

Publicity No. 6-E.

**Hazrat Mirza
GHULAM AHMAD
(THE PROMISED MESSIAH)**

AND

**The Finality of
Prophethood.**

BY

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

(President, Ahmadiyya Anjuman-i-Ishaat-i-Islam, Lahore.)

Translated from Original Urdu

By

MIRZA MA'SUM BEG, B.A.

Published by

THE PUBLICITY COMMITTEE,

**The Ahmadiyya Anjuman-i-Ishaat-i-Islam,
AHMADIYYA BUILDINGS, LAHORE.**

Printed at the New Union Press, 53, Circular Road, Lahore.

INTRODUCTION.

The followers of the Promised Messiah, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, are divided into two sections:—(a) The Ahmadies who have established themselves at Lahore. (b) The Qadianies whose headquarters are at Qadian. There are, as a matter of fact, only two points which have caused the dissension between the two sections:—

Firstly, whether the Promised Messiah was a Mujaddid or a prophet? ‘A full-fledged prophet,’ says the leader of the Qadian section. But the Lahore Group believes him to be a Mujaddid only.

Secondly, whether all the muslims who have not entered his *bai’at* (pledge) are within or without the fold of Islam? In the eyes of the Qadian leader, all the muslims on the face of this earth who have not entered the *bai’at* of the Promised Messiah, are veritable heretics and outside the pale of Islam, even though they may not have heard the name of Hazrat Mirza Sahib, or even if they believe him in their hearts to be truthful, and do not denounce him by the word of their mouth. The

Lahore section, on the other hand, believes that every one who recites the Holy Kalimah and has his faith in it, is a musalman and a member of the Great Fraternity of Islam. Of course, should he reject the Mujaddid of the age, and the Messiah of the nation, and create difficulties in his way, he shall certainly be called to account for it. Nay, even if he refuses to *conjoin hands and combine* with the Man of God, and sits away apathetically while Islam is passing through such a *crime*, he shall have to answer for his criminal indifference.

In the following pages, it has been discussed at length, which of the two sections is on the right path. In the first place, the writings of the Promised Meseiah have been adduced to shew, how forcefully he had disclaimed his prophethood. Standing in the sacred precincts of the House of God, and on the solemnest of oaths, he disavowed the prophethood ascribed to him with all the power at his command, and declared his faith publicaly that no prophet, new or old, could appear after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace and the blessing of God be upon him. In the Hadith, the Promised Messiah has been spoken of as a prophet; Hazrat Mirza Sahib explained that the word *Nabi* had been used in a metaphorical sense and not technically and it meant no more than a Muhaddath. The same interpretation he put upon the words *Nabi* and *Rasul* which have so often occured in his writings and revelations, viz, these terms have

been used not in the strict sense of the Islamic terminology but merely in a literal sense to mean "one who has been granted the gift of prophecy" or "one who has been raised by God." Prophethood, in the real sense of the term, said he, has come to a close with the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and he is a fraudulent imposter, a liar, who makes such a claim after the last Prophet of Arabia. To his own prophethood he prefixed the word *Zil* to shew that it was merely a shadow of the Real Prophethood, which in the Islamic terminology is called *Walayat*. *Zilli Nabuwwat* is not *Nabuwwat*, and the *Promised Messiah* has taken good care to elucidate this point by means of an example. The epithet *Zil Allah* we use not for Allah but some one other than Allah when the latter manifestly displays some attribute of God. A just and a righteous king has been called *Zil Allah* in the Holy Prophet's Hadith. *Zil Allah*, obviously, is not Allah. *Zilli Nabuwwat* likewise, is not *Nabuwwat*; it is something different, although fairly imbued with the light and spiritual illumination of prophethood. He forbade the use of just the word *Nabi* for him, for, said he, it was disparaging and derogatory to the Perfect Prophethood of Muhammad, peace and the blessings of God be upon him. However to indicate the literal significance of the term *Nabi*, namely, that he was spoken to by the Most High God in consequence of the everlasting grace and felicity of Muhammad, Hazrat Mirza Sahib permitted the

use of the word only in conjunction with the term *Ummati*, and explained himself that an *Ummati Nabi* meant a Muhaddath. He was as much clear and explicit on the doctrine of "Kufar and Islam," and stated that it had been his faith from the very beginning that no one shall become a *Kafir* simply for the reason that he refused to accept his claim.

Different testimonies have then been produced in support of what has been stated above. The evidence of Mian Mahmud Ahmad Sahib himself as well as of his followers of the Qadiani Community also support this view. Their earlier writings bear out very clearly that the Jamaat-i-Lahore is promulgating the same doctrines as were taught by the Promised Messiah.

1. The Promised Messiah's Denial of Prophethood.

The Promised Messiah has repudiated the alleged claim to prophethood so emphatically in his books, that it will be too long to give all the relevant quotations. We shall, therefore, be content with only a few of them.

When he was, for the first time accused of laying claim to prophethood, and placed under an interdiction, he issued the following conclusive statement, every word of which deserves a calm and careful consideration. It was issued on October 2, 1891 A. C. in the shape of a poster, and later on in 1910 A. D. Mir Qasam Ali, who now belongs to the Jamaat-i-Qadian, reprinted it in his book named *Din-ul-Haq*.

The Poster.—“I have heard that some of the leading Ulema of this city of Delhi give publicity to this charge against me that I lay claim to prophethood, deny the existence of angels and heaven and hell and also the existence of Gabriel and Lailat-ul-Qadr and miracles and the Holy Prophet's heavenly ascension. Therefore to make manifest the truth I declare before the learned and the laymen that this charge is a fabrication, pure and simple. Neither do I lay claim to prophethood, nor am I

a denier of miracles and angels and Lailat-ul-Qadr etc. on the other hand, I do believe in all those matters which are included in the Islamic articles of faith and like the Ahl-i-Sunnat-wal-Jamaat I accept all these things which are based on the Quran and the Hadith ; and I consider everyone who claims prophethood and messengership after our Lord and Master Hazrat Muhammad Mustafa, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, to be a liar and a Kafir. I have a sure faith that revelation confessing of messengership began with Hazrat Adam Safiyy Allah and came to a close with the Messenger of God Muhammad Mustafa, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him. Let every one be a witness to this my writing, and God, the All-Knowing and the All-Hearing is the first of witnesses."

How vehemently the Promised Messiah has disclaimed the false imputation of prophethood ; and what more could he do ? Any and every claimant to prophethood, after the Holy Prophet Muhammad he denounces as a veritable heretic and an audacious liar.

Debate with Moulvi Abdul Hakim.—In 1892 A. D. a debate was held at Lahore between the Promised Messiah and one Moulvi Abdul Hakim. The moulvi accused him of claiming prophethood, whereupon the Promised Messiah wrote out the following statement which bears the date February 3, 1892 A. D. and also the signatures of a good many witnesses. It was a

written assurance, a covenant as it were, which satisfied the disputing moulvi, and the debate came to an end there and then. The document was published without delay. It was reprinted a second time by Moulve Sayyad Muhammad Ahsan in his famous book Al-Qaul-ul-Mumjad, page 82 :—

“ It is submitted for the information of the entire Muslim World that all expressions like ‘ a Muhaddas is a prophet in one sense ’ or ‘ Muhaddasiyyat is an imperfect prophethood ’, which are met with in my books Fatah-i-Islam, Tauzih-i-Maram and Izalah-i-Awham, have not been used in their real sense, but simply and without any guile, in their literal significance. Otherwise I declare upon the most solemn oath that I have never laid a claim to Real Prophethood. On the other hand I firmly believe, as I have written in my book Izalah-i-Awham, page 137, that our lord and master. Hazrat Muhammad Mustafa, peace and the blessings of God be upon him, is the Last of the Prophets. I, therefore, wish to make it clear to all my Muslim brothers that if these words vex or wound their feelings in any way, they may looks upon them as having been struck off and replaced by the word *Muhaddath* every where. For dissension or disunion among the Musalmans I can never tolerate ; and more so in this case, when from the very beginning, as is very well known to the Most High God, it has never been my intention to take the word ‘ Nabi ’ to

suggest Real Prophethood. The word, to put in a plain language, means a *Muhaddath* which the Holy Prophet has interpreted to denote 'one spoken to by God' :

رَجَالٌ يَكَامُونَ مِنْ غَيْرِ أَنْ يَكُونُوا أَنْبِيَاءً

There is no harm then and no objection if I express this word in another way for the sake of my Muslim brothers' pleasure, that is, the word *Nabi* may be taken to have been obliterated from my writings and the word *Muhaddath* inserted instead."

In this way, the Promised Messiah has made it clear and fundamental that the word 'Nabi' has been used for him merely in a topical sense ; it simply means a *Muhaddath* and nothing more. This writing of the Promised Messiah is as much obligatory on his subsequent writings as on his earlier books.

Letter to a friend.

In the following letter to a friend, Hazrat Mirza Sahib has forbidden the use of the Word *Nabi* in respect of himself. This letter was published in *Al-Hakam* of August 17, 1899 A.D. and reads as follows :—

" Although I have been receiving Divine Revelation for the last 20 years successively, and the terms 'Nabi' and 'Rasul' have been often used for me, but it is a mistake to think it is the same real prophethood of yore which made its recipient the bearer of Divine Law.

The term 'Rasul' in this case means nothing more than 'one sent forth by the Most High God, a messenger from on High', and the term 'Nabi' as 'one invested with the gift of prophecy, one who, receiving his light from God, foretells unseen matters.' But as those words which have been used only in a metaphorical sense, are telling adversely upon Islam and producing evil consequences, they must not be used in ordinary conversation and everyday talk ; and it must be believed from the core of your heart that prophethood in all its essence has really come to an end with the Holy Prophet Muhammad, as says the Most High God in the Holy Quran.

ولكن رسول الله و خاتم النبيين

To deny this verse or even to depreciate it in any manner is tantamount to turning away from Islam and apostatizing. Just as a man who exceeds all limits in denial, is in a dangerous condition, so is he who, after the manner of the Shias, exceeds all bounds in affirmation and affinity. The Most High God, it must be understood very clearly, has brought to a close all kinds of prophethood as well as apostleship with the advent of the Holy Prophet and the Holy Quran ; and I have been raised and sent forth into the world merely to serve and strengthen the cause of Islam, and not to relinquish it and invent a new faith. We should always protect ourselves from the inroads of the Satan, and cherish a true and sincere love for Islam.

The grandeur and greatness of the Holy Prophet we must never forget. As for myself. I am only a humble servant of Islam, and this is entirely the purpose of my advent; the words Nabi and Rasul have been used for me only in a topical sense."

What a pity that the Qadiani Community has fallen into the same Error of Extremes from which the Promised Messiah had warned them to refrain. The words 'Nabi' and 'Rasul' are being used unscrupulously in their ordinary conversation and everyday talk although the Promised Messiah had forbidden it so clearly

In his book *Nishan-i-Asmani*, Promised Messiah has written very clearly that it was his firm faith that no prophet, neither new or old, could appear after the Holy Prophet Muhammad; only Muhaddaths could come. Then, did his 'firm faith' also suffer a change? The firm faith even of an ordinary believer does not vacillate not to speak of one who was a Mujaddid, a Messenger from on High, the Promised Messiah, the Arbiter and the Judge. Writes he:—

"Time and again I have answered these accusations, and explained the purport of my writings that there is not a word of heresy in them. To prophethood I lay no claim, nor extrude myself from the *ummah*. Of miracles, angels and Lailat-ul-Qadar I am no denier. A strong and unshakeable faith I cherish in the fact that our Holy Prophet Muhammad is the

Last of the Prophets, and no prophet, neither new nor old, can appear after him, and of the Holy Quran, not a jot or a tittle can be obliterated. Of course Muhaddaths shall come who hold converse with the Divine Being, and are imbued with the radiance and spirit of prophethood, and mirror some of its attributes. I am one of these."

In a poster dated Shaban 20, 1314 A. H. the Promised Messiah invoked curses upon the claimant to prophethood and imprecated him, His own revelation he called a non-prophetic revelation which is granted to sages and saints (wahy-i-walayat) :—

" Let it be known to Moulvi Ghulam Dastagir of Qasur that we too invoke imprecations upon the claimant to prophethood, and repose full faith in ﷺ and believe in the finality of prophethood with the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace and the blessing of God be upon him. Ours is not a prophetic revelation, but the one which is granted to 'awliya' for completely submitting to and strictly following in the footsteps of the Holy Prophet. This is our belief ; and he who imputes to us more than this, strays away from righteousness and rectitude. And though the reception of the Quranic Revelations turn a man 'kafir' this sentence of heresy should first be pronounced upon Sayyad Abdul Qadir who has professed such a claim. To be brief we lay no claim to prophethood, it is

merely *walayat* and *mujaddidiyyat* that we claim for ourselves”

Muwahib-ur-Rahman is a post 1901 A. D. book of the Promised Messiah *i.e.* a book written after the year 1901 A. D. On page 66, under the caption فبدمن عقائدنا he writes. “The saints of this nation are imbued with the prophetic dye, but they are not prophets in reality, for Law (shariat) has found its perfection in the Holy Quran. It is but obvious that the reason for the termination of prophethood has been stated to be the perfection of Law.” This book had been written after the fanciful change of his claim. Thus the logical conclusion is: Just as the perfection of Law is a bar in the way of other awliyas’ from becoming prophets, it is so even in the case of Hazrat Mirza Sahib. Hence it is a post 1902 A. D. testimony *i. e.* a testimony given after the year 1902, convincing, clear and conclusive that the Promised Messiah did not believe in the advent of a prophet after the Holy Prophet Muhammad.

أنا مسلمون نؤمن بكتاب الله الغرقان ونؤمن
بأن سيدنا محمد النبيه ورسوله وأنه جاء
بخير الاديان - ونؤمن بأنه خاتم الانبياء لانه
بعده لا الذى ربى من فريضة واظهورة وعدة -
ولله مكلمات و مخاطبات مع اوليائه في
هذا الامة وانهم يعطون صبغة الانبياء وليسوا
نبيين في الحقيقة بان القرآن اكمل وطر الشريعة

وَلَا يَعْطُونَ إِلَّا فَهُمُ الْقُرَآنُ وَلَا يَزِيدُونَ عَلَيْهِ
وَلَا يَنْقُصُونَ مِنْهُ وَمَنْ ذَادَ أَوْنَقَصَ فَأُوْلَئِكَ
مِنَ الشَّيْطَانِ الْغَنَّمَةِ -

(موا JB الرحمن صفحه ٦٦، ٦٧)

i. e. I am a musalman, and believe in the Book of God, the Holy Quran. It is my faith that our master, Hazrat Muhammad Mustafa, is the Prophet of God, and his religion is the best of all religions. It is also faith that he is the Last of the Prophets, and there is no prophet after him, but he who has fed upon his grace and appeared in accordance with his covenant. God speaks to the saints of this nation and imbues them with the prophetic dye, but they are not prophets in reality, for the Holy Quran has fulfilled all the needs of Shariat. They are not given anything but a very clear insight into the Holy Quran : but they can neither add nor diminish from the Holy Book ; and the devil and evil one is he who introduces even the smallest change into the the Holy Quran.”

Haqiqat-ul-Wahy is the very last book of the Promised Messiah. An Arabic Supplement entitled ‘Istifta’ has been appended to it, wherein on page 64 he has very explicitly expressed his faith in the termination of prophethood, and of apostleship, and the words ‘Nabi’ and ‘Rasul’ which are met with in his revelations and prophecies, have been used only in a metaphorical

sense and not technically. Writes he :—

والنبوة قد انقطعت بعد نبينا صلى الله عليه وسلم ولاكتاب بعد الفرقان الذي هو خير الصحف السابقة ولا شريعة بعد الشريعة المحمدية -
بيد أني سميته نبيها على المسان خير البرية وذالك امر ظلي من بركات المتابعة وما رأي في نفسي خيراً ووجدت كلما وجدت من هذه النفس المقدسة و ما عنى الله من نبوتي الاكثر المكالمة والمخاطبة ولعنة الله على من اراد فوق ذالك او حسب نفسه شيئاً و اخرج عنقه من الرقبة النبوية - وان رسولنا خاتم النبيين وعليه انقطعت سلسلة المرسلين فليس حق احد ان يدعى النبوة بعد رسولنا المصطفى على الطريقة المستقلة وما بقى بعده الاكثر المكالمة وهو بشرط الاتباع لا بغير متنا بعده خير البرية و والله ما حصل لى هذا المقام الا من انوار اتباع الاشعة المصطفوية وسميت نبياً من الله على طريق المجاز لاعلى وجه الحقيقة ضميم حقيقته الوحي صفحه ٦٤، ٦٥

i.e. "With the advent of our Holy Prophet, prophethood has been cut off for ever. There is now no book but the Holy Quran which is by far the best among the sacred scriptures, nor is there a Law after the Perfect Law of Muham-

mad, peace and the blessings of God be upon him. The appellation of prophet has been conferred upon me by the sacred lips of the Holy Prophet. This distinction, it is but evident, has been received by me by following in his footsteps submissively, otherwise there was no merit in me, no excellence. That ever has been bestowed upon me, is by reason of *his* spiritual power. My prophethood in the eyes of God, means 'frequency of revelation' only, and no more and the malediction of God be upon him who claims anything beyond it or attaches any importance to his own self, or withdraws his neck from under the yoke of Muhammad. Our Holy Prophet, of a truth, is the Last of the prophets; the line of the apostles has terminated with him. No one, therefore, has a right to claim real prophethood after him; and nothing has remained of it excepting His frequent Communion, and this too with, and not without, subservience to the Holy Prophet. I swear by the Most High God that whatever has been achieved by me, has been obtained from the light and lead of Muhammad's footprints. *The title of prophet which the Most High God has given me is merely by way of metaphor and not in the strict sense of the term.*

The prophethood of the Promised Messiah, it is quite obvious from this quotation, means, *frequency of revelation* in the eyes of God. It has also been stated that prophethood as well as apostleship has been cut off for ever, and nothing remains of it now except the frequency of reve-

مابقى بعد ذلك الاكتفية المكارمة The

logical conclusion is that the frequency of revelation is not prophethood. Otherwise it would read thus. Prophethood as well as apostleship has been cut off for ever, and nothing remains of it now but prophethood. That would evidently be senseless and stupid. In the end it has been affirmed that the word 'Nabi' has been used for this frequency of revelation in a

سُبْحَانَ رَبِّنَا مِنْ أَنْ يَكُونَ عَلَى سُبْحَانَ رَبِّنَا مِنْ أَنْ يَكُونَ عَلَى

طَرِيقِ الْمَجَازِ لَا عَلَى وَجْهِ الْحَقِيقَةِ These

concluding words shew clearly that whenever the Promised Messiah has made use of the word 'Nabi' in respect of himself, it has been done in a metaphorical sense and not in the real sense of the word, and a term is used in a metaphorical sense only when the actuality of the thing spoken of is not found in it. For instance the metaphorical use is made of the word 'lion' when it is used to denote a 'bold and brave person,' and of the term 'Hatim' for a liberal and generous man. In like manner the metaphorical use of the term 'Nabi' will be made when it is used to speak of a saintly person, a Muhaddath or a Mujaddid. No body calls the real lion, that beast of the jungle, a metaphorical lion, nor the real Hatim, who once lived in Arabia, a figurative Hatim, nor an actual prophet, a metaphorical prophet. A metaphorical prophet, of a necessity, must be a non-prophet.

2. Could not the Promised Messiah differentiate between a prophet and a Muhaddath?

Mian Mahmud Ahmad Sahib the head of the Qadiani Community affirms that the reason why the Promised Messiah disclaimed prophet-hood and claimed to be a Muhaddath only, was that he could not differentiate between the terms 'prophet' and 'Muhaddath' that is to say, he did not know what a prophet is, and what a Muhaddath. Accordingly, the Mian Sahib wrote in his book Haqiqat-un-Nabuwwat, page 124 :—

"In fine, since the Promised Messiah understood the word 'Prophet' in the beginning, to connote 'one who brings new Law from God, or abolishes and abrogates some commandments, or one who has been raised directly, without any intermedium,' for this reason he refused to adopt the appellation of 'prophet' for himself, although all the conditions of a prophet were found and fulfilled in him, and all through he professed a claim in those very things wherewith a man could become a prophet. But since he took these conditions to be the conditions of a Muhaddath, and not of a prophet, he always called himself a Muhaddath, not knew that the nature of his claim as propounded by him was such as could not be found in any one but a prophet, and still he was refusing to be a prophet."

It has already been shown that the Promised Messiah repudiated his prophethood in the same strain in his later writings as in his earlier books. His book *Muwahib-ur-Rahman* which was written in 1903 A. C. contains precisely the same denial which is found in *Izala-i-Awham* published in 1891 A. C. And, even if it were assumed that he disavowed it only up to the year 1901 A. C. we shall have to admit that for 12 long years, from 1890 to 1901 A. C. the Promised Messiah disclaimed prophethood and claimed Muhaddathiyat for himself, for the reason that he did not know what a prophet, and what a Muhaddath. Very audacious indeed ! On the one hand, to accept him as the Promised Messiah and the Mujaddid, the Arbiter and the judge, and on the other to decry and disparage him that he did not know the difference between a prophet and a Muhaddath is indeed very bold and impetuous. And the worst of it is that Mian Mahmud Ahmad Sahib is saying the same thing to-day which the kafir-making Mullahs said in 1891 A. C. Just read the following from their Sentence of Heresy side by side with what the son and follower of the Promised Messiah says :—

“ In reply to this accusation the Qadiani or his disciples may urge two objections :—(1) That the Qadiani did never lay a claim to prophethood, but affirmed side by side with it that Muhaddathiyat was another name for this prophethood. From this it appears that in claiming prophethood he meant a claim to Muhaddathiy-

yat, and not prophethood, real and independentOur reply is, Although it has been stated by the Qadiani that he is a claimant to that kind of prophethood the door whereof shall remain open unto the Day of Resurrection, and that Muhaddathiyat is another name of this prophethood whereof he is the claimant, but he has, at the same time, put such an interpretation upon the term Muhaddathiyat, and explained its nature to be such as it cannot mean anything but prophethood." (Fatwa-i-Kufr, page 67-68).

Mian Mahmud Ahmad Sahib, we are quite sure, did not write these lines in imitation of the Sentence of Heresy, nor drew his inspiration from there. We are rather prepared to believe that he would not have written them, only if he had known that the same things had been said of the Promised Messiah by his revilers in his lifetime. But it is a strange coincidence that the son of the Promised Messiah, disregarding all limits in filial love, is to-day out to disseminate the same ideas about him which an opponent did in 1891 A. C. A fanatical foe and a passionate friend, there is no gainsaying the fact, both stand upon the same plane. Both of them affirm that Mirza Sahib no doubt called himself a Muhaddath but under the cover of that name said things which are found only in a prophet. Praise as well as prejudice, when these break away and exceed proper bounds, both arrive at the same spot. Of course, an enemy adopts a wrongful course

deliberately, whereas an indiscreet friend, in the excess of his love and devotion, makes the same assertion unintentionally. A Jew also avers that Jesus Christ claimed to be the Son of God ; the same says a Christian. But there it certainly a difference of heaven and earth between their intentions. We are however not concerned with intentions. We must look straight into the facts. One may feel inclined to think, it is just possible, that when friend and foe both arrive at the same conclusion, in consideration of certain words, why should not that conclusion be accepted as correct ? A reply to this objection exists in the writings of the Promised Messiah himself, and so emphatically has he cleared it over and over again that, we shall have to admit that both, the biased foe as well the passionate friend, are in the wrong ; both have strayed from the right path, the one in the passion of love, and the other in the feeling of hatred. When his opponents objected that Mirza Sahib, under the cover of the name Muahddath claims things which are found only in a prophet, the Promised Messiah replied :—

وأني كتبت فى بعض كتبى أن مقام التحدى
أشد تشبها بمقام النبوة ولافرق إلافرق القوة
وال فعل وما فهموا قوله وقالوا ان هذا الرجل
يدعى النبوة والله يعلم ان قولهم هذا كذب
بحت لا يما زجة شيئاً من الصدق ولا اصل لها

اصلًا و ما نحن نهود الا لبيهيو الناس على التكفيرون
والسب واللعن والطعن ويهضو هم للعناد.....
ويفرقوا بين المؤمنين و انى والله آمن بالله
ورسوله و آمن بافة خاتم النبيين نعم قلت ان
اجزاء النبوة توجد في التحديث كلها ولكن
بالقوة لا بالفعل فالمحدث نبى بالقوة ولو لم
يكن سد باب النبوة لكان نبى بالفعل.....
و كما لات النبوة جميعا مخفية مضمورة
في التحديث وما جس ظهورها و خرو جها إلى
ال فعل الاسد باب النبوة و الى ذلك اشار
النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في قوله لو كان
بعده نبى لكان عمر وما قال هذا الابناء على
ان عمر كان محدثا فاشار الى ان مادة النبوة
وبذرها يكون موجودا في التحديث -

حمامنة البشر صفحه ٨٢-٨١

“I have written in some of my books that the office of ‘tahdith’ bears a close resemblance to that of prophethood. There is no difference between them save that of power and position. People have not understood me and say that I am a claimant to prophethood. But the Most High God knows it well that this saying of theirs is quite baseless and false, and contains not even the proverbial grain of truth. They have concocted it to incite the people to scoff

and scold at me, and to call me a 'kafir' and create mischief in the land, and create dissension among the believers. I declare upon the most solemn oath that I believe in the Most High God and His Apostle; and I believe also that the Apostle of God is the Last of the prophets. I have said, it is true, that a Muhaddath contains elements of prophethood in him, but in point of power and not in point of position; and if the door of prophethood had not been closed, he would have been a prophet by position also. In 'tahdith' all the excellences of prophethood lie latent and hidden, but these manifest not to the prophetic degree the door of prophethood having been closed for ever. It was to this fact that the Holy Prophet was alluding when he said. Had there been a prophet after me, it would have been Umar. Hazrat Umar was a Muhaddath and the Holy Prophet said so to indicate that the seed of prophethood, its embryo as it were, is present in a Muhaddath. (Hamamat-ul-Bushra, page 81, 82.)

It is clear from this quotation that the Promised Messiah himself has controverted allegation that the (Mirza Sahib) has used the word Muhaddath but said things which are found in a prophet. It is a deliberate lie, says he, which has been invented to set people against him. Now the question remains, whether Mirza Sahib spurned and scouted the allegations of his opponents without knowing the real significance of the terms 'Nabi' and 'Muhaddath.' And

then, when the Promised Messiah has written with his own pen, that the allegation that he had used the term Muaddath but had claimed things which are to be found only in a prophet, is a daring and deliberate lie, was it not incumbent on Mian Mahmud Ahmad Sahib to consign all his writings to the flames as soon as he came to know of it? This one passage from the writings of the Promised Messiah is enough to reject the religion of Mian Mahmud Ahmad, but it is a pity that neither the Mian Sahib nor his followers have any respect or regard for the writings of the Promised Messiah. By the word of mouth they call him a prophet, but such a clear and express pronouncement of his they are not prepared to submit to and accept.

3. Did the Promised Messiah change his claim in 1901 ?

In ascribing prophethood to the Promised Messiah, Mian Mahmud Ahmad Sahib has urged that the Promised Messiah had changed his claim in November 1901 A. D.; he called himself a Mujaddid and Muhaddath before this year, and disclaimed prophethood, but he felt his error in November 1901 A. D. and rectified it. It was indeed a matter of no small magnitude, this change of claim, but how strange, that not a single Ahmadi there had been who ever felt that the Promised Messiah had introduced a change in his claim, in 1901 A. D. or that his writings prior to this year were faulty in some respects or that he did not know the real significance of the term Nabi and Muhaddath before this year and used the word Muhaddath for himself in stead of the word prophet only by mistake. Very strange indeed. But even into the head of the Mian Sahib himself this whimsical 1901 came in a gradual manner, so that when he began to stress upon and stretch this proposition of prophethood, he wrote, in the first instance, in his book Al Qaul-ul-Fasal, page 24:—

“In fine, it is clear from the above quotation that up to the publication of Tiryaq-ul-Qulub

which began in August 1899 A. C. and finished in October 25, 1902 A. C. the Promised Messiah believed that he possessed only a partial superiority over Jesus Christ, and in accosting him as a prophet, only partial and imperfect prophethood was meant. But later on as is clear from the sentences Nos. (2) and (3) of the text quoted, it was revealed to him from God that he was superior to Jesus Christ in all respects, and that he was a prophet, and not the recipient of a partial prophethood, but of course such a prophet who has received prophethood through the gift and grace of the Holy Prophet peace and blessings of God be upon him. Hence it is not permissible to argue from any of his writings before the year 1902 A. C.”

But since this book, Al Qaul-ul-Fasal, had been written in a hurry (although this swiftness had been dished up as a miracle), the Mian Sahib and his proof-readers did not remember that in the same book which was meant to propound the principal that no conclusion should be drawn from any writing after October 1902 A. D., the Promised Messiah having changed his claim in that year, in the very same book as many as four references have been made on pages 4, 5, 6, and 7, to a Tract of November 5, 1901 A. D. Hot and cold in the same breath. The Mian Sahib, on the one hand, formulates the principle that no inference must be drawn from the ante-1902 writings on the other, he himself makes four references to a writing of

1901 A. C. and reasons out from these. It is very surprising indeed that none of the Mian Sahib's followers ever objected, why he himself committed a deed which he had adjudged to be absolutely unlawful, as many as four times in his book? We ourselves made a mistake at that time; we pointed out the glaring inconsistency of the 'miraculous book'; otherwise the faith of the Mian Sahib and his followers would have hinged on the year 1902 A. C. to-day; and they would have led the world to believe that in 1902 A. C. the Promised Messiah changed his claim, and in 1902 A. C he came to learn the meanings of the words Nabi and Muhaddath. All this they would have said and would not have cared a fig for the fact that they themselves are inferring from the writings of 1901 A. C. The followers of Mian Sahib, as we observe them possess a queer sort of mentality. They do not mind making contradictory statements nor do they feel a bit abashed if their sayings are belied by unshakeable facts. Simply tell them that such and such a thing has been written by the Mian Sahib and this is more than enough. Furthermore about its merits or demerits they would not worry, nor would they dare to see whether or not it is in harmony with the Holy Quran and the Hadith with the hard facts of life and with commonsense. They would unthinkingly repose all faith into it, just as their Mian Sahib would like them to do. For this change of date from 1902 to 1901 A. C. we confess, we are ourselves wholly responsible; for as soon as

we raised this objection, the Mian Sahib changed the date forthwith in his other book, *Haqiqat-un-Nabuwwat*. This, we do not deny, the Mian Sahib had the right to do, for a man does have full power over the thing of his own making. It was he who invented the date 1902 A. D. for the alleged change of claim. He was therefore entitled to change it into 1901 A. D. at his own sweet will. You may rummage the whole Ahmadiyya literature, books, papers, and posters, which had been published before this ingenious invention of the Mian Sahib, but not a single line you shall come across, indicating that the Promised Messiah had changed his claim in 1902 or 1901 A. C. or that he did not know the meaning of the words 'Nabi' and 'Muhaddath' for a time, and hence used the word 'Muhaddath' wrongly for himself in stead of the word 'Nabi'. It is very funny indeed that although it did not occur to a single man out of the entire Ahmadiyya Community that in 1902 or 1901 A. C. their spiritual leader had changed his claim, and all his writings bearing on the denial of prophet-hood had been abrogated, yet when the Mian Sahib said that it was not permissible to argue from the *ante-1902* writings of the Promised Messiah, although in the very same book he had himself done so, all his followers, without giving a moment's thought to it, reposed all their faith in it. We objected. The Mian Sahib changed all his mind and wrote only two months after that it was not lawful to make references to the *ante-1901* A. C. writings of the

Promised Messiah and reason out from these. Now the faith of his Jamaat shifted unto this new pronouncement of his, which they started echoing parrot-like. Here is a passage from Haqiqat-un-Nabuwwat page 121 :—

“ It is thus proved that the Promised Messiah changed his claim in 1901 A. C. The year 1900 is an intervening period which stands between the two ideas, Barzakh-like, and separates them. Hence it is clear that all the writings before year 1901 wherein the Promised Messiah disclaimed prophethood, have been abrogated, and it is wrong to argue from them.”

Thus from the date of this second pronouncement of the Mian Sahib, not the writings before 1902 but all the books written before the year 1901 A. C. have been cancelled out and abrogated.*

* In affirming that the Promised Messiah had been disclaiming his prophethood for a long time, although he was veritably a prophet, Mian Mahmud Ahmad Sahib is inflicting on him a severe religious punishment of which perhaps he is not yet aware, *viz* that it is rank heresy to deny the prophethood of a prophet of God. If Hazrat Mirza Sahib was in reality a prophet as the Most High God had called him, but he disclaimed it with all the power at his command, and invoked curses upon such a claimant, does he not come under this sentence of heresy? A prophet who denounces his own prophethood is, of a truth, the worst of kafirs, for others are spoken to by man whereas he by the Most High God Himself.

But the most irrefragable evidence in this dispute of the alleged change of claim is this. The Mian Sahib would have us believe to-day that in 1901 A. C. when he was a mere child of 12 or 13 years, all the previous books of the Promised Messiah had been abrogated. It was indeed a matter of no small importance. Did it come into the head of any Ahmadi in 1901 A.C. or has it been believed to-day for the reason that their Pir says so? When the poster '*Ek ghalti ka izalah*' was published in 1901 A. C. did any of the followers of the Promised Messiah come to understand that he (the Promised Messiah) had become a prophet that day? Is it not a fact that in this poster Hazrat Mirza Sahib has rectified, not his own mistake but that of another man whom he has reproved for being ignorant of his books, and living away from his company? Have the previous books been vouched for and attested in this poster, or abrogated? Is it written therein that formerly he did not know the meanings of the words 'Nabi' and 'Muhaddath', which he came to know only then?

Let us now look to the indubitable evidence of facts. We reproduce below the evidence, given on solemn oath, of 70 companions of the Promised Messiah who entered his bai't in or before the year 1901 A. C. They depose that in 1901 A. C. they perceived no change in the Promised Messiah's claim, nor learnt that all his former writings disclaiming prophethood had

been abrogated. We can adduce further evidence on this point, but at present these, we think, would suffice. Their deposition is as follows:—

“ We the following signatories depose on a solemn oath that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, the founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, laid no claim to prophethood when in 1891 A. C. he promulgated that the death of Jesus Christ was clearly proved from the Holy Quran, and that he was the Ibn-i-Maryam who, in accordance with the Holy Prophet's saying, was to appear in the Muslim nation. Some ulema of course created misunderstanding about him, and pronounced on him the Sentence of Heresy on the mere assumption that he was a claimant to prophethood. The Promised Messiah, thereupon, asseverated many a time, as is also clear from his writings, that it was simply a false allegation against him. Prophethood he affirmed, had come to a finish with the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace and the blessings of God be upon him, and an insidious imposter and a veritable liar is he who lays a claim to it after the Holy Prophet. The terms 'Nabi' and 'Rasool', Mirza Sahib explained, which are met with in some of his revelations, as also the word Nabi which has been used in the Hadith for the coming Messiah, have not been used in their real sense to mean a prophet but in the topical sense to denote a 'Muhaddath' who may also be called a *Zilli Nabi i. e.* the reflection of a prophet. The Holy Prophet Muhammad is, of a truth, the Last

Prophet, and no prophet, new nor old can appear after him.

“Furthermore we declare on solemn oath that we entered the bai’t of the Promised Messiah before November 1901 A C. And what Mian Mahmud Ahmad Sahib, the leader of the Qadian section, has written that the Promised Messiah, claimed no prophethood in the beginning but in November 1901 A. C. he changed his claim and turned a claimant to prophethood and all his writings of ten or twelve years which disclaim prophethood have been abrogated..... all this is utterly false and diametrically opposed to facts. We solemnly swear by the Most High God that it never came into our head that in 1901 A. C. the Promised Messiah had introduced a change into his claim and all his former books which were replete with repudiations of prophethood, had been abrogated, nor did we ever hear such words from the lips of any man until Mian Mahmud Ahmad Sahib professed and proclaimed them.”

Signatures:—

- (1) Moulvi Syed Muhammad Ahsan of Amroha.
- (2) Moulvi Muhammad Abdullah Khan of Patiala.
- (3) Moulvi Muhammad Mubarak Ali of Sialkote.
- (4) Moulvi Ghulam Hasan, Sub-Registrar, Peshawar.

(5) Moulvi Hakim Mirza Khuda Bakhsh, author of *Asl-i-Musaffa*.

(6) Moulvi Muhammad Ali, Lahore.

(7) Moulvi Mohammad Yahya, Dibgaran.....

.....

(70) Abdul Haque, Rawalpindi.*

Now the Mian Sahib has been asserting superciliously that 98 or 99% of the Promised Messiah's Jamaat is in his following. In view of this preponderating proportion, it is only just and fair that he should produce 7000 companions of the Promised Messiah to give evidence on oath in support of his contention. These people who ought to be of an equal status must declare on solemn oath that in November 1901 A. C. when the poster 'Ek Ghalti ka Izalah' was issued they came to believe that the Promised Messiah that day had laid a claim to prophethood, and that all his previous writings disclaiming prophethood had been abrogated. If he cannot produce 7000 witnesses, let him produce

*Years have quietly rolled by since the publication of this poster, but the Mian Sahib has not been able up to now, to produce a single evidence in spite of our insistence on this point. This is the third testimony which enervates and explodes the theory that the Promised Messiah was a claimant to prophethood.

700 or even 70 men only, who should depose on oath in clear and unambiguous terms that in 1901 A. C. when "Ek Ghalti ka Izala" was published they had come to believe that the Promised Messiah had changed his claim that day and become a prophet, and all his writings bearing on the denial of prophethood had been abrogated.

Tiryaq-ul-Qulub is one of those books of the Promised Messiah in which he has not only repudiated the alleged prophethood but has also stated in the clearest words that no one would turn a kafir simply by refusing to accept his claim. Accordingly he wrote on page 130 of this book. "It has been my faith from the very beginning that no one shall become a kafir or dajjal simply by refusing to accept and acknowledge my claim." He has furthermore explained himself by affixing a note in the margin.

"It must be remembered that to denounce the incredulous people as kafirs becomes and befits only those prophets who bring fresh commandments of Law from the Most High God. Apart from these, all others, Muhaddath included, although they may be blessed with Divine Revelation and hold an exalted position before God, yet a disbeliever in their claim cannot be stigmatized as an infidel."

Now Tiryaq-ul-Qulub is such a book at the end of which the Promised Messiah has written with his own pen the date 25th. October 1902

A. C. and its title page also bears the date 28th October 1902 A. C. November 1901 A. C. as alleged by the Mian Sahib, was the date when the Promised Messiah introduced a change in his claim. It is thus but evident that this book had been published one year after the alleged change. But the Mian Sahib has still been pleased to include it in the list of abrogated books, and on what a puerile pretext that these lines the Promised Messiah must have written sometime before. An author, be it known to the Mian Sahib, becomes responsible for the accuracy of his writing on the date of its publication and not when he wrote down the MSS, excepting only that writing which is published after his death. It was certainly a matter of no small moment, this metamorphosis of a non-prophet into a prophet, who had also, as alleged by the Mian Sahib, begun to brand as kafirs not only those who rejected his claim but the entire Muslim World. Under these conditions if it was still desireable to publish such a book, a statement should have been appended to it explaining that it had become clear to him in the meantime that he was a prophet, and all those who rejected him were kafirs. Hence people should not fall into an error on account of this book. What a rashness on the part of the Mian Sahib to annual and reject a book which its author not abrogates simply for the purpose of flinging open the door of prophethood after the Holy Prophet. But he did not know nor did any one else of his way of thinking that to shatter and

smash this false doctrine by which they were trying to foist a new prophethood on Islam, and to abrogate the Holy Kalimah

اَللّٰهُ اَكْبَرُ مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اَللّٰهِ

to crush this mischief that menaced Islam, an explicit writing of the Promised Messiah shall be discovered stating that the book *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub* in which he had proclaimed himself a non-prophet and his rejecters muslims, is not an abrogated book. This affirmation of his exists in the form of a statement which he gave on solemn oath in the court in 1902 A. C. in connection with some cases, and which he published later on in his famous book *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy* in 1907 A. C. and reads.

“Sign No. 118. Once I was present at Gurdaspur in connection with a criminal case which one Karm-ud-Din of Jhelum had filed against me. It was revealed to me

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِيْمِ عَنْ يَسْأَلُوكُمْ عَنْ خَوْضُهُمْ بِلَعْبِهُمْ

i. e. They will ask you about your rank and dignity. Tell them that it is the Most High God who has conferred this dignity upon you, and then leave them to their levity. This revelation I related to my Jamaat which had accompanied me to Gurdaspur, and consisted of not less than 40 persons including Moulvi Muhammad Ali Sahib M. A. and Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din Sahib B. A. Pleader. When we appeared in the court, the pleader of the opposite party put to

me the very same question, Is your rank and dignity the same as has been described in your book Tiryaq-ul-Qulub? It is so by the grace of God, replied I."

Now this is that book, this Tiryaq-ul-Qulub, which, so far as the rank and dignity of the Promised Messiah are concerned, the Mian Sahib has abrogated with a single stroke of his pen. And the Promised Messiah not only deposes on oath in the court that his dignity and position are the same as depicted in Tiryaq-ul-Qulub, but has it printed and published for the world. Then above all there is the Divine Revelation which also ratifies and approves what has been written in Tiryaq-ul-Qulub, to wit,

(1) Howsoever high a position the Promised Messiah may have before God, being a Muhadath and one spoken to by God, he is still a non-prophet. (2) The denial of his claim does not make one a kafir.

Hence, to turn away from these two things is in reality to turn away from the Promised Messiah himself.

4. Evidence of Mian Mahmud Ahmad Sahib's followers that the Promised Messiah claimed Muhaddasiyyat and not Prophethood for himself.

Some people to-day on account of their being followers of Mian Sahib are repeating after him parrotlike, that the Promised Messiah's prophethood was something higher than Muhaddasiyyat or literal or metaphorical prophethood. It will be interesting to know what these parrots had been saying before the Mian Sahib's book *Haqiqat-un-Nabuwwat* was published. To make their conviction complete, we shall quote only from their post 1902 writings.

(1) Moulvi Sarwar Shah Sahib.

First of all we take Moulvi Sarwar Shah Sahib, the Principal of the Theological College. He is the Mian Sahib's teacher, and conducts prayers in his absence. He has also written a commentary of the seven or eight parts of the Holy Quran. What was his faith up to 1911 A. C. *i. e.* three years after the death of the Promised Messiah? An opponent objected to the use of the word 'Nabi'. Moulvi Sarwar Shah gave him the following reply which was published in *the Badar* of February

16, 1911 A. C. under the caption "Use of, the term 'Nabi' or 'Mujaddid'":—

"The term 'Nabi', regarding its root has two meanings:—(1) One unto whom are revealed matters unseen. (2) A man of exalted position, frequently spoken to by the Most High God, and blessed with the gift of prophecy. In this sense, I believe, all the Mujaddadin of yore have been prophets of different degrees."

In the first place, the very heading "Use of the term Nabi or Mujaddid" makes it clear that the religion of the entire Jamaat, as also of the editors of papers, at that time was that they had been using the term Nabi synonymously with the term Mujaddad. Then Moulvi Sarwar Shah, by calling all the previous Mujaddadin as prophets of different degrees, has furthermore made it clear that the prophethood wherewith the Promised Messiah had been endowed, was identically the same as had been granted to the Mujaddidin of this nation. Hence if ever he had used the word 'Nabi,' he had used it in this sense only, *i. e.* in the sense of Muhaddasiyyat. In the same way if any one else made use of the term Nabi, he used it to mean a Mujaddid and nothing more.

(ii) **Mufti Muhammad Sadiq Sahib.**

Next comes Mufti Muhammad Sadiq, who was the editor of the Badar, and is now holding the Tabligh portfolio in the Jamaat of the Mian Sahib. The Mufti Sahib, giving an

account of his interview with the late Moulvi Shibli, wrote in the Badar (Vol. 9. Nos. 51, 52.) :—

“ Shibli alleged that we believe Mirza Sahib to be a prophet. Our faith in this matter, replied I, is just the same as that of other Musalmans, namely, that the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace and the blessings of God be upon him, was the Last of the Prophets, and no prophet, new nor old, can appear after him. The Divine Revelation, nevertheless, continues, through the good and grace of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and people there have been in this nation, and shall continue to be, who have been favoured with Divine Communion. Since Hazrat Mirza Sahib has also been blessed with Divine Communication, and the Most High God revealed to him future events which came too true; hence he was one who prophesied, and such a one in Arabic lexicon is called a prophet.

It appears from this that the fanciful meanings of the epithet ‘Khatam-un-Nabiyyin’ *riz*, that the Holy Prophet’s Seal shall generate prophets in future had not been invented up till then. But on the other hand, it was rightly interpreted to mean that prophethood in all its essence had come to a close with the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace and the blessings of God be upon him, and that they had been using the term ‘Nabi’ in respect of Hazrat Mirza Sahib merely in a literal sense to signify that he was

blessed with the gift of prophecy, in which sense the term could be applied to other Muhammadasin also, in as much as they too had been invested with this gift.

(iii) Mir Muhammad Saeed Sahib.

The Mir Sahib is the leader of Jamaat-i-Hyderabad (Deccan). In answer to Moulvi Anwar Ullah Sahib of Hyderabad, he had to write a book wherein he had discussed at length the Promised Messiah's claim to prophethood. Writes he on page 363 :

“ If the critic concludes from this, that a claim has been laid to prophethood and apostleship which bears Law with it, it is merely a false and foolish allegation of his. For Hazrat Mirza Sahib has expressly written in his book Tauzih-i-Maram.

واما النبوة التي قامة كملة جامدة لجميع
الكمالات إللوحى فقد أمنا بما نقطا عنها من يوم
نزل فيه مسakan محمد ابا احد من وجا لكم ولكن
رسول الله وخاتم النبيين -

“ It is thus clear that Hazrat Mirza Sahib has claimed to be a Muhaddath only and a Muhaddath, as defined and described in Bukhari, is one inbued with partial or reflected prophethood which is bestowed upon every Muhaddath in this nation.”

“ To put it succinctly, Hazrat Mirza Sahib has professed to be a Muhaddath only, and not a prophet in its real sense which is opposed to **لَا نَبِيٌّ بَعْدِيْ** خاتم النبییین and the Hadith wherein the ۯ prefixed to a common noun signifies complete denial.” (page 269).

In the year 1904 A. D. the Mir Sahib, it is but obvious, had been arguing from Tauzih-i-Maram which was written in 1891 A. C. But now being in the same boat with the Mian Sahib, he will affirm, “ all the pre 1901 books in which the Promised Messiah has disclaimed prophethood, to have been abrogated, and it is not permissible to argue from them ” (Haqiqat-un-Nabuwat page 121). In 1904 A. C. the Mir Sahib wrote, that Hazrat Mirza Sahib had claimed to be a Muhaddath only ; but now doing full justice to the Mian Sahib’s discipleship,, he would say that in 1901 A.C. Hazrat Mirza Sahib had proclaimed that he was not a Muhaddath but a full-fledged prophet! (page 130).

1. The Mian Sahib and his followers should know that all the Ahmadies had been interpreting the phrase خاتم النبییین to mean that prophethood had come to a close with the Holy Prophet, and whatever is left of it, is merely Muhaddasiyyat.

(iv). **Mir Qasam Ali Sahib.**

The Mir Sahib is the editor of a number of papers and the author of a good many books.

1911 A. C. he wrote a book named Din-ul-Haqq wherein quoting at length from the Promised Messiah's writings, he has assured the world that Promised Messiah never laid a claim to prophethood. The following excerpts of the Promised Messiah have been reproduced verbatim in this book :

“ I consider everyone who claims prophethood and messengership after our Lord and Master Hazrat Muhammad Mustafa, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, to be a liar and a kafir. I have a sure faith that revelation relating to Messengership began with Hazrat Adam Safiyy Allah and came to a close with the Messenger of God Muhammad Mustafa.” (page 28).

“ I believe in the finality of the Last of the Prophets, peace and the blessings of God be upon him ; and I look upon him who disbelieves in this doctrine of finality, as a faithless man and a renegade from Islam.” (page 29).

“ A strong and unshakeable faith I cherish in the fact that our Holy Prophet Muhammad is the Last of the Prophets, and no prophet new nor old can appear after him.....Of course Muhaddath shall come who hold converse with the Divine Being, and are imbued with the sheen and spirit of prophethood, and mirror some of its attributes. And I am one of these.” (page 31).

(v) **Moulvi Ghulam Nabi Sahib.**

Whereas these people, the Qadianies, were busy distorting the writings of the Promised Messiah here in India, their own missionary Moulvi Ghulam Nabi Sahib was assuring the people of Egypt, after the year 1901 A. C. that to ascribe prophethood to the Promised Messiah was simply a false imputation of his enemies. His book **لدية السعدية** contains the following statements :

ولكن لصلاح السلسلة مسوية في الدّلائل كانوا
أنبياء وفي السلسلة المحمدية أولياء و
علماء -

(صفحة ٢)

قال الوهابي أمامكم يدعى النبوة لانه يقول
أوحي إلى قال الاحمدى ذالك ظن فاسد لأن
القرآن جاء بلفظ الآيات فى مواضع كثيرة
منها اذا وحينا إلى أمك ما يوحى و اوحي
ربك إلى الخل فنخرج إلى قومه فاوحي اليهم
أن سبحوا بكرة وعشيا وغير ذلك من المواقع
فإن الآيات لا يختص بالنبوة وقولهم
انه يدعى المسبحية وال المسيح كاننبيا قياس
فاسد لأنك قد سمعت دلائل موته ونبينا محمد
عليه الصلاة والسلام خاتم الأنبياء لآياتى

بعدة نبى لامن العرب ولا من اليهود ولا من العجم
لا جديد ولا قديم ولا افدين البابية حق -
(صيفه ١٩٥)

“In the system founded by Moses prophets appeared for the purpose of reformation, but in the line of Muhammad there are saints and savants (awliya).

The Wahabi alleges: Your Imam claims prophethood, for he says that Divine Revelation came upon him. The Ahmadi replies: It is a mistaken idea, for the Holy Quran has used the word ‘wahy’ on several occasions, فَاوْحَىٰ إِلَيْهِمْ أَنْ سَجُّوا وَأَوْحَىٰ رَبُّكَ إِلَى الْخَلْ وَإِذَا وَحَيْنَا إِلَىٰ أَمْكَ مَا يُوَحِّيٰ

Hence Revelation is not a trait peculiar to the prophets only..... Their objection that he claimed to be the Messiah who was a prophet, is again a wrong belief, for you have heard the arguments upon the death of that Messiah. Our Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace and the blessings of God be upon him, is the Last of the Prophets, and no prophet new nor old shall appear after him, neither in Arabia nor in Persia nor among the Israelites; otherwise Babism shall have to be accepted as a true religion.”

We have quoted from six writers only who are still in the discipleship of the Mian Sahib. As to others who have shaken off his

yoke, we do not deem it necessary to cite them. Worthy of mention amongst these are :—Mirza Khuda Bakhsh Sahib, the learned author of the famous book *Asl-i-Musaffa*. He entered the Mian Sahib's *ba'it*, but renounced it shortly afterwards, on account of the Mian Sahib's baneful beliefs. Hazrat Moulvi Sayyad Muhammad Ahsan Sahib tops the list of those who are producing valuable literature in reply to the opponents' allegations. Since 1891 A. D. he has busied himself, heart and soul, in this work. His writings are replete with statements to the effect that the Promised Messiah's prophethood was merely a partial prophethood which is called *Muhaddasiyyat* in other words. As soon as he came to know of the Mian Sahib's new religion he tried to reclaim him, first by means of personal letters, then by publishing pamphlets. But all fell flat upon the ears of the Mian Sahib, and the Moulvi Sahib, at last, parted company with him.

5. The Mian Sahib's own views on the Finality of Prophethood.

In his book Aina-i-Sadaqat, the Mian Sahib has arrogantly asserted that he had never introduced a change in his belief, and that the allegation was merely our fabrication against him. Thus on page 35, he writes :

“ This change of belief, the Moulvi Sahib alleges, is in respect of three points. Firstly, that I have disseminated the idea that the Promised Messiah was in fact a prophet. Secondly, that it is he who has been foretold in the Quranic verse ﴿وَمَنِ اتَّقَىٰ رَبَّهُ﴾ (Saff : 6). Thirdly, that all such Musalmans that have not entered the *ba’it* of the Promised Messiah, even though they might not have heard his name, are kafirs and outside the pale of Islam.* I accept that these are my beliefs ; but I do not admit that these views I adopted only in 1914 A. C. or three or four years before that ” :

* Let these distinct words of the Mian Sahib open the eyes of those of his disciples who say that he does not consider other Musalmans to be outside the pale of Islam. Also read side by side with this what the Promised Messiah has written on this point in Haqiqat-ul-Wahy page 178 :—That we condemn as kafirs all those people who have not even heard our name, is a mere fabrication of Abdul Hakim Khan against us.

The Mian Sahib, in support of his assertion, has quoted from his magazine *Tashhiz-ul-Azhan*, to shew that as far back as 1906 A. C. he had been using the word *Nabi* or *Rasul* for the Promised Messiah in the lectures as well as writings. But the mere use of the word *Nabi* or *Rasul* in its literal sense, we have submitted time and again, does not go to prove that the Ahmadies, as a matter of fact, believed in the advent of prophets after the 'Khatam-un-Nabiyyin', and held the Promised Messiah to be a prophet in reality. Thus, the Mian Sahib's own writing which appeared in the *Al-Hakam* dated March 14, 1911 A. C. under the caption "Khatam-un-Nabiyyin" did not contain a single word which could be taken to mean that in future prophets shall be generated by the Holy Prophet's Seal. The phrase, on the other hand, had been given precisely the same meanings which we expound to-day. Just read these words: 'The result was that the Most High God instating the Holy Prophet on the pedestal of the Khatam-un-Nabiyyin, brought all kinds of prophethood to a close.' It is evident from this that the Mian Sahib, up to the beginning of 1911 A. C., interpreted the phrase 'Khatam-un-Nabiyyin' to mean exactly what we are saying to-day, and the capricious paraphrase had not yet been cooked up, otherwise he would have defined the term Khatam-un-Nabiyyin to indicate 'generating of prophets by the Holy Prophet's Seal' in stead of 'closing up of prophethood of all kinds.' If prophethood,

is of two kinds only, one which carries Law with it, and the other is without Law, and when all kinds of prophethood have come to a close with the Holy Prophet, how then this second kind, this prophethood without Law, could still survive, is certainly too hard to understand. But the fact is that all our people up till then believed exactly what the Mian Sahib has clearly stated in this writing, viz. "It is our faith that the Holy Prophet's excellences had evolved to that highest pinnacle of progress and glory that a complete submission to him has produced persons who could vie very well with the great prophets of yore, so that the Holy Prophet is reported to have said علماء امتی کا فیباء بنی اسرائیل i.e., the Ulema of my people shall be very much like the prophets of the Israelites."

However, a more lucid writing of the Mian Sahib on this point exists in the April 1910 issue of his magazine Tashhiz-ul-Azhan where under the heading 'Najat' (Salvation) he goes on to write :

"The fourth verse which tells of the Holy Prophet's term of office, that is, how long shall his religion abide, is this :

ما كان محمد أبا أحد من رجالكم ولكن رسول الله
وختام النبيين وكان الله بكل شيء عليهم

i.e. Muhammad is not the father of any of your men, but he is the Apostle of Allah and

the last of the prophets ; and Allah is cognizant of all things.

“ The Holy Prophet, says the Most High God, in this verse, is the Last of the Prophets, so that no man shall come after him who shall be raised to the office of prophethood, and who shall abrogate the Holy Prophet’s Law, and institute his own instead. On the other hand, all the sages and the saints, the good and the righteous that be, all these shall achieve whatever they can, through their love for the Holy Prophet and devotion to him. In this way, the Most High God has made it clear that his prophethood is meant not only for this age but for all times to come ; and their being no prophet after him, the Holy Prophet’s teaching shall endure and abide for ever, guiding the nations of the world unto the Right Path, and one who shall stray away from it, shall not enter into the presence of God.

“ It must be remembered here that the Most High God has said in this verse

وَكَانَ اللَّهُ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عَلِيمًا

i.e. He is cognizant of all things. Apparently it seems to be irrelevant to the context, for all the things spoken of by the Most High God are so clear and manifest, and it was not necessary to say that God is cognizant of all things. The statement, in reality carries a deeper significance ; it contains a prophecy pertaining to the Holy Prophet’s being the Last Prophet. Hundreds of

prophets, we know, appeared in this world prior to the Holy Prophet's advent, and they accomplished great things. Not a century, as a matter of fact, there had been which had not seen some one to claim prophethood. Of these prophets Krishna, Ram Chandra, Buddha, Confucius, Zoroaster, Moses, and Jesus, had been of such a standing that their followers are found in the world even to-day. With a force they are carrying on their propaganda, each group claiming to be the exponent of True Religion in an exclusive manner. But 1300 years have elapsed after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and not a single man there has been up to this day who claiming to be a prophet, has met with success in his mission. Before his advent, it is no gainsaying the fact, people did claim to be prophets, and achieved great success; these we look upon as truthful. But why has this system been cut off after his advent? Why no such claimant meets with success now? It is but evident that the said prophecy that he is the Last of the Prophets, is coming too true. We now put it to the opponents of Islam, What sign can there be more manifest than this, that after his advent, no claimant to prophethood has been successful in his enterprise. It was indeed this fact which had been alluded to in

وَكَانَ اللَّهُ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عَلَيْهِمَا

i.e. We have made you the Last of the Prophets, and we know that no prophet shall appear after you, even an impostor shall not dare to

make these pretensions, lest we should kill him. The prophecy is a historical prophecy, which, it is simply impossible, to controvert and confute. If not, let any one come forward and contend with us. But not in this way, that some one proclaimed to be a prophet, and a lac or two of people became his followers, not like this, but let him quote a man who has achieved marvelous success after the manner of the Holy Prophet or the prophets who went before him. No one shall ever be able to adduce such an instance."

From this statement of the Mian Sahib, two things are quite clear.

Firstly, Where he has written that after the Holy Prophet, no man shall appear "who would be raised to the office of prophethood," the Mian Sahib has also added the words "but all the sages and saints that be (awliya)." It shews that the Mian Sahib, at that time, believed fully that the Promised Messiah was from amongst the 'awliya,' and not from among the prophets, and that if ever he used the word *Nabi* or *Rasul* for him it was in this sense only, in which he has accepted the rising up of other saints to the prophets' dignity, *i.e.* in a topical sense only. The Holy Prophet's Hadith

علماء امتي کا نبیاء بنی اسرائیل

the Mian Sahib has adduced as an argument upon it, to conclude therefrom that there are, as a matter of fact, only 'awliya' after the Holy Prophet, and no prophets. And this is quite

correct, and in consonance with what the Promised Messiah has written in *Tiryaq-ul-Qulub*, page 130 in the margin, " Apart from the prophets who bear Law, all the Muhaddathes and others spoken to by the Most High God....."

Secondly, The Mian Sahib, up till then, did not believe that the Promised Messiah was a claimant to prophethood. For he writes very plainly that all through these 1300 years after the Holy Prophet, not one claimant to prophethood there has been who achieved any success in this enterprise. And precisely the same is his verdict for the future. " No prophet shall appear after the Holy Prophet, and even an imposter shall not dare to make these pretensions lest the Most High God should kill him." The Mian Sahib has evidently admitted that no prophet whatsoever, true nor impostor, shall achieve the least success in this undertaking; and it is simly impossible, the Mian Sahib claims ostentatiously, to confute and controvert it; if not, let any body come forward with his contradiction. This argument of the Mian Sahib, we hope, will suffice to silence him. In the face of this perspicuity, we further hope, he will not be led away by such considerations that he had ever used the word *Nabi*. For the word at that time, according to the convention of the Promised Messiah, had been used only for those 'awliya' who have been raised by the Most High God for the purpose of man's reformation *i.e.* for the *Mujaddadin*.

The case is quite clear, only if the Mian Sahib would just try to understand it, and rectifying his error, would renounce the deadly doctrine of calling the musalmans 'kafirs'. The word *Nabi* or *Rasul* has been used in a figurative or literal sense only for a Muhammadi or a 'Wali' who has been raised by the Most High God; and when matters came to a point necessitating the explanation of the term, all the people including the Mian Sahib himself, said with one voice that there is no prophet after the Holy Prophet, but there were 'auliya'; and that prophethood in all its entirety had come to a close, as has been the belief of the whole Muslim nation all these 1300 years. The writings of the Promised Messiah, including the latest book *Haqiqat-ul-Wahy*, also bear it out very clearly.

سُمِّيَتْ نَبِيًّا مِّنْ أَنْ لَهُ
عَلَى طَرِيقِ الْمَجَازِ لِأَعْلَى وَجْهِ الْحَقِيقَةِ

i.e. "I have been called a prophet by the Most High God metaphorically, and not in the real sense of the term." Although it is permissible to use the term in its literal or topical significance, yet so great care and caution the Promised Messiah has taken in respect of this word, that whenever he has used it, he has explained immediately that it has been used merely in its literal or figurative sense. Such carefulness of course others have not been able to observe. The result is this fatal misbelief, which proclaims that prophets also shall appear after the 'Khatam-un-

Nabiyyin.' It was to safeguard against this carelessness that the Promised Messiah had admonished not to use for him the single word **Nabi**, "for it is detracting and derogatory to the perfect prophethood of the Holy Prophet Muhammad," and not to use it at all in every-day conversation.

6. Views of Accredited Muslim Sages re-Prophethood.

The Mian Sahib divides prophethood into two kinds. (1) That which brings Law. But this kind of prophethood, says he, has come to a close. (2) That which bears no Law. This kind, the Mian Sahib thinks, still endures; and one who confides full faith in the Holy Prophet, and walks in his foot-steps faultlessly, can become a prophet for certain. Such a prophet he calls **غیر تشریعی نبی** i.e. a prophet without a Law. He is, with respect to the prophethood itself, on all fours with the prophets of yore, *i.e.* in point of the prophethood itself

نفس نبوت there is no difference between them. If however there is a difference, it is in the way of getting it. Prophets, in the past, were raised directly by the Most High God; now they are made, says the Mian Sahib, by a sincere submission to the Holy Prophet. And in support of this new-fangled belief the Mian Sahib has quoted the sayings of some Ulema which have been discussed in the following lines:—

Shaikh Akbar.

This saying of Shaikh Akbar is adduced first of all that only the Law-bearing prophethood

has come to an end, but the other kind which brings no Law continues even after the Holy Prophet. Shaikh Akbar, it is no gainsaying the fact, has written that the prophethood which has been snipped off is that which brought Law from On High, and the Hadith **لأنبىء بعدى** he has interpreted accordingly. But what does Shaikh Akbar mean by **تشريعى نبأ** is yet to be shown from his own writings. In spite of the fact that Shaikh Akbar has thrown full light on this subject and discussed it at length, the Mian Sahib and his followers quote from his writings in such a manner that one may not get at his real meanings. Writes Shaikh Akbar:—

أول ما بدى به رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم
من الوحي أربعينياً فكان لا يرى رؤياً لا يخرجت
مثل فلق الصبح وهي التي أبقى الله على
المسلمين وهي من أجزاء النبوة فما ارتفعت
النبوة بالكلية وهذه قلنا إنما ارتفعت نبوة
التشريع بهذه معنى لأنبىء بعده -

“Revelation which came upon the Holy Prophet in the beginning was in the form of visions. Not a vision did he see but it came true like the morning dawn. And this is what the Most High God has kept on for the Musalmans, this seeing of true visions, which is one of the elements of prophethood. Hence it is that prophethood has

not been lifted away in all its entirety ; and it was for this reason that we wrote that the prophethood which bears Law has been lifted away, and this was precisely the meanings of the Hadith **لأنبى بعدي** .

Shaikh Akbar, in quite an explicit manner, professes faith in the doctrine which has been accepted unanimously by the entire Muslim nation, that is, Of prophethood nothing remains but true visions, and it is one of the elements of prophethood. He then goes on to write

اسم النبى ذال بعد رسول الله صلعم

i.e. the appellation of Nabi, after the Holy Prophet, has been blotted out and expunged, that is to say, no man can be called a Nabi hence forward. Elsewhere he states

و معهذا لا يطلق اسم النبأة ولا النبى الا على المشرع خاصة

i.e. the terms 'Nabi' and 'Nabuwwat' cannot be used excepting for a prophet who bears Law from the Most High God. Such men, it is but clear now, he calls 'awliya' in the terminology of Sharia, and considers the use of the term *Nabi* for them as wrong and unlawful. As for the coming of Divine Revelation to the 'awliya' no body can deny it. Shaikh Akbar furtheron states in very clear and distinct terms :—

وهذا كل موجود فى رجال الله من اولياء
الذى اختص به النبى من هذادون الولى

الوحى بالتشريع ولا يشرع الا الأنبياء ولا يشرع
الرسول

"All this, the coming of Divine Revelation, is found in those servants of the Most High God who are from among the 'awliya'. And the thing which differentiates a prophet, and exalts him above a 'wali' is the Revelation which brings Law. Hence no body can be the Bearer of Law except a prophet and an apostle."

How clearly Shaikh Akbar has stated here that Nabi and Bearer of Law are two synonymous terms, and 'walayat' and Law-bearing prophethood two different things. But the Qadianies, in order to gain their own ends, artfully adduce one of his sayings, and gobble down others which elucidate and explain this saying and throw a clear light upon his real religion. Furthermore Sheikh Akbar goes on to write:—

فَهُمْ وَرَثَةُ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ لَا شَرِيكَ لَهُمْ فِي الْخَيْرِ
وَأَنْفَرَادُ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ بِالْتَّشْرِيعِ قَالَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى يَلْقَى
الرُّوحُ مِنْ أَمْرِهِ عَلَى مَنْ يَشَاءُ مِنْ عِبَادِهِ فَجَاءَ
بِمَنْ وَهِيَ ذِكْرَةٌ لِيَنْذِرَ يَوْمَ التَّلَاقِ فَجَاءَ بِمَا لَيْسَ
بِشَرَعٍ وَلَا حُكْمٍ بَلْ بِأَنْذِرَ فَقَدْ يَكُونُ الْوَلِيُّ بَشِيرًا
وَنَذِيرًا وَلَكِنْ لَا يَكُونُ مُشَرِّعًا -

"The 'awliya' are the heirs to prophets, for in common with them they also receive Divine Revelation. The prophets are the bearers of Law, and in this point they are unrivalled and

unique. Says the Most High God, He makes His Word to light by His command upon whom He pleases of His servants. The word *min* has been used here which is a common noun, so that he may warn people of the Day of Meeting. Thus a 'wali' brings what is neither a Law nor a Command, for he is merely a warner and a bearer of good news, and not the bearer of Law.'

How then can the Mian Sahib and his followers say in the face of such forceful writings of Shaikh Akbar, that he also divided prophethood into two kinds, and believed in the continuity of one. Shaikh Akbar, it is no denying the fact, has called 'walayat' a kind of prophethood, but he has, at the same time, stated in very plain terms that the word *Nabi* in its true sense cannot be used with regard to these men. This popular sort of prophethood, Shaikh Akbar believes to be common to the entire Muslim nation, and has quoted, in this connection, the Holy Prophet's Hadith

من حفظ القرآن فقد أدرجت النبوة بين جنبيه
i.e. One who conserves the Holy Quran, makes prophethood enter into his bosom."

Imam Shu'rani.

Imam Shu'rani comes next in evidence. From this saying of his that prophethood has not been lifted off in all its entirety, but that which bears Law has been taken away فان

مطلق النبوة لم يرتفع وإنما ارتفع نبوة التشريع

the Qadianies jump to the conclusion that Imam Shu'rani also divided prophethood into two kinds. Very dexterous people these; to gain their own ends they would tear out a line from its context and inflict garbled versions upon it, to mask and mar the real purport of the writer. Just read the full quotation:—

ولذا كان يُؤلَّ به رؤياه وهذا هو ما أبقياه الله تعالى على الامة من اجزاء النبوة فان مطلق النبوة لم يرتفع وإنما ارتفع نبوة التشريع فقط كما يوحيه حدیث من حفظ القرآن فقد ادرجت النبوة بين جنبية -

“For this very reason his vision is interpreted along with it. True vision is one of the elements of prophethood which the Most High God has kept up for this nation. For prophethood has not been lifted off in all its entirety, but that which bears Law has been taken away. The Holy Prophet's Hadith confirms and corroborates it. Prophethood enter into the bosom of him who protects and preserves the teaching of the Holy Quran.”

(Al-Yawaqit wal Jawahar)

This book Al-Yawaqit is furthermore replete with decisive statements like

لَكُنْ بَقِيَ الْأَوْلَيَاءِ وَهُوَ الْهَامُ الَّذِي لَا تَشْرِيعَ فِيهِ

which means, Revelation which bears no Law is still left for the 'awliya', showing thereby that the thing next below prophethood bearing Law, is 'walayat' and nothing else. Quoting from the writing of Shaikh Akbar, the Imam Sahib states:—

اعلم انه لا ذوق لنا في مقام النبوة لنتكلم
عليه وإننا نتكلم على ذالك بقدر ما أعطينا من
مقام مهارات فقط فإنه لا يصح هنا دخول مقام
النبوة -

"It is not for us to deliberate upon and discuss the office of prophethood. And whenever we talk about it, it is in reference to the rank that has been conferred upon us as heritage. For it is impossible indeed that any one of us should be raised to the position of a prophet."

Hazrat Mujaddid Alif-i-thani.

Third witness is that of Hazrat Mujaddid Alif-i-thani who says,

پس حصول کمالات نبوت مرتقا بعan را بطریق تبعیت
و وراثت بعد از بعثت خاتم الرسل منافی خاتمیت
او نیست

"After the advent of the Last of the Apostles, the inheriting of the excellences of prophethood by his followers is not opposed to his being the Last Apostle." It is nothing short of fatuity, to quote this writing of the

Mujaddid Sahib in support of their beliefs. The followers' acquisition of prophetic excellence, says Hazrat Mujaddid Sahib, is not contrary to the Holy Prophet's being the Last Prophet. It is but evident from this that Hazrat Mujaddid Alif-i-thani believed the Holy Prophet to be the Last Prophet. A man states that the gaining of prophetic excellence is not opposed to the finality of prophethood. Is not he saying in so many words that 'Khatam-un-Nabiyyin means the Last Prophet' ? A follower's inheriting of prophetic excellence is not opposed to the Holy Prophet's being the Last Prophet. Who out of the entire nation is audacious enough to deny this ? Although Hazrat Mujaddid believed himself to have been endowed with these excellences, yet he never called himself a *Nabi*. Does it not mean then that in spite of these excellences, no one can be called a *Nabi*. *Muhaddath* the appellation, and not *Nabi*, which Hazrat Mujaddid gives to these Great Souls. The Promised Messiah has also quoted this writing of Hazrat Mujaddid Sahib :—

اعلم ايها الصديق ان كلاما سبحانة مع البشر
قد يكون شغا ها وزالك الافراد من الانبياء وقد
يكون ذالك لبعض المكمel من متنا بعهم واز
اكثر هذا القسم من الكلام مع أحد منهم سهى
محدثا وهذا غير الالهام وغير الالقاء في الرابع
وغير الكلام الذي مع الملك ائما يخاطب بزدة

الكلام لا لانسان الكامل والله يختص ببرحمته من
يشاء -

“ Friend, let it be known to you that the Most High God sometimes speaks to His servants face the face. Such men who hold converse with the Divine Being in this way are from among His chosen prophets. This distinction of Divine Communion is sometimes conferred on such perfect persons who are not prophets but are as a matter of fact, the followers of prophets. And one who is frequently blessd with Divine Communion is called a Muhaddath—This converse of the Divine Being is not of nature of ‘ilham’, nor what has been called ‘ilqa fir ruh,’ nor is it carried on through the agency of an angel. It is granted only to the most perfect man ; and the Most High God sends His blessing on whomsoever He pleases.”

7. The Meanings of Khatam-un-Nabiyyin.

The whole dispute can be reduced to and revolves round one point, *viz.*, the significance of the phrase Khatam-un-Nabiyyin. The Mian Sahib and his disciples interpret it to mean 'a prophet whose seal shall generate prophets in future, But according to our interpretation it means. 'The Last in the line of the Prophets', or briefly. The Last Prophet. Which of these rendering is correct, is the moot-point in this discussion. There are, in support of us, scores of writings of the Promised Messiah, both before as well as after 1901 A. C. As to the former, the pre-1901 writings, none of us, we suppose, has any objection whatsoever. We shall, therefore give a quotation or two from his post-1901 writings:—

والنبوة قد انقطعت بعد نبينا صلى الله عليه وسلم وإن رسولنا خاتم النبيين وعليه انقطعت سلسلة المرسلين فليس حق أحد أن يدعى النبوة بعد رسولنا المصطفى على الطريقة المستقلة وما بقى الاكثر المكافحة (ضميمة حقيقته الروحى ٦٤)

1. Haqiqat-ul-Why, Appendix, page 64.

“ Prophethood has varily been snipped off after the Holy Prophet, peace and the blessings of God be upon him.”

“ Of a truth, our Apostle is the Last of the Prophets, and the line of the Apostles has surely been cut off with him. After him, no body has a right to claim independent prophethood and nothing remains of prophethood but frequency of Divine Communion.”

2. Al-Wasiyyat, page 10.

“ All kinds of prophethood have come to a close with the Holy Prophet: and it ought to have been so, for a thing which has a beginning, must have an end too.”

In contradiction of these clear statements, the following excerpt of Haqiqat-ul-Wahy, page 97, Margin, is generally adduced :—

“ The Most High God has made the Holy Prophet the Master of Seal, that is to say, he has been given a seal for the amplification of his excellences which had never been given to any prophet before. For this reason he has been called Khatam-un-Nabiyyin *i.e.*, obedience to him bestows prophetic excellences, and his spiritual attention shapes out prophets, and this holy power has never been vouchsafed, to any other prophet. These are the very meanings of the Hadith علماء امتی انبیاء بنی اسرائیل

i.e. the Ulema of my Ummat shall be like the prophets of Israel."

The Mian Sahib and his disciples generally adduce this quotation after clipping down the last line: 'These are the very meanings of

علماء امتی کا نبیاء بنی اسرائیل

i.e. the Ulema of my Ummat shall be like the prophets of Israel', so that the real purport of the author may be screened off and shrouded, since the prophethood which has been spoken of here is precisely the same common or literal prophethood which accredited saints of the nation have believed to be current among the Ulema. Hence this quotation does not support the interpretation of the Mian Sahib. But even in spite of it, we submit, that when there is a dispute between the two parties as to what was the meaning of their Imam, let us, according to the clear commandment of the Holy Quran

فَإِن تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ

turn to the Apostle of God for decision. If we do so not the faintest shadow of doubt will be left. For there are, not one nor two but scores of Hadith wherein the Holy Prophet is reported to have explained Khatam-un-Nabiyyin to mean **لَا نَبِيٌّ بَعْدِي** or words akin to these, i.e. There is no prophet after me.

On the other hand, there is not a single Hadith tos how that it means 'a prophet whose seal shall generate prophets in future'. Until the Mian Sahib quotes Hadith of the Holy Prophet to this effect, his word shall be rejected both by man and God ; and he shall not be able to do so even up to the Last Day of Judgment. Hence, no Musalman who believes in the Holy Quran and the Hadith, shall accept this new-fangled faith of the Mian Sahib, his dangerous invention appertaining to the Divine office of prophethood.

PAMPHLETS PUBLISHED

BY THE

PUBLICITY COMMITTEE

عالم اسلامی کی سیاسی و اجتماعی (1) تحریکات پر ایک فظر -
از سید اختر حسین صاحب

حقائق قرآن (قادیانیوں کے عقائد پر (2) تبصراۃ قرآن کریم کی روشنی، مبین) -

(3) Which way to Pakistan by Maulana Yaqub Khan, Editor "The Light."

اسلام اور آریہ سماج کی پچاس سالہ (4) اویش کا فتیجہ -
از مولانا عبدالحق صاحب

ایک مخلص مرید کا مکتوب جناب خلیفہ (5) قادیانی کی خدمتا مبین -

(6) Prophecies of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad by Mirza Ma'sum Beg, B.A.

These can be had free of charge from the
Publicity Committee, The Ahmadiyya
Anjuman-i-Ishaat-i-Islam,
LAHORE.