of this expression is that no prophet would appear after him (i.e., the Holy Prophet) who would abrogate his religion and would not be from among his *Ummah*."[42]

Now, the first question is whether Mullā 'Alī Qārī, by this statement, brings prophethood to an end, or advocates its continuity. The meaning he has given to the term *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* is that:

> "No prophet would appear after him who would abrogate his (the Holy Prophet's) religion."

In other words, according to the expression *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn,* prophethood has come to an end, though in a special sense. And according to Mian Sahib this was also the view of all the lexicologists — that they believed in the termination of prophethood in a special sense. He says:

> "Because the lexicologists also believed that no prophet would come (in a special sense), after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, therefore, according to this belief they rendered *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as the last of the prophets. But these meanings are not binding on us."

Now, whatever belief the lexicologists had was the same that was entertained by Mullā 'Alī Qārī; he also believed that *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* meant that in future, prophets would be made by following the Holy Prophet. (This, indeed is the main point of contention). Inspite of all that, the testimony of the lexicologists was 'not binding on Mian Sahib' but that of Mullā 'Alī Qārī was accepted by him. I wonder, what ultimate benefit would Mian Sahib derive by plunging his disciples in this labyrinth. After all, the historical verdict which will be passed, one day, on his writings will not be very flattering to him and his disciples.

Incomplete evidence

Besides that, Mullā 'Alī Qārī's complete evidence has also not been quoted by Mian Sahib. Mullā 'Alī Qārī has added the following to the reference given by Mian Sahib and quoted by me above:

> "And this is strengthened by the hadith: Had Moses been alive he would have also followed me."

Was it not the testimony of Mullā Alī Qārī? Why did Mian Sahib omit this part? Only because it went against his own belief! If the possibility of prophethood without a Law could be inferred from the hadith "Had Ibrāhim lived..." (although nothing like that is mentioned there), then, from the hadith "Had Moses been alive..." the possibility of (the continuity of) prophethood with a Law could also be deduced, because according to Mian Sahib:

> "Something which is not possible in its nature cannot even be mentioned conditionally."[43]

And if, for the sake of argument, Moses (a Law-bearing prophet) were alive he would also have been a follower of the Holy Prophet. This means that it is also possible that a Law-bearing prophet could also be a follower of the Holy Prophet, which makes the door of prophethood wide open — that Law-bearing prophets could also come!

Still a greater fallacy which Mian Sahib has tried to create by quoting a statement by Mullā 'Alī Qārī is, that he has quoted one statement and has omitted another. Mullā 'Alī Qārī has also said just before his statement quoted by Mian Sahib:

> "Had Ibrāhim lived and reached the age of forty and become a prophet then it necessarily followed that our Holy Prophet would not have been *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn.*"

This also shows that according to Mullā'Alī Qārī *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* meant the Last of the Prophets. However the point to reflect on is, that these two statements are found at one and the same place. One which throws light on the real issue is not mentioned by Mian Sahib at all and by omitting a part from the whole text he wants us to believe that Mullā 'Alī Qārī did not believe that the Holy Prophet was the last prophet. Whatever Mullā 'Alī Qārī may believe, it is neither binding on me nor on Mian Sahib, but whatever is written by him is a trust with us and when we want to divulge it to other people we should do so faithfully, the whole of it — not that which serves our own interest should be transmitted and whatever is against our views should be camouflaged. These sayings are more precious than money. It is not proper that after declaring oneself a Muslim and a spiritual leader of a group one should be guilty of breach of a sacred trust like that.

Muhy-ud-Din Ibn-i 'Arabi (1165 - 1240 CE)

The second person whose testimony Mian Sahib quoted is Muhy-ud-Din Ibn-i Arabi.[44] Here also Mian Sahib is not discharging his trust faithfully, which the public expects from a

man of his position. No doubt, Shaikh Akbar (*i.e.* Ibn-i 'Arabi) has said that the prophethood that has been cut off is the prophethood with Law and has explained *lā nabiyya ba'dī* as 'there is no prophet after me' in this sense. However, what Ibn-i 'Arabi actually means by prophethood with Law should have also been explained, but Mian Sahib has quoted his statement in such a way that Ibn-i 'Arabi's exact point of view cannot be fully comprehended. Let it be borne in mind that Ibn-i 'Arabi has discussed this issue in detail in his works. He says:

> "The first revelations which were granted to the Holy Prophet were true dreams, so that he never dreamt but the truth of it shone forth like the dawn of the morning. And this is what God has retained for Muslims and this is from among the parts of prophethood. Thus prophethood in its entirety has not been taken away. That is why I have said, that prophethood with Law has been taken away and this is also the meaning of, 'there is no prophet after me."

Prophethood with Law?

How clearly and explicitly, in this passage, has Ibn-i 'Arabi confirmed the generally accepted view among Muslims that what has been left for Muslims is true vision which is a part from among the parts of prophethood. He further says:

> "The name 'prophet' has been wiped out after the Holy Prophet (*i.e.*, no person can be called a prophet)."

And at another place he writes:

> "The name of 'prophethood' or 'prophet' does not apply to anyone except the Law-bearing prophet."

Thus in the terminology of Shari'ah he calls them (who receive true visions) saints (*auliyā'*) and does not consider it proper to use the word prophet for them, and who can deny that

saints of God are granted revelation. Ibn-i 'Arabi makes this point further clear:

> "All this (the granting of revelation) is found among those men of God who are from among the saints (*auliyā'*). And the thing specially bestowed on a prophet and which makes him distinct from a saint (*wali)* is Law-bearing revelation. Thus, no one can be a law-bearer except a prophet and a messenger."

Look in what a plain and lucid manner Ibn-i 'Arabi regards a prophet and law-bearer as one, while prophethood with law (*tashrī-ī Nubūwwah*) is mentioned in comparison with saintliness (*wilayah).* But Mian Sahib has only quoted one part of Ibn-i 'Arabi's statement which suited his own views and those parts which would have clarified the true beliefs of Ibn-i 'Arabi have been completely ignored.[46] When persons like Mian Sahib can stoop so low to lead people in error, what can I say of the condition of such Muslims except: "Surely we are of God and to Him we shall surely return."[47]

By his conduct Mian Sahib has put such a blemish on the name of his honoured father (that is, the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement), the effect of which will disappear only after a very long time. It cannot be said that the statements of Ibn-i 'Arabi, which are found in abundance in his works, remained hidden by chance from Mian Sahib's eyes. Anyone who has just glanced once over *Futūhāt-i Makiyyah* by Ibn-i 'Arabi will undoubtedly come to the conclusion that Mian Sahib has simply tried to misconstrue the beliefs of Ibn-i 'Arabi. On the other hand, if he has not read at all *Futūhāt-i Makkiyyah* and has quoted a saying of Ibn-i 'Arabi after hearing it from his disciples, he will be absolved of this charge. But I still have the right to question how he can rely on hearsay on such an important subject, that is, accepted by the general body of Muslims.

Let me quote another statement by Ibn-i 'Arabi:

فهم ورثة الانبياء لا شتراكهم فى الخبر و انفراد الانبياء بالتشريع قال الله تعالى يلقى الروح من امره على من يشاء من عباده فجاء بمن و هى نكرة لينذر يوم التلاق فجاء بما ليس بشرع و لا حكم بل بانذار فقد يكون الولى بشيراً و نذيراً و لا كن لا يكون شرعا۔

"They, (*i.e.*, saints), are the inheritors of the prophets because they are co-sharers with the prophets in receiving the Word of God. And the prophets are conspicuous by *Shari'ah* (Law). God the Most High says: "He makes the spirit to light by His command upon whom He pleases of His servants."[48] Here *min*, which is an indefinite noun, has been used so "that he may warn (men) of the Day of Meeting." Thus he brings a thing which is neither law nor command, because a saint (*wali*) is a bearer of good news and a warner but he is not a law-bearer."[49]

How is it that all these qualifications remained concealed from Mian Sahib's eyes? The answer to this is that either he did camouflaged these facts intentionally — thinking that no one would bother to verify these points about Ibn-i 'Arabi's writings and if a counter reply was made Mian Sahib's disciples would not read it and they would keep on believing that whatever their leader had said about Ibn-i 'Arabi was right — or, as is his habit, whatever his disciples said, he would cite it without proper investigation and make it the foundation of a new religious doctrine. No doubt Ibn-i 'Arabi has stated that *wilāyat* (sainthood) is *nubūwwat 'āmmah* (prophethood in general) but he has clearly specified that the word prophet cannot be used for such persons. Furthermore, Ibn-i 'Arabi thinks that this *nubūwwat-i 'ammah or nubūwwat-i lughwī* (prophethood in its literal sense) is found in the whole of the *ummah*. To support this point he quotes the following hadith:

> "Anyone who guards the Holy Qur'an, prophethood is inserted in him between his two sides."

And at another place he writes:

> "And this prophethood is found in the animal world also, such as God's saying: and thy Lord revealed to the bee."[50]

And he further writes that this prophethood will exist in the hereafter as well: "Similarly prophethood with Law will be cut off in the Hereafter after one enters Paradise and not general prophethood (*nubūwwat-i 'āmmah*)."

How clear are his statements! According to Ibn-i 'Arabi, this prophethood amounts only to communication with God; in other words, in the literal sense of the word, as is mentioned in a saying of the Holy Prophet also:

> "Among those who were before you of the Israelites there used to be men who were spoken to by God though they were not prophets, and if there is one among my followers, it is 'Umar."[51]

Look at all these clarifications and see what a great injustice has been done by Mian Sahib by twisting and tangling one of Ibn-i 'Arabi's statements!

Imam 'Abdul Wahāb Sha'rānī

The third person whose testimony Mian Sahib has cited is Imam Sha'rānī. Here again he has distorted and contracted Sha'rāni's statement to suit his own purpose. Mian Sahib writes that according to Sha'rānī:

> "It is not absolute prophethood that has been taken away but it is Law-bearing prophethood."

The opening and the concluding portion of the statement has unfortunately been thrown to the winds. The complete statement runs thus:

> "That is why an interpretation of his *ru'yā* (true vision) is made and this is a part of the parts of prophethood which God has retained for this *ummah* because absolute prophethood has not been taken away. What is taken away is the Law-bearing prophethood, as this is supported by the following *hadith*:
>
> "Anyone who guards the Qur'an (i.e., the commandments of the Holy Qur'an), Holy prophethood is inserted in him from his two sides."[52]

What can I say about the cutting and clipping of such statements by Mian Sahib? May God guide him on the right path so that he may be able to take himself and his disciples out of this delusion and deception. A plain and simple utterance was wrenched out of shape in such a way that it appeared like a strong argument against the conception of the finality of prophethood. Well, all Muslims believe that a true vision (*ru'yā sāliha*) is a part from among the parts of prophethood; and the hadith: "There is nothing left of prophethood except *mubashshirāt* (good news)", is unanimously accepted. Among these *mubashshirāt* are included the inspiration (*ilhāmāt)* of God's saints (*auliyā')* which in the Hadith have been called true visions (*ru'yā al-sāliha*) because as compared to the light of prophetic revelation, *ilhām* and *ru'yā* are included in God's speech 'from behind a veil'.[53]

However, this was only left to the ingenuity and erudition of Mian Sahib that he pronounced *mubashshirāt* as true prophethood (*'ain-i nubūwwah*)[54] and thus established the excellence of his scholarship for all times to come! As if the Holy Prophet had said: There is nothing left of prophethood except (true) prophethood. Could such meaningless words be uttered by the Holy Prophet? That there is nothing left of

prophethood except a part of it that is, *mubashshirāt* (good news), is known to every Muslim, but the feather in the cap of Mian Sahib is that he has invented a new meaning of this tradition that: nothing has been left of prophethood except true prophethood.

What Imam Sha'rānī has said about Law-bearing prophethood is the same that has been said by Ibn-i 'Arabi. In fact, Sha'rānī's statement is a commentary of Ibn-i 'Arabi's saying. What is called absolute or general prophethood by Ibn-i 'Arabi is saintliness (*wilāyat*) or mere communication with God.

Then in the same book *al-Yawāqīt wal-Jawāhir* (from which Mian Sahib has quoted his reference from Imam Sha'rani) the point has been clarified at several places. It is stated:

> "But for saints (*auliyā*) remain revelation and inspiration wherein there is no Law."

It shows that after Law-bearing prophethood there is nothing left for the *Ummah* except *wilayat* (saintliness). At another place Imam Sha'rānī, after quoting Ibn-i 'Arabi's saying, writes:

> "Be it known that we are not in the position to explain the station of prophethood, and whatever we talk about it is by speculation of what we have been granted by way of inheritance, because it is not legitimate for any of us to enter the station of prophethood."[55]

Mian Sahib has not understood even what *maqām-i wirāthat* (station of inheritance) is, as is clear from the reference he has quoted next.

Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi Mujaddid Alf Thānī (1561-1624 C.E.)

The fourth testimony given by Mian Sahib is that of Mujaddid Alf Thānī thus:

> "Thus, attainment of the excellences of prophethood for the *followers* by way of allegiance and as legacy after the advent of the Seal of the Messengers (*i.e.* the Holy Prophet) does not contravene his finality."[56]

To put forth this as evidence by Mian Sahib in his support is either an extreme form of naivety or impudence. Mujaddid Alf Thānī says that the acquisition of the "excellences" of prophethood by the *followers* is not against the Holy Prophet's being the Last Prophet and to Mian Sahib this statement means that according to Mujaddid Alf Thānī the Holy Prophet was not the Last Prophet! How wonderful is this quick apprehension and understanding of the text by Mian Sahib! If a person says that the attainment of the excellences of prophethood is not against the conception of the finality of prophethood (*Khātm al-Nabuwwah*), is he not saying in clear terms that *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* means the Last of the Prophets? Who in the *Ummah* rejects the view that the attainment of excellences of prophethood by way of allegiance and as a legacy, is against the Holy Prophet's being the Last Prophet?

Perhaps, Mian Sahib may go a step further than this. The Holy Prophet is reported to have said: "Develop in you the ethics of God." When a person has developed in him the Divine manners, then according to Mian Sahib he has become God in the same way that a person becomes a prophet by acquiring the excellences of prophethood! Mian Sahib has committed the same blunder which the Christians have done by taking metaphorical and symbolical expressions in their real sense towards making the Messiah the son of God.

A *Muhaddath* acquires the excellences by way of inheritance

I do not say that Mian Sahib is unaware of what *wirathat* (inheritance) and *tab'iyyat* (following) are. He also knows that Mujaddid Alf Thānī believed that these excellences were found in his own person but he did not call himself a prophet. And he also knows that in the terminology of the Shari'ah, these persons of high spiritual calibre are called *Muhaddath* and not prophets according to Mujaddid Alf Thānī. Then what else is it, if not intentional deception? The following passage from the writings of Mujaddid Alf Thānī has been quoted twice by the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement and Mian Sahib has certainly read it — it has been put foward by us several times, but when it suits his purpose, his principle is, only to gulp down whatever is sweet! This is how the Founder has quoted Mujaddid Alf Thānī's writing:

اعلم ایها الصدیق ان کلامه سبحانه مع البشر قد یکون شفاها و ذالک الافراد من الانبیاء و قد یکون ذالک لبعض المکمل من متابعیهم و اذا کثر هذا القسم من الکلام مع واحد منهم یسمی محدثا و هذا غیر الالهام و غیر الالقاء فی الروع و غیر الکلام الذی مع الملک انما یخاطب بهذا الکلام الانسان الکامل و الله یخص برحمته من یشاء۔

"Let it be known to you,[57] O friend, that God sometimes communicates with a person face to face and such persons are from among the prophets, and sometimes the communication takes place with some of these perfected ones who, although they are not prophets, are their followers. And when a person is honoured with this kind of communication (*kalām*) in abundance he is called a *muhaddath*. And this (Divine communication) is not of the kind of inspiration called *ilhām* nor is it what has been called *ilqā fil rau'*, which is a sudden suggestion made directly to the heart of the inspired one, nor is it the kind of communication which takes place through the agency of the angel. Such communication is addressed to

> the perfect person (*al-insān al-kāmil*). And God with His blessing distinguishes whomsoever He pleases."[58]

If the translation does not seem to be correct it could be verified from page 915 of *Izālah-i Auhām* in Urdu (by the Founder). And for God's sake, think carefully that a passage has been quoted from Mujaddid Alf Thānī's writing and the deduction has been made that he believed in the coming of the prophets after the Holy Prophet, but how is that his other writing is kept out of sight by Mian Sahib in which Mujaddid Alf Thānī clearly indicates that such perfected persons are not prophets but *muhaddathīn?* Mian Sahib! I feel sorry that you keep on disregarding even the Qur'anic injuction:

> "And mix not up truth with falsehood nor hide the truth while you know."[59]

For how long will you keep on concealing the truth to give effect to your own desires? I notice that your behaviour is approaching the point of mockery towards God's religion!

Mirza Mazhar Jānjānān (1699-1780 C.E)

The fifth testimony is that of Mirza Mazhar Jānjānān whose words are almost the same as those used by Mujaddid Alf Thāni:

> "No excellence has come to an end except original prophethood."

It is simply lack of understanding on the part of Mian Sahib that he regards reflective prophethood (*zillī nubūwwah*) as prophethood which is in fact opposed to the original prophethood, as if *zill al-Allāh*[60] should be considered as God. It is a figurative expression. Neither is God's reflection (truly) God, nor is the Holy Prophet's reflection is (truly) a prophet. Thus, a person who considers that original prophethood has come to an end believes in the finality of prophethood. If the

sun reflects itself in a thousand mirrors, the original sun is only one and it has not turned into a thousand suns.[61]

Maulavi Muhammad Qāsim Nānotawī

The sixth testimony is that of Maulavi Muhammad Qāsim Nānotawī who has entered into a hypothetical discussion, that on other planets, prophets like our Holy Prophet could also appear. At the same place it has been mentioned:

> "On the other hand, for the sake of supposition, if another prophet is born after the Holy Prophet, even then it would not effect any difference in the *khātamiyyat* of Muhammad although his contemporary may be on some other planet."

The words "for the sake of supposition" (*bil-fard*) do not express the belief of a person. Again there is no distinction made here between Law-bearing and non-law-bearing prophethood. Nor is there any mention made of one being a *follower* of the Holy Prophet. Maulavi Nānotawī only means that in the expression *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* there is also an indication of prophetic excellences and, the point of time is not the sole subject, as he writes in the beginning:

> "Even if shutting the door (of prophethood) was permitted there were scores of other opportunities for that. The basis of *khātamiyyat*, however, is on something else with which the delay in terms of a period of time and the shutting of the door aforementioned follow of necessity."

It has been clearly stated here that the author is a believer in the door of prophethood being closed, and according to him the basis of this is not the subsequence in terms of period of time but something else. And he also declared the denier of *Khatm-i-Nubūwwat* a *kāfir* on p.10:

> "Then the Holy Prophet's clarifications such as: 'You ('Ali) stand to me in the same relation as Aaron stood to Moses, except that there is no prophet after me', which are derived from the expression *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* are enough in this respect, because (the reporting of) this subject has reached a stage of unbroken continuity, and a consensus of opinion has also been held in this respect....As its denier is a *kāfir*, similarly, the denier of that one is a *kāfir*, too."

And furthermore it is stated: "And *khātimiyyat* of time is also not lost."

To say that such a person does not believe the Holy Prophet to be the Last Prophet is concealing the truth to the highest degree. The other views he has expressed on the basis of "supposition" cannot be adduced to prove that *Maulavi* Qāsim Nānotawī did not accept the Holy Prophet as the Last Prophet.

CHAPTER IV

THE SAYING OF HAZRAT 'Ā'ISHAH

Apart from the above references, Mian Sahib has quoted a saying attributed to Hazrat 'Ā'ishah:

> "Say that he verily is *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn,* (the Seal of the Prophets), but say not, there is no prophet after him."[62]

This saying of Hazrat 'Ā'ishah, having no authority at all, (never reported in any book of hadith), cannot have any value against the forty authentic traditions of the Holy Prophet, except that it should be interpreted in such a way as to conform with the other traditions. But Mian Sahib's logic always moves in a reverse direction. He starts interpreting all the other traditions in the light of this saying. He begins thus:

> "Certainly, Hazrat 'Ā'ishah, may God be pleased with her, understood these words to mean other than last prophet."

What those meanings were have not been explained, as though, according to Mian Sahib, Hazrat 'Ā'ishah also understood by *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* that prophets will be made by bearing the seal of the Holy Prophet. But as it seems, Mian Sahib probably likes riddles; therefore, he has not pointed out what those other meanings were which Hazrat 'Ā'ishah understood. Why did he not lift the veil from this mystery? Because those meanings will be nothing else except, the last of the Prophets. It is better for him to leave his disciples in the

dark, so that they keep on guessing whatever meanings have been rendered by Mian Sahib as the meaning given to this expression by Hazrat 'Ā'ishah. What he has written after this is indeed amazing:

> "Another conclusion derived from this saying of Hazrat 'Ā'ishah, 'that do not say there will be no prophet after him? is, that this sentence also had two meanings, in as much as this statement was definitely reported from the Holy Prophet ... Hazrat 'Ā'ishah's prohibiting the use of these words and people not raising any objection at her prohibition shows that Hazrat 'Ā'ishah had two meanings of this sentence in her mind; one in conformity with the term *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* and another one opposed to it. Because the people were being misled by this sentence, therefore, for the sake of expediency she stopped them from using it."

The meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* and *lā nabiyya ba'duhū*

What a great mystery, that *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* has only one meaning and *lā nabiyya ba'duhū* (there is no prophet after him) had two! According to Mian Sahib, Hazrat 'Ā'ishah did not grasp the meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as the Last of the Prophets. The only meaning she grasped was the same which Mian Sahib had advanced — that in future prophets will be made by following the Holy Prophet. In other words, previously, prophets were appointed by God directly and now they will be made after bearing the seal of the discipleship of the Holy Prophet — one who will follow him in a perfect manner will become a prophet! But the most surprising point is that from among thousands of sayings of Hazrat 'Ā'ishah, these meanings are not found anywhere at all. Neither were they known to the author of *Majma al-Bihār*, who transmitted this utterance, without any testimony, to us, nor to any of the Companions of the Holy Prophet nor to the Holy Prophet himself. The Holy Prophet has explained the words *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* so many times and in so may different ways in his

Traditions that he could easily have pointed out somewhere the 'real significance' of these words. But it is strange that he kept on emphasising the meanings which were not meant by these words, and the real meanings of these words were not mentioned by him even once! And then, according to Mian Sahib, Hazrat 'A'ishah understood that there were two meanings of 'there is no prophet after him,' one meaning was that there will be no prophets after him and the second meaning was that there will be prophets after him. And Mian Sahib has adjudged the first meaning to be wrong. Is there any truth behind these assertions or is it all the result of his oscillating temperament? In the saying of Hazrat 'A'ishah there is not a trace of any of these points. But, for the sake of argument, let us suppose that *Khatam al-Nabiyyin* has only one meaning and *la nabiyya ba'duhu* (there is no prophet after him) two.[63] The simple conclusion then would be that the meaning of *Khatam al-Nabiyyin* is the same as has been explained by the Holy Prophet over and over again, and that is:

'There is no prophet after me.'

'The claimant of prophethood after me will be a liar.'

'I am the last brick of the house of prophethood.'

'There is nothing left of prophethood after me except *mubashshirat* (good news).

'Had there been a prophet after me he would have been 'Umar.'

'The Prophets used to appear after Moses, but there will be no prophet after me.'

'I am *al-Aqib,* after whom there will be no prophet.'

Hazrat 'A'ishah must have also understood the same and the only meaning of the term *Khatam al-Nabiyyin* as explained above. However, according to Mian Sahib, *la nabiyya ba'duhu* (there will be no prophet after him) would be used in two senses: first, that there will also be prophets after him — but they would not be the possessors of Law — and *Hazrat*

'Ā'ishah prevented people from saying *lā nabiyya ba'duhū,* so that they may not take the second meaning to be the correct meaning: that a prophet could also appear after the Holy Prophet with Law.

It rests with Mian Sahib now to prove that the particular meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* — prophethood is continued — was known to the Holy Prophet and his Companions. Otherwise, whatever meanings were reported by the Holy Prophet and his many Companions were the meanings which were also accepted by *Hazrat* 'Ā'ishah — and an intelligent person like Mian Sahib who might have rendered *lā nabiyya ba'duhū* to mean that prophets will be raised after the Holy Prophet, was prevented by her from using these words; as if *Hazrat* 'Ā'ishah would say: you should not say these words which cause confusion in your mind (about the true significance of this saying). One point, however, that is settled by this statement of Mian Sahib that is the Companions of the Holy Prophet understood only one meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn.* Now, it is his duty to prove that the Companions did believe in the same meanings which he advocates otherwise the same utterance of Hazrat 'Ā'ishah is conclusive proof against him according to his own reasoning — that *Hazrat* 'Ā'ishah prohibited the use of *lā nabiyya ba'duhū* because it could also mean that prophethood was still in the process of continuation. However, in support of the view of the Finality of Prophethood there is another hadith, the reporter of which is *Hazrat* 'Ā'ishah herself:

> "It has been reported from 'Ā'ishah that the Holy Prophet said: nothing has been left of prophethood after me except *musbashshirāt* (good news)."

Now, if we say, as Mian Sahib has done, that *mubashshirāt* are true prophethood (*'ain-i nubūwwat*), then it would be as though the Holy Prophet had said: 'There has been left nothing of prophethood after me except true prophethood.' If this is how the meanings of words can be twisted, then, not

to mention a prophet, there is no obstacle left in our way to making a person God. But if we have some respect for the Holy Prophet, the matter is plain and simple. *Hazrat* 'Ā'ishah did not believe that propethood remained, (after the Holy Prophet), although she accepted the view that a part of prophethood remained. Another version of this *hadith lam yabqā minan nubūwwati* (nothing is left of prophethood) is: *zahabtun nubūwwata wa baqītul mubashshirāt,* that is, "prophethood has gone but good news has remained." But according to Mian Sahib this would mean "Prophethood has gone but prophethood has remained." The souls of the lexicologists must have gone into a trance on hearing these meanings.

Thus this provides conclusive evidence that Hazrat 'Ā'ishah held in her mind the same meaning of the term *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as has been accepted by the whole Muslim world until now that is, that prophethood has come to an end with the Holy Prophet.

A person who, like Mian Sahib, might have rendered *lā nabiyya ba'duhū* (there is no prophet after him) to mean that no prophet greater than the Holy Prophet will be raised, though prophets of a lesser calibre will appear — who, according to Mian Sahib may also be equal to the Holy Prophet in respect of excellences,' or even greater than him, God forbid us from such blasphemies! — might have been prevented by Hazrat 'Ā'ishah from saying *lā nabiyya ba'duhū* and only one meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* survived, that there was no prophethood after the Holy Prophet. Or, it is also possible that, like Mian Sahib, someone said that *lā nabiyya ba'duhū* meant that there would be no prophet immediately after the Holy Prophet although prophets would appear after some time had passed, and Hazrat 'Ā'ishah forbade the use of these words.

Or, if such a topsy-turvy interpretation were not given, but another absurd claim was made, as Mian Sahib and his disciples generally say, that as the Holy Prophet's time extended to the Day of Judgement, therefore *lā nabiyya*

ba'duhū meant that after the Day of Judgement no prophet would appear after the Holy Prophet although prophets would appear before that — then again, Hazrat 'Ā'ishah forbade the use of these words and accordingly the term *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* meant that no prophet could appear after him at all.

In short, all the false and unbefitting meanings which Mian Sahib has advanced by his intellectual and imaginative skill have been rejected by the utterance of Hazrat 'Ā'ishah: 'Do not say there is no prophet after him.'

Then, I say that if *lā nabiyya ba'duhū* has two meanings, the reports relating to the interpretation of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* can also have two meanings — or can they bear only one interpretation? For instance, the hadith about the house of prophethood where there was only one place left for a stone and the Holy Prophet said:

> "I am the self-same stone and I am *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn*" (the last of the prophets)."

What other meaning will Mian Sahib give to this tradition? Will this house of prophethood be demolished and a new house raised in which, instead of the Holy Prophet being the *last* stone, he would be the *first*? Then, how will he interpret the hadith where the Holy Prophet is again reported to have said that there would be thirty liars after him and everyone of them would assert that he was a prophet?

What would be the other meaning of this authentic hadith — that the prophets used to administer among the Israelites after Moses but there will be *khalīfahs* after him? According to Mian Sahib, non-Law-bearing prophets also appeared after Moses. No other meanings of this hadith are possible at all, (except that generally explained and understood).

And in what other different way will this *hadith* be interpreted: "I am *al-'Āqib* (the one who comes last)? Did *'āqib*

in the Arabic dictionary mean the one who comes last or did it mean, in the original Arabic usage, the one who comes first? And did the lexicologists give preference to the first meaning because they had earlier accepted a belief in a wrong doctrine that no prophet would be raised after the Holy Prophet?

In short, all these reports clearly indicate that only this meaning of the expression *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* was known to the Holy Prophet and his Companions, that there would be no prophet after him. And Mian Sahib's contention is that this meaning is wrong — and the true meaning is such, the trace of which, strangely enough, is not found during the last thirteen hundred years — either in any tradition of the Holy Prophet, or in any saying of Hazrat 'Ā'ishah, or in any utterance of any other Companion of the Holy Prophet, or any *Imam*.

Saying of Hazrat 'Ali

Against the consensus of opinion of the *Ummah*, Mian Sahib has put forth a piece of 'evidence' from *Hazrat* 'Ali on the basis of what was reported by Abū Abdur Rahmān who said:

> "I was coaching Hassan and Hussain (Allah be pleased with them) and 'Ali Tālib (Allah be pleased with him) passed by while I was teaching. He said to me, Teach them to read *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* with *fatha* on the *ta*."[64]

What an astounding piece of evidence is this that Hazrat 'Ali did not believe that *khātam* meant last! What a unique and extraordinary proof Mian Sahib has produced! Thus he writes:

> "It is apparent from several readings (of the Holy Qur'an) that the reading of *ta* (in *khātam*) with *kasra* was also taught by the Holy Prophet. If according to Hazrat 'Ali *tā* with *fatha* (in *khātam*) also meant the last prophet then why did he prevent (the reporter) from teaching *ta* with *kasra* because with *kasra* the meaning would have become clearer. Does this not prove that he ('Ali)

understood the difference between the two readings and was afraid of teaching *tā* with *kasra*, so that a belief, opposed to reality, might not take root in the minds of these children?"

At this strange piece of evidence, if Mian Sahib's disciples keep on shouting 'Well done' from morning till evening, even then it would not do justice to this argument of exceptional novelty! How amazing, that on one hand there are forty traditions of the Holy Prophet clearly indicating that there will be no prophet after him and all these are upset by a saying of Hazrat 'Ali's 'subtle proof' that *tā* with *kasra* in *khātam* should not be taught to the students. This, according to Mian Sahib, showed that Hazrat 'Ali did not accept the meaning of *khātam* as the last. If this is the sum and substance of the whole argument, then it is not Hazrat 'Ali's evidence alone, but that of the whole *Ummah* (*ijmā'*), because all the people read the *ta* in *khātam* with *fatha*. I wonder if there was any need for Mian Sahib to write such a long article — this argument alone was enough. The reading of the *ta* with *fatha* is even current among Muslims today. Does it mean that they do not accept *khātam* to mean 'last'? If Mian Sahib had such strong evidence in his favour, I wonder why he took all the trouble in making this long statement for nothing. No Muslim will ever consider such a statement to be untrue. Even I cannot do so! Because if someone reads the *tā* with *kasra* in the Holy Qur'an in my presence, I will certainly prevent him from doing so. Does it mean that I, also, do not accept *'last'* as the meaning of *khātam?* And if I say anything contrary to it, it will be my utter lack of understanding of the subject! Apparently a 'strong argument' has been offered and the proof of its strength is that it has come out of the mouth of Mian Sahib.

If someone harbours any doubt that inspite of Hazrat 'Ali's extreme caution, "that a belief opposed to reality might not take root in the minds of these children," how could this belief, opposed to reality, become implanted in the minds of

these children *viz.*, Hassan and Hussain, so much so, that even the Shi'ahs do not record any authentic tradition which supports the views of Mian Sahib on this subject? Neither did Hazrat 'Ali himself abandon this "belief opposed to reality" nor did any other Companion. Furthermore, even during the period of his *khilāfat*, Hazrat 'Ali never tried to uproot this doctrine from the minds of the people.

This world is so full of curiosities that in spite of the efforts of the Holy Prophet, Hazrat 'Ā'ishah and Hazrat 'Ali and all the Companions of the Holy Prophet became staunch followers of this "belief opposed to reality" and not a single voice was raised in the whole *Ummah* against it! If Hazrat 'Ā'ishah was not involved, we could have understood the sad plight of the doctrine of *Khātm-i Nubūwwah* like that of the doctrine of *khilāfat* without interception (*khilāfat bilā-fasl*). I hope that after further consideration, Mian Sahib would delete the name of *Hazrat* 'Ā'ishah from among the supporters of the doctrine of continuity of prophethood and would solve the puzzle that, when the Holy Prophet said to Hazrat 'Ali: "You stand to me in the same relation as Aaron stood to Moses, except that there is no prophet after me," Hazrat 'Ali, at that time, must have addressed the Holy Prophet thus:

> Neither do I like the rank granted to Aaron, nor do I accept prophethood without a Code; if I have to accept anything it should be Law-bearing prophethood!

Such are the arguments on which Mian Sahib is trying to lay the foundation of his new religion. These interpretations are so trifling and trivial that it is an insult to the intelligence of any person to place them even under the category of shoddy interpretations.

Mughīra Ibn Sha'bah

From among the Companions of the Holy Prophet, Mian Sahib has also produced the testimony of Hazrat Mughira ibn

Sha'bah in his favour. "Someone in his presence said: The Seal of the Prophets, there will be no prophet after him." So ibn Sha'bah said: "That is enough for you if you say *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* because we used to say that 'Isa (may peace be on him) was going to come. Thus, if he comes he will be before him (*i.e.* the Holy Prophet) and after him also.

And this saying is exactly in accordance with the saying of *Hazrat* 'Ā'ishah."[65]

How strange is the fact that the reports of the Holy Prophet quoted in *al-Bukhārī* and *al-Muslim* are over-ruled by these two sayings of unauthentic origin. This practice was adopted against Islam by Christians in that they would condemn all the principles of Islamic faith on the basis of the weakest reports. It seems Mian Sahib is also following in their footsteps. No authority has been quoted at all for the saying of Hazrat 'Ā'ishah, and Ibn Mughīra's saying has been communicated by Ibn Ali Sha'bah whose reporting may be regarded, perhaps, by Mian Sahib like the reporting of *al-Bukhārī* and *al-Muslim*. Over and above all this, when Mian Sahib would find abundance of reports on the other side, that is, against his views, he himself would not hesitate to reject the traditions mentioned in *al-Bukhārī* and *al-Muslim*. Does he not know what he has often been saying about *Hazrat* Abū Hurairah's saying: "Read whatever you like"?

Is the Holy Prophet's hadith not binding on us — that he interpreted *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as 'the Last of the Prophets' and said: 'There will be no prophet after me,' — but a weak saying of Ibn Mughirah has been considered as an authority? If this is actually what Ibn Mughira thought, as attributed to him in his statement, is it obligatory for us to accept it? Let us look at the issue from another point of view. There is a consensus of opinion (*ijmā'*) about the guarding and preservation of the text of the Holy Qur'an, but I can quote a solitary saying by a Companion of the Holy Prophet recorded even in *al-Muslim* that a particular part of the Holy Qur'an was not preserved.

Will Mian Sahib (on the basis of a solitary report) then change his view, or bow his head before the accusations of the Christians, or will he disregard one person's testimony against the testimony of the majority of the Companions? And why did Mian Sahib not stop to think that if Ibn Mughirah made such a statement, he was himself expecting the coming of Hazrat 'Isa (peace be on him) and consequently he misunderstood and misjudged the whole issue, especially when he said that it was enough to say *Khātam al-Anbiyā*, as Jesus had appeared before him but not *la nabiyya ba'duhu*[66] because Jesus was also going to appear after him. Without giving it due consideration, Mian Sahib has put forth this saying in his support. The words: "It is enough for you if you say *Khātam al-Anbiyā*," clearly indicate that according to Ibn Mughirah, *Khātam al-Anbiyā* meant the Last of the Prophets while Mian Sahib's contention is that the Companions of the Holy Prophet did not interpret *Khātam al-Anbiyā'* as the Last of the Prophets — consequently they should have advocated the other meaning of this expression of which Mian Sahib is a claimant — that by following the Holy Prophet other prophets will be made. How and from where these meanings are extracted from the above saying, are beyond my comprehension. Did Ibn Mughirah say: "It is enough for you that you say that the Holy Prophet is he by following whom other prophets will be made — because when Jesus appears he will appear before him as well as after him"? If these meanings can be assigned to the above saying, it is worthwhile quoting it, otherwise it looks as if a drowning man is trying to catch at a straw to save himself.

What Ibn Mughirah actually thought was that although the Holy Prophet was the Last Prophet — but because Jesus had appeared before him and was also going to appear after him — therefore it was better not to say *lā nabiyya ba'duhū*. But obviously, as compared with the clear saying of the Holy Prophet, this was Ibn Mughira's mistake. He understood that the prophecy (of the second advent) meant the actual coming of Jesus himself in person, but at that time he did not give any

thought to the point that if Jesus himself was coming, why did the Holy Prophet say: There is no prophet after me? And in scores of other sayings the Holy Prophet kept on repeating the same point in so many different ways, that there would be no prophet after him.

The Second Appearance of Jesus

It is not Ibn Mughīrah alone who is faced with this difficulty, but also all those people who have similar views about the coming of Jesus in person. They never think seriously that to believe in the coming of the same Jesus Christ amounts to the breaking of the Seal of Prophethood, nor do they ask themselves why, after all, did the Holy Prophet explain in so many different ways that no prophet could come after him. Even if a prophet appears after the Holy Prophet, all the reports, so clear and consistent, which mention the Holy Prophet being the last prophet, have to be cast aside — the entire conception of the *Khatm-i Nubūwwat* (Finality of Prophethood) has to be abandoned in this case. Thus the prophecy of the descent of Jesus has, perforce, to be interpreted in such a way that it does not go against the conception of the Finality of Prophethood.[67] To overcome this problem, those people who have discussed the subject of Jesus' descent, have stated at times that his second coming would be in the form of a *mujaddid* (renovator). But in this case, he will have to be deposed from his office of prophethood which is an impossibility, because a prophet can under no circumstances be deposed from his office.

CHAPTER V

FINALITY OF PROPHETHOOD AND THE FOUNDER OF THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT

The interpretation of the prophecy of Jesus Christ vis-a-vis the conception of the Finality of Prophethood has been discussed in detail by the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement and he has solved all the intricate points connected with the issue in such a beautiful way that the truth of *Khatm-i Nubūwwat* has shone like the mid-day sun. It is regrettable that those wrong meanings — that is, that prophets will be made by following the Holy Prophet — have been attributed to a person who clarified all the dim and hazy points which surrounded the subject of *Khatm-i Nubūwwat*. He said in plain and unmistakable terms that no prophet, new or old, could appear after the Holy Prophet. I quote only a few of his statements on the subject:

> "And how was it possible that any prophet could come, after the *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn,* in the complete and perfect sense, which is one of the conditions of perfect prophethood (*nubūwwat-i tāmmah*)? Is it not necessary that the perfect prophethood of such a prophethood should contain the essential requisites of revelation and the descent of Angel Gabriel? Because according to the express teachings of the Holy Qur'an, a prophet is one

who has received the commands and creeds of faith through Angel Gabriel. But a seal has been set on the prophetic revelation for the last thirteen hundred years. Will this seal be broken then?"[68]

"And I have written this several times that the coming of the Messiah, the Messenger of Allah, the son of Mary, after *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* is the cause of great disturbance. As a result, either it has to be accepted that prophetic revelation will start again, or that God will send the Messiah, son of Mary, after making him only a follower, depriving him of the essential characteristics of prophethood; but both these positions are prohibited." [69]

"Many doubts arise at this place that when the Messiah, son of Mary, would be a perfect follower (*ummatī*) at the time of his descent, he cannot be in any way a messenger (*rasul*) because of his being a follower, for (the words) *rasul* and *ummatī* in their meanings are antithetical. Moreover, our Prophet being *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* bars the coming of any other prophet except such a prophet who receives his light from the light of the prophethood of Muhammad and does not possess perfect prophethood, and who, in other words, is also called a *muhaddath* (one spoken to by God). Such a person is outside this restriction. On account of his discipleship and annihilation in the Messenger (*fanā fil-rasūl*) he is included in the being of the Seal of the Messengers (*Khātam al-Mursalīn*) as a part is included in the whole." [70]

"If it is said, that the Messiah would only be told this much by revelation: 'Follow the Holy Qur'an', and then for the rest of his life revelation will be cut off and Gabriel would never descend on him and he (Jesus) would become like the followers after being absolutely

deprived of prophethood, then all this is childish fancy, worth only a laugh. It is quite obvious that should revelation descend but once and should Gabriel bring only a single sentence and become silent for ever thereafter, still this thought is contrary to the Finality of Prophethood, for when the seal of the finality is broken and the apostolic revelation begins to come down again, it is the same whether the revelations are few or frequent. Every wise person can understand that if God is true to His promise and the promise which has been granted in the verse *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* and whatever has been made so explicit in the traditions — that after the death of the Holy Prophet, Gabriel has been for ever prevented from bringing down prophetic revelation — if all these matters are true and right, then no one can ever come in the capacity of a messenger after our Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of God be upon him)."[71]

"The Holy Qur'an does not permit the coming of another messenger, whether new or old, after the *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn*, because a messenger receives the knowledge of faith through the mediation of Gabriel and the door of the descent of Gabriel with apostolic revelation has been shut. And this is also an impossibility that a messenger should come to the world without apostolic revelation."[73]

"I have a firm faith that our Holy Prophet is *Khātam al-Anbiyā'* and no prophet, either new or old, shall appear after him in this *Ummah*."[74]

"And I believe that our Holy Prophet Muhammad is the Seal of the Prophets (*Khātam al-Anbiyā'*) and our book the Holy Qur'an is the source of Guidance. There is no prophet for us whom we should obey except Muhammad and there is no book for us which we should follow

except the Holy Qur'an, the Guardian over the previous Scriptures. And I believe that our Messenger is the leader of the descendants of Adam and the leader of the messengers and surely God has brought an end to prophets with him."[75]

"Do you not know that the Lord, the Beneficent, has declared our Holy Prophet to be *Khātam al-Anbiyā'* without exception and our Holy Prophet has interpreted this verse[76] with *lā nabiyya ba'dī*[77], — there is no prophet after me. For the seekers of truth it is evident that if, after our Holy Prophet, we accept the lawfulness of the coming of another prophet, it means that we have opened the door of prophetic revelation which was closed and this is against the universal belief of Muslims. And how can a prophet appear after our Messenger, may the peace and blessings of God be upon him, and verily after his death prophetic revelation has been cut off and God has brought an end to prophets with him?"[78]

Such references from the books of the Founder can be produced in great number. As far as his followers are concerned, to understand what his views were on *Khatm-i Nubūwwat,* these statements are enough for them to understand. If other people also ponder over the subject, it would not be difficult for them to understand that when Mian Sahib, with great audacity, can produce references from the writings of Ibn-i 'Arabi, *Imam* Sha'rānī, Mujaddid Alf Thānī, etc. after clipping and cutting according to his own liking, it would not be difficult for him to deal with the writings of the Founder of the Movement in the same manner.

Mian Sahib has gained another feather in his cap by inventing and issuing an extremely loose statement, that the writings of the Founder on the subject of prophethood prior to

1901 have been abrogated. In other words, the Founder's affirmations on oath that prophethood had come to an end with the Holy Prophet and that it was his firm belief that no prophet could appear after him — this was all a lie and his affirmations were false. May Allah protect us from this! On one side the Founder is called *Mujaddid*, Promised Messiah and *Mahdi* and on the other he is regarded as having faith in falsehood! This is the tribute which Mian Sahib, as a son, has paid to his father! This theory of change in 1901[79] is mere fiction which cannot be accepted by anyone except by those disciples who blindly follow Mian Sahib. That *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* meant one who has brought prophets to an end, was the view advocated by the Founder before, and after 1901, as is mentioned in *al-Wasiyyat* written after 1901:

> "With this particular prophethood is the end of all prophethoods and thus it ought to have been, for whatever has a beginning must also have an end."[80]

Is not *Lecture* (on Islam) in Sialkot, a book written after 1901? Read what he says in it:

> "And the Finality of the Prophethood was granted to him not only because he appeared last of all, in period of time, but also because all the excellences of prophethood came to an end with him."[81]

Has it not been clearly indicated in *Haqiqat al-Wahy:*

> "God the Most High ... created Adam, sent Messengers and Books and last of all he raised Muhammad, the Chosen one, (peace and blessings of God be upon him), who is *Khātam al-Anbiyā'* and the best of the messengers."[82]

In the Supplement of the same book he has explained the term *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* thus:

> "And surely our Messenger is *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* and with him is cut off the chain of messengers, so no one has the right to claim substantial prophethood (*mustaqil nubūwwat*) after our Messenger, the Chosen one, and nothing remains after him except abundance of communication."[83]

Have any meanings other than the Last of the Prophets been given to the term *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* in these four places? However, in spite of all these clarifications, it is being propagated ceaselessly that the Founder did not interpret *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as the Last of the Prophets.

Reflective (*zillī*) Prophethood

The Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, in speaking of reflective (*zillī*), *baruzī*[84] prophethood and the station of being annihilated in the love of the Messenger (*fanā fi al-rasūl*), is not solitary in this realm. Similar statements have been made by other Muslim saints, too. But there is no remedy for a person who blindfolds himself and keeps on saying that *zillī* or *barūzī* prophethood is real and true prophethood. Until now, nobody in the world has declared reflection (*zill*) to be real and metaphor (*majāz*) a reality. However, Mian Sahib, in his keenness to propagate the doctrine of the continuity of prophethood, has bypassed all the terminologies and has thrown himself in the distant realms of fantasy.

If *zillī nubūwwat* is real *nubūwwat* then *zill al-Allāh* means Allah himself and when the saints call themselves *azlal* (*azlāl* is plural of *zill*. Tr) of the *Rahman* (the Beneficent), they should also be considered gods, and a king should also be

accepted as God — because in the Hadith the term *zill al-Allah* has been used for a king.

To hide his fallacious views, Mian Sahib also comes out with the excuse at times that he also accepts the prophethood of the Promised Messiah as *zilli* and *barūzī*. If this is true, then it is not prophethood but *wilayat* (sainthood), because the *zill* (reflection) of prophethood is *wilayat*. It seems that Mian Sahib has found a way out of this dilemma to conceal his real doctrine and to keep his disciples in the dark, because he also says that the terms *zillī* and *barūzī* have not been coined by God but by the Founder himself. In the same court case, Mian Sahib's close friend, Zulfiqār Ali Khān, Secretary or Additional Secretary, when interrogated about the differences between the two sections of the Ahmadis, recorded the following statement:

> "We accept the other party of the Ahmadis as Ahmadis. We believe Mirza Sahib (i.e. the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement. Tr.) to be a prophet. But they believe Mirza Sahib to be a *baruzi* and a *zillī* prophet."

This clearly shows that Mian Sahib and his choice disciples, in fact, do not accept Mirza Sahib as a *barūzî* and a *zillī* prophet. Perhaps the disciples of Mian Sahib generally cannot accept everything at the moment; *prima facie* this new doctrine lifts the veil gradually. Thus, the Founder's view that prophethood in the form of *zill* and *barūz* and the excellences of prophethood (*kamālāt-i nubūwwat*) remain in this *Ummah* should be understood in the same sense in which Ibn-i 'Arabi and Mujaddid Alf Thānī have expressed their views on the subject. And this is the view of the whole *Ummah*, and this is what the Founder said before and after 1901. For instance, he says in *Izālah Auhām* (1891):

> "Moreover, our Prophet being *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* bars the coming of any other prophet except one who receives his light from the light of the Prophethood of Muhammad and does not possess perfect prophethood, who in other words is also called a *muhaddath* (one spoken to by God). Such a person is beyond this restriction; rather, on account of his perfect discipleship and annihilation in the Messenger (*fanā fi al-rasūl*), he is included in the being of the Seal of the Messengers (*Khātam al-Mursalīn*) as a part is always included in the whole."[85]

And in 1901, in his leaflet *Ek Ghalati kā Izālah*, which according to Mian Sahib has abrogated the previous writings, the Founder says:

> "So it is evident that by earning the names Muhammad and Ahmad by way of *baruz* two Muhammads and Ahmads have not come into existence; similarly, calling (a person) prophet or messenger in the form of *barūz* does not mean that the seal[86] of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* is broken, because a *barūz* is not a part of its original."

And then after 1901 he again wrote:

> "And finally it should be remembered that if a follower receives a station of revelation, inspiration and prophethood merely by following the Holy Prophet and is exalted by being given the name 'prophet', it does not break the seal (see footnote number[86]) of prophethood because he is a follower and does not possess a separate existence of his own."[87]

The Seal of Prophethood

What is this "Seal of Prophethood", the breaking of which has been mentioned in the writings of the Founder? Does this Seal of Prophethood mean anything other than that prophethood has come to an end? Has it been denied here or clearly admitted that *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* means the Last of the Prophets? It is true that once or twice the Founder has also argued from the word *khātam* that the word seal points out towards the imparting of the Holy Prophet's grace. While quoting this reference, Mian Sahib has cleverly omitted a part which explained the true sense of the passage. Mian Sahib quotes from *Haqiqat al-Wahy* thus:

> "God, Who is eminent in His glory, has made the Holy Prophet the possessor of the Seal, that is, He granted him a Seal, which was not granted to any other prophet at all, for the dissemination of excellences, then he was called *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn*, that is to say, excellences of prophethood are obtained by following him and his spiritual care (*ruhānī tawajjuh*) is a prophet-fashioner."[88]

By writing these words in bold letters Mian Sahib has tried to prove that the Founder of the Movement did not render *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as the Last of the Prophets but gave this term the same meaning which Mian Sahib had all along advocated, that in future prophets will be raised by following the Holy Prophet. The fact that in the above passage only the receiving of the excellences of prophethood (*kāmalāt-i nubūwwat*) has been mentioned, explains the true significance of the afore-mentioned passage:

> "And this holy power did not come to the share of any other prophet. And this is the true meaning of the tradition: *Ulamā-u ummatī ka-anbiyā-i Banī Isrāīl,* that

is, the learned of my *Ummah* will be like the Israelite prophets."[89]

What a great injustice Mian Sahib has done to his father, that by curtailing and pruning his writings he has mutilated the whole sense of the passage. The Founder only wanted to convey the point that by following the Holy Prophet the learned of this *Ummah* will become like the prophets of the Israelites and Mian Sahib is stretching it to mean that by the Holy Prophet's seal, prophets will be made! The whole *Ummah* believes in the doctrine of the learned ones becoming like the prophets of the Israelites, but their actually becoming prophets is something which has been repudiated by the term *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* itself. Let Mian Sahib ponder for a moment what kind of techniques he is applying to extract his own ideas from a writing of the Founder. He has not done this once, or twice, but all the time, while quoting the other Muslim divines and dignitaries as well.

From the beginning to the end, the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement has rendered *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as the Last of the Prophets and the hadith, *lā nabiyya ba'dī* (there is no prophet after me), has been considered by him as its true and clear interpretation and this is the only meaning which he has accepted of *Khātm-i Nubūwwat*. It is true that he has also accepted the word *khatam* as implying another meaning, that is, the imparting of prophetic excellences. But the result of Mian Sahib's lack of deliberation is this: that he thinks that this implication has abrogated the previous meanings of the term. The Holy Prophet's passing on prophetic excellences has been mentioned in the earlier and later works of the Founder as well.

In *Haqīqat al-Wahy* which tells us of the Seal which imparts the Holy Prophet's grace, he also mentions that *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* means the termination of the dispensation of

Prophethood: "and that God sent our Holy Prophet after all other prophets."[90]

Again in *Haqiqat al-Wahy*, the Founder interprets *Khatm-i Nubūwwat* as the termination of the chain of prophethood thus:

> "And surely our Messenger is *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* and with him is cut off the chain of messengers."[91]

And then he says: "And nothing remains after him except the abundance of communication."[92]

Thus, according to the Founder, the receiving of "abundance of communication" (*kathrat-i mukālimah*), and prophethood or messengership, are not one and the same, as otherwise the statement should read like this:

> "With him has been cut off the chain of messengers and nothing remains after him except messengership,"

and this obviously is a meaningless statement.

As in the saying: "Nothing has been left of prophethood except *mubashashirāt* (good news)," it is not possible that *mubashashirāt* should be considered true prophethood (*'ain-i nubūwwat*), similarly, it is not possible that in the statement above: "Nothing remains after him except the abundance of communication," the abundance of communication should be considered prophethood. The Founder further writes:

> "And I have been called a prophet by God by way of metaphor, not by way of reality."[93]

And in *Izālah Auhām* he has already stated that a prophet in the metaphorical sense is called a *muhaddath* (one spoken to by

God).[94] Thus, in spite of this clear explanation, to give a contrary meaning to a statement of the Founder is to make a mockery of his writings and this is what Mian Sahib has done and has played a similar game with the writings of Ibn-i 'Arabi, Mujaddid Alf Thānī, *Imam* Sha'rānī etc. The Founder had explained the point in a subtle manner for the sake of his less knowledgeable opponents and Mian Sahib on this basis has found an excuse to wash the earlier and later writings of the Founder down the drain.

The Finality of Prophethood and the transmission of prophetic excellences

There is a fine point underlying the use of *khātam* instead of *khātim*, although they carry the same meaning. Mian Sahib neither understood this point, nor did he try to do so. On the other hand, all the writings of the Founder, before or after 1901, where he explained the meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as the Last of the Prophets were abrogated[95] by him and he raised an objection against one of my writings saying that I have now changed my views on the subject. According to him, I used to explain *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* in the same sense in which he used to explain it and now I render it in a different way. A person who does not pay close attention to a matter and is in the habit of picking up at something and running away with it at top speed should most probably be excused for not grasping such a delicate point, that *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* means the Last of the Prophets and that it also implies, in a subtle manner, that prophethood has itself attained perfection.

Mian Sahib has also taken notice of my English comments of the Holy Qur'an (on verse 33:40) and has discussed my use of the words "primarily" and "secondarily"[96]. If I start quoting the lexicons on this point it would need another long article; therefore, I would only say that in my

commentary of the Holy Qur'an I have given both meanings, firstly, "a seal" and secondly "the last". It is also true that the word *khātam* is mostly used in the sense of a seal and less in the sense of 'the last', and this is what I meant when I adopted these meanings in my notes. Both the readings, *khātim* and *khātam*, have been mentioned in the reports but the Holy Qur'an which is being recited today contains the reading *khātam*. The popular meaning of the word *khātim* is the "end", although it is used in the sense of a seal also. The preference given to *khātam* is for the reason that the object of setting a seal on something is that nothing else will enter therein. Thus, *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* does mean the Last of the Prophets but it also carries a deeper significance that finality now has been combined with the highest form of perfection and nothing more will enter therein from outside. In other words, prophethood has become perfect and has also come to an end. The use of the word *khātim* could not convey this significance. And only in this sense could the saying of Hazrat 'Ā'ishah be considered as correct that: "Say *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* but say not: there is no prophet after him", because in the term *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* is included the meaning of *lā nabiyya ba'duhū*[97] as well as the conception of the perfection of prophethood, and *lā nabiyya ba'duhū*[98] only contains one meaning, that is to say, simply the termination of prophethood.

According to the Founder of the Movement, the word *muhr* (seal) denotes the transmitting of prophetic excellences also. He has pointed this out, so that when *khātam* is explained as a seal (*muhr*), it may not be understood that when a seal is set on something nothing at all can come out of it, which will amount to rejecting the continuous transmission of the prophetic grace (among the followers of the Holy Prophet). On the other hand, this is such a seal that has brought prophethood to perfection, that nothing can be added to it, and at the same

time, it has also brought the bestowing of prophetic bounties to perfection; because the real object of prophethood is the transmission of spiritual excellences — if this is lacking in prophethood, that is not real prophethood. The only true object of prophethood is that it should make others drink to the full from the same stream from which the Holy Prophet himself drank and should illuminate others from the same source from which the Holy Prophet himself received his illumination. Thus, the prophethood of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn*, as well as its transmission of spiritual excellences, both attained perfection. The Founder expresses the same view in the following words:

> "He became *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn'* but not in the sense that no spiritual grace will be obtained from him, but he is the possessor of the seal (*sāhib-i khātam*) in the sense that no grace can be obtained by any person except by his seal and that for his followers the door of divine communication and communion shall never be shut . . . substantive prophethood has come to an end with the Holy Prophet but the reflected (*zillī*) prophethood, which means the receiving of revelation only by the grace of Muhammad, shall remain to the Last Day so that the door for the perfection of human beings may not be closed."[98]

How beautiful was the whole explanation which was distorted into something entirely different!

Follower Prophet

Mian Sahib has also stumbled over the term "follower and prophet" (*ummati aur nabī*). What it actually means has been clearly explained by the Founder himself in the following words:

"So the fact that he has been called a prophet as well as a follower indicates that he shall possess both the aspects of followership (*ummatiyyat*) and prophethood (*nubūwwat*) as it is necessary that both these aspects should be found in a *muhaddath*. But the possessor of perfect prophethood (*sāhib-i nubuwwat-i tāmmah*) owns one aspect of prophethood only. In short, *muhaddathiyyat* is imbued witn both colours. That is why in *Barāhīn-i Ahmadiyyah*, God the Most High gave this humble servant the name of follower as well as prophet."[99]

Mian Sahib's views correspond with those of the Babis[100]

Before concluding, I would like to put a question to Mian Sahib. When he has categorically denied the meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as the Last of the Prophets, from which verse of the Holy Qur'an does he bring Law-bearing prophethood to an end? Had he said that although *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* means the Last of the Prophets, but by this is actually meant the last of the Law-bearing prophets, then he would have kept himself aloof from the Babi doctrine. However, by denying the termination of absolute prophethood he has fully fallen in line with the Babis. If he had said that the verse "This day have I perfected for you your religion,"[101] denotes that the Law (*Shari'ah*) has come to an end, then Mian Zahir-ud-Din,[102] who conforms to his ideas to a certain extent, argues that such words are also to be found about the law of Moses: "Again, We gave the Book to Moses to complete (Our blessings) on him who would do good, and making plain all things and a guidance and a mercy,"[103] and Mian Sahib's own disciples sometimes use this very argument.

I say that if the Law (*Shari'ah*) has been made perfect, it has consequently come to an end; similarly, if prophethood has

reached a stage of perfection it necessarily means that prophethood has also come to an end. And this is a decisive and ultimate argument against him. It is now up to him to reject it and adopt for himself an entirely different religion or join the followers of the Bab.

I have given conclusive proof from the lexicons about the term *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn*, that it was invariably explained by the words 'the last of the prophets' and until now Mian Sahib has not quoted the authority of a single lexicon to prove that the term meant 'prophet by following whom prophets will be made in future,' or, *khātam al-qaum* meant 'that person, by following whom, a nation shall come into existence'. Similarly, I have quoted the evidence of nine different reports by the Holy Prophet and have also mentioned that there are forty reports like that on the subject where the Holy Prophet's being the final prophet has been clearly explained. But Mian Sahib has not quoted a single report which would support his meaning — that by following the Holy Prophet new prophets shall be made in future.

Then I have shown from the writings and sayings of Muslim savants, including the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, that they all believed that the Holy Prophet was the Last Prophet. There have been a few exceptions of those who believe in the coming of Jesus Christ, but they have interpreted it in this way, that Jesus had been born or appointed before the Holy Prophet — and this assumption of theirs is wrong — or have declared him only a *mujaddid* (at the time of his second coming) which is correct but Jesus was prophet of God and his coming as a *mujaddid* after being deposed from his office of prophethood is not proper. This doctrinal error has been rectified by the Founder.

On the other hand, Mian Sahib has not shown from the writings of any of the Muslim divines, including the Promised Messiah, that prophets shall be made in future by following the Holy Prophet. The true and real basis of our faith is the Holy Qur'an and the Tradition (*Hadith*). I have cited all these other testimonies as additional and conclusive proof against him. And my final demand is that he should produce even a solitary authority from the *Hadith*, lexicons and the sayings of the *Imams* in support of his meaning about the term *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn*.

CHAPTER VI

MIAN SAHIB EXPLAINED *KHĀTAM AL-NABIYYĪN* AS THE LAST OF THE PROPHETS IN 1910 C.E.

Finally as conclusive proof against him and his disciples I would like to quote from a writing of Mian Sahib to show that he himself, not long ago, believed that the Holy Prophet was the Last Prophet and he also understood the term *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* in the same sense. In the newspaper *Al-Hakam*, Mian Sahib wrote under the heading of *KHĀTAM AL-NABIYYĪN*:

> "As a result God, the Most High, appointed him *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* and **brought all kinds of prophethood to an end.**"[104]

Probably these meanings were also written in lexicons at that time! Mian Sahib could say about the Founder that he remained in error till the end of his life, or that after his claim of being the Promised Messiah for twelve years he did not know the meaning both of *nabi* and *muhaddath*,[105] but about himself he would not dare use such words. There was a time when he wrote that *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* meant one who brought all kinds of prophethood to an end and now this very term acquired a different meaning, as, one by following whom, prophets will be made in future.

As compared to the above statement in *Al-Hakam* Mian Sahib has expressed his views with further clarity in an article entitled *Najāt* (Salvation) in 1910. There he writes:

"پھر چوتھی آیت جس میں آنحضرت صلعم کے عہدہ کی میعاد بیان کی گئی ہے کہ کب تک آپ ؐ کا مذہب قائم رہے گا یہ ہے ما کان محمد ابا احد من رجالکم و لکن رسول اللہ و خاتم النبین و کان اللہ بکل شئی علیما (سورۃ احزاب رکوع ۵) یعنی نہیں ہیں آنحضرت صلعم تمہارے مردوں میں سے کسی کے باپ لیکن آپ ؐ اللہ تعالیٰ کے رسول ہیں اور رسول بھی کیسے کہ "خاتم النبیین" ہیں اور اللہ تعالیٰ ہر ایک چیز کا جاننے والا ہے اور کوئی ذرہ بھی اس کے علم سے باہر نہیں۔ اس آیت میں خدا تعالیٰ نے فرمایا ہے کہ آنحضرت صلعم خاتم النبیین ہیں اور آپ ؐ کے بعد کوئی شخص نہیں آئے گا کہ جس کو نبوت کے مقام پر کھڑا کیا جائے اور وہ آپ ؐ کی تعلیم کو منسوخ کر دے اور نئی شریعت جاری کرے بلکہ جس قدر اولیاء اللہ ہوں گے اور متقی اور پرہیزگار ہوں گے سب کو آپ کی غلامی میں ہی ملے گا۔ جو کچھ ملے گا۔ اس طرح خدا تعالیٰ نے بتا دیا کہ آپ ؐ کی نبوت نہ صرف اس زمانہ کے لئے ہے بلکہ آئندہ بھی کوئی نبی اور نہیں آئے گا بلکہ اب ہمیشہ کے لئے آپ ؐ کی ہی تعلیم جاری رہے گی اور یہی لوگوں کی ہدایت کا موجب ہو گی۔ جو اس سے باہر نکلے گا وہ درگاہ الٰہی میں نہیں پہنچ سکے گا۔

"اس جگہ ایک اور نکتہ یاد رکھنا چاہئے کہ اس آیت میں خدا تعالیٰ فرماتا ہے کہ کان اللہ بکل شئی علیما مگر بظاہر اس جگہ اس کا جوڑ کوئی معلوم نہیں ہوتا کیونکہ اللہ تعالیٰ نے جس قدر باتیں بیان فرمائی ہیں وہ ظاہر ہیں ان کے لئے یہ بتانا کہ اللہ تعالیٰ ہر ایک چیز کا جاننے والا ہے' کچھ ضروری نہ تھا۔ سو اصل بات یہ ہے کہ یہاں آپ کے خاتم النبیین ہونے کے متعلق ایک پیش گوئی ہے اور وہ یہ ہے کہ آنحضرت صلعم سے پہلے دنیا میں سینکڑوں نبی گزرے ہیں جن کو ہم جانتے ہیں اور جنہوں نے بڑی بڑی کامیابیاں دیکھیں بلکہ کوئی صدی نہیں معلوم ہوتی کہ جس میں ایک نہ ایک جگہ مدعی نبوت نظر نہ آتا ہو۔ چنانچہ کرشن' رامچندر' بدھ' کنفیوشس' زرتشت' موسیٰ' عیسیٰ تو ایسے ہیں کہ جن کے پیرو اب تک دنیا میں

موجود ہیں اور بڑے زور سے اپنا کام کر رہے ہیں۔ اور ہر ایک اپنی ہی سچائی کا دعویٰ پیش کرتا ہے۔ مگر آنحضرت صلعم کے دعوے کے بعد تیرہ سو برس گزر گئے ہیں کہ کسی نے آج تک نبوت کا دعویٰ کر کے کامیابی حاصل نہیں کی۔ آخر آپؐ سے پہلے بھی تو لوگ نبوت کا دعویٰ کرتے تھے اور ان میں سے بہت سے کامیاب ہوئے (جن کو ہم تو سچا ہی سمجھتے ہیں)۔ مگر آپؐ کی بعثت کے بعد یہ سلسلہ کیوں بند ہو گیا۔ اب کیوں کوئی کامیاب نہیں ہوتا۔ صاف معلوم ہوتا ہے کہ وہی پیشگوئی ہے کہ آپؐ خاتم النبیین ہیں۔ اب ہم اسلام کے مخالفین سے پوچھتے ہیں کہ اس سے بڑھ کر کیا نشان ہو سکتا ہے کہ آپؐ کے دعوے کے بعد کوئی شخص جو مدعی نبوت ہوا ہو' کامیاب نہیں ہوا۔ پس اس کی طرف اشارہ تھا کہ کان اللہ بکل شئی علیما یعنی ہم نے آپؐ کو خاتم النبیین بنایا ہے اور ہم جانتے ہیں کہ آپ کے بعد کوئی نبی نہیں آئے گا۔ اور کوئی جھوٹا آدمی بھی ایسا دعویٰ نہ کرے گا کہ ہم اس کو ہلاک نہ کر دیں۔ چنانچہ یہ ایک تاریخی پیشگوئی ہے کہ اس کا رد کسی سے ممکن نہیں' اگر ہے تو ہمارے سامنے پیش کرو۔ مگر اس طرح نہیں کہ کسی نے دعویٰ کیا ہو اور لاکھ دو لاکھ آدمی اس کے پیرو ہو گئے ہوں۔ بلکہ ایسا آدمی کہ جس نے آنحضرت صلعم یا آپؐ سے پہلے نبیوں کی طرح کامیابی حاصل کی ہو۔ مگر کوئی نہیں جو ایسی نظیر پیش کر سکے"۔

(رسالہ شہید الاذہان' اپریل ۱۹۱۰ء ص ص ۱۵۱۔۱۵۲)

"Then the fourth verse which mentions the period of the Holy Prophet's office that is, how long his religion will last, is: "Muhammad is not the father of any of your men but he is the Messenger of Allah and *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* and Allah is ever Knower of all things (33:40).

"In this verse, God has said that the Holy Prophet is *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn*, and none shall come after him who may be raised to the dignity of prophethood and may abrogate his teachings and establish a new Law; nay,

whatever *auliyā Allāh* (saints)[106] there are and whatever God-fearing and righteous people there are, will get, whatever they get, through obeisance to him. Thus God has made it clear that his prophethood was meant not only for the age in which he appeared, but that no prophet will come after him and his teaching will remain in existence for ever and it will be the only source of guidance for mankind and whoever shall go out of it will not be able to reach the threshold of God.

"At this place, another point should be borne in mind that God says in this verse: Allah is ever Knower of all things. Obviously this part does not seem to fit in here, because all the things which God has told are evident and to say about them that God is the Knower of everything was not really necessary. So the real point here is of a prophecy about the Holy Prophet being the *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* and that prophecy is, that before the Holy Prophet, hundreds of prophets have passed, about whom we know, and they have been extremely successful. There does not seem to be a century in which a claimant to prophethood is not found somewhere. Accordingly, the followers of Krishna, Ramachandra, Confucius, Zoroaster, Moses and Jesus who are still found in the world are enthusiastically engaged in this work and every one of them puts forth the truth about his own claim, but during the thirteen hundred years that have passed since the Holy Prophet's claim, no one who laid claim to prophethood has been successful. Undoubtedly there arose people before him who claimed prophethood and many of them were successful, (and we regard them to be true in their claims), but why has this law ceased to work after the appearance of the Holy Prophet? It is clear that it is due to the prophecy that he is the *Khātam al-*

> *Nabiyyīn*. Now we ask the opponents of Islam what greater sign can there be than this, that after the Holy Prophet's claim none who laid claim to prophethood has been successful? It is in reference to this that the verse ends with the words: 'God is ever Knower of all things;' that is to say, 'We have made him *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* and We know that no prophet would appear after him, and that even a liar would not lay claim to this office whom We would not destroy. This is historical prophecy which no one can deny, and if there is anyone who denies it, produce him before us but not in the way that a person laid a claim and a hundred thousand persons became his followers, but like such a person who achieved success like the Holy Prophet or like the previous prophets. There is no one who can produce such an example."[107]

Now, in this article, two points are clear. Firstly, where it has been mentioned, 'and none shall come after him who may be raised to the dignity of prophethood,' and later it has been added, 'nay, whatever *auliyā' Allāh* (saints) there are,' which show that at that time Mian Sahib truly believed in the appearance of only saints (*auliyā' Allāh*) after the Holy Prophet and he accepted the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement from among the category of saints only, and not of the prophets. And if the Founder had ever used the word *nabi* or *rasul* for himself, it was only in the sense in which he had accepted other (Muslim) dignitaries obtaining the rank of prophethood by way of metaphor and simile about which he has argued from the hadith: "the learned of my nation will be like the Israelite prophets." This means that there are only *auliyā'* after the Holy Prophet and not *anbiya'*. And this is absolutely correct and on all fours with the views of the Founder who wrote in *Tiryāq al-Qulūb*:

> "It has been my belief right from the beginning that no one can become a *kafir* or *dajjāl* on account of denying my claim."[108]

Under this a footnote is added:

> "It is to be remembered, that to call a denier of one's claim a *kāfir* is the privilege of those prophets alone who bring from God, Law (*Shari'ah*) and new commandments, but as for all the inspired ones (*mulham*), and the ones spoken to by God (*muhaddathīn*), other than the possessors of the *Shari'ah*, however great their dignity may be in the sight of God, and how even much they may have been honoured by being spoken to by God, no one becomes a *kāfir* by their denial."

The words 'the inspired ones' and 'the ones spoken to by God other than the possessors of the Law', should be particularly noted.

The other point is that at the time of writing his article about *Najāt*, Mian Sahib did not regard the Promised Messiah as a true claimant to prophethood because he clearly says: "During the thirteen hundred years that have passed since the Holy Prophet's claim, no one who laid claim to prophethood has been successful" and, about the future the same is true that "God has made the Holy Prophet *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* and God knows that no prophet would appear after him and that even a liar would not lay claim to this office whom We (God) would not destroy."

It has been clearly admitted here by Mian Sahib that neither can there be a true prophet after the Holy Prophet nor can a false prophet become successful after laying claim to this office and he has issued a big challenge that 'this is a historical

prophecy which no one can deny, and if there is any one who denies it, produce him before us!'

I hope Mian Sahib will find his own argument sufficiently strong enough to nullify his own convictions on the subject.

SUMMARY

The sum total of all this is that Mian Sahib had said that the meaning of *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* in the lexicons was not the last of the prophets and the meaning he had rendered — that is to say, such a prophet by following whom prophets will be made — was mentioned in the lexicons in a clear-cut manner without any interpretation attached thereto.[109]

I have, however, shown from almost all the lexicons, the Traditions and the sayings of the *Imams* that they all rendered *Khatam al-Nabiyyin* as the Last of the Prophets. And this is also the meaning which the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement also gave to these words. On the other hand, Mian Sahib has not produced even a weak or counterfeit authority in his support — neither any idiom of Arabic usage nor a saying of the Founder that the term *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* meant a prophet by following whom prophets will be made in future. *Khātam* may mean a "seal" or the "last". But *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* in both cases means the Last of the Prophets.

Now, either Mian Sahib should prove his own meanings from any tradition or if not, at least from any sayings of the *Imams*, or from the Arabic dictionary that the phrase *Khātam al-qaum* did not mean the last (person) of the people but a person by following whom people were to be made. It is only in this manner that his statement could be considered true. It

should also be borne in mind that this very point settles the question of prophethood, because if the meaning of the term *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* is the Last of the Prophets, the issue about the Promised Messiah's prophethood is automatically settled — that is to say, no prophet could appear after the Last Prophet.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

* It has been translated by me under the name *Prophethood in Islam*. Its first three chapters were published by the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishā'at-i-Islam, Lahore (Pakistan) in 1968. An abridged edition of the first few chapters was also published by the Woking Muslim Mission & Literary Trust, Woking, Surrey, England under the name *The Finality of Prophethood*. The complete translation has now been published by Maulana Tufail Literary Memorial Trust, U.K.

1. Truth about *Khātm-i-Nubūwwat*, Mirza Bashir Ahmad, pp. 7-8, 11.

2. If the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement was a prophet of the third category, or for that matter of any category, how is it that after his death, *Maulana* Nur-ud-Din, his foremost and beloved disciple and his first successor, accepted by both sections of the community, approved with the full knowledge of the members of the Anjuman and elders of the community, the following words to be inscribed on the headstone of the Founder's grave: **Mujaddid of the 14th century?**

   When an army officer dies his last rank is mentioned on his epitaph. If he is a colonel he is described as a colonel and not as a captain or an officer of a lower rank.

   It is also worth mentioning that 30 years after this headstone was replaced by another one, the words, '**Mujaddid of the 14th century** are, of course, not there any more.

3. Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, leader of Qadian Section.

4. *Tirmidhi* Ch. Names of the Prophet.

5. The Qur'an, 33:46

6. The other is the Unity of Godhood. Tr.

7. Referred to later as Mian Sahib. Tr.

8. The greatest error in which Mian Sahib has tried to lead his community is, that as the meaning of *khātam* in the lexicons is "seal", therefore it would automatically render *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* as such a prophet by following whom others will be made prophets in future. We do not

challenge the meaning of word *khātam*. What we demand is that he should show from the lexicons that the term *Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* means such a prophet by following whom other persons would become prophets.

9. *Imam* Muhibb al-Din Abu-I-Faiz Murtaza.
10. *'Allamah* Abu-I-Fazl Jamāl al-Din Muhammad ibn Mukarram.
11. *Sheikh* Abu-I-Qāsim Al-Hussain al-Rāghib al-Isfahāni.
12. *Dictionary of Hadith* by *Al-Sheikh* Muhammad Tāhir.
13. Edward William Lane.
14. Abu-I-Qāsim Mahmūd ibn 'Umar al-Zamakhshari.
15. Worshipping one's spiritual leader. Tr.
16. Most of these reports have been added in the Supplement. Tr.
17. Published by the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishā'at Islam, Lahore. Jan. 1922.
18. *Al-Sahih al-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-Manāqib, ch. Khātam al-Nabiyyīn; Al-Muslim; Tirmidhi, abwāb al-Manāqib, etc.*
19. *Al-Sahih al-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-Tauhid; Al-Muslim, Abwāb al-Fitan; al-Dārmi, Ibn Mājah.*
20. *Masnad, Imam* Ahmad; *Tirmizi.*
21. *Sahih of al-Bukhārī* and *Muslim; Musnad of Imam Ahmad; Ibn Mājah.*
22. Unanimously accepted.
23. *Bukhārī, Muslim.*
24. *Muslim, Nasā'i, Tirmizi.*
25. *Sahih al-Bukhārī, Muslim, Mishkāt al-Masābih, ch. Manāqib Ali.*
26. *Tirmizi,* ch. *Manāqib 'Umar.*
27. The Qur'an, 7:31. The complete verse is "*Eat and drink and be not prodigal.*"
28. The Qur'an 4:43. The other part of the verse is ". . . *when you are intoxicated.*"
29. *Al-Muslim.*
30. *Haqiqat al-Wahy,* pp. 170-171.
31. *Ibn Mājah, Kitāb al-Janāiz,* ch. Prayer for the Messenger's son and the mention of his death.
32. The Qur'an, 6:15;39:13.

33. *Ibid.* 39:65.

34. *Ibid.* 43:81.

35. *Ibid.* 21:22.

36. *Ibn Mājah, kitāb al-Janā'iz,* ch. Prayer for the Messenger's son and the mention of his death.

37. Sometime it is said that *Mullā* 'Ali Qārī and Baidāwi accepted this hadith as true. These two persons were not critics of the *Hadith.* Therefore, their opinion on this matter is not authentic. Tr.

38. *Ibn. Mājah, Kitāb al-janā'iz.*

39. The Qur'an, 21:22.

40. *Tirmizi,* ch. *Manāqib 'Umar.*

41. I shall discuss the point later on, that to ascribe such a meaning to the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, is nothing but slander.

42. I will discuss it later that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement regarded such a *nabi* as a *muhaddath* (one spoken to by God).

43. See ch. II, p. 31.

44. I cannot lay hand on the original document as referred to by *Maulana* Muhammad 'Ali in his article, but Ibn-i Arabi's quotations have been extensively used in their incomplete forms several times by the scholars of the Rabwah section. On this subject *Mirza* Bashir Ahmad, one of their leading scholars, has presented his case thus:

"I will now refer to the pronouncement of Hazrat Shaikh-i Akbar Muhy-ud-Did Ibn-i 'Arabi (died A.H. 638) who was a great luminary of the Middle Ages of Islam. In his pronouncement he is very explicit and reiterates that only the door to Law-bearing prophethood and not of general prophethood has been closed. He says:

ان النبوة التی انقطعت بوجود رسول الله صلی الله علیه وسلم انما هی النبوة التشریع لا مقامها... وهذا معنی قوله صلی الله علیه وسلم ان الرسالة حکماً اخر و هذا معنی قوله صلی الله علیه وسلم ان الرسالة و النبوة قد انقطعت فلا رسول بعدی و لا نبی ای لا نبی بعدی یکون علی شرع بخالف شرعی بل اذا کان یکون تحت حکم شریعتی۔

(فتوحات مکیہ، جلد ۲، صفحہ ۳ طبع مصر)

'The prophethood that terminated with the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), is verily the Law-bearing prophethood since there remains no need in this field; therefore, there is no further Law to abrogate his Law nor to add to his Law any new ordinance.. and this is the meaning of his statement that 'verily apostleship and prophethood ceased,' and therefore there shall not be another apostle after him, nor such a prophet as 'would follow a law other than mine but he shall be subject to my law'. (*Futūhāt-i Makkiyyah*, vol 2, p.3, printed in Egypt).

"(General) prophethood is open to people till the Day of Judgement and only Law-making has stopped; and Law-making is but one of the parts of prophethood" (*Futūhāt-i 'Makkiyyah*, vol. ii, p. 100) And in yet another book, Hazrat Ibn-i 'Arabi says:

"In so far as Law-bearing prophethood is concerned, it has verily ceased and terminated in Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and therefore there is no Law-giving prophet after him, but Allah has, in His graciousness to His servants continued general prophethood without the Law-bearing elements" (*Fusūsul al-Hikam*, pp. 140, 161).

The above three pronouncements of a leading luminary and eminent scholar of Islam, made some 700 years ago, decisively establish the four cardinal principles:

1. That according to *Hazrat Shaikh* Muhy-ud-Din Ibn-i 'Arabi only the door of Law-bearing prophethood has been closed after the appointment of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and not of every category of prophethood.

2. That according to *Hazrat Shaikh*, the door to non-Law-bearing prophethood is kept open after the advent of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and shall remain open till the Day of Judgement and such type of prophethood has been termed as "general prophethood" by him.

3. That whosoever comes after the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) shall follow his Law and be subject to his command.

4. That prophethood is composed of several elements, and Law-giving is but one of the components of prophethood.

(See, *Mirza* Bashir Ahmad's *Truth About Khatm-i Nubuwwat*, pp.128-131, published by the Ahmadiyya Muslim Foreign Missions, Rabwah, Pakistan.)

45. The Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement has accepted the same meaning of Law-bearing prophethood (*tashri-'i nubuwwah*) as he says:

"This is a point worth remembering, that to call a denier of one's claim a *kafir* is the privilege of those prophets alone who bring from God, the Most High, a Law (*Shari'ah*), and new commandments, but as for all the inspired ones (*mulham*) and the ones spoken to by God (*muhaddath*) other than the possessors of *Shari'ah*, however much they may have been honoured by being spoken to by God, no one becomes a *kafir* by their denial" (*Tiryāq al-Qulūb*, p. 120, footnote).

This shows that besides law-bearing prophethood, whatever is left there, its name is *muhaddathiyyat* which contains nothing else but receiving good-news (*mubashshirat*).

46. Every scholar has his own way and terminology for explaining things which should not be confused with the terminology of other scholars. — Tr.

47. An expression used at receiving the news of the death of a person or the loss of a thing. Tr.

48. The Qur'an, 40:15.

49. *Futūhāt-i Makkiyyah*, vol. ii, p. 188.

50. The Qur'an, 16:68; *Futūhāt*, vol. ii, p.5.

51. *Al-Bukhārī, Kitab: Faza'il Ashab al-Nabi*, ch. *Manaqib 'Umar.*

52. *Al-Yawaqit wal-Jawahir*, vol. ii, p. 22.

53. The Qur'an, 42:51. *Maulana* Muhammad Ali's detailed comments on this verse should be of some interest here:

"And it is not vouchsafed to a mortal that Allah should speak to him, except by revelation, or from behind a veil, or by sending a messenger and revealing by His permission what He pleases. Surely He is High, Wise."

This verse shows how Allah speaks to a person or makes known His will to him. Three modes of this are stated: (1) By *Wahy*, which is generally translated as meaning revelation. The primary significance of the word *wahy* is, however, a hasty suggestion, and since the different kinds of revelation are spoken of here, the meaning intended must be

the primary significance of the word. Hence, the inspired words which enter the hearts of the prophets and of the righteous are called *wahy* or revelation, because it is like a hasty suggestion made directly to the heart of the inspired one, *ilqa-'un fil-rau*. It is in this sense that a revelation is spoken of as being granted to the mother of Moses (28:7), and to the apostles of Jesus who were not prophets (5:111). 2. The second mode of Allah's speaking to His servants is that He speaks from behind a veil — a scene is shown as in a vision carrying a deeper significance, or words are heard by the person spoken to as from behind a veil, 3. The third form of revelation is that in which a messenger — an angel — is chosen by the Almighty to deliver His message to the person to whom He wishes to speak. This is the highest form of revelation and such is the revelation of the Holy Qur'an, recited by Gabriel and granted to the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). This is called *wahy matluww, or revelation that is recited.* This revelation is granted only to prophets, while the other two may also be granted to the righteous who are not raised to the dignity of prophethood. It should, however, be borne in mind that in all these cases the recipient of the revelation is granted certain other senses. He sees what others do not see and he hears words which others do not hear. It is, therefore, with what may be called the spiritual senses that he hears and sees and feels things which others do not hear, see, or feel.

54. *Haqiqat al-Nubuwwat,* p.109, where after making a mention of *mubashshirāt*, he says: "something which God declares as true prophethood."
55. *Al-Yawāqīt wal-Jawāhir*, vol. ii, p. 72.
56. *Maktūbāt Ahmadiyyah*, vol. i, letter No. 27.
57. *Maktūbāt Ahmadiyya*, vol. ii, p. 99.
58. *Izalah Auham*, p. 915, quoted from *Maktūbāt*, vol. ii, p. 99.
59. The Qur'an, 2:42.
60. God's shadow or reflection by which Muslim kings were addressed. Tr.
61. Mirza Mazhar Jānjānān was the author of several books. His letters (*Maktūbāt*) have been printed separately. In one of his letters he has written about Hindus:

"Prophets and messengers were sent to India also, and they have been mentioned in their books. News and signs about them show that they were possessors of (spiritual) excellences. God's general mercy did not

forget the spiritual needs of mankind in this land. However, before the advent of the Holy Prophet of the Last Ages every nation had a messenger to whom obedience and subjection for that nation were essential and it was not concerned with the prophet of another nation. But since our Messenger, the Last of all the Messengers, has been appointed, there will be no prophet till the end of the world. (As quoted in *Mauj-i Kauthar* p. 648 by Dr. Shaikh Muhammad Ikrām, published by Ferozsons, Lahore 1970 edition).

62. As quoted in a commentary of the Holy Qur'an, *Durr-i Mansūr*, vol.v and *Takmilah Majma' al-Bihār*, p. 85.

63. To interpret a sentence which has only one meaning with a sentence which has two meanings is the invention of Maulvi 'Abdullāh Chakrālwi who interpreted the verse *obey Allah and the Messenger* (3:131), like this that the word *rasūl* means messenger as well as message which is the interpretation of Allah. Mian Sahib has also found this way of escape.

64. *Durr-i Mansūr* by Imam Suyūtī under v. 33:40.

65. Is it not possible that this saying might have been wrongfully attributed to Hazrat 'Ā'ishah because no authority has been quoted to establish its authenticity?

66. *There is no prophet after him.*

67. For a detailed discussion of this point see Maulana Muhammad Ali's book *Masīh Mau'ūd* (The Promised Messiah). Tr.

68. This is not the "seal" about which Mian Sahib says that by bearing it prophets are made.

69. *Izālah Auhām*, p. 534.

70. *Ibid.*, p. 575.

71. *Ibid.*, p. 577.

73. *Ibid.*, p. 614.

74. *Nishān-i Asmāni*, p. 28.

75. *A'inah Kamālāt-i Islām* (20th February 1893), p. 27.

76. The Holy Qur'an, 33:40.

77. *Al-Bukhari, al-Muslim* etc. ch. *Manāqib 'Ali.*

78. *Hamāmat al-Bushrā*, p.20.

79. This subject has been discussed in detail in Maulana Muhammad Ali's *Al-Nubūwwat fil Islām* particularly in chapter 9.

80. *Al-Wasiyyat* (20th December 1905), p.10.

81. *Lecture Islam, Sialkot* (2nd Novemeber 1904), p.6.

82. *Haqiqat al-Wahy* (15th May 1907), p. 141.

83. *Ibid.*, Supplement, p. 64.

84. A mystical term indicating the manifestation or reflection of another person's prophethood. Tr.

85. *Izālah Auhām* (3rd September 1891), p. 575.

86. Does this seal make prophets, or bring prophets to an end?

87. *Chashma Masihi* (1st March, 1906), p. 40.

88. This has been the general practice by other scholars and authors of the Rabwah section Tr.

    Haqiqat al-Wahy, p. 97 footnote. The last sentence could also be translated thus: "and his care is a prophet-fashioner of a spiritual category." This, in fact, will be in consonance with the text which subsequently mentions the coming of the *like* of prophets (not prophets) in the *Ummah*. It is interesting to note that one of the revelations of the Founder is:

    "Thou art to me like the prophets of Israel (that is by way of reflection, thou resemblest them)" (*Tabligh-i Risālat*, vol.i, p. 61, originally quoted from *Ishtihār*, 20th February 1886. Tr.)

    See also *Maktūbāt Ahmadiyya*, vol.i, Letter No. 271, already quoted in ch. iii, p. 46.

89. *Ibid.*

90. *Haqiqat al-Wahy*, Supplement, p. 44.

91. *Ibid.*

92. *Ibid.*

93. *Ibid.*

94. *Izālah Auhām* (3rd September, 1891), p. 579, detailed ref. quoted in ch. V. See also *Izālah Auhām*, pp. 349, 421.

95. "The writings before 1901 wherein he denied being a prophet have been abrogated now, and it is wrong to argue from them" (*Haqiqat al-Nubūwwat*, p. 121, by Mirza Mahmūd Ahmad, 1915 edition). Tr.

96. "The word *Khātam* means primarily a seal, and secondarily, the end or the last part or portion of a thing, the latter being the primary significance of the word *khātam*," The Holy Qur'an (English) by Muhammad 'Ali, under verse 33:40, 1920 edition. Tr.

97. that is, *There will be no prophet after him* (Tr.)

98. *Haqiqat al-Wahy*, pp. 27, 28.

99. *Izālah Auhām* (3rd September 1891), p. 533.

A detailed discussion on this point will be found in *Al-Nubūwwat fil Islām*, ch. 7 and 8, *Ahmadiyya Movement*, ch. 4. Tr.

100. Ali Muhammad Bāb of Shirāz (born March 26, 1821 executed July, 8, 1850) expounded a new doctrine abrogating and altering the Qur'anic Law. After the death of Bāb, schism divided the Babis into two sects, the Azabis and the Bahā'is. For a detailed discussion see *Bābi Movement* by Muhammad 'Ali. Tr.

101. The Holy Qur'an, 5:3.

102. Mian Zahir-ud-Din, a clerk in the Canal Department at Gujranwala wrote a book entitled *Nabi Ullāh Kā Zahūr* (The Appearance of a Prophet of God) in 1911. In this book the writer tried to prove that the Holy Prophet was not the last of the prophets and that prophets would continue to appear after him. The author had some correspondence with the Maulana Nur-ud-Din after which he was excommunicated from the Ahmadiyya community. This was followed by repentance on the part of Zahir-ud-Din, but the repentance was not long-lived. In 1913 he published another pamphlet in which he tried to defend his previous views. For the promulgation of these beliefs, the Ahmadiyya community again cut off all connections with him. It is also alleged that he claimed *khilāfat* for himself and that was one of the reasons of his excommunication. Tr.

خلاصہ کلام یہ کہ حضرت مسیح موعود چونکہ ابتداء نبی کی تعریف یہ خیال فرماتے تھے کہ نبی وہ ہے جو نئی شریعت لائے یا بعض حکم منسوخ کرے یا بلاواسطہ نبی ہو اس لئے باوجود اس کے کہ وہ سب شرائط جو نبی کے لئے واقع میں ضروری ہیں آپ میں پائی جاتی تھیں۔ آپ نبی کا نام اختیار کرنے سے انکار کرتے رہے اور گو ان ساری باتوں کا دعویٰ کرتے رہے جن کے پائے جانے سے کوئی شخص نبی ہو جاتا ہے لیکن چونکہ آپ ان شرائط کو نبی کی شرائط نہیں خیال کرتے تھے بلکہ محدث کی شرائط سمجھتے تھے اس لئے اپنے آپ کو محدث کہتے رہے اور نہیں جانتے تھے کہ میں دعوے کی کیفیت تو وہ بیان کرتا ہوں جو نبیوں کے سوا اور کسی میں پائی نہیں جاتی اور نبی ہونے سے انکار کرتا ہوں"۔

(حقیقتہ النبوۃ از مرزا بشیر الدین محمود احمد صاحب صفحہ ۱۲۴۔ ایڈیشن اول، ۱۹۱۵ء قادیان)۔

103. The Holy Qur'an, 6:155

104. *Al-Hakam,* 14th March, 1911.

105. "In short, because the Promised Messiah, in the beginning, thought that the definition of a prophet was that he should bring a new *Shari'ah*, or should abrogate some commands, or should be raised directly, therefore, in spite of the fact, that all the conditions which were really essential for being a prophet were found in him, he declined to accept the title of prophet for himself, and although he professed a claim in those very things wherewith a man could become a prophet, nevertheless since he took these conditions to be the conditions of a *muhaddath*, and not of a prophet, he always called himself a *muhaddath*, not knowing that the nature of his claim as propounded by him was such as could not be found in anyone but a prophet" (*Haqiqat al-Nubūwwat*, Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmūd Ahmad, p. 124, 1915 edition, Qadian). Tr.

106. This shows clearly that he was then conscious that *auliyā Allāh*, and not prophet, was the proper term for the great men who appeared after the Holy Prophet.

107. *Tashhīz al-Azhān*, (April 1910 C.E.), Qadian.

108. *Tiryāq al-Qulūb* (28th October, 1902), p. 120.

109. See ch. i, p. 10.

For further information and literature on Islam & Ahmadiyyat, Please contact the following branches and our representatives in India

(1) Musjide Ahmadiyya Qalamdanpura SRINAGAR - 190 002. Kashmir

(2) Dr. Khurshid Alam Tareen C/o Tareen Medicate Bara Paththar Batamaloo SRINAGAR - 190 009. Kashmir

(3) Musjide Ahmadiyya. Peermitha Lakhdata Bazar JAMMU. J & K State

(4) Musjide Ahmadiyya. Mohalla HAVELI BHADARWAH. Dist. - DODA. J & K State

(5) Musjide Ahmadiyya, Darus Salam YARIPURA. Dist. - ANANTNAG. Kashmir 192232.

(6) Musjide Ahmadiyya C/o Haji MUHAMMAD SIDDIQ BUTT SOOFIPURA 192124 Dist. - PULWAMA. Kashmir

(7) AHMADIYYA ANJUMAN ISHAAT-I-ISLAM Fatimabai Court, 4th Floor, 17, M. Azad Road, Jacob Circle, BOMBAY - 400 011. Tel. 309 34 38 & 308 83 30.

(8) Mr MUHAMMAD ISRAIL SAHEB H/3 – 6/3. CANAL WEST ROAD, CALCUTTA 700 009.

A Comparative Study

BELIEFS OF THE TWO SECTIONS OF THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT

Lahore Section	Qadian Section
1. Muhammad (may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) is *Khatam al-Nabiyyin*, the interpretation of which is that he is the greatest and the *last of* all the prophets.	1. Muhammad (may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) is *Khatam al-Nabiyyin*, the interpretation of which is that he is the greatest though not the last of all the prophets.
2. The Holy Quran is the final *Shariah* (code) for the world.	2. The same.
3. No prophet, whether new or old, shall appear after the Holy Prophet Muhammad.	3. Prophets appear after the Holy Prophet Muhammad.
4. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian was not a prophet but a *Mujaddid* (Reformer) and Promised Messiah and Mahdi in Islam.	4. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was a prophet as well as Promised Messiah and Mahdi in Islam.
5. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad never changed his claim, views or definition of prophethood in 1901 with the publication of *Ek Ghalati ka Izala*.	5. The first written evidence of the change of belief with regard to prophethood was the poster *Ek Ghalati ka Izala*.
6. Belief in the advent of Mirza Sahib as a Mujaddid is not essential for becoming Muslim but his acceptance is necessary in the interest of progressive Islam.	6. Belief in the mission of Mirza Sahib as the prophet is essential for becoming Muslim.

Lahore Section	Qadian Section
7. Any one who professes faith in the Kalima – *La-ilaha illa llahu Muhammad ur Rasul Allah* (there is only one God and Muhammad is His Apostle) — is a Muslim and not a *kafir*.	7. Any one, who does not believe Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian to be a Prophet, is a *kafir*.
8. It is permitted to say prayers behind any Muslim Imam provided he is not guilty of proclaiming other Muslims *kafirs*.	8. It is not permitted to say prayers behind any Imam who does not recognise Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's claims.
9. Marriage relations with non-Ahmadis are permitted.	9. Marriage relations with non-Ahmadis are not permitted.
10. After the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) Wahi-e-Nabuwat has ceased, only Wahi-e-Wilayat (Saintly revelation) is continued. Hazrat Mirza Sahib's revelation was Wahi-e-Wilayat and not Wahi-e-Nabuwat.	10. After the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) Wahi-e-Nabuwat is continued. Hazrat Mirza Sahib's revelation was Wahi-e-Nabuwat.
11. The Founder of the Lahore Section was Maulana Muhammad Ali, M.A., LL.B. Translator and commentator of the Holy Qur'an into English, a companion and disciple of the Founder of the Movement.	11. The Founder of the Qadian Section was Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, who was the son of the Founder of the Movement and was a young man in his teens at the time of his noble father's death.
12. The members of this section call themselves Ahmadis, and are generally known also as Ahmadis or Ahmadis of Lahore Movement.	12. The members of this section call themselves Ahmadis, but are generally known as Qadianis.