

# *Correction of an Error*

English translation of  
*Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*

by

**Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad,  
Founder of the Ahmadiyya  
Movement**

*With explanatory Notes  
and a detailed study of the subject*

**Ahmadiyya Anjuman Lahore Publications, U.K.**

*CORRECTION OF AN ERROR*

# Correction of an Error

English Translation of

*Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*

by

**Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad**

**Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement**

*Translated by*

**Zahid Aziz**

with

*Explanatory notes, further discussion  
and a detailed study of the subject*

Incorporated by the Translator

Ahmadiyya Anjuman Lahore Publications, U.K.

2011

A LAHORE AHMADIYYA PUBLICATION

*Urdu pamphlet 'Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala', first published, November 1901*

*This translation with Notes and Study, March 2011*

Copyright © 2011 by Ahmadiyya Anjuman Lahore Publications, U.K.  
15 Stanley Avenue, Wembley, U.K., HA0 4JQ

Websites: [www.aaiil.org](http://www.aaiil.org)  
[www.ahmadiyya.org](http://www.ahmadiyya.org)

e-mails: [aaiil.uk@gmail.com](mailto:aaiil.uk@gmail.com)  
[info@ahmadiyya.org](mailto:info@ahmadiyya.org)

*This book is available on the Internet at the above websites.*

ISBN: 978-1-906109-10-3

## Preface

*Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*, a short Urdu writing by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, dealing with his claims, was published in November 1901. About thirteen years later, it was alleged by one section of his followers that he had announced in this pamphlet that he was laying claim to be a prophet. In refutation of this charge, the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha‘at Islam of Lahore, known colloquially as the Lahore section or Lahore *Jama‘at* of the Ahmadiyya Movement, has over the years published this pamphlet several times, along with commentary and additional material by various of its scholars, showing that he did not claim to be a prophet.

An English translation with introduction and explanatory notes was published as long ago as 1951, translated and compiled by Maulana Shaikh Muhammad Tufail, who was later Imam of the Woking Mosque in England.

After my experience of translating the writings of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad for the Cape Town (South Africa) court cases of the 1980s, relating to his claims, I translated *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* afresh in the late 1990s and added a series of explanatory notes. This version was published on our websites, along with an introduction quoting the views of Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, Head of the Qadiani *Jama‘at*, to show their beliefs about why this pamphlet was written.

That website version, with some revision, is now presented here in print for the first time, with some additional material comprising Sections 4 to 8 of this publication.

We have in this publication refuted the false notion that in *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad cancelled his previous denials, made over the past ten years, of claiming to be a prophet, and that his writings from that time onwards express his claim of being a prophet, instead of his earlier claim of being a reformer and saint.

This false conception has a similarity with certain erroneous interpretations of the teachings of Islam. It is widely believed both by critics of Islam as well as a large section of the Muslim *Ulama* that although the Holy Prophet Muhammad, during the first years of his mission at Makka, taught freedom of religion, tolerance and forgiveness but these principles were abrogated during his life at Madina and there he preached a religion of violence, intolerance, forced conversion, and unrelenting war against all non-Muslims. However, now there is a growing realization that the basic principles taught at Makka cannot be overturned because of the later wars at Madina, but still remain in force, and are in fact more relevant and necessary today than ever because they are permanent, fundamental cornerstones of Islam.

Likewise, the principles regarding the concept of prophethood and revelation in Islam, and regarding his own claims, which Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has elaborated at great length in so many books over the long period of 1891 to 1901, cannot be lightly ignored on the pretext that they have been annulled by a few passages in later writings. They are essential and basic to understanding his claims correctly.

Zahid Aziz  
March 2011

# Contents

<b>Preface .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1. The Controversy about this Pamphlet.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Correction of an Error .....</b>	<b>9</b>
Translation of <i>Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala</i> by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad	
<b>3. Notes on the Translation .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>4. Letter of Reply to Opponent by Maulana     Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan of Amroha .....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>5. Maulana Sana-ullah of Amritsar and the     Theory of Change of Claim in 1901 .....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>6. Seventy Ahmadis take oath that no change in     claim took place in 1901 .....</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>7. Final Collapse of ‘Change of Claim’ Theory     under its own Contradictions .....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>8. Finality of Prophethood in the book <i>Haqiqat-     ul-Wahy</i> .....</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Index of Quoted Sources .....</b>	<b>105</b>

## Explanation

In the translation of *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* (pages 9–20), each number placed within square brackets in bold, such as [1], indicates the number of the note in the Notes section (pages 21–70) which relates to that point in the translation. For the reader’s convenience, on every page of the translation which has references to notes, the page numbers of the Notes section where those notes start are indicated at the foot of the page under a ruled line. In the Notes section, the heading of each note indicates the page number of the translation section where the reference to the note occurs.

In all translated extracts in various sections of this book, including the translation of *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*, wherever it was necessary to insert extra text to clarify the meaning of the translation, such additional words have been placed within square brackets, thus [...]. References to the Holy Quran have also been inserted in the same way.

In the translations, whenever it was necessary to show both the original term and its translated equivalent, either the term or its translation is added in parentheses, after the other; for example, “claims to be a prophet (*nabi*)” and “this promised one would be his *burooz* (image)”.

The *Publisher’s Note* at the foot of page 16, quoting the vision of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad about Hazrat Fatima from *Barahin Ahmadiyya*, occurring after the author’s own footnote, was added in 1964 upon the instructions of the authorities in Pakistan. An objection about the vision had been raised, but the authorities were satisfied when they were shown the description of the vision from *Barahin Ahmadiyya* containing the words “*like a kind mother*” and they asked for it to be added in a note.

# 1. The Controversy about this Pamphlet

The short pamphlet by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*, published in November 1901, became controversial in 1915 shortly after the split in the Ahmadiyya Movement. The section which remained in Qadian, under the leadership of Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad (hereinafter called the Qadiani *Jama'at*), believed that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had claimed to be a prophet, while the Lahore *Jama'at* headed by Maulana Muhammad Ali held that he denied claiming to be a prophet but had claimed to be a *mujaddid* and *muhaddas* (a reformer and saint) who is a non-prophet receiving revelation from God.

In response to the many statements of the Founder put forward by the Lahore *Jama'at* in which he denied claiming to be a prophet, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad wrote as follows in his book *Haqiqat-un-Nubuwwah* published in March 1915:

1. "The books in which he has denied being a prophet in clear words, and has called his prophethood as partial and imperfect, and as the prophethood of saints (*muhaddas*), are all without exception books from before the year 1901 ... It is definitely found that in 1901 the Promised Messiah certainly made a change in his belief, that is to say, previously he considered his prophethood as being sainthood (*muhaddas*) but afterwards he only called it prophethood." — p. 120.

2. “The issue of prophethood became clear to him in 1900 or 1901, and as *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* was published in 1901, in which he has proclaimed his prophethood most forcefully, it shows that he made a change in his belief in 1901, and the year 1900 is a middle period which is like a boundary between the two views. ... It is proved that the references dating prior to the year 1901 in which he has denied being a prophet, are now abrogated and it is an error to use them as evidence.” — p. 121.
3. “The Promised Messiah during two different periods defined ‘prophet’ in two different ways. Before the year 1901 he used one definition of ‘prophet’. Afterwards, by pondering on his continuous revelation from God and by examining the Holy Quran, he discovered a different definition of ‘prophet’. According to the previous definition of ‘prophet’ in his mind, he was not a prophet, and therefore while all the characteristics of prophethood were found in him, he refrained from calling himself a prophet. ... Thus afterwards he had to change his belief. He discovered from the Holy Quran that the definition of ‘prophet’ was different from what he had thought, and as according to the definition of ‘prophet’ in the Quran he was proved to be a prophet, therefore he declared his prophethood” — p. 122.
4. “The first evidence of the change in this belief is found in the announcement *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*, which is the first written evidence.” — p. 124.\*

It can be seen that the Qadiani and the Lahore Ahmadis *both agree* that after Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad laid claim to be the Promised Messiah in 1891, he denied and kept on denying that he was claiming to be a prophet, and claimed to

---

\* This book is available on the Qadiani *Jama'at* website [www.alislam.org](http://www.alislam.org) in the collection *Anwar-ul-'ulum*, v. 2, as book no. 10. See pages 444–447 for these extracts.

be a *muhaddas* and *mujaddid*. The difference between them is that the Qadiani Ahmadis believe that after about ten years he *changed* his position and declared to the world in *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* in November 1901 that he was in fact a prophet. But the Lahore Ahmadis hold that his position never changed, and remained the same as it was before to the very end of his life.

It is not sufficient for the Qadiani *Jama'at* just to point out that Hazrat Mirza has used for himself the word 'prophet' in this pamphlet, because they agree that he had been using this word for the past ten years but in a metaphorical sense and *without claiming to be a prophet*. What they must show is that in this pamphlet Hazrat Mirza has announced a *change*, saying that he is now using this word *not as in his previous writings* but as meaning a real prophet.

In his book *Haqiqat-un-Nubuwwat* quoted above, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad goes on to summarise his standpoint as follows, as to why *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* was written:

“He [the Promised Messiah] did not know that the nature of the claim he was putting forward was that of a claim that only prophets can make, and no one else, and yet he was denying being a prophet. But when he discovered that the nature of his claim that he had been putting forward since the beginning of his claim was that of prophethood and not sainthood, he declared himself as a prophet, and he rebuked the follower who had denied his being a prophet, telling him: as I am a prophet why did you deny my prophethood.” — p. 124

The question to be determined is, whether this is what he has written in this pamphlet, namely, that he was wrong in his previous writings to deny being a prophet, and that he was now publishing a correction of *his own* error.

In the above extract, the last part (“he rebuked the follower who had denied his being a prophet”) contradicts the beginning of the same extract, and indeed it contradicts Mirza Mahmud

Ahmad's whole argument. The follower could not possibly be rebuked for denying his prophethood since the Promised Messiah himself had been denying his prophethood in all the writings up to that point when he allegedly rebuked his follower in *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala!* If, as alleged by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, the Promised Messiah himself in his writings previous to this pamphlet "did not know that the nature of the claim he was putting forward" was that of a prophet, and as a result he was wrongly "denying being a prophet", how could he rebuke his follower for putting forward the same denial of prophethood?

In recent years the Qadiani *Jama'at* has kept its members in the dark about this explanation of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, and consequently they are generally *unaware* that their own belief is supposed to be that before writing this pamphlet Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had, by mistake, been denying claiming to be a prophet. The impression given to them is that he had claimed to be a prophet already, but that an ignorant follower denied it in an argument with an opponent, just like the Lahore *Jama'at* denies it.

In the recent Qadiani *Jama'at* translation of *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* entitled *A Misconception Removed*, published in 2007, the Publisher's Note says that this pamphlet "is also the last word in settling the dispute between those who believe the Promised Messiah to be a Prophet of God and those who do not". But, as quoted above, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad called it the *first* evidence of claim of prophethood which abrogated all the denials which came before it. They can hardly call it the "last word" if it overturned all that went before it and opened a new phase in the claims of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad.

## 2. Correction of an Error

*Translation of Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*  
by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad

Some people in our Movement who are not well-acquainted with my claim and the arguments relating to it — not having had the occasion to study my books carefully, nor having stayed in my company for a sufficient length of time to complete their knowledge — in some instances in response to an objection of the opponents give a reply which is entirely against facts. So, despite being on the side of truth, they have to face embarrassment.[1]

Thus it happened a few days ago that a person faced from an opponent the objection that “the man whose pledge you have taken claims to be a prophet (*nabi*) and a messenger (*rasul*)”. This was answered by only a denial, while such an answer is not correct. The fact is that the holy revelation of God the Most High which descends upon me contains words such as *rasul*, *mursal* (messenger) and *nabi*, not once but hundreds of times. So how can the reply be correct that such words are not present?[2] In fact, at this time these words occur more clearly and explicitly than in the earlier days. And in the *Barahin Ahmadiyya* too, published 22 years ago, these words are not few.[3]

Thus, in the Divine communications published in *Barahin Ahmadiyya*, one revelation from God is as follows: “He it is Who sent His messenger (*rasul*) with guidance and the true religion in order to make it prevail over all other religions” (see

p. 498, *Barahin Ahmadiyya*). Here, this humble one has been clearly addressed as *rasul*. Then after this, in the same book, is the following Divine revelation regarding myself: “The messenger of Allah (*jari-ullah*) in the mantle of the prophets” (p. 504). Then quite near this in the same book is the following revelation: “Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah; those with him are firm against disbelievers, compassionate among themselves”. In this revelation I have been given the name ‘Muhammad’ as well as *rasul*. [4] Then there is the following Divine revelation noted on page 557 of *Barahin Ahmadiyya*: “A warner came into the world”. Another version of it is: “A prophet (*nabi*) came into the world”. [5] Similarly in many other places in *Barahin Ahmadiyya* the word *rasul* has been applied to this humble one. [6]

If it be said that the Holy Prophet Muhammad is the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*, so how can another prophet come after him, the reply is that there certainly cannot come any prophet, new or old, in the way in which you people consider Jesus to descend in the latter days and believe him in those circumstances to be a prophet. In fact, it is your belief that the kind of revelation which comes to prophets (*wahy nubuwwat*) shall then continue for forty years, exceeding even the term of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. [7] Such a belief is undoubtedly a sin, and the verse “he is the Messenger of Allah and the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*” [the Quran, 33:40] along with the hadith “there is no prophet after me” are conclusive proof of the absolute falsity of this view. [8]

I, however, am strongly opposed to such beliefs, and have true and full faith in the statement “he is the Messenger of Allah and the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*”. This verse contains a prophecy which our opponents know not. It is that Allah the Most High says in this verse that, after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him, the doors of prophecies have been closed till the Day of Judgment, and it is not possible now for a Hindu or a Jew or a Christian or a nominal Muslim to apply the word *nabi* to himself. All the windows of

prophethood have been closed, but one window, that of the path of [Abu Bakr] *Siddiq*, is open, namely, *fana fir-rasul* (self-effacement in the Holy Prophet).[9] The person who comes to God through this window is made to wear, by way of reflection (*zill*), that same mantle of prophethood which is the cloak of the prophethood of Muhammad.[10]

His being a prophet, therefore, is not a violation of sanctity because he gets all this, not from his own person, but from the fountain of his Prophet, and it is not for himself but for the glory of that Prophet. It is for this reason that his name in heaven is *Muhammad* and *Ahmad*. It means that the prophethood of Muhammad was in the end given only to Muhammad, though in the manner of *burooz*, but not to anyone else.[11] Hence the verse: “Muhammad is not the father of any man from among you, but he is the Messenger of Allah and the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*” means: Muhammad is not the father of anyone from among the men of this world, but he is a father to men of the other world because he is the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*, and there is no way to the graces of Allah except through his mediation.

In short, my prophethood and messengership is in my capacity as Muhammad and Ahmad, not on account of myself. And I received this title in the position of *fana fir-rasul*. Hence, it makes no difference to the meaning of *Khatam an-nabiyyin*. However, the descent of Jesus would certainly make a difference.[12]

It is also to be remembered that the meaning of *nabi* according to the lexicon is one who gives the news of matters unseen, having received it from God. Wherever this meaning applies, the word *nabi* will also apply.[13] And a *nabi* must necessarily be a *rasul*, for if he is not a *rasul* he cannot receive news of the holy, unseen realm, the following verse being a bar against it: “He [Allah] does not make His unseen known to anyone except a messenger (*rasul*) whom He chooses” [the Quran, 72:26–27].[14] If, after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the coming of a prophet according to this meaning is denied, it

---

[9] p. 32. [10] p. 35. [11] p. 39. [12] p. 41. [13] p. 43. [14] p. 46.

implies that one should believe that this *Umma* is destitute of Divine communication and revelation, because the person through whom news of the unseen from Allah is manifested, to him the meaning of *nabi* shall necessarily apply according to the above verse. Similarly, he who is sent from God the Most High will be the one we shall call *rasul*.**[15]**

The difference is that, after our Holy Prophet Muhammad till the Day of Judgment, there is no prophet to whom a new *shariah* is to be revealed, nor one who is granted the title of prophethood without the mediation of the Holy Prophet and without attaining to such a stage of *fana fir-rasul* that he is named Muhammad and Ahmad in heaven.**[16]** And whoever makes such a claim indeed commits heresy.

The real secret in this is that the meaning of *Khatam an-nabiyyin* requires that, so long as there remains a veil of separation, if a person is called *nabi* he would be breaking the seal which is upon *Khatam an-nabiyyin*. If, however, a person is so lost in that *Khatam an-nabiyyin* that, due to a complete union and absence of difference,**[17]** he has received his name, and the face of Muhammad is reflected in him as in a clear mirror, he will be called *nabi* without breaking the seal, because he is Muhammad, though in the manner of *zill*. Hence, despite the claim to prophethood of the person who has been given the names Muhammad and Ahmad by way of *zill*,**[18]** our master Muhammad still remains *Khatam an-nabiyyin* because this second Muhammad is the image and the name of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him. Jesus, however, cannot come without breaking the seal because his prophethood is a separate prophethood.

And if no person can be a prophet and messenger in the sense of *bu-rooz*, then what is the meaning of the following: "Guide us on the right path, the path of those upon whom Thou hast bestowed favours" [the Quran, 1:5–6]. **[19]**

It should be borne in mind that, according to this sense, I do not deny prophethood and messengership.**[20]** It is in this

---

[15] p. 47. [16] p. 47. [17] p. 47. [18] p. 47. [19] p. 47. [20] p. 49.

sense that the Promised Messiah has been called *nabi* in the *Sahih Muslim*. [21] If one who receives news of the unseen from God is not to be called *nabi*, tell us what he should be called? If it is said that he should be called *muhaddas*, I say that in no lexicon is the meaning of *tahdees* ‘making known the unseen.’ The meaning of *nubuwwat* is, however, making known matters of the unseen. [22] *Nabi* is a word which is common to Arabic and Hebrew. In Hebrew this word is *naabi*, and is derived from *naabaa* which means ‘to prophesy, upon receiving intimation from God.’ [23] And it is not a requirement for a *nabi* that he should be a bearer of *shariah*. [24] This is a mere gift by which matters of the unseen are disclosed. As I have received up to this time about 150 prophecies from God, and seen with my own eyes that they were fulfilled clearly, how can I deny the application of the word *nabi* or *rasul* to myself? And when God the Most High has himself given me these titles, how can I reject this, or fear someone other than Him? [25]

I swear by God Who has sent me — and about Whom it is the work of the accursed to make fabrications — that He has sent me as the Promised Messiah. And just as I believe in the verses of the Holy Quran, similarly, without an iota of difference, I believe in the clear and open revelation of God which I receive, the truth of which has become evident to me by its repeated signs. I can swear on oath in the House of God that the holy revelation which descends on me is the word of the same God Who sent His word to Moses, Jesus and Muhammad *mustafa*, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him. [26] The earth testified for me, and so did heaven. So also did both heaven and earth proclaim that I am the *khalifa* (appointed one) of God. However, according to the prophecies it was necessary that I should be denied, so those upon whose hearts are veils do not accept me. I know that God will certainly succour me, as He has ever been helping His messengers. None can stand against me, as he has not the aid of God.

Wherever I have denied prophethood and messengership, it is only in the sense that I have not brought a *shariah* indepen-

---

[21] p. 50. [22] p. 52. [23] p. 57. [24] p. 57. [25] p. 58. [26] p. 58.

dently, nor am I a prophet in my own right.[26a] However, in the sense that, having gained spiritual graces from the Messenger whom I follow, and having attained for myself his name, I have received knowledge of the unseen from God through the mediation of the Holy Prophet, I am a messenger and a prophet but without a new *shariah*. [27] I have never denied being called a prophet in this sense. In fact, this is the sense in which God has addressed me as *nabi* and *rasul*. Nor do I now deny being a prophet and messenger in this sense. [28] And my statement, “I am neither a messenger nor bearer of a scripture”, means only that I am not a possessor of *shariah* (*sahib-i shariah*). [29]

Nonetheless, it must be imperatively remembered, and never over-looked, that despite being addressed as *nabi* and *rasul*, I have been informed by God that all these graces have not been bestowed upon me without mediation, but that there is a holy being in heaven, namely, Muhammad *mustafa*, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him, whose spiritual benefit I have received. On account of this mediation, and by having submerged in him and having received his names Muhammad and Ahmad, I am a *rasul* and *nabi*, i.e., one who has been sent and one who receives news of the unseen from God. [30] In this way, the seal of *Khatam an-nabiyyin* is preserved because I have received the same name in the sense of image and reflection, through the mirror of love.

If anyone is indignant at this Divine revelation, as to why God the Most High has called me *nabi* and *rasul*, it is his own folly because the seal set by God is not broken by my being a prophet and messenger.\*

---

\* *Author's Footnote:* What a fine point it is that, in this way, neither does the prophesied seal of *Khatam an-nabiyyin* get broken, nor are all the members of the *Umma* deprived of that sense of prophethood which corresponds to the verse “He does not make His unseen known to anyone...”. But by bringing down Jesus, whose prophethood was established 600 years before Islam, nothing at all remains of Islam, and the *Khatam an-nabiyyin* verse is clearly falsified.

It is obvious that, just as I say about myself that God has addressed me as *nabi* and *rasul*, so do my opponents assert about Jesus, son of Mary, that he shall return to the world after our Holy Prophet, and as he is a prophet the same objection applies to his coming as the one levelled against me, namely, that the seal of finality of *Khatam an-nabiyyin* will be broken. But I say that after the Holy Prophet, who was actually the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*, my being called by the words *nabi* and *rasul* is not a matter for objection, nor is the seal of finality broken by it. For I have explained over and over again that, in accordance with the verse “others from among them who have not yet joined them” [the Quran, 62:3] I am that same prophet, the *Khatam al-anbiya*, [31] in the sense of *burooz*, and twenty years ago in *Barahin Ahmadiyya* God named me Muhammad and Ahmad and declared me to be the very embodiment of the Holy Prophet. Hence, in this way, the Holy Prophet’s being the *Khatam al-anbiya* does not suffer at all by my prophethood because a reflection is not separate from its original. And as, in the sense of reflection (*zill*), I am Muhammad, the seal of *Khatam an-nabiyyin* does not break because the prophethood of Muhammad remained limited to Muhammad. In other words, Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him, is the Prophet and no one else. [32] As I am Muhammad in the sense of *burooz*, and all his attainments including his prophethood are projected as an image by way of *burooz* in my mirror of reflection, who is the other person that has made a claim to prophethood separately?

If you do not accept me, then understand it in this way that the promised Mahdi is to be akin to the Holy Prophet in creation and nature, and his name is to correspond to that of the Holy Prophet, i.e., his name too shall be Muhammad and Ahmad, and he is to be from his line (*ahl bait*).\*

---

The opponents will only abuse me for this, so let them. “The unjust shall know which final destination they will return to.”

\**Author’s Footnote:* It is known from the history of my ancestors that a grandmother of mine belonged to the noble family of *Saadaat* and the *Bani*

In some hadith reports, it is said that “he shall be from me”. This is a profound indication of the fact that, from a spiritual view-point, he shall be an offspring of the Prophet and an image of his spirit. A very strong evidence supporting this is that the words in which the Holy Prophet has described the relationship — so much so that the names of the two have been made into one — clearly show that he wanted to convey that this promised one would be his *burooz* (image), just as Joshua was a *burooz* of Moses. It is not necessary for the *burooz* to be a son or maternal grandson of the original person. However, it is necessary that, in terms of spiritual relationship, the *burooz* must be his offspring, and from the very beginning there must be mutual attraction and connection between them. It is, therefore, totally derogatory to the status of the Holy Prophet’s knowledge to think that he would leave aside the description which is necessary to express the significance of *burooz*, and instead declare that he would be his maternal grandson. What has being a maternal grandson conceivably got to do with *burooz*?

---

*Fatima.* The Holy Prophet has also confirmed this, and said to me in a dream: “Salmaan is from the people of my house, having the disposition of Hasan”. He named me Salmaan [a companion of the Holy Prophet, of Persian descent], which means ‘two *salm*’. *Salm* in Arabic means *reconciliation*, and thus it is destined that two kinds of reconciliation will take place at my hands. One is internal which will remove the internal enmity and discord, and the other is external which, by eliminating the causes of external opposition and demonstrating the greatness of Islam, shall incline the followers of other faiths towards Islam. It appears that by the Salmaan mentioned in Hadith is also meant myself, for the prophecy of two reconciliations was not fulfilled by Salmaan himself. I say, having received revelation from God, that I am of Persian descent, and according to the hadith in *Kanz al-Ummal* the Persians are from among the Israelites and the Holy Prophet’s household. In a vision, Hazrat Fatima put my head upon her lap, and showed me that I was from her lineage. This vision is in *Barahin Ahmadiyya*.

*Publisher’s Note:* In the account of this vision in *Barahin Ahmadiyya* it is recorded: “Then at that time there appeared five handsome, pleasing and beautiful persons, namely, the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, Ali, Hasan, Husain and Fatima, may Allah be pleased with them. One of them, and I seem to remember that it was Fatima, with tremendous love and affection, like a kind mother, put my head upon her lap.”

If such a connection was necessary for being a *burooz*, why was the imperfect relationship of being merely a maternal grandson required? It should have been son. However, God the Most High in His Holy Word has negated the Holy Prophet being a father of anyone, but has given the news of a *burooz*. If *burooz* is not meant, how could the comrades of this promised one have been considered as companions of the Holy Prophet in the verse “others from among them”? Denial of *burooz* implies a rejection of this verse.

People who think in physical terms have variously considered this promised one to be a descendant of Hasan, or of Husain, or of Abbas. But the Holy Prophet only meant that, like a descendant, he would be his heir — heir to his name, heir to his nature, heir to his knowledge, and heir to his spirituality — displaying his image within himself from every aspect.[33] Not of his own self but from the Holy Prophet would he acquire everything, and would reflect his face through annihilation in him. Just as he shall receive his name, his nature and his knowledge in the sense of reflection (*zill*), in the same manner shall he receive his title *nabi*, because the *burooz* image cannot be complete if it does not possess the qualities of its original in every respect. Hence, as prophethood also is a quality of a *nabi*, it is essential for it to be manifested in the *burooz* image. All prophets have held that the *burooz* is a perfect image of its original,[34] so much so that even the name becomes one. Therefore, it is obvious that, just as by being named Muhammad and Ahmad in the sense of *burooz*, there are not two Muhammads and two Ahmads, similarly by using *nabi* and *rasul* in the sense of *burooz* is not meant that the seal of *Khatam an-nabiyyin* has been broken, because the *burooz* does not have a separate existence. In this way, the prophethood bearing the name Muhammad remains limited to Muhammad,[35] may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him.

All prophets, peace be upon them,[36] have agreed that there is no duality in *burooz*, for the station of *burooz* is as described in the following saying:

“I become thou and thou become me, I become the body and thou become the soul, So no one can thereafter say: I am one and thou art another.”

If, however, Jesus returned to the world, how could he do it without breaking the seal of *Khatam an-nabiyyin*? In other words, the term *Khatam an-nabiyyin* is a Divine seal which has been put upon the prophethood of the Holy Prophet. It is not possible now that this seal could ever break. However, it is possible that the Holy Prophet, not only once but a thousand times,[37] come into the world in the sense of *burooz* and express his prophethood in the manner of *burooz* along with his other qualities. And this particular *burooz* was a confirmed promise from God the Most High, as He says: “Others from among them who have not yet joined them”.

The prophets do not feel their honour violated by their *burooz* because such a one is their very form and image, but they would certainly feel their honour violated in case of someone else. Consider how Moses, when he saw the Holy Prophet Muhammad on the night of *mi'raj* rise higher than his station, wept to show his sense of self-esteem. So, considering that God has said that “no other prophet shall come after you”,[38] if He were to send Jesus against His own word, how very hurtful would this act be to the Holy Prophet!

In brief, prophethood in the sense of *burooz* does not make any difference to the finality of prophethood, nor is the seal broken. But the coming of another prophet does undermine Islam, and it is a terrible indignity to the Holy Prophet Muhammad that the great task of slaying the *Dajjal* (Anti-Christ) be accomplished by Jesus and not by him. And the holy verse “but he is the Messenger of Allah and the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*” is — we seek refuge in Allah — falsified by it. There is a hidden prophecy in this verse, namely, that a seal has been put upon

---

[36] p. 67. [37] p. 67. [38] p. 68.

prophethood till the Day of Judgment. And except for a *burooz*, which is the being of the Holy Prophet himself, none has the power to receive knowledge of the unseen from God in a clear and open manner like prophets. As the *burooz* of Muhammad which was promised of old is myself, prophethood in the sense of *burooz* has been bestowed upon me. The whole world is now helpless in the face of this prophethood because a seal has been put upon prophethood. A *burooz* of Muhammad, having all his qualities, was destined for the latter days, and therefore he has appeared. Except for this window, there is no other window left for obtaining water from the fountain of prophethood.

To summarise, the seal of finality is not broken by prophethood and messengership in the sense of *burooz*. But the concept of the descent of Jesus, which implies denial of the verse “but he is the Messenger of Allah and the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*”, does break the seal of finality. There is no trace of this meaningless and contradictory belief in the Holy Quran; and how could there be, as it is clearly opposed to the above verse. However, the coming of a *burooz* prophet and messenger is established from the Holy Quran, as is clear from the verse “others from among them”.

One subtlety of expression in this verse is that that group has been mentioned here which is considered as being included among the Companions of the Holy Prophet. But there is no explicit mention here of the *burooz*, i.e., the Promised Messiah, through whom these people came to be considered as the Companions and regarded, like them, as being under the guidance of the Holy Prophet himself. This omission of reference is meant to indicate that the *burooz* does not have an existence of his own, and hence the seal of finality is not broken by his prophethood and messengership in the manner of *burooz*. Therefore, in this verse he is treated as a non-existent being, and the Holy Prophet is mentioned in his stead.[39]

Similarly in the verse “We have granted you *al-kausar*” [the Quran, 108:1] there is the promise of a *burooz* in whose time *kausar* (abundance) will appear, i.e., fountains of spiritual blessings shall flow forth, and an abundance of people in the world shall become true followers of Islam. In this verse also, the necessity for physical progeny is belittled, and a prophecy is given of offspring in the form of *burooz*. And although God has bestowed upon me the privilege of being an Israelite as well as a Fatimi, having a share of both stocks, I give precedence to the spiritual relationship which is the *burooz* connection.[40]

Now by all of this writing, I mean to say that ignorant opponents accuse me of claiming to be a prophet and messenger. I make no such claim. I am neither a prophet nor a messenger in the sense which they have in mind. However, I am a prophet and a messenger in the sense which I have just explained.[41] Hence the person who maliciously accuses me of claiming prophethood and messengership is a liar and evil-minded.[42] It is the form of *burooz* which has made me a prophet and a messenger, and it is on this basis that God has called me *nabi* and *rasul* again and again, but in the sense of *burooz*. My own self does not come into it,[43] but that of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him. It was on this account that I was called ‘Muhammad’ and ‘Ahmad’. So prophethood and messengership did not go to another person. What belonged to Muhammad remained with Muhammad, peace and blessings be upon him.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian,  
5 November 1901 C.E.

### 3. Notes on the Translation

#### Note 1 (p. 9)

Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad writes here, at the very outset, that those of his followers *who have not read his previous books carefully, nor stayed in his company for a sufficient length of time*, are unfamiliar with his claims, and therefore give wrong answers to the opponents. It is absolutely clear from this that, far from declaring any change in his claims made in his earlier books, he is confirming and reiterating his previous position.

If, as the Qadiani *Jama'at* asserts, Hazrat Mirza was announcing in this booklet that his previous denials of claiming to be a prophet were in error, and that he now understood that he was actually a prophet, how could he possibly write that if his followers had read his *previous* books carefully they would have obtained a complete and correct knowledge about his claim?

Therefore, according to what Hazrat Mirza says here, we must study this pamphlet in conjunction with his earlier books and statements, which are more detailed, in order to understand his claims. This is what we now proceed to do in the following Notes.

A highly significant event in this connection is that only two months prior to the publication of *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* Hazrat Mirza issued an announcement as follows:

“It has been considered important that within this *Jama'at* of ours there must be at least one hundred men of such learning and accomplishment that they have

knowledge of the signs, arguments and strong evidences that God has manifested about this Movement and its claims so that they can convey the case conclusively to the opponents in every gathering and refute their fabricated objections. ... For these purposes, it has been decided to draw the attention of capable, knowledgeable and intelligent persons that, by 24th December 1901, they should prepare themselves for an examination by reading our books, and come to Qadian during the holidays of next December to take part in the written examination on these topics.”

(*Ishtihar Mufid-ul-Akhyar*, dated 9 September 1901, *Majmu'a Ishtiharat*, 1986 edition, v. 3, pp. 429–430)

The books they have been asked to read in preparation for this examination could only be those published before November 1901. In a further announcement in October, the names of certain of his books were specified for study for the examination. In a column headed “General Announcement”, in *Al-Hakam*, it is stated:

“In this examination the following books will be included in the course: *Fath-i Islam*, *Tauzih Maram*, *Izala Auham*, *Anjam Atham*, *Ayyam-us-Sulh*, *Surma Chashm Arya*, *Hamamat-ul-Bushra*, *Khutba Ilhamiyya*. Written questions will be asked, generally from these books. This examination will commence on 27 December and end on 30 December 1901.”

(*Al-Hakam*, 10 October 1901, p. 5, col. 1)

This proves beyond all doubt that even in October 1901, less than one month before the publication of *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*, Hazrat Mirza regarded his earlier books, going back to 1891, as valid sources for learning about his claims. Yet according to the Qadiani *Jama'at* leader, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad:

“The issue of prophethood became clear to him in 1900 or 1901, and as *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* was published in 1901, in which he has proclaimed his prophethood most forcefully, it shows that he made a change in his belief in 1901, and the year 1900 is a middle period which is like a boundary between the two views. ... It is proved that the references dating prior to the year 1901 in which he has denied being a prophet, are now abrogated and it is an error to use them as evidence.”

(*Haqiqat-un-Nubuwwat*, p. 121)

All but one book (*Khutba Ilhamiyya*) in the list of books in the October 1901 announcement in *Al-Hakam* are dated *well before* 1900. This conclusively refutes the Qadiani *Jama'at* notion, quoted above, of a change taking place during 1900 and 1901.

As can be seen, we have in the Notes below given quotations from five of the eight books listed in the announcement above, besides referring to other writings of Hazrat Mirza.

### **Note 2 (p. 9)**

The follower was wrong to answer this objection by *only* a denial, without further explanation, and further he was wrong to deny that such words (*nabi, rasul*) even occurred in the revelation to Hazrat Mirza.

The right answer was to deny that Hazrat Mirza claimed to be a prophet, and explain that the words *nabi* and *rasul* do occur in his revelations, but are meant in a metaphorical and not in a real sense. This was exactly how Hazrat Mirza himself answered such questions in his previous books. See the next Note.

### **Note 3 (p. 9)**

Previously too, Hazrat Mirza had stated that these words occurred about him very frequently in his revelation and he had given the following explanations:

“Do not level false allegations against me that I have claimed to be a prophet in the real sense. ... It is true that, in the revelation which God has sent upon this servant, the words *nabi*, *rasul* and *mursal* occur about myself quite frequently. However, they do not bear their real sense. ... We believe and acknowledge that, according to the real meaning of *nubuwwat* (prophethood), after the Holy Prophet Muhammad no new or former prophet can come. The Holy Quran forbids the appearance of any such prophets. But in a metaphorical sense God can call any recipient of revelation as *nabi* or *mursal*. Have you not read those Sayings of the Holy Prophet in which occur the words *rasulu rasulillah* (‘messenger of the Messenger of Allah’)? The Arabs to this day call even the message-bearer of a man as a *rasul*, so why is it forbidden for God to use the word *mursal* (messenger) in a metaphorical sense too? Do you not even remember from the Quran [36:14] the words: ‘So they [some non-prophets] said, We are messengers to you’? ... I say it repeatedly that these words *rasul* and *mursal* and *nabi* undoubtedly occur about me in my revelation from God, but they do not bear their real meanings.” (*Siraj Munir*, March 1897, p. 3)

“By virtue of being [Divinely] appointed, I cannot conceal those revelations I have received from Allah in which the words *nubuwwat* and *risalat* occur quite frequently. But I say repeatedly that, in these revelations, the word *mursal* or *rasul* or *nabi* which has occurred about me is not used in its real sense. (Such words have not occurred only now, but have been present in my published revelations for sixteen years. So you will find many such revelations about me in the *Barahin Ahmadiyya*.) The actual fact, to which I testify with the highest testimony, is that our Holy Prophet, peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him, is the *Khatam al-anbiya*, and after him no prophet is to come, neither an

old one nor a new one. ... But it must be remembered that, as we have explained here, sometimes the revelation from God contains such words about some of His saints in a metaphorical and figurative sense; they are not meant by way of reality. ... How can there be a prophet after the *Khatam al-anbiya*?" (*Anjam Atham*, January 1897, footnote, pp. 27–28)

This is the correct answer that the follower should have given, if he had read Hazrat Mirza's previous books carefully: that the words *nabi* and *rasul* do occur but are not meant by way of reality, and that the Holy Prophet Muhammad is the Last Prophet after whom no prophet can come.

#### **Note 4 (p. 10)**

If, by being given the name *rasul* (messenger) from God, Hazrat Mirza actually became a *rasul*, then by being given the name Muhammad he should have become the real Muhammad! For Hazrat Mirza does not only say that God called him as *rasul* but that God called him as "*Muhammad-ur rasul-ullah*", Muhammad the Messenger of Allah. This proves conclusively that he is called *rasul* only metaphorically, and not in a real sense, because if he is really a *rasul* then he is also really Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah.

Members of the Qadiani *Jama'at* repeatedly argue that Allah has called Hazrat Mirza as *nabi* and *rasul*, and this means that he was a prophet and messenger. But, as he says here, Allah has called him *Muhammad-ur rasul-ullah*. Do they therefore believe him to be Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah!

#### **Note 5 (p. 10)**

These are almost the same examples of revelation that Hazrat Mirza had quoted in a letter which he wrote and published two years earlier in August 1899. He wrote there:

"The situation is that, although for twenty years I have been constantly receiving Divine revelation, often the word *rasul* or *nabi* has occurred in it. For example, there

is the revelation: ‘He it is Who sent His messenger (*rasul*) with guidance and the true religion’, and the revelation: ‘The messenger of Allah (*jari-ullah*) in the mantle of the prophets’, and the revelation: ‘A prophet came into the world but the world accepted him not’. There are many such revelations in which the word *nabi* or *rasul* has occurred regarding myself. However, that person is mistaken who thinks that by this prophethood and messengership is meant *real* prophethood and messengership ... in fact, by the word *rasul* is only meant ‘one sent by God’, and by the word *nabi* is only meant ‘one who makes prophecies’ having received intimation from God, or one who discloses hidden matters. As these words, which are only in a metaphorical sense, cause trouble in Islam, leading to very bad consequences, these terms should not be used in our community’s ordinary talk and everyday language. It should be believed from the bottom of the heart that prophethood has terminated with the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him, as Allah the Most High says: He is the Messenger of Allah and the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*.” (*Al-Hakam*, 17 August 1899, page 6)

Not only does Hazrat Mirza emphasize that these words ‘prophet’ and ‘messenger’ in his revelation are purely metaphorical, or used according to their linguistic and not religious sense, he further instructs his followers to avoid using them lightly, in ordinary talk, as he fears that such free use would lead to “very bad consequences.”

#### **Note 6 (p. 10)**

As shown in Notes 3 and 5, being called *nabi* or *rasul* by God does not mean that the recipient of the title is a real prophet. The following further quotations from Hazrat Mirza’s books may also be given in addition:

1. In a book published less than a year before *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*, he quotes these revelations under the heading “Those Divine revelations which I have been honoured with, recorded in *Barahin Ahmadiyya*,” and then writes in a footnote:

“At this place, the words *rasul* and *nabi* which have been used about me in the Divine revelation, i.e., he is a *rasul* and *nabi* of God, this application is metaphorical and figurative.” (*Arba'in* No. 3, December 1900, footnote, p. 25)

2. Elsewhere, quoting one of the revelations given here, “The messenger of Allah in the mantle of the prophets”, he writes in a footnote:

“These words are by way of metaphor, just as in Hadith also the word *nabi* has been used for the Promised Messiah. It is obvious that he who is sent by God is His envoy, and an envoy is called *rasul* in Arabic. And he who discloses news of the unseen received from God is called *nabi* in Arabic. The meanings in Islamic terminology are different. At this place, only the linguistic meaning is intended.” (*Arba'in*, No. 2, September 1900, footnote, p. 18)

He further adds here:

“Maulvi Muhammad Husain Batalvi mentioned all these places in his review [of *Barahin Ahmadiyya*] and raised no objection against it. In fact, for twenty years all the *ulama* in Punjab and throughout India have been reading these revelations in *Barahin Ahmadiyya* and accepting them, and none has objected except two or three maulvis of Ludhiana who have no understanding.”

The Muslim *Ulama* who opposed Hazrat Mirza, especially his leading opponent named here, had not raised any objections against the occurrence of the words *nabi* and *rasul* in his revelations (particularly when these were first published) because

they knew that revelations of Muslim saints could include such terms in a metaphorical sense.

3. He writes:

“By *rusul* [plural of *rasul*] are meant ‘those who are sent’, whether such a one is a *rasul* or a *nabi* or a *muhaddas*. As our Master and Messenger, the Holy Prophet Muhammad, is the *Khatam al-anbiya*, and after him there cannot come any prophet, for this reason saints (*muhaddas*) have been substituted for prophets in this religious system.” (*Shahadat-ul-Quran*, September 1893, p. 23)

Thus the word *rasul* applies to non-prophets as well, and after the Holy Prophet Muhammad any Muslim to whom this word applies is a saint (*muhaddas*) and not a prophet.

4. In his famous book *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, published only a year before his death, he writes:

“And I have been called *nabi* by Allah by way of metaphor, not by way of reality.” (*Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, May 1907, Appendix, p. 64)

### Note 7 (p. 10)

Elsewhere Hazrat Mirza has explained that *wahy nubuwwat* or *wahy risalat* (type of revelation exclusive to prophets) has closed with the completion of the revelation of the Quran, and that the closure of *wahy nubuwwat* means that no prophet can come, whether Jesus or any other prophet. He writes:

1. “Every wise person can understand that if God is true to His promise, and the promise given in the *Khatam an-nabiyyin* verse, which has been explicitly mentioned in the Hadith, that now, after the death of the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him, Gabriel has been forbidden forever from bringing *wahy nubuwwat* — if all these things are true and correct, then no person at all can come as a

messenger (*rasul*) after our Holy Prophet.” (*Izala Auham*, September 1891, p. 577)

2. “After the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*, the Holy Quran does not allow the coming of any *rasul*, whether he is a new one or a former one, because a *rasul* receives knowledge of religion through the agency of Gabriel, and the coming of Gabriel as bringing *wahy risalat* has been closed. It is self-contradictory that a messenger (*rasul*) come into the world, but not be accompanied by *wahy risalat*.” (ibid., p. 761)
3. “It is part of the concept and essence of *rasul* that he should receive religious knowledge through Gabriel, and it has just been shown that *wahy risalat* has been terminated till the Day of Judgment.” (ibid., p. 614)
4. “According to the explanation of the Holy Quran, *rasul* is he who receives the commands and tenets of the religion through Gabriel. But a seal has been put upon *wahy nubuwwat* since thirteen hundred years ago. Will this seal then break?” (ibid., p. 534)
5. “It is my belief that *wahy risalat* began with Adam and ended with the Messenger of Allah, Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him.” (Announcement dated 2 October 1891, *Majmu‘a Ishti-harat*, 1986 edition, v. 1, p. 231)
6. “If we allow the appearance of a prophet after our Holy Prophet, we would have to allow the opening of the door of *wahy nubuwwat* after its closure. And this is wrong, as is not hidden from the Muslims. How can a prophet come after our Holy Prophet, when revelation has been cut off after his death, and God has ended the prophets with him?” (*Hamamat-ul-Bushra*, 1894, p. 20)
7. “Our unjust opponents do not consider the doors of the finality of prophethood to be fully closed. On the

contrary, they believe that a window is still open for the return of the Israelite prophet Jesus. If, therefore, a real prophet appeared after the Quran, and the process of *wahy nubuwwat* commenced, then please explain what would happen to the finality of prophethood? Will the revelation of a prophet be called *wahy nubuwwat* or something else?" (*Siraj Munir*, March 1897, p. 3)

8. "The fact that our Holy Prophet is the *Khatam al-anbiya* also requires the death of Jesus because if another prophet comes after the Holy Prophet, then he cannot remain the *Khatam al-anbiya*, nor can *wahy nubuwwat* be considered as terminated. ... What audacity, boldness and insolence it is that, by pursuing shallow conjectures, one should deliberately depart from the clear meaning of the Quran and believe in the coming of a prophet after the *Khatam al-anbiya*, and recommence the process of *wahy nubuwwat* after its termination! For, the revelation of the man who possesses the rank of prophethood is undoubtedly the *wahy* of *nubuwwat*." (*Ayyam-us-Sulh*, August 1898, p. 146)

### Note 8 (p. 10)

Regarding the *Khatam an-nabiyyin* verse of the Quran (33:40) and the hadith report "there is no prophet after me", Hazrat Mirza has written again and again that this means that the Holy Prophet Muhammad is the Last of the prophets, after whom no prophet whatsoever can come. For example, he wrote:

1. " 'Muhammad is not the father of any man from among you, but he is the Messenger of Allah and the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*. ' Do you not know that the Merciful God has declared our Holy Prophet unconditionally to be the *Khatam al-anbiya*, and in explanation of this verse, our Prophet has said: 'There is no prophet after me'. " (*Hamamat-ul-Bushra*, 1894, p. 20; new edition pp. 81-82)

2. "The Holy Prophet had repeatedly said that no prophet would come after him, and the hadith 'There is no prophet after me' was so well-known that no one had any doubt about its authenticity. And the Holy Quran, every word of which is absolute, in its verse 'he is the Messenger of Allah and the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*', confirmed that prophethood has, in fact, ended with our Holy Prophet." (*Kitab-ul-Bariyya*, January 1898, p. 184, footnote)
3. "In brief, God by naming the Holy Prophet Muhammad as *Khatam an-nabiyyin* in the Quran, and the Holy Prophet himself by saying 'There is no prophet after me' in Hadith, had settled the point that no prophet can come after the Holy Prophet, in terms of the real meaning of prophethood." (*ibid.*, p. 185, footnote)
4. "Besides these arguments, the following verse also stops the return of Jesus: 'He is the Messenger of Allah and the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*', and also the hadith: 'There is no prophet after me'. How could it be permitted that, despite the fact that our Holy Prophet Muhammad is the *Khatam al-anbiya*, some other prophet should appear sometime and *wahy nubuwwat* commence." (*Ayyam-us-Sulh*, August 1898, p. 47)
5. "God says: 'He is the Messenger of Allah and the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*.' And it is in the Hadith: 'There is no prophet after me.' ... If another prophet were to come, whether new or old, how could our Holy Prophet be the *Khatam al-anbiya*." (*ibid.*, p. 74)
6. "The return of Jesus is not mentioned anywhere in the Holy Quran, but the finality of prophethood is mentioned perfectly explicitly. To make a distinction between an old prophet and a new prophet is mischievous. Neither the Hadith nor the Quran make this distinction. The negation contained in the hadith 'There is no prophet after me' is all-embracing." (*ibid.*, p. 146)

7. “In the same way, by saying ‘There is no prophet after me’, he [the Holy Prophet] closed the door absolutely to any new prophet or a returning prophet.” (ibid., p. 152)
8. Quoting the *Khatam an-nabiyyin* verse in Arabic, he translates it into Urdu and explains it as follows:

“That is to say: Muhammad is not the father of any man from among you, but he is the Messenger of Allah and the one to end the prophets. This verse, also, clearly argues that after our Prophet, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him, no messenger (*rasul*) shall come into the world.”  
(*Izala Auham*, September 1891, p. 614)

In the last quotation above, Hazrat Mirza has himself translated *khatam an-nabiyyin* into Urdu as ***khatam karnai wala hai nabiun ka***, which translates as: “the one to end the prophets”.

In addition to these quotations, the extracts given in Note 7 also show that Hazrat Mirza believed that no prophet can come after the Holy Prophet Muhammad.

### Note 9 (p. 11)

The terms *fana fir-rasul*, and also *zill* and *burooz* which occur a little later, were devised by the scholars and saints of Islamic sufi-ism many centuries ago to refer to Muslim saints of a high spiritual rank who, by modelling themselves entirely on the Holy Prophet Muhammad, display some qualities of prophets. These concepts are derived from the Holy Quran and Hadith, where such persons are designated by terms such as *wali* and *muhaddas*, that is, non-prophets of high spiritual standing. Hazrat Mirza’s mention of *fana fir-rasul* as the path of *Siddiq*, i.e. Abu Bakr, shows that Hazrat Abu Bakr is the ultimate example of one who follows the Holy Prophet.

What the Quran and Hadith call as *wali* and *muhaddas*, the Islamic Sufi literature calls as *fana fir-rasul* (‘one who has effaced himself in the Holy Prophet’), a prophet by way of *zill*

(‘reflection’ or ‘shadow’), and a prophet by way of *burooz* (‘appearance’ or ‘image’). These expressions do not denote that they are prophets, but that they display certain qualities of prophethood (such as being spoken to by God) which continue among Muslims after the Holy Prophet Muhammad.

Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has explained these concepts in the same way as the earlier leaders of Islamic spiritual philosophy. Regarding *fana fir-rasul* he writes:

“The fact that our Holy Prophet is the *Khatam an-nabiyyin* prohibits the coming of any other prophet. However, a prophet who obtains light from the lamp of the prophethood of Muhammad, who in other words is also called a *muhaddas*, is exempt from this restriction because, due to his obedience to the Holy Prophet and due to his being *fana fir-rasul*, he is included within the person of the Last of the Messengers, just as a part is included in the whole.” (*Izala Auham*, September 1891, p. 575)

It is absolutely clear from this passage that by “a prophet who obtains light from the prophethood of Muhammad”, or a *fana fir-rasul*, is not meant a prophet. Hazrat Mirza begins by stating that no prophet can come after the Holy Prophet Muhammad because he is the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*. Then as to what can come, he says that such a one is called a *muhaddas*, which is a term from Hadith meaning a person who receives revelation without being a prophet.

The significance of the concept of *fana* has been explained by Hazrat Mirza as follows:

“The very reason why God sent prophets into the world is in order to create people like them. If this does not happen, then prophethood becomes meaningless. Prophets do not come so that they should be worshipped but they come so that people follow their example, attain a similarity to them, and by self-effacement (*fana*) in

them become, as it were, exactly the same as them. Allah says: ‘Say: If you love Allah then follow me [Prophet Muhammad], Allah will love you’ [The Quran 3:31]. When God loves someone, then which is the blessing that He will keep him deprived of? By ‘follow me’ is meant the rank of *fana* which takes one to the level of being a likeness. This concept is accepted by all.” (*Ayyam-us-Sulh*, August 1898, p. 164)

That a *fana fir-rasul* is not a prophet is also clear from the following words of Hazrat Mirza:

“God gives the honour of His word to a person who is *fana fin-nabi*, just as He does with His prophets.” (*Zameema Anjam Atham*, January 1897, p. 15)

“At the head of every century ... God raises someone who is a substitute for a prophet and whose nature reflects the image of a prophet. That substitute-prophet shows people, through his own being, the qualities of the prophet whom he obeys.” (*Ainah Kamalat Islam*, February 1893, p. 247)

Now we give two examples of what other Muslim religious scholars have written about the concept of *fana fir-rasul*.

1. Khwaja Zia-ullah Naqshbandi writes:

“The rank of *fana fir-rasul* is attained when all the characteristics and qualities of the Holy Prophet are to be found in one, and all one’s deeds, movements, habits, devotions and meditations are exactly according to the manner of the Holy Prophet. ... Perfect good fortune is that God should paint His servant with the colour and qualities of His friend, the Holy Prophet.” (*Maqasid as-Salikeen*, p. 46, published Lahore)

2. Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi, one of the founders of the Deobandi school of thought, and a contemporary of Hazrat Mirza, answered a question as follows:

“Question: What are *fana fish-shaikh* and *fana fir-rasul*? From where are these concepts established, and what have Sufis said about it?

“Answer: Both these words are from the terminology of spiritual leaders (*Shaikh*). The meaning is to obey God and have overwhelming love for Him. Its basis is in the Quranic words: Follow me [i.e. Muhammad], and God will love you [the Quran 3:31].” (*Fatawa Rashidiyya*, p. 48, Islamic Kutab, Karachi)

### Note 10 (p. 11)

As stated in the last Note, *zill* or ‘reflection’, is a concept in Islamic Sufi-ism similar to *fana fir-rasul*. A Muslim saint can be referred to as a ‘prophet by way of *zill*’, or *zilli nabi*, but this does not mean that he is a prophet. He is a saint in whom certain qualities of prophets are reflected.

Regarding the concept of *zill*, Hazrat Mirza writes elsewhere:

“I firmly believe that our Holy Prophet Muhammad is the *Khatam al-anbiya*, and after him no prophet shall come for this *Umma*, neither new nor old. Not a jot or iota of the Holy Quran shall be abrogated. Of course, *muhaddases* will come who will be spoken to by Allah, and possess some attributes of full prophethood by way of reflection (*zill*), and in some ways be coloured with the colour of prophethood. I am one of these.” (*Nishan Asmani*, May 1892, p. 28)

In this extract Hazrat Mirza first affirms the ending of prophethood with the Holy Prophet Muhammad in the clearest words, and then writes that saints will arise among the Muslims who will be the reflections, or *zill*, of the prophets. This establishes that anyone who is referred to as receiving the mantle of prophethood by way of *zill* is not a prophet, but a saint or *muhaddas*. He then claims to be “one of these”.

He further writes:

“Sainthood (*wilayat*) is the perfect *zill* of prophethood.”  
(*Hujjat-Ullah*, May 1897, p. 24)

“The prophet is the real thing, and a saint is the *zill*.”  
(*Karamat-us-Sadiqeen*, August 1893, p. 85)

These two quotations show that the *zill* or reflection of prophethood is through a saint (who is known as *wali* or *muhaddas*), and no matter how perfect that reflection may be he still remains a saint and does not become a prophet.

Again, Hazrat Mirza writes:

“Corresponding to the issues of every age, for the resolving of those issues, spiritual teachers are sent who are the heirs of the messengers [*rusul*, plural of *rasul*] and who attain the qualities of the messengers by way of *zill*. And the *mujaddid* whose work bears striking similarity to the appointed task of one of the messengers, is called by the name of that *rasul* in the sight of Allah.” (*Shahadat-ul-Quran*, September 1893, p. 52)

Here the spiritual teachers or *mujaddids* who arise among the Muslims are described as the *zill* of prophets. And it is *mujaddids* who are given the names of various prophets. They do not become prophets thereby, but remain as *mujaddids*.

Hazrat Mirza has explained the significance of the concept of *zill* in detail as follows:

“Allah, be He glorified, says: ‘*Whatever thing benefits mankind, it remains in the world*’ [the Quran, 13:17]. Now it is obvious that the group most benefitting mankind are the prophets who, by signs, miracles, prophecies, truth, knowledge, and their own example of righteousness, strengthen the faith of people and give religious benefit to seekers of truth. It is also obvious that they do not remain in the world for a great length of time, but are taken from this world after spending a

short life here. However, this does not go against the contents of the verse, nor is it possible that the word of God be against facts. So, when applied to prophets, the meaning of this verse would be that they continue to exist in terms of *zill*, and at every time of need God raises some servant of His in their likeness and similitude, as a reflection, who causes them to have perpetual life by being in their mould. For the continuation of this existence in terms of reflection, God has taught His servants the prayer: '*O our Lord, show us that right path which is the way of those servants of Thine upon whom are Thy favours*' [the Quran 1:5–6]. And it is obvious that God's favour to the prophets, for the seeking of which there is a command in this prayer, is not of monetary form but it is the favour of light, blessings, love, faith, miracles, heavenly assistance, recognition, perfect knowledge, revelation and visions. God had commanded this *Umma* to seek this favour precisely because He had decided beforehand to grant it to them. So this verse too proves openly that God has made this *Umma* the heir to the prophets, in the sense of reflection (*zill*), so that the prophets continue to exist forever by way of *zill*, and the world is never deprived of their presence." (*Shahadat-ul-Quran*, September 1893, p. 53)

It is clear from this that, because prophets have stopped coming, this is why those persons arise who are their reflection or *zill*, to give the prophets continued existence. If the *zill* of prophets were themselves prophets, it would be absurd to say that they come because prophets no longer come.

Hazrat Mirza has also referred to Umar, the second *Khalifa* of Islam, who was obviously not a prophet, as being a *zill* of the Holy Prophet:

“An example is the prophecy of our Holy Prophet Muhammad that the keys to the treasures of the Qaisar and Kasra have been placed in his hand, whereas it is

clear that the Holy Prophet had died before the fulfilment of this prophecy, seeing neither the treasures of the Qaisar and Kasra, nor the keys. But as it was destined that Hazrat Umar receive those keys, and the person of Hazrat Umar was, as it were, the person of the Holy Prophet Muhammad by way of *zill*, therefore in the realm of revelation the hand of Hazrat Umar was considered to be the hand of the Messenger of God, the Holy Prophet.” (*Ayyam-us-Sulh*, August 1898, p. 35)

The greatest of Muslim religious scholars, who are household names in the Islamic world, have elaborated on the concept of *zill*. We give some examples below.

1. Shaikh Abdul Haqq (d. 1642), the famous scholar of Hadith of Delhi, wrote:

“*Wilayat* [sainthood, or being a *wali*] is the *zill* of prophethood.” (*Sharh Futuh al-Ghaib*, Lucknow, India, 1918, p. 23)

2. Shaikh Ahmad of Sirhind (d. 1624), known as the *Mujaddid Alif Sani*, and recognized in the Indian subcontinent as *mujaddid* of the eleventh century *hijra*, wrote:

“In short, the station of *wilayat* is the *zill* of the station of prophethood, and the attainments of *wilayat* are the *zill* of the attainments of prophethood.” (*Maktubat, Daftar II*, Letter no. 71, p. 236)

3. Sayyid Ismail Shaheed (d. 1831), the religious leader and scholar who died in a battle against the Sikh rulers of North-West India, wrote in his books:

(a) “There will be many pure and holy souls who shall bear a likeness to the prophets, and shall be the *zill* of messengership. ... In short, these persons are of such a rank that, if there had not been an end to prophets, they would have held the office of prophethood. To conclude, such persons will continue to exist till the Last

Day.” (Preface to *Sirat-i Mustaqim*, p. 1, Urdu translation by Abdul Jabbar)

(b) “It should be known that the Imam is the deputy of the Messenger, and *Imamat* is the *zill* of messenger-ship.” (*Mansab-i Imamat*, p. 125, Ainah Adab, Lahore, 1969)

### Note 11 (p. 11)

The same applies to the concept of *burooz* as to the concepts of *fana fir-rasul* and *zill* discussed in the last two Notes. One who is said to have obtained prophethood in the sense of *burooz* is not a prophet, but a saint or *mujaddid* in whom certain qualities of prophethood are manifested as an image because of his complete following of the Prophet Muhammad.

When Hazrat Mirza’s Muslim critics objected that he could not be the like of a prophet because he was not himself a prophet, he gave the following reply:

“Objection: Only a prophet can be the like of a prophet.

“Answer: The entire *Umma* is agreed that a non-prophet takes the place of [or deputises for] a prophet by way of *burooz*. This is the meaning of the hadith report: ‘The *ulama* of my *Umma* are like the prophets of the Israelites’. Look, the Holy Prophet has declared the *ulama* to be like prophets. One hadith says that the *ulama* are the heirs of the prophets. Another hadith says: Among my followers, there will always be forty men who take after the heart of Abraham. In this hadith, the Holy Prophet has declared them to be the likes of Abraham.” (*Ayyam-us-Sulh*, August 1898, p. 163)

He clearly states here that it is a non-prophet who becomes the *burooz* of a prophet. Then he quotes various hadith reports to show that the great and eminent *ulama* of the Muslims are in the likeness of prophets, and says that these hadith reports refer to the concept of *burooz*.

Explaining the concept of *burooz*, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad writes:

“Sometimes the coming of a soul into this world, which resembles the soul of some righteous person of the past, and not only has a connection with that soul but derives benefit from it as well, is considered as the coming of the original soul itself. In the terminology of the Sufis this is known as *burooz*.” (*Sat Bachan*, December 1895, p. 49)

“The Sufis believe that the nature, disposition and moral qualities of a person from the past come again in another. In their terminology, they say that so and so is in the footsteps of Adam, or the footsteps of Noah. Some also call this as *burooz*.” (*Malfuzat*, 1984 edition, v. 1, p. 444, speech on 28 December 1899)

This definition of *burooz* is borne out by the writings of the great spiritual men of Islam.

1. In an Urdu translation of *Fusus al-Hukam*, the famous Sufi work written by the great Shaikh Muhiy-ud-Din Ibn Arabi, the translator Maulana Muhammad Abdul Qadeer writes in an introductory note:

“*Burooz* means that the nature of some of the saints resembles the nature of a particular prophet. Many saints are made to journey through the attainments of the great prophets, and the saints become dyed with the colour of the prophets. To put it another way, the image of the attainments of the prophets is cast upon them. Or one could say that the special characteristics of the prophets are manifested and projected (*burooz*) through them. But after the completion of the journey, each of them remains at his original position of natural affinity. For instance, the saint who aids the cause of the faith is known as having the nature of Noah, or being in the footsteps of Noah, or one who manifests Noah, or the

*burooz* of Noah. The saint who accepts the will of God is known as one having the nature of Moses, he who annihilates himself is known as one having the nature of Jesus, and he who is a perfect servant, combining all these, is known as one having the Muhammadi nature. Sometimes it is said that such and such a saint is the *burooz* of such and such a prophet, just as the moon is the *burooz* of the sun. In short, the prophet is the original, and the saint is his copy.” (Urdu translation of *Fusus al-Hukam*, published by Nazir Sons, Lahore, 1979, p. 24)

2. Khwaja Ghulam Farid of Chachran (d. 1904), the famous saint who lived in the Bahawalpur area of present-day Pakistan, gives the following definition:

“*Burooz* is that a soul gains benefit from another one which is perfect. When it receives the benefit of Divine illumination, it becomes its manifestation, and says: *I am that one.*” (*Isharat Faridi*, Collection of Sayings of the famous Punjabi saint, Khwaja Ghulam Farid, Islamic Book Foundation, Lahore, p. 418)

### **Note 12 (p. 11)**

*Receiving the names of prophets:* This theme occurs several times in this pamphlet. Again, it is a non-prophet who receives or is awarded the name of some prophet. He is not, and does not become, a prophet. Hazrat Mirza writes in this connection:

“Here it is worth remembering that the spirituality of our Holy Prophet has always manifested itself at times when the internal crises of Islam became overwhelming, and the ‘essence of Muhammad’ has always made its appearance through some perfect follower. If those statements in Hadith are authentic which say: The Mahdi will arise, and he shall bear my name, and he shall have my morals, then it is a reference to precisely this descent of spirituality. But this descent is not confined to any particular sect. There have been hundreds

of persons in whom the ‘essence of Muhammad’ was established, and with Allah they had the names ‘Muhammad’ and ‘Ahmad’ by way of reflection (*zill*).” (*Ainah Kamalat Islam*, February 1893, p. 346)

These “hundreds of persons” who had the names Muhammad and Ahmad by way of *zill* were all saints in Islam, and did not become prophets by receiving these names.

Hazrat Mirza also writes on this point as follows:

1. “There are some servants of Allah from among the saints who are given, in heaven, the names of the prophets because they resemble them in nature and qualities, and take light from their light, and are created with their character. So Allah makes them their inheritors, and calls them by the names of their forebears. ... He sends some saints who follow in the footsteps of certain of the prophets. He who is sent following in the footsteps of a certain prophet, is named by the name of that prophet among the high heavenly angels.” (*Ainah Kamalat Islam*, February 1893, p. 375)
2. “Of all the leaders of *Tasawwuf* [Sufi-ism] that there have been till the present day, not even one has disagreed with the point that in this religion the path to become the likes of prophets is open, as the Holy Prophet Muhammad has given the glad tidings for spiritual and godly learned persons that ‘the *ulama* of my *Umma* are like the prophets of the Israelites’. The words of Abu Yazid Bustami [famous Muslim saint, d. 874 C.E.] given below, which are recorded in *Tazkirat-ul-Auliya* by Farid-ud-Din Attar, and are also found in other reliable works, are on this basis, as he says: ‘I am Adam, I am Seth, I am Noah, I am Abraham, I am Moses, I am Jesus, I am Muhammad, peace be upon him and upon all these brothers of his.’ ... Similarly, Sayyid Abdul Qadir Jilani, in his book *Futuh al-Ghaib*, refers to this point, i.e. that man, by leaving his ego

and annihilating himself in Allah, becomes the like, rather the very form, of the prophets.” (*Izala Auham*, September 1891, pp. 258–260)

3. “It is necessary that a *muhaddas* should be the like of some prophet, and in the sight of God the Most High he must receive the same name which is the name of that prophet.” (ibid., p. 569)
4. “Remember well that the fruits of perfect obedience [to the Holy Prophet] are never wasted. This is a teaching of *Tasawwuf*. If the rank of *zill* had not existed, the saints of the *Umma* would have died. It was exactly this perfect obedience, and the rank of *burooz* and *zill*, due to which Abu Yazid was called ‘Muhammad’. Upon his so saying, the verdict of heresy was pronounced against him seventy times over, and he was exiled from the city. In brief, the people who oppose us are unaware of these facts.” (*Malfuzat*, 1984 edition, v. 8, p. 64–65, from talk given on 24 September 1905)
5. “And the *mujaddid* whose work bears striking similarity to the appointed task of one of the messengers, is called by the name of that *rasul* in the sight of Allah.” (*Shahadat-ul-Quran*, September 1893, p. 52)

All these extracts show that it is saints who receive the names of prophets, and those receiving such names are not prophets.

### Note 13 (p. 11)

In his writings Hazrat Mirza has clearly distinguished between the religious meaning of the word *nabi* and its linguistic meaning as given in lexicons (and similarly for the word *rasul*). A man to whom the word *nabi* only applies in its linguistic sense is not a prophet in Islamic terminology. Hazrat Mirza writes as follows on the question of whether his followers should believe him to be a *nabi* and *rasul*:

1. “*Risalat* in the Arabic language is applied to ‘being sent’, and *nubuwwat* is to expound hidden truths and matters upon receiving knowledge from God. So, bearing in mind a significance of this extent, it is not blame-worthy to believe in the heart in accordance with this meaning. However, in the terminology of Islam, *nabi* and *rasul* mean those who bring an entirely new *shariah*, or those who abrogate some aspects of the previous *shariah*, or those who are not called followers of a previous prophet, having a direct connection with God without benefit from a prophet. Therefore, one should be vigilant to see that the same meaning is not taken here.” (*Al-Hakam*, 17 August 1899, page 6)
2. “It is obvious that he who is sent by God is His envoy, and an envoy is called *rasul* in Arabic. And he who discloses news of the unseen received from God is called *nabi* in Arabic. The meanings in Islamic terminology are different. At this place, only the linguistic meaning is intended.” (*Arba’in*, No. 2, September 1900, footnote, p. 18)

He also writes:

1. “A sign of the coming Promised Messiah, which is written, is that he shall be a prophet (*nabi*) of Allah, meaning one who receives revelation from God the Most High. However, full and complete prophethood is not meant here because that has been sealed. Rather, that prophethood is meant which is limited to the significance of *muhaddasiyya*, which obtains light from the lamp of the prophethood of Muhammad.” (*Izala Auham*, September 1891, p. 701)
2. “Be it known to all the Muslims that all such words as occur in my writings *Fath Islam*, *Tauzih Maram* and *Izala Auham*, to the effect that the *muhaddas* is in one sense a prophet, or that being a *muhaddas* is partial prophethood or imperfect prophethood, are not to be

taken in their real sense, but have been used according to their root meaning in a straight-forward way; otherwise, I lay no claim whatever to actual prophethood. On the other hand, as I have written in my book *Izala Auham*, page 137, my belief is that our leader and master Muhammad *mustafa* — may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him — is the *Khatam-ul-Anbiya*.

“So I wish to make it clear to all Muslim brothers that, if they are displeased with these words and if these words give injury to their feelings, they may regard all such words as amended, and instead consider me to have used the word *muhaddas*. For I do not like to create dissension and discord among the Muslims.

“From the beginning, as Allah knows best, my intention has never been to use this word *nabi* as meaning actually a prophet, but only as signifying *muhaddas*, which the Holy Prophet has explained as meaning *one who is spoken to by Allah*. Of the *muhaddas* it is stated in a saying of the Holy Prophet: ‘Among the Israelites who were before you, there used to be men who were spoken to by Allah, though they were not prophets, and if there is one among my followers, it is Umar.’

“Therefore, I have not the least hesitation in stating my meaning in another form for the conciliation of my Muslim brethren, and that other form is that in every place instead of the word *nabi* the word *muhaddas* should be understood, and the word *nabi* should be regarded as having been deleted.” (*Majmu‘a Ishtiharat*, 1986 edition, v. 1, p. 313, announcement dated 3 February 1892, issued in Lahore.)

It is clear from these references that whenever the word *nabi* is used about someone only in its linguistic sense of ‘one who receives revelation from God’ then that person is a saint or *muhaddas*.

3. In a letter dated 23 May 1908, written to the newspaper ‘*Am*, Lahore, three days before his death, Hazrat Mirza wrote:

“The basis on which I am called *nabi* is only this, that I am privileged with being in communication with God the Most High and He speaks to me abundantly ... The only reason that I am known as *nabi* is that in the Arabic and Hebrew languages the word *nabi* means one who makes prophecies abundantly upon receiving revelation from God.” (*Badr*, 11 June 1908, p. 10)

#### Note 14 (p. 11)

Regarding exactly this verse, Hazrat Mirza has written that the word *rasul* is used in it in a broad sense and includes saints as well as the prophets. He writes:

1. “Allah says: ‘He does not make His unseen known to anyone except a *rasul* whom He chooses’. The word *rasul* is general, and included within it are *rasul*, *nabi* and *muhaddas*.” (*A’inah Kamalat Islam*, February 1893, p. 322)
2. “The Holy Quran says: ‘He [Allah] does not make His unseen known to anyone except a *rasul* whom He chooses’, i.e. to disclose unseen matters perfectly is only the work of those who are *rasul*; others are not given this status. By *rasul* are meant those persons who are sent from God the Most High, whether it is a *nabi*, or a *rasul*, or a *muhaddas* and *mujaddid*.” (*Ayyam-us-Sulh*, August 1898, p. 171, footnote)
3. “Allah says: ‘He does not make His unseen known to anyone except a *rasul* whom He chooses’. That is to say, God the Most High does not inform anyone of His secrets in an open manner except those who are *rasul*, i.e. those persons who are appointed with *wahy risalat* or *wahy wilayat*, and are considered as being from Allah.” (*Al-Haq Mubahasa Ludhiana*, October 1891, p. 117)

So if someone is described as being a *rasul* under this verse, then that person is not necessarily a prophet, but can be a saint (*muhaddas* or *wali*).

### Note 15 (p. 12)

Again, it is clear that Hazrat Mirza is speaking of the linguistic or literal use of the words *nabi* and *rasul*, the sense in which they apply to saints.

### Note 16 (p. 12)

It has been shown in Notes 9 and 12 above that such a person, who is a *fana fir-rasul* and receives the names ‘Muhammad’ and ‘Ahmad’, is not a prophet.

### Note 17 (p. 12)

As shown in a quotation given in Note 9, the man who attains “a complete union and absence of difference” is a saint:

“...*muhaddas*, ... due to his obedience to the Holy Prophet and due to his being *fana fir-rasul*, he is included within the person of the Last of the Messengers, just as a part is included in the whole.” (*Izala Auham*, September 1891, p. 575)

In this quotation he uses the expression “included within the person of the Holy Prophet, as a part is included in the whole”, which is the same as “a complete union and absence of difference”.

### Note 18 (p. 12)

As shown above in Notes 10 and 12, it is saints who receive the names of prophets by way of *zill*, i.e. due to reflecting the image of prophets, or having a likeness to prophets.

### Note 19 (p. 12)

Elsewhere Hazrat Mirza has explained in detail that this prayer is for enabling one to follow the example of the prophets. Therefore by his statement here that, through this prayer, a person can become “a prophet and messenger by way of *burooz*”,

it is meant that a person can acquire likeness to prophets, in the way that Muslim saints attain it. It is certainly not meant that this is a prayer for one to become a prophet.

Hazrat Mirza writes:

1. “God exhorts us to pray to Him five times a day and beseech Him as follows: ‘*Guide us on the right path, the path of those upon whom Thou hast bestowed favours*’, i.e. O my God, the Beneficent and the Merciful, grant us guidance so that we may become the like of Adam, the chosen one of Allah; the like of Seth, the prophet of Allah; the like of Noah, the second Adam; the like of Abraham, the friend of Allah; the like of Moses, the recipient of Allah’s word; the like of Jesus; and the like of the Holy Prophet Muhammad and Ahmad, and the like of every truthful and faithful one.

...

“Of all the leaders of *Tasawwuf* that there have been till the present day, not even one has disagreed with the point that in this religion the path to become the likes of prophets is open, as the Holy Prophet Muhammad has given the glad tidings for spiritual and godly learned persons that ‘the *ulama* of my *Umma* are like the Israelite prophets’.” (*Izala Auham*, September 1891, pp. 256–259)

2. “The entire *Umma* is agreed that a non-prophet takes the place of a prophet by way of *burooz*. This is the meaning of the following hadith: The *ulama* of my *Umma* are like the prophets of the Israelites. Look, the Holy Prophet has declared the *ulama* to be like prophets. ... God has it in the Holy Quran: ‘*Guide us on the right path, the path of those upon whom Thou hast bestowed favours*’. All the commentators of the Quran agree here that the purpose of being guided ‘*on the path of those upon whom Thou hast bestowed favours*’ is to attain likeness to the prophets, which is the real

essence of following.” (*Ayyam as-Sulh*, August 1898, pp. 163–164)

In these quotations Hazrat Mirza has referred to the hadith report: “The *ulama* of my *Umma* are like the Israelite prophets”, and it is clear that what he is saying is that the prayer “Guide us on the right path” is a prayer, not for becoming a prophet, but for becoming one of the righteous persons of this *Umma* who bear a likeness to prophets.

3. “The Quran has taught the prayer, ‘*Guide us on the right path, the path of those upon whom Thou hast bestowed favours*’. What is the object of this prayer? Just this that ‘O our God, make us the likes of the prophets and messengers.’ (*Izala Auham*, September 1891, p. 539)

#### Note 20 (p. 12)

Which is the sense in which Hazrat Mirza does not deny prophethood and messengership? It is the linguistic or metaphorical sense in which a saint may be called prophet. He wrote:

1. “There is no doubt that this humble one has come from God the Most High as a *muhaddas* for this *Umma*, and a *muhaddas* is also in one sense a prophet. Though he does not possess complete prophethood, nonetheless he is a prophet in a partial sense because he has the privilege of communication with God, and matters of the unseen are disclosed to him, and his revelation, like the revelation of messengers and prophets, is also protected against interference by the devil.” (*Tauzih Maram*, January 1891, pp. 9–10)
2. “There is no claim of prophethood. On the contrary, the claim is of *muhaddasiyya* [being a *muhaddas*], which has been advanced by the command of God. And what doubt is there that *muhaddasiyya* has within it one function of the powers of prophethood.

Considering that true visions are one element out of the forty-six constituents of prophethood, then if *muhaddas-iyya* — which is described in the Holy Quran alongside prophethood and messengership, and for which there is a hadith in *Sahih Bukhari* — is declared to be metaphorical prophethood, or is called one of the aspects of prophethood, does this imply a claim to prophethood?” (*Izala Auham*, September 1891, pp. 421–422)

It is this sense in which Hazrat Mirza does not deny prophethood, the sense in which any *muhaddas* may be called prophet.

### Note 21 (p. 13)

The sense in which the Messiah-to-come has been called *nabi* in the Hadith prophecies is the same sense as discussed in the last Note. Hazrat Mirza has written a great deal about this:

1. “It is conclusively stated about the previous Messiah that he was a prophet. But the coming Messiah has been called a ‘follower’ [of the Holy Prophet Muhammad], as is obvious from the hadith: ‘He shall be your imam from among yourselves’. And in the hadith ‘The *ulama* of my *Umma* are like the prophets of the Israelites’, the news is implicitly given regarding the like of the Messiah. Therefore, according to this, the coming Messiah, due to being a *muhaddas*, is also metaphorically a prophet.” (*Izala Auham*, September 1891, p. 349)
2. “It is true, of course, that the coming Messiah has been described as ‘prophet’ (*nabi*). But he has also been described as a ‘follower’ [of the Holy Prophet Muhammad], and in fact the news has been given: O you followers, he shall be from among you, and shall be your imam.  
...

“Now it is clearly obvious from all these references that he shall not possess the attribute of complete prophethood in the actual and real manner. However, imperfect prophethood will be found in him, which in

other words is called *muhaddasiyya*, and has within it one of the qualities of complete prophethood. So the fact that he has been called *follower* and also *prophet* shows that the qualities of both being a follower and of prophethood will be found in him, just as it is necessary for both these qualities to be found in a *muhaddas*.” (ibid., pp. 532–533)

3. “God has promised that no *rasul* shall be sent after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and the students of Hadith have surely made an extremely grave error in believing, by just seeing the word ‘Jesus’ or ‘son of Mary’, that the very same son of Mary, who was a *rasul* of God, shall descend from heaven. It did not occur to them that his coming is tantamount to the departure of the religion of Islam from this world. ... In *Sahih Muslim* there is a hadith about this, namely, that the Messiah shall come as a *nabi* of Allah. Now if, in a symbolic sense, by ‘Messiah’ or ‘son of Mary’ is meant a member of the *Umma* who holds the rank of *muhaddas*, then no difficulty arises. For, a *muhaddas* is a prophet in one sense, but he is a prophet who obtains light from the lamp of the prophethood of Muhammad, and receives knowledge not directly on his own account, but through the agency of his Prophet.” (ibid., p. 586)

So Hazrat Mirza’s belief was that the sense in which the Messiah-to-come has been called *nabi* in *Sahih Muslim* is as meaning *muhaddas*, not as meaning a real prophet. He further wrote:

4. “The epithet ‘prophet of Allah’ for the Promised Messiah, which is to be found in *Sahih Muslim* etc. from the blessed tongue of the Holy Prophet, is meant in the same metaphorical sense as that in which it occurs in Sufi literature as an accepted and common term for [the recipient of] Divine communication. Otherwise,

how can there be a prophet after the *Khatam al-anbiya*?" (*Anjam Atham*, January 1897, footnote, p. 28)

5. "And it should also be remembered that in *Sahih Muslim* the word *nabi* has occurred with reference to the Promised Messiah, that is to say, by way of metaphor." (*Ayyam as-Sulh*, August 1898, p. 75)
6. "These words are by way of metaphor, just as in Hadith also the word *nabi* has been used for the Promised Messiah. ... And he who discloses news of the unseen received from God, is called *nabi* in Arabic. The meanings in Islamic terminology are different. Here only the linguistic meaning is intended." (*Arba'in* No. 2, September 1900, p. 18, footnote)
7. "I say it repeatedly that these words *rasul* and *mursal* and *nabi* undoubtedly occur about me in my revelation from God, but they do not bear their real meanings. And just as they do not, similarly the Promised Messiah being called *nabi* in Hadith, is not meant in a real sense. This is the knowledge which God has given me. Let him understand, who will. This very thing has been disclosed to me that the doors of real prophethood are fully closed after the *Khatam al-anbiya*, the Holy Prophet Muhammad. According to the real meaning, no new or ancient prophet can now come." (*Siraj Munir*, March 1897, p. 3)

He says that no prophet, new or old, can come after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and so the Promised Messiah being called as *nabi* in the Hadith prophecy must be taken metaphorically as denoting a *muhaddas*.

### Note 22 (p. 13)

Hazrat Mirza is not saying here that only a prophet receives news of the unseen from God, and that a *muhaddas* does not. The discussion here is not on the concept and definition of prophet and *muhaddas* in Islamic theology. It is about the meaning

of the words *nabi* and *muhaddas* in the Arabic language, i.e. the root or linguistic meaning.

In the August 1899 letter reproduced in Note 5 and Note 13, Hazrat Mirza makes it quite plain that ‘one who receives news of the unseen from God’ is only the root meaning of *nabi*, and that an actual prophet in Islamic terminology is in an entirely higher class than being merely a recipient of revelation.

Similarly, as may be seen from extracts given above (Notes 14 and 20), he has clearly described a *muhaddas* as receiving revelation and news of the unseen from God, and has claimed to be a *muhaddas* in these terms. For example, as quoted above, he says about a *muhaddas* that:

“...he has the privilege of communication with God, and matters of the unseen are disclosed to him, and his revelation, like the revelation of messengers and prophets, is also protected against interference by the devil.”  
(*Tauzih Maram*, pp. 9–10)

See also the three quotations in Note 14, the first being as follows: “Allah says: ‘He does not make His unseen known to anyone except a *rasul* whom He chooses’. The word *rasul* is general, and included within it are *rasul*, *nabi* and *muhaddas*” (*A’inah Kamalat Islam*, p. 322), which also show that a *muhaddas* receives knowledge of the unseen from God.

Similarly, he wrote:

“I am a *muhaddas* and Allah speaks to me as He speaks to those who are *muhaddases*. Allah knows that He has bestowed upon me this rank.” (*Hamamat-ul-Bushra*, 1894, p. 79)

As regards this passage in *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*, the opening lines of the paragraph make the meaning clear. He writes:

“... according to **this sense** I do not deny prophethood and messengership”,

and

“it is in *this sense* that the Promised Messiah has been called *nabi* in Hadith”.

And what is that sense? As shown in Notes 20 and 21, it is the *root* or *linguistic* sense of the word *nabi*, not the sense of prophet in the terminology of Islamic theology. He then adds:

“If one who receives news of the unseen from God is not to be called *nabi*”,

that is, in terms of the *linguistic* meaning,

“tell us what he should be called?”

If the reply is given that he should be called *muhaddas*,

“I say that in *no lexicon* is the meaning of *tahdees* ‘making known the unseen’.”

Here he is simply dealing with the linguistic meanings of the words *nabi* and *muhaddas*, and explaining that only the word *nabi*, and not the word *muhaddas*, has the linguistic, dictionary meaning of ‘one who receives knowledge of the unseen from God’. He is neither denying that a *muhaddas* receives knowledge of the unseen from God, nor is he claiming to be a prophet rather than a *muhaddas*.

### **Use of word *muhaddas* after 1901**

In his books written after 1901, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad continued to refer to *muhaddas* alongside *nabi* and *rasul* as one who receives knowledge of the unseen from God:

1. “Some people think that if an error is made in the understanding of a revelation [by the recipient], then faith [in him] is lost, and doubt arises that perhaps that *nabi* or *rasul* or *muhaddas* has also made an error as regards his claim.” (*Zameema Nuzul-ul-Masih*, published November 1902, p. 24)

2. "... many people raise the objection that there are women who have dreams about themselves or about their neighbours that a son will be born to them, and a son is born, then should we accept that woman as a *nabi* or *rasul* or *muhaddas* of God?" (*Tajalliyat-i Ilahiyya*, written March 1906, *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 20, p. 414)
3. "A tribulation regarding the coming of which Allah gives information through a *nabi* or *rasul* or *muhaddas* is more deserving of being cancelled than one a tribulation regarding the coming of which information is not given [by Allah], because the giving of information implies that God intends that if a person repents or prays or gives in charity [as a mark of repentance] then the tribulation would be set aside." (*Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, published May 1907, p. 389, footnote)

Examples of this use are also found in his reported talks:

1. "Just as the revelation of a *nabi* and *rasul* is protected, similarly the revelation of a *muhaddas* is protected, as indicated in this verse." (*Malfuzat*, 1984 edition, v. 4, p. 121; statement made on 26 October 1902)
2. "It is a very useful point and worth remembering that those persons who come having been appointed by Allah, whether a *rasul* or *nabi* or *muhaddas* and *mujaddid*..." (*Malfuzat*, 1984 edition, v. 6, p. 205; statement published December 1903)
3. "In Lahore I had a debate with a Maulvi on the word *muhaddas*, that it says in Hadith reports that *muhaddas* is one to whom God speaks, and this applied to Hazrat Umar. The Maulvi replied that as in Islam there is no revelation after the Holy Prophet, therefore Hazrat Umar did not achieve this rank." (*Malfuzat*, 1984 edition, v. 7, p. 229; statement made on 28 October 1904)

4. “The Mujaddid sahib [Shaikh Ahmad of Sirhind, Mujaddid Alif-i Sani] has written that dreams and revelations which man receives now and then, if someone receives these in abundance then he is known as a *muhaddas*. I have explained all this in my book *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*.” (*Malfuzat*, 1984 edition, v. 10, p. 155; statement made 6 March 1908)

### Confirmation by Qadiani *Jama‘at* scholar

Shortly before the Qadiani *Jama‘at* put forward the new notion that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad claimed to be a prophet in *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*, one of their scholars also wrote that Hazrat Mirza is here not denying being a *muhaddas* but he is only discussing the literal meaning of this word.

In 1914 Hafiz Raushan Ali, a Qadiani *Jama‘at* religious scholar, answered an objection from the opponents of the Ahmadiyya Movement as follows:

“Objection: In *Tauzih Maram* you [i.e. Hazrat Mirza] call yourself a *muhaddas* and say that a *muhaddas* too is a prophet in one sense. But now in this poster you write that ‘my title cannot be *muhaddas* because in no lexicon does the word *tahdees* convey the meaning of disclosing the unseen’.

Answer: We say that there could only have been a contradiction between these two places if there was an affirmation of being a *muhaddas* in a certain sense, and then a denial made with regard to the same sense. But here the senses in the two places are different. Therefore, in accordance with the principle, *lau l-al-i‘tibaraat la-batal-al-hikma*, your alleged contradiction disappears. In the poster [*Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*], he has made the denial in the sense that in Arabic lexicology the meaning of *tahdees* is not that of disclosing the unseen. And in *Tauzih Maram* he has made the affirmation in

terms of the technical meaning, despite having made it explicit there that a *muhaddas* is also a prophet in a sense.” (*Tashhiz-ul-Azhan*, October 1914, vol. ix, no. 10)

*Tashhiz-ul-Azhan* was a magazine founded and edited by Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, and the issue cited above dates from a few months *after* the split in the Ahmadiyya Movement. The answer given here is the same as our explanation, namely, that Hazrat Mirza is not changing his earlier view (as expressed in *Tauzih Maram*, for example) about what a *muhaddas* is, and now saying that he was not a *muhaddas* but a prophet. He is not discussing the Islamic concept of *muhaddas* (according to which he is a *muhaddas*), but the meaning of this word in Arabic.

#### **Note 23 (p. 13)**

These lines are further clear proof that he is discussing the root or linguistic meaning of *nabi*, in terms of language, as distinct from the defined Islamic concept.

#### **Note 24 (p. 13)**

This again refers to a saint or *muhaddas*. Just as someone who is described as a *nabi* in the linguistic or metaphorical sense is not in fact a prophet but is a saint, similarly someone who is described as a non-law-bearing *nabi*, for whom “it is not a requirement that he should be a bearer of *shariah*”, is not a prophet but is a saint. The reason is that every prophet is a bearer of *shariah*, in that every prophet had authority over the law, even though he might be following a law revealed before him. Every prophet became a prophet by receiving *wahy nubuwwat*, the revelation exclusive to prophets. He acted directly under the authority of his own revelation, which was supreme over any previous law or revelation he might be following.

On the other hand, a saint like Hazrat Mirza is a recipient of *wahy wilayat* which has **no** authority over the Quran and

Islamic *shariah*, but is itself subordinate and subject to the Holy Quran and *shariah*. In view of this distinction between prophets and saints, the Sufis devised the term “prophet without a *shariah*” to refer metaphorically to a saint. See further Note 29.

**Note 25 (p. 13)**

He has fully explained that these titles are *not* meant in the real sense when they are given to him or to any other Muslim saint by God. See the preceding Notes.

**Note 26 (p. 13)**

Hazrat Mirza is not claiming that his revelation is equal in kind and status to the revelation of the prophets Moses, Jesus and the Holy Prophet Muhammad. He is saying that all revelation is from the *same source*, i.e. God, and that he believes with the same certainty that his revelation is from God as he believes that the verses of the Quran are from God. He has written elsewhere that non-prophets who receive revelation are also absolutely sure that their revelation is from God. He says:

“I have just explained that when the sun of Divine revelation manifests itself on a heart in actual fact, there is definitely no darkness of uncertainty and doubt with it. Can darkness exist alongside pure light? Then considering that the mother of Moses received sure revelation, and by fully believing in it she cast her baby in the place of destruction, and she was not considered by God the Most High to be guilty of the crime of attempted murder, is the Muslim *Umma* inferior to the women of the Israelites? Likewise, Mary also received sure revelation, and by trusting in it she cared not for (the criticism of) her people. Pity, then, on this forsaken *Umma* which is inferior to these women. In these circumstances, this *Umma* could not be the ‘best of nations’, but the worst of nations and the most ignorant of nations. Similarly Khizr, who was not a prophet, was granted Divine knowledge. If his revelation was doubt-

ful, and not sure, why did he kill a child unjustly? And if the revelation of the Companions of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, to the effect that his dead body ought to be washed, was not sure and definite, why did they act upon it?

“To conclude, if a man, due to his blindness, denies my revelation, then if he is nonetheless called a Muslim, and is not a secret atheist, it should be part of his belief that there can be sure and definite Divine revelation, and that just as in previous religious communities many men and women used to receive God’s revelation, even though they were not prophets, in this *Umma* too it is essential that sure and definite revelation should exist, so that it does not become the least of the nations instead of the best of the nations.” (*Nuzul-ul-Masih*, written 1902, published 1909, p. 89)

For revelation to Moses’ mother see the Quran, 28:7; for Mary see 19:17–21; for Khizr see 18:65–82.

By giving these examples of revelation to non-prophets, Hazrat Mirza has settled conclusively that his revelation too was that of a non-prophet.

He also writes:

“Now the curse of Allah is upon those who say that they can bring the like of the Quran. It is a miracle, the like of which cannot be shown by any human or jinn. It is a collection of points of deep knowledge and beauties, which cannot be assembled by human knowledge. Nay, it is a revelation like which there is none other, even though there may be another revelation from God after it. For, in revelation are the manifestations of Allah, and it is certain that His manifestation upon the *Khatam al-anbiya* was such that there was no manifestation like it before, nor shall there be after. The status of the revelation of saints is not like the status of the revelation of

the Quran, even though words may be revealed to them which are like the words of the Quran.” (*Al-Huda*, June 1902, pp. 32–33)

Both the above quotations are from books written after the publication of *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*. They show that after its publication too, as before it, Hazrat Mirza was classifying his revelation as that of non-prophets.

### Note 26a (p. 14)

In the statement, “I have not brought a *shariah* independently, nor am I a prophet in my own right”, the words translated as “independently” and “in my own right” are, in both cases, *mustaqil taur pur*. The word *mustaqil* means ‘established’ or ‘standing by itself, without support’, and hence independent, absolute or permanent. *Mustaqil* prophethood denotes real prophethood because a prophet has independent authority.

In his book *Ayyam-us-Sulh*, at the beginning of the passage quoted below, Hazrat Mirza has expressed the same concept in the words *nubuwwat jo apna sikka jamati ho*, literally meaning ‘prophethood which issues its own coinage’, that is, prophethood which is sovereign and autonomous, and establishes its own authority. He goes on to contrast this prophethood, which is closed after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, with sainthood or *wilayat*, which continues and which is his own rank:

“...in Islam the door of that prophethood which establishes its own authority is closed. Allah says: ‘He is the Messenger of Allah and the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*’, and it is in Hadith: ‘There is no prophet (*nabi*) after me’. ... And if some other prophet, new or old, were to come then our Holy Prophet Muhammad cannot remain the *Khatam al-anbiya*. However, the door of revelation to saints (*wahy wilayat*) and Divine communication is not closed. ... it is established from authentic Hadith that a *muhaddas* too, like prophets and messengers (*nabi, rasul*), is included among those sent by God.... It should also be remembered that in *Sahih Muslim* the

word *nabi* has occurred in regard to the Promised Messiah, that is to say, metaphorically and figuratively. It is for this reason that in *Barahin Ahmadiyya* such words have occurred about me from God.... The testimonies of the signs of God are never weak, whether those signs are shown through a *nabi* or through a *muhaddas*. The fact is that the prophethood of our Holy Prophet Muhammad itself, and grace (*faiz*) from him, by producing a man who is its manifestation, testifies to its own truth. The *wali* attains these names for free.” (*Ayyam-us-Sulh*, p. 74)

This explanation by him plainly shows that his statement “I am not a prophet by way of *mustaqil*” (i.e., “not a prophet in my own right”, or “not an independent prophet”) means that he is a *wali* and *muhaddas*.

#### **Note 27 (p. 14)**

He says here:

“... in the sense that ... I have received knowledge of the unseen from God through the mediation of the Holy Prophet, I am a messenger and a prophet but without a new *shariah*.”

This again is use of the words *nabi* and *rasul* in the linguistic sense: receiving knowledge of the unseen from God. Compare this with the following words from his August 1899 letter as quoted earlier in Notes 5 and 13:

“The words *nabi* and *rasul* are figurative and metaphorical. *Risalat* in the Arabic language is applied to ‘being sent’, and *nubuwwat* is to expound hidden truths and matters upon receiving knowledge from God. So, bearing in mind a significance of this extent, it is not blame-worthy to believe in the heart in accordance with this meaning. However, in the terminology of Islam, *nabi* and *rasul* mean those who bring an entirely new *shariah*, or those who abrogate some aspects of

the previous *shariah*, or those who are not called followers of a previous prophet, having a direct connection with God without benefit from a prophet. Therefore, one should be vigilant to see that the same meaning is not taken here ... ”

Comparing the two passages it is clear that one who is a prophet and messenger due to receiving knowledge of the unseen or knowledge of hidden matters from God, and is without a *shariah*, is in fact *not* a prophet in Islamic terminology.

For the meaning of ‘prophet without *shariah*’, see Notes 24 and 29.

#### Note 28 (p. 14)

He writes here: “I have never denied being called a prophet in this sense. In fact, this is the sense in which God has addressed me as *nabi* and *rasul*. Nor do I now deny being a prophet and messenger in this sense”.

These words make it absolutely plain that Hazrat Mirza is *not claiming anything here which he was denying previously*. The Qadiani *Jama‘at* belief about this pamphlet is that previously Hazrat Mirza ***had been denying*** claiming to be a prophet and in this pamphlet he was ***now claiming*** to be a prophet. But Hazrat Mirza says that the sense in which he previously allowed the application to him of the words *nabi* and *rasul*, it is in exactly the same sense that he is now affirming that application.

Therefore we must look in his previous writings to see in what sense had he never denied being called a prophet. This is the sense in which a *muhaddas* is a prophet, i.e. in the imperfect, or linguistic, or metaphorical sense. See the two quotations in Note 20 in this connection.

As Hazrat Mirza has referred here to his previous denials of claiming prophethood, and has in fact confirmed them, we may quote here some of those vociferous denials to show exactly what he denied and what he did not deny:

1. "Let it be clear to him [an opponent Maulvi] that I too curse the man who would claim prophethood ... And it is not *wahy nubuwwat* but *wahy wilayat* which is received by the saints under the shadow of the prophethood of the Holy Prophet Muhammad by perfect obedience to him, in this we do believe. ... In short, there is no claim of prophethood on my part either. The claim is only of *wilayat* (sainthood) and *mujaddidiyya* (being a *mujaddid*)." (*Majmu'a Ishtiharat*, April 1986 edition, v. 2, pp. 297–298, January 1897)
2. "One of the objections of those who call me *kafir* is that they say: This man claims prophethood and says that I am one of the prophets. The answer is that you should know, O brother, that I have not claimed prophethood nor have I said to them that I am a prophet. ... I said to them nothing except what I wrote in my books, namely, that I am a *muhaddas* and Allah speaks to me as He speaks to *muhaddases*." (*Hamamat-ul-Bushra*, 1894, p. 79)
3. "I make no claim to prophethood. This is your mistake, or you have some motive in mind. Is it necessary that the person who lays claim to revelation should also be a prophet?" (*Jang Muqaddas*, June 1893, p. 67)
4. "I do not make a claim to prophethood ... After our leader and master, Muhammad *mustafa*, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him, the *Khatam al-mursal* (last of the messengers), I consider anyone who claims prophethood and messengership to be a liar and *kafir*." (*Majmu'a Ishtiharat*, April 1986 edition, v. 1, pp. 230–231; statement issued on 2 October 1891)
5. "By way of a fabrication, they slander me by alleging that I have made a claim to prophethood and that I deny miracles and the angels. It should be remembered that all this is a fabrication." (*Kitab al-Bariyya*, January 1898, p. 182, footnote)

6. “Can a wretched imposter who claims messengership and prophethood for himself have any belief in the Holy Quran? And can a man who believes in the Holy Quran, and believes the verse ‘He is the Messenger of Allah and the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*’ to be the word of God, say that he is a messenger and prophet after the Holy Prophet Muhammad? The man calling himself ‘seeker of justice’ should remember that I have never, at any time, made a claim of prophethood or messengership in the real sense. To use a word in a non-real sense, and to employ it in speech according to its broad, root meaning, does not imply heresy (*kufir*). However, I do not like even this much, for there is the possibility that ordinary Muslims may misunderstand it.” (*Anjam Atham*, January 1897, p. 27, footnote)

In all the above extracts, Hazrat Mirza has denied claiming to be a prophet, without any reservation or qualification. What is more, using very strong language he has called this allegation against him as a “fabrication”, and cursed anyone who claims prophethood and described such a claimant as a liar, a *kafir*, and a wretched imposter. While denying claiming prophethood what he did not deny was claiming to be a recipient of revelation as bestowed upon non-prophets.

#### **Note 29 (p. 14)**

One who is not a prophet with a *shariah* is not a prophet, as mentioned earlier in Note 24. The term “non *shariah*-bearing prophet” was, like the terms *zill*, *burooz* and *fana fir-rasul*, coined by Sufi writers and saints as referring to one who is not a real prophet but is spoken to by God. It is not a type of prophet. Nowhere do the Holy Quran or Hadith mention a kind of prophethood called “non *shariah*-bearing”. What the Quran and Hadith refer to as a *wali* or *muhaddas*, such a one is sometimes known in the Sufi terminology as a “non *shariah*-bearing prophet” (*ghair tashri’i nabi*).

It is abundantly clear from Hazrat Mirza's own writings that, besides the possessors of *shariah*, others who receive revelation are saints, and not prophets of some kind. He writes:

1. "The point is worth remembering that to call the denier of one's claim as *kafir* is only the privilege of those prophets who bring a *shariah* and new commandments from God the Most High. But apart from possessors of *shariah* (*sahib-i shariah*), all the others who are *muhaddas*, no matter how high a rank they may have with God, and be exalted with the robe of Divine revelation, no one becomes a *kafir* by denying them." (*Tiryaq-ul-Qulub*, October 1902, p. 130, footnote)

According to this statement, besides "possessors of *shariah*" (*sahib-i shariah*) all others who receive revelation are saints or *muhaddas*.

2. "Allah speaks to, and communicates with, His saints in this *Umma*. They are given the colour of prophets, but they are not prophets in reality because the Holy Quran has completed all the requirements of the *shariah*. They are given nothing but the understanding of the Quran; they do not add to the Quran, nor take anything away from it." (*Mawahib-ur-Rahman*, January 1903, p. 66)

Here Hazrat Mirza says that the reason why saints are not prophets is that the Islamic *shariah* has been perfected with the revelation of the Quran. A prophet would only need to come if the *shariah* required change or improvement. So there are only two categories: (1) saints, and they are not prophets in reality, and (2) prophets, and they come to perfect the *shariah*.

### **Note 30 (p. 14)**

Again Hazrat Mirza makes clear that the words *nabi* and *rasul* only apply to him in their linguistic sense. As quoted in Note 27, he stated that the Islamic meaning of these words is different and he cautioned his followers that: "one should be vigilant to see that the same meaning is not taken here".

**Note 31 (p. 15)**

If, by using the word *nabi* about himself, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad becomes a prophet, as the Qadiani *Jama'at* holds, then by calling himself “that same prophet, the *Khatam al-anbiya*” he should become the same person as the Holy Prophet Muhammad! The Qadiani *Jama'at* ought to clarify whether they believe Hazrat Mirza to be, not only a *nabi*, but the *Khatam al-anbiya* and exactly the same as the Holy Prophet Muhammad.

The fact is that he is using these titles “in the sense of *burooz*”, which means that he is a saint, a non-prophet who is like a mirror in which a prophet’s prophetic qualities are reflected.

**Note 32 (p. 15)**

The important point to note here is: “Muhammad is the Prophet and no one else”. The person of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is not, and does not become, a prophet. As “Muhammad is the Prophet and no one else”, then belief in the Holy Prophet Muhammad is sufficient and there is no requirement to believe in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as a prophet in addition to the Holy Prophet.

**Note 33 (p. 17)**

The discussion here, that the Mahdi would be a spiritual heir of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and that being a physical descendant is in itself of no significance or value whatsoever, contains a rejoinder and refutation of another Qadiani *Jama'at* doctrine. They believe that the descendants of Hazrat Mirza have been specially favoured and chosen by God, and are the only ones entitled to be his successors. They believe Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad to be the Promised Reformer (*muslih mau'ud*) chiefly on account of being Hazrat Mirza’s eldest son.

Hazrat Mirza has explained here that when the Holy Prophet prophesied that the Mahdi would be from his family (the *ahl bait*), he did not at all mean that the Mahdi would be his physical descendant but that he would be his spiritual heir

in terms of morals and qualities. Unfortunately the Qadiani *Jama'at* ignores this basic principle of religion in the high reverence they give to the descendants of Hazrat Mirza.

**Note 34 (p. 17)**

Notice the words here:

1. "Hence, as prophethood also is a quality of a *nabi*, it is essential for it to be manifested in the *burooz* image."

It is clear that the *burooz* image is not himself a *nabi*, for if he were then the above words become meaningless because they amount to saying that the qualities of a prophet are manifested in a prophet! What he is saying is that the qualities of a prophet are seen reflected in one who is not a prophet.

2. "All prophets have held that the *burooz* is a perfect image of its original."

By *all prophets* it is clear that real prophets are meant here, because their *burooz* are spoken of separately. Therefore *all* prophets are only the real prophets, and this category does not include the *burooz*.

**Note 35 (p. 17)**

Again, if prophethood of Muhammad remains limited to the Holy Prophet Muhammad then it is entirely wrong to say that the man Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was a prophet.

**Note 36 (p. 18)**

Again, by *all prophets* here are meant the real prophets, and therefore anyone known as 'prophet in the sense of *burooz*' is not in the category of all prophets.

**Note 37 (p. 18)**

As to what is meant by the Holy Prophet Muhammad coming into the world a "thousand times", read again a part of the quotation from Hazrat Mirza given earlier in Note 12:

“...the spirituality of our Holy Prophet has always manifested itself at times when the internal crises of Islam became overwhelming, and the ‘essence of Muhammad’ has always made its appearance through some perfect follower. ... There have been *hundreds of persons* in whom the ‘essence of Muhammad’ was established, and with Allah they had the names ‘Muhammad’ and ‘Ahmad’ by way of reflection (*zill*).” (*Ainah Kamalat Islam*, February 1893, p. 346)

These hundreds of persons are clearly the saints of Islam, and it is their coming which is referred to in *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* here as the Prophet Muhammad coming a thousand times. Hazrat Mirza is placing himself in the same category as these persons: they all had the names ‘Muhammad’ and ‘Ahmad’ in the sight of Allah, they were all *zill* and *burooz*. As they were not prophets, and the Qadiani *Jama‘at* does not consider them to be prophets, so also Hazrat Mirza was not a prophet.

**Note 38 (p. 18)**

Again, Hazrat Mirza affirms that Allah had told the Holy Prophet Muhammad that no prophet would come after him.

**Note 39 (p. 19)**

The verse of the Holy Quran that Hazrat Mirza has referred to here, and earlier, as “others from among them” is the following:

“He it is Who raised among the illiterates a Messenger from among themselves, who recites to them His messages and purifies them, and teaches them the Book and the wisdom, although they were before certainly in manifest error, and *others from among them who have not yet joined them.*” (The Holy Quran, 62:2–3)

The meaning is that the Holy Prophet Muhammad is the teacher not only of his contemporaries, but also of the future generations. He is the teacher of the later generations through the Muslim saints who present in their lives a true example of

the Holy Prophet and who broadcast that same message in its original form which was preached by the Holy Prophet.

Hazrat Mirza is that great Muslim saint and *mujaddid* who is particularly outstanding in preaching the message of the Holy Prophet in its pristine purity, at a time when that message had been so entirely distorted. Also he breathed into his companions such a spirit of sacrifice for the cause of Islam that it gave a glimpse of the companions of the Holy Prophet. So he particularly and perfectly fulfils the prophecy contained in this verse. In Sufi terminology, one who does such work for Islam is called a *buuroz* of the Holy Prophet.

Hazrat Mirza further says here that this verse does not explicitly state that the later generations would be taught through a follower of the Holy Prophet, but rather mentions the Holy Prophet personally as being their teacher and guide, as if that follower has no existence of his own.

What this really means is that the spiritual light of the Holy Prophet Muhammad is seen reflected so perfectly through the person and mission of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad that it is as if this light was being seen directly. So it is the light of the Holy Prophet Muhammad to which Hazrat Mirza invites people, and not to himself in his own right. The person to be accepted as prophet and to be followed is the Holy Prophet Muhammad. Hazrat Mirza, and the mission founded by him, is the *means* sent by Allah through which the message of the Holy Prophet Muhammad will reach the world in its true and original purity.

#### **Note 40 (p. 20)**

See Note 33. Again Hazrat Mirza says that spiritual relationship is what matters, and that being a physical descendant is of no merit in itself.

#### **Note 41 (p. 20)**

As explained in many earlier Notes, the sense in which he is a prophet and messenger is the metaphorical or linguistic sense in which these words may be applied to the saints in Islam.

**Note 42 (p. 20)**

If Hazrat Mirza claimed to be a prophet, of whatever kind, how could he call it a malicious accusation that he claimed to be a prophet, and how could he denounce anyone making this accusation as “a liar and evil-minded”?

**Note 43 (p. 20)**

Again, the words “my own self does not come into it” show that it is not the person of Hazrat Mirza that has become a prophet. He closes by saying that the prophethood of the Holy Prophet Muhammad did not go to another person, but remained with the Holy Prophet. Therefore the prophethood to be believed in and acknowledged is the prophethood of Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him, and not of anyone after him.

## **4. Letter of reply to opponent by Maulana Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan of Amroha**

Maulana Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan of Amroha was a top-most scholar of the Ahmadiyya Movement who used to write replies, on behalf of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and on his instructions, to allegations of the opponents of the Movement. The Ahmadiyya community newspaper *Al-Hakam* reported that on 19 November 1901, a few days after the publication of *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*, the Maulana informed Hazrat Mirza that he had received a letter from one Hafiz Muhammad Yusuf saying he had heard that Hazrat Mirza sahib had claimed to be a prophet in this pamphlet. Learning of this, Hazrat Mirza directed Maulana Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan as follows:

“This letter should be answered in detail so that our beliefs are conveyed to him. It is a matter of wonder that these people call it a new claim. ... You must write him a very detailed and clear letter.”<sup>1</sup>

The reply written by Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan, dated 21 November, was also published in *Al-Hakam* and extends over six long pages (9 to 14) in the issue for 24 November 1901.

The editor has added an introductory note as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> Newspaper *Al-Hakam*, 30 November 1901, p. 2, col. 3.

“Below we reproduce an invaluable letter by Maulana Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan of Amroha which, although written by him as a reply to a postcard from Muhammad Yusuf of Amritsar, is in fact a fine exposition of that pamphlet which *Hazrat Aqdas* [Hazrat Mirza] published under the title *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*. The points of truth and knowledge contained in this letter need no explanation or advertisement from us — the name ‘scholar of Amroha’ is sufficient. But we should say that in this letter the scholarly gentleman is speaking with the support of the Holy Spirit. ...

Here is that blessed letter, full of knowledge.”

### The letter

After some initial comments, reminding the critic of his past favourable attitude and contrasting it with his unfair and extreme reaction to this pamphlet, Maulana Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan produces a list of nineteen places in *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* where a claim to prophethood is denied. That section of the letter is translated below. For convenience of reference, we have added in square brackets after each quotation the page number of this book where the extract occurs.

“ Sir, the pamphlet with reference to which you say that Mirza sahib has claimed prophethood in it, that very pamphlet contains the following texts in which he has denied this claim clearly and explicitly. We regret that you neither understood the claim itself nor the denial. The texts are as follows:

1. ‘ *there certainly cannot come any prophet, new or old, in the way in which...* ’ [p. 10].
2. ‘ *Such a belief is undoubtedly a sin, and the verse ‘he is the Messenger of Allah and the Khatam an-nabiyyin’ along with the hadith ‘there is no prophet after me’ are conclusive proof of the absolute falsity of this view* ’ [p. 10].

3. '*I, however, am strongly opposed to such beliefs*' [p. 10]. Look how strong is the denial.
4. '*I ... have true and full faith in the statement*' [p. 10], that is, the *Khatam an-nabiyin* verse.
5. '*after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the doors of prophecies have been closed till the Day of Judgment. ... but one window, that of the path of Siddiq, is open, namely, fana fir-rasul*' [p. 10], i.e., perfect successorship to the Holy Prophet, which is known in other words as *burooz*.
6. '*it is not possible now for a Hindu or a Jew or a Christian or a nominal Muslim to apply the word nabi to himself*' [p. 10]. That is, without reaching the station of *fana fir-rasul*.
7. '*All the windows of prophethood have been closed*' [p. 10], that is, without becoming *fana fir-rasul*.
8. '*there is no way to the graces of Allah except through his mediation*' [p. 11], the mediation of the Holy Prophet.
9. '*after our Holy Prophet Muhammad till the Day of Judgment, there is no prophet to whom a new shariah is to be revealed*' [p. 12]. Look, in this extract it is denied that a law-bearing prophet will ever come after the Holy Prophet.
10. '*And whoever makes such a claim indeed commits heresy*' [p. 12]. That is, the person who claims prophethood with *Shariah* becomes a *kafir*.
11. '*I have not brought a shariah independently*' [p. 13]. Mr. Hafiz, open your eyes to read this!
12. '*nor am I a prophet in my own right*' [p. 14]. Mr. Hafiz, read this sentence for God's sake!
13. '*I am not a possessor of shariah*' [p. 14]. Read this with fear of God!

14. ‘ *all these graces have not been bestowed upon me without mediation, but that there is a holy being in heaven, namely, Muhammad mustafa, whose spiritual benefit I have received*’ [p. 14].
15. ‘ *In other words, the term Khatam an-nabiyyin is a Divine seal which has been put upon the prophethood of the Holy Prophet. It is not possible now that this seal could ever break*’ [p. 18]. Look how strong is this denial.
16. ‘ *a seal has been put upon prophethood till the Day of Judgment*’ [p. 18]. See how often this denial is repeated in a 3-page poster.
17. ‘ *ignorant opponents accuse me of claiming to be a prophet and messenger. I make no such claim*’ [p. 20]. Mr. Hafiz, it is the height of ignorance to level this charge after all these denials.
18. ‘ *I am neither a prophet nor a messenger in the sense which they have in mind*’ [p. 20].
19. ‘ *Hence the person who maliciously accuses me of claiming prophethood and messengership is a liar and evil-minded*’ [p. 20].

O Mr. Hafiz, if you have any fear of God in you, can you say of a man whose writing in a 3-page poster so frequently denies a claim to autonomous prophethood, that he is a claimant to autonomous prophethood? Or, can any sane adult say that this *fana fir-rasul* has claimed that prophethood and messengership which is denied by the consensus of opinion of the entire Muslim *Umma*? Both you and I are nearing the end of our lives. How, then, can you be so bold as to make this unjustified accusation? We seek refuge in Allah from the evil promptings of our souls and from our bad deeds! ”<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> *Al-Hakam*, 24 November 1901, p. 10.

From this point, the letter continues as below:

“ After this statement, I place before you certain principles that are accepted by all the chief authorities of this *Umma* and are supported by the Book of Allah, authentic *Sunna* and the agreement of the *Umma*. As you too acknowledge those principles, for details I refer you to pamphlets written by me, so that you are not offended by a lengthy explanation given here.

**First Principle:** Members of this *Umma* are not deprived of receiving words and communications from God. They are blessed with revelation of matters unseen according to need. True dreams are a forty-sixth part of prophethood, as it says in authentic hadith.

**Second Principle:** The word *nabi* means one who conveys news of the unseen, having been informed of it by God, and the word *rasul* means one sent by God. This principle is also accepted by you, and it is a proven fact because the word *nabi* is related to *naba'*, meaning ‘news’, and the word *rasul* is derived from *risalat*, meaning ‘sent’ and ‘appointed’.

**Third Principle:** You had accepted Hazrat Mirza sahib as *mujaddid* as a matter of certainty, and you had accepted the revelations published in *Barahin Ahmadiyya*. This means that Hazrat Mirza sahib’s being a *mujaddid* was, to you, a proven truth, which cannot be dispelled by doubt and qualm. It is a principle of knowledge, accepted by you and everyone else, that certainty cannot be removed because of a doubt.

After introducing these three principles, I ask you: What is the claim made by Hazrat Mirza sahib in this poster which is contrary to these three principles? If you say that Mirza sahib has claimed to be *rasul* (messenger) in it, we submit that as you accepted Hazrat Mirza sahib as *mujaddid* it means you also accepted him as having been appointed (*mab‘ūth*) by Allah, and as you accepted him as appointed, you also accepted him as a *rasul* by way of reflection (*zill*) because the words *rasul* and *mab‘ūth* are synonymous. Of course, he is very far from

claiming the messengership (*risalat*) which is special to the Holy Prophet Muhammad. And when you accepted that Hazrat Mirza sahib received revelation from God comprising matters of the unseen, you also accepted him as a *nabi* by way of reflection (*zill*). Please refer to the above three principles. Of course, he is very far from claiming the prophethood (*nubuwwat*) which is special to the Holy Prophet Muhammad.

Thus, he declares himself as a *burooz* (manifested image) of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, who is *Khatam an-nabiyyin*, just as the image of an object in a mirror, where there appears to be no difference between the source and the image except that one is real and the other is its image. In *Barahin Ahmadiyya*, which you had accepted, there are plenty of revelations of this kind, such as *jari-ullah fi hulul-il-anbiya* (“The messenger of Allah in the mantle of the prophets”), the meaning of *jari* in dictionaries being that of *rasul*. So what is it that has arisen now to make him *kafir*, because of which you now do not wish to meet us?

To sum up, as long as you accept the three principles stated above, you most certainly cannot deny the poster of Mirza sahib or his claim to be Mahdi and Messiah through any argument based on Islam.”<sup>3</sup>

Later the letter continues:

“ Then there is the question that if partial prophethood and messengership by way of reflection can be attained by persons of this *Umma*, why did not the four caliphs and anyone of the first, best generations of Islam apply the word *nabi* and *rasul* to themselves, when many of them were spiritually perfect and *fana fir-rasul* (self-effaced in the Holy Prophet)? Why did Mirza sahib dare to do this, the example of which cannot be found in the first, best generations? The answer is that there are two

---

<sup>3</sup> *Al-Hakam*, 24 November 1901, from p. 10, col. 1 to p. 11, col. 2.

points here. The first point is the confirmation and establishment of the doctrine of *Khatam an-nabiyyin*, which has the highest precedence. The second point, which is a branch of the first one, is the proof and establishment of the benefits and blessings of the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*, which in other words is known as prophethood by way of reflection, partial messenger-ship or the *bu-rooz* of Muhammad. Though these two concepts are mutually dependent, but unless the first one is established and proved, the second one cannot be proved. For this reason, Divine wisdom required that in the times of the early generations of Islam, due to the arising of false claimants to prophethood, such as Musailima the Liar, the aim should be the proof and confirmation of the first point. For, when the first is established and proved, the proof of the second, which they were themselves witnessing, would become a part of it. However, unless the first doctrine is proved the second cannot be.

Therefore, because of this natural sequence, Allah drew the attention of the perfect ones of the early generations of Islam only towards establishing and confirming the doctrine of *Khatam an-nabiyyin*. Through their efforts, the false claimants of prophethood who had arisen were destroyed, as their destruction was ordained in the holy books. If Allah had not drawn the attention of the early generations towards the doctrine of finality of prophethood, by means of these efforts, this doctrine would have become obscure. This is why, to be further cautious, the perfect ones of the early generations were not sent any Divine revelation enabling them to apply the word *nabi* or *rasul* to themselves by way of reflection, despite the fact that they fully possessed the graces of *Khatam an-nabiyyin*, which are known as prophethood by way of reflection....

Its parallels can certainly be found in the teachings of Islam. For example, in the matters of visiting graves the Holy Prophet said: "I forbade you to visit the graves but [now] do visit them", or at the time of the revelation of the Quran, the sayings of the Holy Prophet were not written down for fear of mixing up the Divine word with the word of a mortal. Hence,

when belief in the finality of prophethood had become well fixed in the minds of the entire *Umma*, then came the time for the proof and demonstration of those graces and blessings of the finality of prophethood. The flowing graces had reached the abstemious persons of the early generations, and according to the Book of Allah and authentic Sunna, these were as apparent as the mid-day sun, and it is these which are in other words known as *burooz* of Muhammad and prophethood by way of reflection. In these last days, due to the passage of a long time after the finality of prophethood, which fulfils the description “time was prolonged for them, so their hearts hardened” [the Quran, 57:16], it was sorely needed that the graces of *Khatam an-nabiyyin* be displayed. Therefore, the Holy Prophet himself gave the names Muhammad and Ahmad to the Mahdi, which point to just this concept of *burooz* and prophethood by way of reflection.”<sup>4</sup> ...

“ If the blessings of the finality of prophethood cannot be attained, by way of reflection, by its worthy, perfect and sincere followers, then how can the reform of the *Umma* and the revival of the religion of Islam take place? Which accomplishment of the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*, the head of the messengers, will remain in the world, if all those doors of graces and Divine blessings which were open for the Israelites are closed and all blessings from the Holy Prophet Muhammad have come to an end?

Allah says: ‘Muhammad is not the father of any man from among you but he is the Messenger of Allah and the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*’ [the Quran, 33:40]. Think over this verse, as to why the word ‘but’ (*lakin*) occurs in this verse, the word which is used for the removal of doubt created by the preceding text.... The doubt created in this verse was that as the Holy Prophet was not the father of any man, so his movement would not continue to exist in the world, and, God forbid, as the disbelievers had alleged, he would be cut off without issue [the

---

<sup>4</sup> *Al-Hakam*, 24 November 1901, p. 12.

Quran, 108:3]. Allah dispelled this doubt by using the word 'but', saying that this would not happen because he is the Messenger of Allah, and moreover the Messenger who is *Khatam an-nabiyyin*. The graces of his messengership and the blessings of his finality of prophethood will continue till the Day of Judgment, and the perfect members of his *Umma* who are symbolically his progeny shall attain these blessings till the Day of Judgment, which is partial prophethood and messengership by way of reflection. And in the last days a Mahdi will arise who will be 'Muhammad' and 'Ahmad'. ...

To sum up, this is just as in the days of the Companions of the Holy Prophet the truths and meanings of the Quran which are being explained these days were not explained at that time. The attention of the Companions was devoted to the collection of the Quran, according to the verses: 'Surely on Us rests the collecting of it and the reciting of it. So when We recite it, follow its recitation. Again on Us rests the explaining of it.' [the Quran, 75:17-19]. After the generation of the Companions till the present day, commentaries have come into existence in accordance with the needs of the times to prove the perfect miraculous nature of the Holy Quran. Just as such true commentaries, full of knowledge and truths, according to arising needs, are not a wrong innovation, even though these explanations cannot be traced to the Companions, similarly the publicising of the grace of the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*, which is to be found in the concept of the *burooz* of the Holy Prophet, is necessary and imperative particularly in these last days which is the time of the Mahdi and Promised Messiah.

Now I turn to the statements of the great men of this *Umma* who claimed to be the *burooz* of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. There is, in the first place, a hadith itself referring to prophethood by way of reflection (*zill*): 'The *ulama* of my *Umma* are like the prophets of the Israelites'. Since the *ulama* of the *Umma* are like the prophets of the Israelites and the Mahdi and the Promised Messiah occupies a very high position above the *Ulama* of the *Umma*, is he not a prophet in one sense then?

There is a hadith: ‘Whomever death overtakes while he is searching for knowledge with which to revive Islam, there is only one degree between him and the prophets in heaven’, reported by Darimi, also in *Mishkat*. Now I ask you: do you think that the Mahdi and the Promised Messiah is no greater at all than that seeker of knowledge who seeks knowledge in order to revive Islam? Hazrat Ali has also been called the *burooz* of the Messiah by the Holy Prophet.

It is written in *Tazkirat-ul-Auliya* that Hazrat Bayazid Bustami said: I am Adam, I am Seth, I am Noah, I am Abraham, I am Moses, I am Jesus, I am Muhammad. It is worth remembering here that Bayazid Bustami has made this claim to be *burooz* by himself. There is no specific prophecy about him made by the Holy Prophet. But the Holy Prophet has himself given the Promised Mahdi the names Muhammad and Ahmad in his sayings. Even more interesting is that in *Barahin Ahmad-iyya* both these names are to be found in revelations. Thus the hadith confirms the revelation, and the revelation confirms the hadith. And the name Ahmad was given to him even at birth as a mark of respect and honour for the Holy Prophet Muhammad, that is: Ghulam Ahmad. It is obvious that by the giving of the name [in hadith] is not meant the name merely as a word, for hundreds of children are given the names Ahmad and Muhammad. Here by names Muhammad and Ahmad is meant the true nature underlying these names. Muhayyud-ud-Din Ibn Arabi writes in *Fatuhah* that he saw the Holy Prophet Muhammad in a dream, in which Imam Abu Muhammad Ibn Hazm embraced the Holy Prophet and disappeared into him, so that there was none there except the Holy Prophet Muhammad. All these matters were accepted by Maulvi Muhammad Husain [Batalvi] in his review of *Barahin Ahmadiyya*. This is called *itihad* (union), and the one who appears as *burooz* can be such a *mujaddid* who is self-effaced in the Holy Prophet. ”<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> *Al-Hakam*, 24 November 1901, pages 13–14.

### **Our comments on this letter**

It is absolutely clearly stated in this letter, written by order of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, that there has been no change in his claim in *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*, and there is no claim to “that prophethood and messengership which is denied by the consensus of opinion (*ijma'*) of the entire Muslim *Umma*”. The objector was a person who, though not a follower of Hazrat Mirza, had earlier accepted that Hazrat Mirza was a *mujaddid* who received revelation. Pointing this out to him, the Maulana asks him: “What is the claim made by Hazrat Mirza sahib in this poster which is contrary to” what the objector had already accepted? This proves that the claim of Hazrat Mirza, even after publishing *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*, was that of being a *mujaddid*.

Later in the letter it is explained that the reason why the words *nabi* and *rasul* were not applied during the first generations of Islam to any of the great Muslims of the time, even though they were also *fana fir-rasul* (self-effaced in the Holy Prophet), is that at that time *it was crucial to establish the doctrine that the Holy Prophet Muhammad was the last and final prophet*. Once this belief was established, these words could in later times be used for persons who had received spiritual benefit from the Holy Prophet, in order to show that blessings from his prophethood continue among the Muslims.

In the last paragraph of the letter in the quoted extract given above, the Maulana cites examples of earlier Muslim saints who claimed to be *burooz* of prophets, and thus he clarifies that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was a part of the chain and series of these saints.

## **5. Maulana Sana-ullah of Amritsar and the theory of change of claim in 1901\***

The doctrine later adopted by the Qadiani *Jama'at*, that the Promised Messiah changed his claim in the year 1901 to that of being a prophet, had already been put forward by Maulana Sana-ullah of Amritsar, one of the worst enemies of the Promised Messiah. The Promised Messiah forwarded the irrefutable argument to prove the truth of his claim, that since he lived for more than 23 years after his claim, so he is proved as true in his claim. This argument is based on verses 69:44–46 of the Holy Quran. For Maulana Sana-ullah of Amritsar, an inveterate opponent of the Promised Messiah, it was absolutely essential to refute this. This is why he put forward the theory that the Promised Messiah did not lay a claim to prophethood before 1901 but that he made the claim to being a prophet in November 1901 by writing the pamphlet *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*.

The proof of this is contained in an article which was published in *Al-Hakam* dated August 6, 1908, just two months after the sad death of the Promised Messiah. It is a long article written by one Hakim Dr. Ahmad Husain of Lyallpur. The whole article is devoted towards the refutation of different allegations that Maulana Sana-ullah made against the Promised Messiah. The issue mentioned above is also discussed there and the writer of the article has refuted this allegation too.

---

\* Based on a writing by Abid Aziz, Lahore.

The relevant part of the said article is translated below. Notes in brackets, thus [ ], are provided by the translator.

“He [Sana-ullah] writes that Mirza sahib has written in *Hamamat-ul-Bushra* [published 1893]: ‘How is it possible for me to claim prophethood and thereby become a *kafir*.’ After saying this, he [Sana-ullah] himself draws the conclusion that Mirza sahib did not claim prophethood at that time [in 1893-1894] but he claimed prophethood in 1901. So in this way from November 1901 till May 1908 is 6 years and 7 months, and not 23 years.

We answer this from his own same magazine. He writes on page 5 that Mirza sahib claimed to be a *Mujaddid* in 1880 by publishing his first advertisement [*ishtihar*]. Then he wrote *Barahin Ahmadiyya* in the same year which is a good book to some extent but in most of it he has mentioned his prophecies, revelations and claims. Maulana Sana-ullah accepts here that Mirza sahib laid his claim in 1880 and that all his claims are mentioned in the *Barahin*. It is true to say: *Darogh Go ra hafiz naba shood* [a Persian saying, meaning that the memory of a liar is not good]. Since 1880 till now, 28 years have passed.

As to the fact that he [Promised Messiah] has called a claimant to prophethood as *kafir* in *Hamamat-ul-Bushra*, the answer to this is that it is true that, even after writing it, he has not claimed the prophethood which is mentioned in *Hamamat-ul-Bushra*. In fact, he has denied such kind of prophethood just three or four days before [his death]. See *Badr*, 24 May 1908. He himself and also his *Jama'at* consider the claimant of such prophethood, which is against the finality of prophethood, as *kafir*. However, an *ummati* who is spoken to by God in abundance can be called as subordinate-prophet or *mujaddid* or *muhaddas* or *fana-fir-rasul*.

And such kind of prophethood does not go against the prophethood of the Holy Prophet Muhammad; rather it displays its light. Since this *Ummah* is the best of all *ummahs* so it has all the ranks of previous *ummahs*: *Al-ulama warasat-al-Anbia* [the righteous *ulama* are the heirs of the prophets].” \*

This answer clearly shows that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad did not later claim any kind of prophethood which he had been denying in the 1890s. Moreover, the term *muhaddas* was appropriate to describe his status, even at his death.

---

\* *Al-Hakam*, 6 August 1908, p. 8, col. 1.

## 6. Seventy Ahmadis take oath that no change in claim took place in 1901

When, shortly after the Split, the assertion was first made that in the pamphlet *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had announced that he had now *changed his claim* into a claim of being a prophet and cancelled his previous denials of claiming to be a prophet, the Lahore Ahmadiyya *Jama'at* published a sworn declaration, signed by seventy of his followers who had taken the pledge into the Movement before November 1901, to refute this allegation. This is translated below:

“ We, the undersigned, declare on oath that when Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, announced in 1891, that the prophet Jesus was dead according to the Holy Quran, and that the ‘son of Mary’ whose advent among the Muslims was spoken of in Hadith was he [Hazrat Mirza] himself, he did not lay claim to prophethood. However, the Maulvis misled the public, and issued a *fatwa* of *kufir* against him by alleging that he claimed prophethood. After this, the Promised Messiah declared time after time in plain words, as his writings show, that to ascribe to him a claim of prophethood was a fabrication against him, that he considered prophethood to have come to a close with the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and that he looked upon a claimant to prophethood, after the Holy Prophet, as a liar and a *kafir*. And that the words *mursal*, *rasul*, and *nabi* which had

occurred in some of his revelations, or the word *nabi* which had been used about the coming Messiah in Hadith, do not denote a prophet in actual fact, but rather a metaphorical, partial or *zilli* prophet who is known as a *muhaddas*. After the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*, the Holy Prophet Muhammad, no prophet can come, neither new nor old.

“ We also declare on oath that we entered into the pledge of the Promised Messiah before November 1901, and that the statements of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad sahib, the head of the Qadian section, that though in the beginning Hazrat Mirza sahib did not claim prophethood, but that he changed his claim in November 1901, and laid claim to prophethood on that date, and that his previous writings of ten or eleven years denying prophethood are abrogated — all this is entirely wrong and absolutely opposed to facts. We do swear by Allah that the idea never even entered our minds that the Promised Messiah made a change in his claim in 1901 or that his previous writings, which are full of denials of a claim to prophethood, were ever abrogated; nor, to our knowledge, did we ever hear such words from the mouth of even a single person until Mirza Mahmud Ahmad sahib made these statements. Allah is witness to what we have stated. ”

The Lahore Ahmadiyya *Jama'at* then issued a challenge to members of the Qadiani *Jama'at* to make a counter declaration by testifying on oath that *in November 1901 while being members of the Ahmadiyya Movement* they came to know that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, by publishing *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*, was *changing his claim to that of prophet* and declaring his previous denials of claiming prophethood to be wrong. No one, *not even one person who was a member of the Ahmadiyya Movement in November 1901*, was ever able to make this counter declaration.

### Signatories to the declaration:

1. (Maulvi) Sayyid Muhammad Ahsan Amrohi
2. (Maulvi) Muhammad Abdullah Khan Patialvi
3. (Maulvi) Muhammad Mubarak Ali (Sialkoti)
4. (Maulvi) Ghulam Hasan, sub-registrar, Peshawar
5. (Maulvi Hakim) Mirza Khuda Bakhsh, author of *Asal Musaffa*
6. (Maulvi) Muhammad Ali (Lahore)
7. (Maulvi) Muhammad Yahya (Debgaran)
8. (Maulvi) Muhammad Yaqub (Debgaran)
9. (Shaikh) Rahmatullah (Merchant, Lahore)
10. Dr. Mirza Yaqub Beg (Lahore)
11. Shaikh Ziaullah (former headmaster, Taleem-ul-Islam School, Qadian)
12. (Maulvi) Muhammad Hasan Quraishi, Qiladar
13. (Baba) Hidayatullah (poet Punjabi, Lahore)
14. (Mian) Nabi Bakhsh (Government Pensioner, Lahore)
15. Dr. Sayyid Tufail Husain (Lahore)
16. Mirza Jamal-ud-din, copyist (Lahore)
17. Shaikh Din Muhammad (Lahore)
18. (Master) Faqirullah (Lahore)
19. Dr. Nabi Bakhsh (Bhati Gate, Lahore)
20. Hafiz Fazl Ahmad (presently Badomalhi)
21. Hafiz Ghulam Rasul (Trader, Wazirabad)
22. Chaudhry Ghulam Hasan (former Station Master, resident of Lowairiwala)
23. Shaikh Ghulam Husain Siddiqi Ahmadi (Sialkot)
24. Shaikh Muhammad Jan (Merchant, Wazirabad)
25. Shaikh Abdur Rahman (Wazirabad)
26. (Maulvi) Aziz Bakhsh, B.A. (Dera Ghazi Khan)
27. Wali Muhammad, court reader (Dera Ghazi Khan)
28. (Master) Ghulam Muhammad, B.A. (Headmaster, Rawalpindi)
29. Hakim Sardar Khan (brother of the late Hakim Shah Nawaz, Rawalpindi)
30. (Seth) Ahmad-ud-din (former Municipal Commissioner, Jhelum)
31. Shaikh Qamar-ud-din (optician, Jhelum)
32. Mistri Abdus Sattar (Jhelum)
33. Shaikh Ghulam Muhayy-ud-din (appeal recorder, Jhelum)
34. (Maulvi) Muhammad Ibrahim (Imam mosque, Jhelum)
35. Dr. Hayat Muhammad (Tooth-maker, Rawalpindi)
36. Babu Allah Bakhsh (Officers' Clerk, Jhelum)
37. Babu Abdul Haq (Clerk, Canal Department, Jhelum)
38. (Mistri) Abdul Sattar (Jhelum)
39. (Mistri) Yaqub Ali (Jammu)
40. Master Muhammad Ramzan (Jammu)
41. Malik Sher Muhammad Khan (B.A., Personal Assistant, Jammu)
42. Mufti Fazl Ahmad (Jammu)

- 
43. (Mistri) Shahab-ud-din (Jammu)
  44. Muhammad Shah (Jammu)
  45. Nawab Khan (Jammu)
  46. Sayyid Masud Shah (Teacher, Jammu)
  47. (Mistri) Nizam-ud-din (Jammu)
  48. Sayyid Amir Ali Shah (Pensioner sub-Inspector)
  49. Shaikh Hidayatullah (Peshawar)
  50. Ramzan Ali (Peshawar)
  51. Mian Muhammad Makki (Peshawar)
  52. Sayyid Lal Shah Barq (Peshawar)
  53. Shaikh Fazl Karim (Peshawar)
  54. (Munshi) Nawab Khan (sub-Inspector Police, Gujranwala)
  55. Shaikh Maula Bakhsh (Sialkot)
  56. Hakim Shams-ud-din (Sialkot)
  57. Mian Boora (Sialkot)
  58. Allah Din (Sialkot)
  59. Shaikh Muhammad Jan (Trader, Sialkot Cantonment)
  60. Babu Ata Muhammad (Engineer, Sialkot)
  61. Mirza Hakim Beg (Sialkot)
  62. Mistri Muhammad Akbar (Contractor, Sialkot)
  63. Mistri Abdullah (Sialkot)
  64. Muhammad-ud-din (Sialkot)
  65. Haji Fazl-ud-din (Sialkot)
  66. Sayyid Amjad Ali (Court Inspector)
  67. (Dr.) Hasan Ali
  68. Muhammad Sarfraz Khan (numberdar, Badomalhi)
  69. Shaikh Muhammad Naseeb (former Head Clerk, Qadian)
  70. Abdul Haq (Rawalpindi)
- 

The above declaration was published in *An-Nubuwwat fil-Islam* by Maulana Muhammad Ali, published in December 1915, chapter 9.

*Shown on the next page is the Urdu text of this sworn declaration.*

ہم دستخط کنندگان ذیل علفی شہادت ادا کرتے ہیں کہ بانی سلسلہ احمدیہ حضرت مرزا غلام احمد صاحب قادیانی نے جب ۱۸۹۱ء میں یہ اعلان کیا کہ حضرت عیسیٰ علیہ السلام کا وفات پا جانا قرآن کریم سے ثابت ہے اور حدیثوں میں جس ابن مریم کے اُمت محمدیہ میں آنے کا ذکر ہے وہ میں ہوں۔ تو اس وقت آپ نے نبوت کا دعویٰ نہیں کیا۔ ہاں بعض علمائے لوگوں کو غلط فہمی میں ڈالا۔ اور ان کو مدعی نبوت قرار دیکران پر کفر کا فتویٰ لگایا جس کے بعد حضرت موصوف نے صاف طور پر کئی مرتبہ یہ اعلان کیا جیسا کہ آپ کی تحریروں سے ظاہر ہے کہ آپ کی طرف دعویٰ نبوت منسوب کرنا محض افتراء ہے۔ اور آپ نبوت کو آنحضرت صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم پر ختم سمجھتے ہیں۔ اور آنحضرت صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم کے بعد مدعی نبوت کو کاذب اور کافر یقین کرتے ہیں۔ اور آپ کے بعض الامات میں جو مرسل یا رسول یابی آیا ہے یا حدیث میں آئیوںے مسیح کی نسبت جو لفظ نبی کا آیا ہے تو اس سے مراد فی الحقیقت نبی نہیں۔ بلکہ مجازی۔ جزوی۔ تعلق نبی ہے جسے محدث کہا جاتا ہے۔ اور خاتم النبیین صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم کے بعد کوئی نبی نہیں آسکتا نہ نیا نہ پرانا۔

ہم یہ بھی علفی شہادت ادا کرتے ہیں کہ ہم نے نومبر ۱۹۱۷ء سے پہلے حضرت مسیح موعود کی بیعت کی اور میاں محمود احمد صاحب سرگروہ احمدی فریق قادیان نے جو یہ لکھا ہے کہ حضرت مرزا صاحب کا دعویٰ ابتداء میں نبوت کا نہ تھا مگر نومبر ۱۹۱۷ء میں آپ نے اپنا دعویٰ تبدیل کر لیا۔ اور نبوت کے مدعی بن گئے اور انکار نبوت کی دس گیارہ سال کی نگہ تاریخیں منسوخ ہیں۔ یہ محض غلط اور سراسر خلاف واقعات ہے۔ ہم اللہ جل شانہ کی قسم لکھا کہ کہتے ہیں کہ کبھی ہمارے وہم و گمان میں یہ بات نہیں آئی کہ ۱۹۱۷ء میں حضرت مسیح موعود نے اپنے دعوے میں تبدیلی کی۔ یا آپ کی سابقہ تحریریں جو انکار دعویٰ نبوت سے بھری پڑی ہیں منسوخ ہو گئیں۔ نہ ہم نے اپنے علم میں کبھی ایسے لفظ کسی ایک شخص کے بھی منہ سے سنے جب تک کہ میاں محمود احمد صاحب نے ان کا اعلان نہیں کیا۔ واللہ علی ما نقول شہید۔

## 7. Final collapse of ‘change of claim’ theory under its own contradictions

For completion of the subject, and for the interest of those wishing to pursue this topic further, we show here how the ‘change of claim’ theory constructed by the Qadiani *Jama‘at*, after taking various bizarre turns and twists, finally collapsed under its own contradictions.

Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad and the Qadiani *Jama‘at* misinterpreted an answer to a question given by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad in his book *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, published in May 1907.<sup>1</sup> They took it to mean that he had changed his earlier standpoint expressed in the book *Tiryag-ul-Qulub*, published in October 1902 — that he is a “non-prophet” and only excels Jesus in some limited respects as a non-prophet — and subsequently realised that he was, in fact, a prophet.

Hence, in his book *Al-Qaul-ul-Fasl*, published on 30th January 1915, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad wrote:

“In short, the reference quoted above proves that until the publication of *Tiryag-ul-Qulub*, [the writing of] which began in August 1899 and ended on 25 October 1902, his belief was that he has partial excellence over Jesus and that his being called prophet means a kind of partial prophethood and deficient prophethood. But

---

<sup>1</sup> Pages 148–155. *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 22, pages 152–159.

afterwards ... he learnt from God that he excels the Messiah in all qualities and is not the recipient of any partial prophethood, but is a prophet. ... Thus it is absolutely unallowable to use any writing before 1902 as evidence because the Promised Messiah has given the decision that, as regards his belief about prophethood which he expressed in *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub*, later revelation made him change it.”<sup>2</sup>

However, in this same book Mirza Mahmud Ahmad gave quotations from *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* to show that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had expressed in it **his later claim** that he was a prophet.<sup>3</sup> Now as *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* was published almost one year before 25 October 1902, Maulana Muhammad Ali raised the objection that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad was violating his own rule that “it is absolutely unallowable to use any writing before 1902 as evidence”.

So when Mirza Mahmud Ahmad published another book only two months later in March 1915, entitled *Haqiqat-un-Nubuwwat*, he wrote in it:

“...the issue of prophethood became clear to him in 1900 or 1901, and as *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* was published in 1901, in which he has proclaimed his prophethood most forcefully, this shows that he made a change in his belief in 1901.... It is proved that the references dating prior to the year 1901 in which he has denied being a prophet, are now abrogated and it is an error to use them as evidence.”<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> *Al-Qaul-ul-Fasl*, p. 24. This book is on their website [www.alislam.org](http://www.alislam.org) in the collection *Anwar-ul-'ulum*, v. 2, book no. 8. See page 285.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, the very next page in this book in *Anwar-ul-'ulum*, v. 2, book no. 8, p. 286.

<sup>4</sup> P. 121 of the original edition. This book is available on the Qadiani *Jama'at* website [www.alislam.org](http://www.alislam.org) in the collection *Anwar-ul-'ulum*, v. 2, book no. 10. See pages 444–445 for this extract.

Because of his own contradiction, he has been forced to amend the date *from October 1902 to November 1901*, the date which, according to him, is the dividing line between the earlier writings in which Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad denied claiming to be a prophet and the later writings in which he claimed prophethood, so that his writings about his claim before this date cannot be used to prove that he did not claim to be a prophet.

The question then arises, if “the issue of prophethood became clear to him in 1900 or 1901”, how is it that in *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub*, which is dated by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad at the end of the book as 25 October 1902, he claims to be a non-prophet? In explanation of this, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and his *Jama‘at* took great pains to try to prove that the book *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub* was in fact written in 1899, and thus pre-dates *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*.<sup>5</sup>

It is easy to show the absurdity of this explanation. In the first place, it is simply untenable and incredible that, if Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had announced the changing of his claim in November 1901, he would have published a book in October 1902 expressing his former claim, and yet he did not add a note to it while writing its final lines on 25 October 1902, to caution the reader that the book contained his old claim which had now been superceded and was no longer applicable!

Looking more closely, according to the Qadiani *Jama‘at* explanation the book *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub* up to page 158 had been written in 1899, and Hazrat Mirza merely finished it off in October 1902 by writing the last two pages, 159 and 160, and published it. However, it so happens that his statement which they declare as cancelled, that is to say, the statement that he is a non-prophet (*ghair nabi*), occurs at the very end of page 157.

---

<sup>5</sup> See *Haqiqat-un-Nubuwwat* in *Anwar-ul-‘ulum*, v. 2, book no. 10, p. 365 onwards, and also the introduction by Maulana Jalal-ud-Din Shams in *Ruhani Khaza‘in* volume 15, the volume containing *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub*.

This makes it all the more necessary, and expected, that on pages 159 to 160 he should have told the readers that his statement on page 157 was now outdated.

Looking even more closely, we find that he begins a new topic on page 154 which continues unbroken till the end of the book.<sup>6</sup> Therefore, even accepting the Qadiani *Jama'at* claim that he only wrote pages 159–160 in October 1902, having written up to page 158 in 1899, it is obvious that when he resumed writing page 159 he must have been aware of what he had written before it as far back as page 154. Otherwise, how could he continue the same topic, and, in particular, quote his same revelation on page 160 as he did at the start of the topic on page 154.<sup>7</sup> This makes it absolutely certain that his statement on page 157, that he is a non-prophet, was still his claim when he finished writing this book on 25th October 1902.

### **Claim in *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub* confirmed in *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy***

In his book *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, published in May 1907, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad recounts an incident in a courtroom that occurred in 1904:

**“Sign no. 118.** Once when I was in Gurdaspur due to a court case which Karam Din of Jhelum had instituted against me, I received the revelation ... meaning, ‘they will ask you about your rank, as to what is your rank and status; tell them: It is God Who has bestowed this status upon me; then leave them sporting in their idle talk’. So I related this revelation to the members of my *Jama'at* who were accompanying me in Gurdaspur, who were not less than forty men, including Maulvi Muhammad Ali, M.A., and Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, B.A., Pleader. Then after this, when we went into the courtroom, the lawyer for the opposite party asked me

---

<sup>6</sup> In *Ruhani Khaza'in*, this corresponds to volume 15, pages 475–486.

<sup>7</sup> “I desired to manifest Myself, so I created Adam.”

this same question: Is your rank and status as stated in the book *Tiryaaq-ul-Qulub*? I replied: Yes, by the grace of God this is my status, and He has bestowed it upon me. Then this revelation which had come from God in the morning was fulfilled at nearly the time of *asr* prayers, and strengthened the faith of all our *Jama'at*.”<sup>8</sup>

The Qadiani *Jama'at* admits that his rank and status as stated in *Tiryaaq-ul-Qulub* was what he believed it to be in 1899, two years before *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* was published. And we find it described in *Tiryaaq-ul-Qulub* as follows:

1. No Muslim becomes a *kafir* by denying his claim because he is a *mulham*, *muhaddas* and *wali* (recipient of revelation, who is a saint without being a prophet).<sup>9</sup>
2. He is a non-prophet (*ghair nabi*) in contrast with Jesus who was a prophet.<sup>10</sup>

Thus in 1904 in court, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad confirmed his rank and status as described above, and himself later recorded this confirmation in a book published in 1907.

### **Qadiani *Jama'at* response**

To undo this powerful argument, the Qadiani *Jama'at* publishers have added a footnote in *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy* at the point where the above incident is reported, to say that his mention of the book *Tiryaaq-ul-Qulub* is an error of memory by him and that he was actually asked about the book *Tuhfa Golarwiyya*, published in September 1902. In the footnote they claim that they have the court record, and quote a question and answer from it, which is in regard to *Tuhfa Golarwiyya*.

However, there was more than one case going on at the same time between the same parties. The name of the case as

<sup>8</sup> *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, pages 265–266. *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 22, pages 277–278.

<sup>9</sup> Page 130–131, footnote. *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 15, pages 432–433.

<sup>10</sup> Page 157. *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 15, page 481.

given in the Qadiani *Jama'at* footnote is one in which Maulvi Karam Din of Jhelum was the *defendant* against a follower of Hazrat Mirza called Hakim Fazl Din who had started that case. The case which Hazrat Mirza refers to here is the one *instituted* by Maulvi Karam Din of Jhelum in which Hazrat Mirza was the *defendant*, as he says: "a court case which Karam Din of Jhelum had instituted against me".

Even leaving that fact aside, let us suppose that when writing *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy* Hazrat Mirza misremembered the name of the book that he was asked about, and that in fact he was asked about *Tuhfa Golarwiyya*. In the introduction to volume 17 of *Ruhani Khaza'in*, which contains this book, the Qadiani *Jama'at* compiler, Maulana Jalal-ud-Din Shams, concludes:

"Therefore it has to be accepted with certainty that the time of writing of *Tuhfa Golarwiyya* was the year 1900, though its printing and publication were delayed. Just as *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub* remained printed and was later published in 1902 after the addition of one or two pages, the same took place with *Tuhfa Golarwiyya*. After adding the title page and the announcement on page 2 about a reward of 50 Rupees in 1902, it was published in 1902."

Thus the book *Tuhfa Golarwiyya*, according to Qadiani *Jama'at* scholars, belongs to the same period of writing as *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub*, the period about which they admit that during it Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad claimed to be a non-prophet and denied claiming to be a prophet. Therefore, it makes **no difference** if he was asked about *Tuhfa Golarwiyya* and not *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub*. In either event, he affirmed in court in 1904 that his rank and status was as he had described it in a book written when, even the Qadiani *Jama'at* admits, he was not claiming to be a prophet, and he went on to relate this account later on when writing *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, published May 1907.

This brings about the final collapse of the theory of a change of claim by him in 1901 or 1902.

## 8. Finality of prophethood in the book *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*

The collapse of the theory of a change of claim in 1901 also proves that the question/answer in *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, referred to at the start of the last section (page 90),<sup>1</sup> cannot bear the misinterpretation which the Qadiani *Jama'at* attach to it, i.e., that Hazrat Mirza was saying that he changed his claim which he had previously expressed in *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub*. He could not say this on pages 149–150, and then on pages 265–266 confirm that his rank and status was as described in *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub* (and even if he should have said *Tuhfa Golarwiyya*, as the Qadiani *Jama'at* asserts, it makes no difference, as we have shown in the last section).

In that passage in *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, Hazrat Mirza refers to the change that he is mentioning as follows: “In the beginning my belief was that I bear no comparison to Jesus. He was a prophet and a venerable one among those chosen by God”.<sup>2</sup> This was his belief long ago, before he claimed to be appointed by Allah, that he bore *no comparison* to Jesus. It changed when he claimed to be appointed to a Divine mission in the 1880s, several years before he wrote *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub*. When claiming to be *Mujaddid*, he wrote in an announcement in 1885:

“... the author [of *Barahin Ahmadiyya*] has been given the knowledge that he is the *mujaddid* of this time and

---

<sup>1</sup>*Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, pp. 148–155; *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 22, pp. 152–159.

<sup>2</sup>*Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, pp. 149–150; *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 22, p. 153–154.

that spiritually his excellences resemble the excellences of Messiah, the son of Mary, and that the one of them bears a very strong resemblance and a close relation to the other.”<sup>3</sup>

Thus even in 1885 he did not hold the belief that “I bear no comparison to Jesus”, let alone when writing *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub*.

He goes on to write in the above-cited passage in *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*: “But later on the revelation from God the Most High, which came to me like rain, did not let me remain holding this belief and clearly bestowed upon me the title of prophet, but in the manner of a prophet from one aspect and a follower from another”. He adds in a footnote at this point: “My prophethood is a reflection (*zill*) of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, not actual prophethood.”

These expressions refer to saints in Islam, as we have shown in the Notes section of this book (see Notes 10, 20 and 21). He wrote that a *muhaddas* is “a prophet in one sense” (Note 20, quote 1) and that it is a *muhaddas* who is called “follower and also prophet” (Note 21, quote 2).

Therefore, the change he is describing is that from the state of not being appointed to a mission to the state of being charged with a mission like that of Jesus. It is not a change from being a *muhaddas* and *mujaddid* to becoming a prophet.

Moreover, in that passage there is no mention or indication by him whatsoever of the Qadiani *Jama'at* theory of change, i.e., that he had been mistakenly denying claiming to be a prophet because he was using a wrong definition of what is a prophet, and that he later realised the correct definition and hence changed his claim to that of being a prophet. There is also no mention by him of having written *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala* to declare a change in his claim to that of prophethood.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Majmu'a Ishtiharat*, 1986 edition, v. 1, p. 24. In the same period, he speaks of “the intense similarity between my nature and the nature of Jesus ... like two fruits on the same tree” in *Barahin Ahmadiyya*, Part 4, published 1884. See *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 1, p. 593, lower footnote.

### Finality of prophethood and his claim in *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*

Looking generally at the book *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, we find that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has clearly stated in it that it is a *fundamental* doctrine of Islam that no prophet can come after the Holy Prophet Muhammad.

1. Discussing what it means to believe in *Allah*, he writes:

“God the Most High has defined the name *Allah* in the Holy Quran as follows. Allah is the Being Who is *Rabb-ul-‘alamin*, *Rahman* and *Rahim*, Who created the earth and the heaven in six days, and made Adam, and sent messengers, and sent scriptures, and at the end of all of them sent Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him, who is the *Khatam-ul-anbiya* and the best of messengers.”<sup>4</sup>

Therefore, believing in Allah, as He is represented in the Quran, includes believing that the Holy Prophet Muhammad came at the end of all the messengers sent by Allah.

2. While referring to some of his own prophecies about severe weather and storms in various countries of the world, he writes:

“This news was given only by that God Who sent our Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him, at the end of all the prophets, in order to gather all the nations under his banner.”<sup>5</sup>

3. According to Hazrat Mirza, the *Kalima* of Islam itself implies that no prophet can come after the Holy Prophet Muhammad. He writes:

“If all the books of God the Most High are looked into closely, it will be found that **all prophets** have been

<sup>4</sup> *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, p. 141; *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 22, p. 145.

<sup>5</sup> *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, *Titma*, p. 44; *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 22, p. 477.

teaching: believe God the Most High to be One without partner and along with it also believe in our *risalat* (messengership). It was for this reason that the **summary** of the teachings of Islam was taught to the entire *Umma* in these two sentences: *La ilaha ill-Allah Muhammad-ur Rasul-ullah* (There is no god but Allah, Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah).”<sup>6</sup>

The words given in bold above (**all prophets** and **summary**) are bold in the original Urdu book. According to this statement, every prophet teaches people the *Kalima* in his own name (“There is only one God, and I am His messenger”). As the entire Muslim *Umma*, i.e., for all time to come, has been taught the *Kalima* of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, “*There is no god but Allah, Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah*” as the basis of Islam, it means no prophet can come after him because such a prophet would have to teach people the *Kalima* in his own name. This is also the definition of a prophet in Islamic law: one who requires people to acknowledge belief in God and belief in his own prophethood as the basis of his teaching.

4. The above extract from *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy* occurs in a lengthy section where Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad establishes the absolute necessity of believing in the Holy Prophet Muhammad. He explains what essential functions a prophet comes to perform, which make it imperative to believe in the Holy Prophet Muhammad. Throughout this section he lays stress on, and mentions, *only* belief in the Holy Prophet Muhammad and its utmost necessity. If he himself had claimed to be a prophet, he would mention the need to believe in him.

He argues that the existence and the oneness of God (*tauheed*) can *only* be known through the prophets:

“It must be remembered that it is only the prophets who disclose the existence of God and teach people the

---

<sup>6</sup> *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, p. 111; *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 22, p. 114.

knowledge that He is one without partner... It is impossible that the oneness of God (*tauheed*) can be known except through a prophet ... When God wants to manifest Himself to the world, He sends a prophet, who is a manifestation of His powers, and gives him His revelation, and displays the powers of His providence through him. Then the world finds out that God exists. ... the fountain of the oneness of God and the perfect manifestation of the oneness of God is only the prophet, through whom the hidden face of God is seen and it is discovered that God exists.”<sup>7</sup>

Having stated this fact repeatedly about prophets, he writes referring to the Holy Prophet Muhammad:

“I would be ungrateful if I do not acknowledge that I found true oneness of God (*tauheed*) through this Prophet, and the recognition of the Living God I found through this Perfect Prophet and his light.”<sup>8</sup>

All that Hazrat Mirza has said above about the basic and essential functions of a prophet, and the very purpose of a prophet’s coming, he applies to the Holy Prophet Muhammad, not to himself. If he were claiming to be a prophet, he would be saying that he is fulfilling these functions now.

He writes later on in the same discussion:

“I have explained that what is called *tauheed* ... cannot be attained except through belief in the prophet of the time (*waqt kay nabi*), that is, the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and obedience to him.”<sup>9</sup>

Here he says that the *prophet of the present time*, the person through whom the oneness of God can be realized, is the

---

<sup>7</sup> *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, pp. 111 to 113; *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 22, pp. 114 to 116.

<sup>8</sup> *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, p. 116; *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 22, p. 119.

<sup>9</sup> *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, p. 124; *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 22, pp. 127–128.

Holy Prophet Muhammad. If Hazrat Mirza were claiming to be a prophet then he himself would be the prophet of the time.

### **Hazrat Mirza's own claims**

The claim of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is clearly given in *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy* as that of being *Mujaddid*. Enumerating the various signs from Allah that he has fulfilled, he begins the first such sign by quoting the hadith about the coming of *Mujaddids*, and then declares his claim to be *Mujaddid*:

“I am the only man who made the claim before the beginning of this century [*hijra*] and I am the only one over whose claim 25 years have passed and I am still living ... So until, as against my claim, another claimant can be presented fulfilling the same characteristics, my claim stands proved that the Promised Messiah who is the *Mujaddid* of the Last Days is none other than myself.”<sup>10</sup>

Earlier under the same sign he writes:

“If someone says that if this hadith is authentic then tell us the names of the *mujaddids* of [the previous] twelve centuries, the answer is that this hadith has been accepted by the *ulama* of the *Umma* ... It is not necessary for us to know the names of all the *mujaddids*. ... Can you tell us how many prophets have come in every nation from Adam to the Holy Prophet Muhammad? If you can tell us that, we will also name the *mujaddids*.”<sup>11</sup>

It is also plain from this that he is speaking of two categories: (1) prophets from Adam to the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and (2) *mujaddids* who appeared in Islamic history. He is claiming to be in the category of *mujaddids* and saying to his

<sup>10</sup> *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, p. 194; *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 22, p. 201.

<sup>11</sup> *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, p. 193; *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 22, pp. 200–201.

critics: if you want me to name all the other *mujaddids*, in order to prove this hadith to be true, then you should name all the prophets.

### **Metaphorical use of word *nabi***

In the Arabic section of *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has mentioned the challenge which he issued to John Alexander Dowie of the USA who had claimed to have arisen as a prophet with the mission of spreading the belief of Jesus' divinity in the world and destroying Islam. He writes:

“You are making a fabrication against God by claiming prophethood. Prophethood (*nubuwwat*) has indeed been terminated after our Prophet, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him. There is no book after the Quran, the best of the former scriptures, nor any *shariah* after the *shariah* of Muhammad. Nonetheless, I have been called as prophet by the tongue of the Holy Prophet, and this is by way of *zill* due to the blessings of following him. I see no good in myself, and I have obtained all that I have obtained from that Holy man. Allah does not mean anything by my prophethood except the abundance of communication from Him. Whoever intends more than this, or considers himself as of any worth, or frees himself from obedience to the Holy Prophet, the curse of Allah is upon him. Certainly our Messenger is the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*, with whom the chain of messengers has been terminated, so no one is entitled to claim prophethood in his own right after our Messenger, the *Mustafa*. Nothing remains after him but the abundance of communication from Allah, and that is on condition of following the Holy Prophet, not without obedience to him. By Allah! I did not attain this status except by the lights of following the rays of

the Holy Prophet. And I have been called *nabi* by Allah by way of metaphor, not by way of reality.”<sup>12</sup>

The meaning of being called prophet “by way of metaphor, not by way of reality” is perfectly clear by itself. Should further clarification be required of what is meant by a title being metaphorically bestowed upon someone and not by way of reality, it is provided by his explanation, earlier in the same book, of how prophets of God were called as ‘sons of God’. He writes:

“In the earlier scriptures the perfectly righteous ones have been called sons of God. This also did not mean that in reality they were sons of God, for this is heresy and God is clear of having sons and daughters. The meaning is, in fact, that God had manifested Himself as an image in the clear mirror of (the hearts of) these perfectly righteous ones. ...

As to Jesus being called son of God in the Gospels, if Christians had remained within the limit of saying that just as Abraham, Isaac, Ishmael, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, David, Solomon etc. were called sons of God in a metaphorical sense in the books of God, in the same way is Jesus so called, then there would have been no objection. For, just as these prophets were called son metaphorically in the books of the earlier prophets, our Holy Prophet has been called God in some prophecies. The fact is that neither were all those prophets sons of God, nor is the Holy Prophet God. All these are metaphorical expressions based on love.”<sup>13</sup>

Just as, in the earlier scriptures, prophets had been called ‘sons of God’ or even ‘God’ metaphorically, similarly it was by way of metaphor that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was

<sup>12</sup> *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy, Zameema*, pp. 64–65; *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 22, pp. 688–689.

<sup>13</sup> *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, pp. 63–64; *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 22, p. 65–66.

called ‘prophet’ in his revelation and in a Hadith prophecy about him. According to Islam, the prophets did not become sons of God or God in reality by any stretch of the imagination. However, Christians took Jesus for son of God in reality, which was a great error. This amply illustrates what is meant by metaphor as opposed to reality. Similarly, Hazrat Mirza was not a prophet in reality, and it is a great error to consider him so.

Note also that at the beginning of the extract from the Arabic section of *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy* quoted above (ending with: “And I have been called *nabi* by Allah by way of metaphor, not by way of reality”), he writes:

“There is no book after the Quran, the best of the former scriptures, nor any *shariah* after the *shariah* of Muhammad.”

Thus, not only can no *shariah* come after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, but no book of Allah can come either, whether that book contains new laws or not. The revelation sent to a prophet includes *wahy nubuwwat*, which is exclusive to prophets, identifies him as a prophet in reality, and constitutes his ‘book’. Such revelation is closed after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and therefore no prophet can come after him. The revelation received by his followers after him, such as Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, cannot constitute a ‘book’ of Allah in Islamic terminology.

# Index of Quoted Sources

## Writings and statements of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad

- Ā'īnah Kamālāt Islām* (Feb 1893), 34, 41–42, 46, 68  
*Al-Ḥakam* (Aug 1899), 25–26, 44, 61–62. (Nov 1901), 71  
*Al-Ḥaq Mubāḥaṭha Ludhiāna*, (Oct 1891), 46  
*Al-Hudā* (Jun 1902), 59–60  
*Anjām Ātham* (Jan 1897), 24–25, 34, 51–52, 64  
*Arba 'īn* (No. 3, Dec 1900), 27. (No. 2, Sep 1900), 27, 44, 52  
*Ayyām-uṣ-Ṣulḥ* (Aug 1898), 30, 31, 32, 33–34, 37–38, 39, 46, 48–49, 52, 60–61  
*Badr* (June 1908), 46  
*Barāhīn Aḥmadiyya* (1880–1884), 9–10, 15, 16f., 24, 27, 83  
*Izālah Auhām* (Sep 1891), 28–29, 32, 33, 42–43, 44, 47, 48, 49–51  
*Ḥamāmat-ul-Buṣhrā* (1894), 29, 30, 53, 63, 83  
*Ḥaqīqat-ul-Wahy* (May 1907), 28, 55, 93–94, 95, 96–104  
*Hujjat-ullāh* (May 1897), 36  
*Jang Muqaddas* (June 1893), 63  
*Karāmat-uṣ-Ṣādiqīn* (Aug 1893), 36  
*Kitāb-ul-Bariyya* (Jan 1898), 31, 63  
*Majmū'a Ishṭihārāt*: (Oct 1891), 29, 63. (Sep 1901), 21–22. (Feb 1892), 44–45. (Jan 1897), 63. (1885), 96–97  
*Malfūzāt in Rūḥānī Khazā'in No. 2*: (Dec 1899), 40. (Sep 1905), 43. (Oct 1902), 55. (Dec 1903), 55. (Oct 1904), 55. (Mar 1908), 56  
*Mawāhib-ur-Raḥmān* (Jan 1903), 65  
*Niṣhān Āsmānī* (May 1892), 35  
*Nuzūl-ul-Masīḥ* (Nov 1902), 54, 58–59  
*Sat Baḥān* (Dec 1895), 40  
*Shahādat-ul-Qur'ān* (Sep 1893), 28, 36, 36–37, 43  
*Sirāj Munīr* (Mar 1897), 24, 29–30, 52  
*Tajalliyāt-i Ilāhiyya* (Mar 1906), 55  
*Tauḍīḥ Marām* (Jan 1891), 49, 53, 56

*Tiryāq-ul-Qulūb* (Oct 1902), 65, 90–95, 96, 97  
*Tuhfah Golarwiyya* (1902), 94–96

### Other writers

*Al-Ḥakam* (Oct 1901), 22. (Nov 1901), 71–81. (Aug 1908), 82–84  
*Al-Qaul-ul-Faṣl* by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad (Jan 1915), 90–91  
*An-Nubuwwat fil-Islām* by Maulana Muhammad Ali, 88  
*Fatāwā Rashīdiyya* by Rashid Ahmad Gangohi, 34–35  
*Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥukam*, 40–41  
*Ḥaqīqat-un-Nubuwwah* by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad (Mar 1915), 5, 6, 7, 23, 91, 92f  
*Ishārāt Farīdī* of Khwaja Ghulam Farid of Chachran, 41  
*Maktūbāt* of Mujaddid Alif Sani, 38  
*Maṣab-i Imāmat* by Shah Ismail Shaheed, 39  
*Maqāṣid as-Sālikīn*, 34  
*Sharḥ Futūḥ al-Gḥaib*, 38  
*Ṣirāt-i Mustaqīm* by Shah Ismail Shaheed, 38–39  
*Tashḥīz-ul-Adhḥān*, 56–57

### Verses of the Holy Quran cited

33:40 (*Khātām an-nabiyyīn*) — 10, 11, 18, 19, 28, 30, 31, 32, 60, 64, 78  
 1:5–6 (“Guide us on the right path...”) — 12, 37, 48, 49  
 72:26–27 (“He does not make His unseen known...”) — 11, 14f., 46  
 62:3 (“others from among them who have not yet joined them”) — 15, 17, 68  
 Other verses — 20, 24, 34, 35, 36, 59, 79

### Hadith reports

“No prophet after me” — 10, 30, 31–32, 60  
*Ulama* like prophets — 39, 42, 48, 50, 79, 84  
 About *muhaddas* — 45, 50, 55, 60  
 About *mujaddids* — 101  
 Promised Messiah called *nabi* in — 27, 51, 52  
*Sahih Muslim* — 13, 51, 52, 60  
*Sahih Bukhari* — 50  
 Miscellaneous — 16, 24, 28, 77, 80

## **About Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad**

Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad (1835–1908) arose in India at a time when the faith of Islam was under the heaviest attack by its critics. It was being misrepresented as a primitive, crude and violent ideology. Muslim leaders, with their out-dated knowledge, narrow vision and their own misconceptions about Islam, were entirely failing to meet these challenges. Hazrat Mirza, in his writings and lectures, put forward the captivating picture of Islam as found in the Quran and the life of the Holy Prophet Muhammad — a religion of reason, peace and tolerance. He refuted all charges against Islam and established its superiority over the opposing faiths and philosophies.

His achievements in the revival of Islam and the reform of Muslims proved his claim of being one of the *mujaddids* (Reformers) of Islam who arose throughout Muslim history. He also claimed to be the Messiah whom the Muslims were expecting would come at the most critical time in their history. He repeatedly denied the false allegation made against him of claiming to be a prophet; on the contrary, his mission was to preach Islam in its pristine purity, as taught by the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the Last of all the Prophets.

## **About the book**

This book contains the English translation of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's short pamphlet *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*, published in November 1901. In addition to the translation, this book provides explanatory notes and a detailed study of the subject in order to refute the allegation that in this pamphlet Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was announcing his claim to be a prophet and cancelling his previous denials of claiming to be a prophet which he had made up to this point.

The notes and study, quoting extensively from his writings before and after November 1901, show that his claim of being a *Mujaddid* (reformer) and the Messiah expected by the Muslims, *who is not a prophet*, remained consistently the same till the end of his life.