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“Muḥammad is not the father of any of your men, but he is the Messenger of Allah and the Seal of the prophets”.
—The Qur’ān, 33:40.

“There is no prophet after me”.
—Saying of the Prophet Muḥammad as quoted in al-Bukhārī, 64:48.

“I have firm belief that our Prophet (peace be on him) is the last of the prophets and after him there will appear no prophet in this nation, neither new nor old”.
—Founder of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement in Nishān-i-Āsmānī, p. 28.

“If the Qādiānīs deny the finality of prophethood in the Prophet Muḥammad by bringing in a new prophet after him, even the orthodox Muslims set no value on finality because they insist on bringing in a past prophet, and one sees no difference between the positions of the two parties, the Qādiānīs and the orthodox”.

PREFACE

The Ahmadiyyah Movement is the translation of the Late Maulānā Muḥammad ‘Ali’s work Tahrik-i Ahmadiyyat. When I translated its first chapter and sent it to him he approved of it. This chapter was printed separately while he was still alive. The greater part of the book was translated and sent to him for revision but his illness at that time and other responsibilities did not give him time to attend to this matter. However the thought of publishing the translation of the entire book was present in his mind during the last two years of his life. It is only now, fifteen years after his death, that I have been able to send this book to the press in its present form.

The Maulānā Muḥammad ‘Ali intended to write another volume of this book with a view to discussing some other matters concerning the Ahmadiyyah movement. This part he never wrote. I have tried to make up for this by adding annexes and the last three chapters from his writings. This could give, more or less, a complete picture of the Lahore Ahmadiyyah movement as it is to-day.

The third chapter, entitled The Anti-Christ, Gog and Magog, included in the present volume was already translated and published by the Late Maulānā in 1948 C.E. Each chapter of the book, however, is a complete study in itself. Repetition of certain points in this case was unavoidable. Those who do not have time to go through the entire book are requested to read at least the first and the fourth chapters to have a fair amount of understanding about this movement.

I would like to express my thanks here to Al-Hājj Shaikh Miān Muḥammad who has borne the expenses of the publication of this book and to Mr. Nāṣir Ahmād who has seen this book through the press.

S. MUḤAMMAD ṬUFAIL
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THE MAULANA MUHAMMAD ‘ALI*

Life and Work

It was probably in the winter of 1876 C.E. that Muḥammad ‘Alī was born at Murār, a small village in the Kapūrthala State of India. He was the fifth son of Hāfīz Fāṭḥ Din, the headman of the village. He was not yet five years old when sent to the nearest village school of Diālpūr with his brother ‘Azīz Bakhsh who was four or five years older than he. After three years the two brothers were sent to Kapurthala High School and from there they passed their Matriculation examination in 1890 C.E.

Muḥammad ‘Alī was a brilliant boy doing very well in the school. His love of virtue and truth was proverbial commanding a great respect for him from the teachers and fellow scholars.

He was not taught to read and recite the Qur’ān before he was admitted to the school but having an inherent love for this Sacred Book he used to study it regularly till he learnt to recite it by himself.

After completing his studies in school, his father was anxious to give him higher education and with scanty means he managed, somehow, to provide funds for sending both of his sons to the Government College, Lahore. The Maulānā spent five years in this college, passing the Faculty of Arts examination in 1892 C.E., Bachelor of Arts in 1894 C.E., and Master of Arts in 1895 C.E.

As for his academic life, his college career was brilliant. Having an aptitude for Mathematics he stood first in that subject in the Panjāb University in B.A. When he once asked for a certificate from one of his professors the only remark he received was:

“He is the best mathematician of our College.”

For his M.A., he took up English as his subject and was one of the five candidates out of twenty-three, declared successful in the examination.

THE MAULANA MUHAMMAD ‘ALI

Strangely enough, during his college days he never took part in literary activities. He never wrote anything for publication and never appeared on the college platform to deliver a speech. He was only interested in athletic sports and was a good player in football (even at the age of 75 he went for long walks early in the morning, this being perhaps the secret of his good health even in his old age).

After passing his B. A. examination in 1894 C.E. and while still attending the M.A. classes at the Government College, he joined the Islāmia College, Lahore, as a lecturer in mathematics when he was only nineteen. After getting through his M.A., while still working in the Islāmia College, he joined the Law College and came out second, first and third in the three Law Examinations of the Panjāb University.

In 1897 C.E. he left the Islāmia College for the Oriental College, Lahore, where he worked as a professor till 1900 C.E. when he left that college too to start practice as a lawyer in Gurdās-pūr, but before three months had passed he decided to begin the great work of his life as editor of the Review of Religions, in obedience to the wishes of Ḥadrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad of Qādiān, Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement.

Contact with the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement

It was in 1892 C.E. that the Founder paid a visit to Lahore and the two brothers had the chance to visit him frequently. They had heard much about his reputation as a great saint, in their village Murār, being situated only twenty miles south of Qādiān. They had now the opportunity to hear from his own lips, what the saint of Qādiān had to say. It was at this time that they were told that the time had come when Islam was destined to triumph in the world. The impression left on their minds was going to stay with them for the rest of their life, though at that moment Muḥammad ‘Alī did not realize that these meetings had in fact cast his life in a different mould.

Later Muḥammad ‘Alī paid a visit to Qādiān in March 1827 C.E. in the company of Khwājah Kamāl al-Dīn, (the Founder of the Woking Muslim Mission and Literary Trust, Woking, England) who was also at the time a lecturer in the Islāmia College, and who had earlier
joined the Aḥmadiyyah Movement. There he too enlisted himself as a member of this great revivalistic Movement in Islam and had his spiritual instructions in the company of the Founder and was enlightened on the deeper meaning of Islam. He admits it himself in the preface of the English translation of the Qur‘ān:

"And lastly, the greatest religious leader of the present time, Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad of Qādiān, has inspired me with all that is best in this work. I have drunk deep at the fountain of knowledge which this great Reformer—Mujaddid of the present century—and founder of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement, has made to flow."

His joining the Aḥmadiyyah Movement opened for him a new chapter of his life. Had he not come into contact with the dynamic personality of the Founder he could not have been able to guide thousands of people all over the world towards Islam to-day.

After joining the Movement he remained at Lahore for three years. During that time he paid frequent visits to Qādiān and did the work of rendering into English many of the manifestos issued by the Founder. This was just the beginning of his literary career.

A visit to the village of Qādiān in those days was rather a hard task, as it was situated at a distance of about eleven miles from Batāla, the nearest railway station and accessible only through an ekka (a type of horse carriage) on kachcha road. But often would Muḥammad ‘Alī walk over this distance at midnight, on Saturday in the company of friends, and come back on foot on Sunday evening for his work in the college next morning.

When he decided to start work as a lawyer in 1900 C.E. he sought the advice of the Master, who after some time told him that he was thinking of starting an English monthly to carry the message of Islam to Europe and America, and that he would like him to edit the journal. Muḥammad ‘Alī immediately gave up the idea of working as a legal practitioner.

Assiduously learning all he could in the company of the Founder, he now undertook, for the rest of his life, to convince the world of the beauties and practicability of the teachings of Islam.

The first number of the Review of Religions came out in January 1902 C.E. with the following declared object:
"Our object in starting The Review of Religions is two-fold. Firstly, to draw the world to truth, viz., to teach true morals, to inculcate true beliefs, to disseminate true knowledge, and last but not least, to make men act upon the principles of truth ordained.

"Secondly, to draw them with a magnetism so mighty in operation that it may create in them a power to act upon the doctrines taught."

This declaration ends with the words:

"It shall defend the cause of truth and oppose every false doctrine or erroneous teaching which is in violation of the rights of the Creator or the created."

Dealing with all burning questions which troubled men's minds in those days the Review within a period of three years acquired a fame not only in India but also in the religious circles of England and America. Its great merit was its clear exposition of the religion of Islam, though at the same time it carried on controversy with other religions, particularly with Christianity.

The Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement had, however, also a desire to get the Qur'an translated into English to which he gave expression in 1891 C.E. in his book entitled Izâlah Auhâm. He passed away on 26th May, 1908 C.E., at Lahore and the Šadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah, Qâdiân, which was founded by him to carry on his mission, worked under the guidance of the late Maulînâ Nûr al-Dîn who was a great scholar and religious divine of his age.

In 1909 C.E. Muḥammad 'Ali was called upon to undertake the work of the translation of the Qur'an. Here also Nûr al-Dîn helped him and went through "the greater part of the explanatory notes and made many valuable suggestions" (Preface to the English translation of the Qur'an). It took him eight years to accomplish this task. The labour spent on this translation is evident from the wealth of the footnotes attached to it. The author had to work hard for these years, tracing not only original authorities and sayings of the Prophet Muhammad and all sorts of questions that are dealt with in the notes but also the great Arabic Lexicons on which he based his interpretations wherever he made a departure from the interpretations of the current translations. He worked on it for almost twelve hours daily and had at time to perform the task in
standing posture, to keep himself fit, for which he used a high desk to enable him to work in this position. He gave up this habit only after many years when he was forced to the use of a table and chair entirely.

**Farewell to Qadian**

By this time difference had arisen in the Ahmadiyyah Movement. This is a sad, but inevitable aspect of the story. The Founder had been misunderstood and misrepresented by his friends and foes alike. A certain number of his followers, overpowered with passion and fanaticism, thought that the Founder was a prophet in the real sense of the term and all those who did not accept him as such were outside the pale of Islam. After the death of the Maulānā Nur al-Dīn in 1914 Muḥammad ‘Alī left Qādiān in April 1914, owing to these differences on doctrinal issues with the party in Qādiān and took up his residence at Lahore where a new Anjuman was formed under the name of The Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Ishā‘at Islām, of which the Maulānā Muḥammad ‘Alī was chosen the President.

The belief in the finality of the Prophethood of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad was perhaps never brought under discussion so explicitly before. The question engaged the Maulānā’s attention for a considerable time. His various writings and particularly his book *Al-Nubuwwah fil Islām* (The Prophethood in Islam) made this point abundantly clear.* There has never been anybody else in the past centuries who has so elaborately discussed and defended the conception of the finality of prophethood (*khatm Nubuwwat*). His writings in this respect are unique.

The other point which he emphasised was that whoever declared his faith in the Kalimah (There is no god except God, Muḥammad is His messenger) is a Muslim and nobody has any right to dub him as kāfir (heretic). Declaring brother Muslims kāfirs had sapped the vitality of Muslims and had divided them against one another. This was a ‘pleasant’ pastime of the so-called Mullāhs. When such a practice made its way through the followers of Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad, Muḥammad ‘Alī and Khwājah Kamāl al-Dīn stood up against it. To them this was quite alien to what they had been taught by the Founder.

---

*This book has also been translated in English by the writer of these lines.*
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When Muhammad 'Ali settled in Lahore he started from scratch. There was no organisation and no funds to push forward the cause of Islam. A handful of men assembled and decided to carry on the task of the propagation of Islam assigned to them by the Founder. As 'Amir (spiritual leader) and President of the Anjuman, the Maulana Muhammad 'Ali had manifold duties. Besides all this he steadily pushed on with his literary work. The English translation of the Qur'an with notes and comments was published in 1913 C.E., the Urdu translation and commentary of the Qur'an being published seven years later.

He was a prolific writer, being the author of a large number of books both on the doctrinal and historical sides of Islam and having contributed about seven thousand pages to English literature and about ten thousand pages to Urdu literature on Islam. Reviewing one of his books The Religion of Islam Marmaduke Pickthall an English convert to Islam and the translator of the Qur'an wrote in 1936:

"Probably no man living has done longer or more valuable service for the cause of Islamic Revival than Maulana Muhammad 'Ali of Lahore. His literary works, with those of the late Kamal al-Din, have given fame and distinction to the Ahmadiyyah Movement. In our opinion the present volume is his finest work. It is a description of Al-Islam by one well-versed in the Sunnah who has on his mind the shame of the Muslim decadence of the past five centuries and in his heart the hope of the revival, of which signs can now be seen on every side. Without moving a hair's breadth from the traditional position with regard to worship and religious duties, the author shows a wide field in which changes are lawful and may be desirable because here the rules and practices are not based on an ordinance of the Qur'an or on an edict of the Prophet (peace be on him) and should be altered when they cease to meet the needs of the community. Such a book is greatly needed at the present day when in many Muslim countries we see persons eager for the reformation and revival of Islam. making mistakes through lack of just this knowledge.

"We recommend it as a stimulus to Islamic thought. To use an old fashioned word, it is an edifying book."
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Like his translation of the Qur'ān this book is ‘indispensable’, as the late ‘Allāmah Iqbāl put it, to the students of Islam. This monumental work deals comprehensively with the sources, principles, laws and regulations of Islam. In parts this work has been translated into Turkish and an Arabic translation is also under preparation. *Living Thoughts of the Prophet Muḥammad*, *New World Order*, *A Manual of Ḥadīth* and Urdu translation of *al-Saḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* with comments, are some of his books which have also been greatly appreciated.

When the educated classes of Muslims were dazzled by the glory of Western civilization, Muḥammad ‘Alī’s writings showed them the right path. From the date when the Maulānā Muḥammad ‘Alī Jauhar (of the Khilafat Movement) was editing the *Comrade* till now Muḥammad ‘Alī’s writings have been awakening Muslims to the potential beauties of Islam. Muḥammad ‘Alī Jauhar was thrilled when he received a copy of the translation of the Qur’ān. He wanted to shout about it from the top of every European house. To him it was an austerely faithful translation into English which could help groping humanity at this great hour of peril. Muḥammad ‘Alī Jināh (Founder of Pakistan) sometimes remarked with pride that he had read the English translation of the Qur’ān by his namesake. He possessed all the important works by the Maulānā in his library and would often consult them whenever he wanted to address Muslims of India on any religious occasion.

The late Liāquat ‘Alī Khān, the first Prime Minister of Pakistan (d. 1951) was also a great admirer of the Maulānā’s works. He was so interested in his writings that he donated a considerable sum to present these works to various libraries of the world on his behalf.

As a man, writer and preacher

After the death of the Founder, the Movement had to pass through many difficulties internal as well as external but Muḥammad ‘Alī always stood against all forces which threatened to undermine the spirit and message of the Movement.

Although Muḥammad ‘Alī had never been a legal practitioner or a judge, he kept close to the evidence of facts and was never moved
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to action on the basis of emotion. This attitude of his has been the
guiding principle of the Lahore Ahmadiyyah Movement, which has
stayed away throughout these years from the extremism of the Qādiān
section. It was Muhammad ‘Alī the man, the writer and the preacher
who was the moving figure behind all the activities of the Lahore
Ahmadiyyah Movement.

The secret of his success lay in his unwavering faith in God kept
active by his constant study of the Qur’ān, the Ḥadīth and the
inspiring words and memory of the Founder, and last but not least
his devotional prayers. As a man he had unassuming habits and did
not know how to pose. As a writer he was a very hard working and
methodical person. As a preacher he only knew how to say a thing
and he simply said it. It is rather difficult to describe him in full as
he was. Only those who have seen him and lived with him may feel
and remember the live personality behind him. I can only describe a
part of his person as I found it.

He always spoke gently. His gestures were very few. While
addressing his audience from the pulpit he had a gentle and facile
manner. He would never go in for effect. Unnecessary oratorial
expressions were alien to his nature. He said nothing superfluous.
He would quote the Holy Qur’ān and the Ḥadīth accurately but on
quoting poetry he was not so good, forgetting a line or altering the
sequence of words, not caring, not knowing perhaps about the
metre.

I can very well remember one bright morning. It was in 1947
C.E. the occasion of ‘Id al-Adhā (Festival of the Sacrifices) I
observed him dressed in a sherwānī (a long coat) dark brown colour
and a white shalwar (a kind of pyjāma). He had a fez cap on his
head. Generally he used a turban but on that occasion he had a cap.
More or less this was his dress throughout his life. In this respect he
did not change.

He started his sermon with a recitation of the Qur’ān in a low
voice. He stood straight and held his right hand with his left
just a little below the abdomen. This posture was very common with
him. As he proceeded with his sermon he steadily moved his face
sideways. His movements were reserved for a while but when he
wanted to emphasize some point, he lifted his left hand with its palm
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towards the audience and raised his voice and became enthusiastic. He let his hand then move freely. Sometimes he would place one of his hands on his hip, in his effort to bring home some point to his audience, and point out with the first finger of the other to make them really understand it. He then pressed the palms of his hands against each other, sometimes running his fingers into one another. When he finished the sermon he uttered words of prayer loudly and asked forgiveness and pardon from God and then quietly sat down. This is how he spoke in public.

The last phase

As the shadows of the evening of life fell on him he became more busy and worried. In 1950 C.E. his main health trouble started. He had a severe attack of coronary thrombosis at Karachi in September. For forty days he was struggling with life and death and then he recovered. On December 10th he reached Lahore by Pakistan Mail in the evening. His friends gathered at the Lahore station to receive him and took him out sitting in a chair which they placed by the wall of the platform. He looked completely exhausted but smiled and shook hands with all those who were present. From the next day, despite the advice of doctors, he started his work. As he could not sit on a chair for long he ordered his bed to be moved to his office. Here he would sit and go through the proofs of the new edition of the English translation of the Qur'ān, reply to letters and send instructions to the Anjuman’s office. When visitors came he listened to them but said very little in reply. Talking for him was more or less forbidden. That might affect his lungs which had become weak through his prolonged illness.

The climate of Lahore had a soothing effect on him and his health steadily improved. He could stroll a little now and worked harder. For the annual gathering of the Anjuman in December he dictated two long speeches which were later read out at the meeting. He emphasised the need of opening missions in Hong Kong, Turkey, and Egypt. Two more months slipped by peacefully. In March 1951 he was almost working with the zeal of a young man. I requested him once not to exert himself so much, but he just smiled and said that he could not live without work. If he stopped doing
anything he would cut short his life; this work kept him going. He did not listen to what his friends and doctors said. He had his own theories and he stuck to them to the last. He wanted to go through the proofs of the Qur'ân that were coming from England. He had another programme in mind, so he wanted to complete this work as soon as possible. He wrote about it to me from Karachi and asked me to get ready to accompany him in his journeys and even after the severe heart attack this idea still occupied his mind. He wanted to make a tour of Europe, America and the Middle-East and perform the Hajj when returning. I would like to quote a part of his letter:

"I had decided to leave this year in the month of June but two difficulties have arisen in the meantime. Firstly, the typed manuscript is still lying with Dr. Ahmad Hasan and has not been fully compared by him yet and secondly they have also started sending me the proofs (of the Qur'ân T.) which has increased my work considerably. I intended to leave after the 'Id but that is not possible now, and still if I go sufficient time is not left, so I have decided to leave for England in April next. And if God wills I would like to present the true picture of Islam to those people by visiting these places. It is just possible that God may bless me in these efforts. After staying for sometime at Woking, I intend to go to Berlin and then visit Istanbul . . . . while returning I have definitely a mind to stay in Egypt. If God makes it possible for me I would like to perform the Hajj also which has been my ardent desire throughout. After the Hajj we shall be coming back via Damascus, Baghdad and Basra."

So everything was settled and the passage was booked for April, but when the doctors examined him in March they dissuaded him from undertaking such a long journey. In April he had another attack of the disease and once more he was in the hands of nurses and doctors, who struggled hard day and night for his recovery. The proofs of the Qur'ân were still coming from England and that was his main worry. He wanted to see the Qur'ân printed as early as possible. He personally looked through every detail of it. He was never content unless he himself had compared the manuscript for the last time. His writings were dear to him like one's own child. He was
warned not to exert himself again but Allāh gave him another chance. When his condition improved he left for Karachi. It was on the 31st May, 1951 C.E., when his friends, relatives and followers saw him off to Karachi for the last time. He looked pale and exhausted. When the train whistled and started moving he stood up from his chair and with shaking legs and hands said goodbye to all who had come to see him off. The train faded away in the mist taking away the soul which was dear and near to many hearts.

Karachi again put on him a comforting hand and within three months he finished going through the proofs of the Qur’ān (except those of the Index), making minor alterations here and there, at the same time sending instructions to the office at Lahore, as he still controlled the general administration of the Anjuman. This was too heavy now for his weak constitution, but he worked and worked because he could not live without it. But the mighty pen wielded for fifty years for the cause of Islam at last came to a stop at 11-30 a.m. on the 13th of October, 1951.

"O soul that art at rest! return to thy Lord well pleased with Him, well pleasing Him" (89 : 27-28).

He had booked his seat for Lahore by Pakistan Mail on the 15th, but he arrived two days earlier. Five or six days before his demise he became very quiet and lost all interest in things around him. He wanted to come to Lahore as early as possible. He told his attendants that he must go on the 13th otherwise it would be difficult for them to take his body to Lahore, as if he knew his appointed time had come. Everybody tried his best to book a seat for him on the thirteenth but it was not possible. His body was carried to Lahore on the same day by the train.

About a thousand people gathered at the Railway Station to receive him. They brought his coffin out of the train at 8 p.m. with tears in their eyes. The funeral services were led by the Maulānā ‘Aziz Bakhsh his elder brother, in the mosque at the Ahmadiyyah Buildings. At 9-40 p.m. his body was slowly lowered at Miānī Sāhib Graveyard in his earthly abode for eternal rest. Forty five minutes
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"From among my people the Maulawi Muhammad ‘Ali, M. A. is one of the best and sincerest of friends. Besides his other capabilities he has just passed his examination in Law. At the cost of great personal loss he is staying with me at Qādiān for the last few months for the translation of some of my works in English .... During this period, that is from the time he is staying with me, I have been watching him very closely with regard to his character and other behaviour. So thanks be to God that I have found him a wonderful person in every respect. He is humble, modest, noble and pious and a person to be envied for many of his qualities .... This is obvious that such brilliant youngmen, intelligent and honourable in every respect, the embodiment of all the good qualities, cannot just be found even if you search for them."  

"I am very happy at this that another righteous youth has joined our movement by the grace of God, that is my dearest friend the Maulawi Muhammad ‘Ali, M. A. Pleader. In his person I see wonderful signs. He is staying at Qādiān for a considerable time now for the service of Islam, at the great loss of his worldly affairs. And he is listening to the discourses of the Qur‘ān by the Maulawi Ḥakīm Nur al-Dīn. And I am sure that my prudence will not go wrong in this that this youngman will make progress in the path of God, and I am sure that with the grace of God he will set such example by his steadfastness in righteousness and love of Islam which will be worthy of following by his friends. O God let it be so! Let it be so!"  

1. Majmū‘ah Ightīharat (9th August 1899) vol. VIII, p. 47.
2. Ibid., (4th October 1899) vol. VIII, p. 68.
"I have great confidence in you. That is why I love you so much, if in the sight of God your nature was not righteous I could never, never have confidence in you. I love you from the core of my heart and very often pray for you in my fifteen times prayers. I hope these prayers will have their effect one day."³

"I wish to write a book on the teachings (of Islam) and get it translated by the Maulawi Muḥammad ʿAlī. This book will be divided into three parts. One part should deal with our duties towards God, the second part with our duties towards ourselves and the third as to what the rights of our fellow beings are on us."⁴

Although the Founder did not write such a book, his wish was fulfilled by Muḥammad ʿAlī by the publication of his famous book *The Religion of Islam.*

**A vision about the Commentary of the Qur’an**

"After this a book was given to me about which it was told that that was the commentary of the Qur’an which was written by ʿAlī and now ʿAlī was giving that commentary to you. Thus praise be to God over this."⁵

"So my proposal is this that instead of these preachers some literature of excellent value should be sent to these countries. And if my community supports me fully in this I also wish to prepare a commentary (of the Qur’an) and get it translated in English and send it there. I cannot help myself from expressing this view that this is my work. Nobody would be able to accomplish it in the manner it would be done by me or by him who is of my branch and is just included in me."⁶

**Miscellaneous**

"Saw the Maulawi Muḥammad ʿAlī in a vision. You were righteous and had pious intentions. Come and sit by us."⁷

---

4. *Manzūr Iṣḥāq* (Published by Aḥmadiyyah Anjuman Ishāʿat Islam, Lahore), p. 188.
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“The Founder once called for the editors of Al-Ḥakm and Al-Badr and told them that “they should always take care in writing down his speeches and articles, so that nothing could be reported wrongly by mistake, therefore, it seems proper that such articles should be shown to the Maulawi Muḥammad 'Ali before publication.”

“I wish there were more people like the Maulawi Muḥammad 'Ali. Nobody can be sure of his life. He is alone and there is no one to help him or take his place.”

9. Ibid., Al-Ḥakm, Qādiān, 30th November, 1905.
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"The Ahmadies are at present the most active propagandists of Islam in the world"\(^{10}\) are the words with which Dr. Titus, a Christian missionary ends the first paragraph of his article about the Ahmadiyyah Movement in his book *Indian Islam*.

In the following pages I want to explain who the Ahmadies are and in what way our Muslim friends, only under a misunderstanding, are trying to undermine and destroy the great work on which actually depends the success and triumph of Islam. When Islam is, as at present, involved in a severe struggle and is faced with the gravest situation in its history, it is the first and foremost duty of every son of Islam to come to its help in whatever way he can. It is a sin even to keep oneself aloof at such a moment.

With a little thought it would become clear that on the preaching of Islam (*Ishâ'at Islâm*), depends all the success of Islam. In this way we can turn the European foes of Islam, who have been trying their utmost to destroy the Muslims for so many centuries, into the faithful servants of Islam. The place that gives rise to poisonous thoughts against Islam can also be made to produce an elixir for this poison. By *Ishâ'at Islâm* we can turn the minority of Muslims in India into a majority.\(^ {11}\) By *Ishâ'at Islâm* we can create that power and passion of faith among Muslims which would help them to live as a strong community in spite of their being in minority in any part of the world. By *Ishâ'at Islâm* we can teach them to lead a simple and straightforward life and thus break all their un-Islamic habits and customs which have brought them to such a condition of disgrace. By *Ishâ'at Islâm* we can bring about a unity among Muslims which will make them a strong and triumphant nation in the world in spite of their being weak in financial resources. What does *Ishâ'at Islâm* mean in reality? It is presenting the true picture of Islam to the


\(^{11}\) The Muslims of India did not generally pay heed to the call of the Ahmadiyyah Movement in time, otherwise the history of this subcontinent would have been quite different T.
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world. On the one hand it will attract the heart of the other people towards Islam and on the other create a zeal for action among Muslims which is lacking in them today. This will lead them to the paths of progress and prosperity, the paths which have been unfortunately lost by them today. The power of captivating the hearts exists in the Qur’ān itself; it exists in the pure and perfect precept of the Prophet Muḥammad. The only shortcoming is that the true picture of Islam is hidden behind a veil. The opponents have a wrong picture of Islam before them on account of which they are despising it and trying to destroy it from the face of the earth. Muslims themselves are oblivious of the real beauty of Islam, Islam which had profoundly affected the lives of Muslims of earlier centuries and had given them an invincible strength to uphold the cause of the truth. IVER Makan means the unveiling of the beauty of Islam once again; it means opening up of new vistas for the progress of Muslims. If in this country there are eighty million Muslims it is only due to Ḥāʾat Islām. The source by which we became eighty millions can raise us to the number of two hundred millions as well.

God has given a promise to us that He it is Who sent His Messenger with guidance and the Religion of Truth, that He may cause it to prevail over all religions.12 This is not a mere promise. In Arabia God manifested the fulfilment of this promise during the life of the Prophet, i.e. within a short span of twenty years. Afterwards on whatever soil Islam set its foot it received its due share from the people of that country, as for instance from the fireworshippers of Iran, from Christians of Egypt and Syria, from Hindūs and Buddhists of India, from the pagans and idolators of Java and Sumatra, from the followers of Confucius in China and from the nations of Central Asia. If we can just show the example of the courage and valour of our ancestors we shall see with our own eyes the fulfilment of this Divine promise. One fact, however, is obvious that the principles of Islam are even now gaining ground throughout the world. People get disheartened by the dominance of materialism and irreligion in the world. But they forget that any lasting civilization has never been based or will never be based on the forces of materialism and

irreligion. Its permanent foundation can only be laid on spiritual and moral values. If the human civilization has to exist then religion, which is the fountain-head of all spiritual life and moral values, will also exist in its complete and perfect form, the other name of which is Islam.

The only object of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement is to create such conditions under which Islam could flourish. I end this brief introduction on the prayer:

"O Allāh help him who helps the religion of Muḥammad and make us from among them. O Allāh foresake him who forsakes the religion of Muḥammad and do not make us from among them."

I hope from the heart of every lover of Islam will rise amen at this prayer! I call my Muslim friends to help the religion of Muḥammad and expect that my call will not be a call in the wilderness.

Aḥmadiyyah Buildings,
Lahore.
31st March 1931
CHAPTER I

A BRIEF SURVEY OF THE AHMADIYYAH MOVEMENT

Early life of the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement

It was probably in the year 1835 C.E. that Mirzā Ghulām Āḥmad, the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement, was born. He was the son of Mirzā Ghulām Murtaḍā. His ancestors had emigrated from Samarqand to India in 1530 C.E. during the reign of the Mughal Emperor Bābur and settled down in the Gurdaspur district, Panjāb, India. Here they founded the present town of Qādiān, which was originally named Islām Pūr Qādi. This was shortened to Qādi and then to Kādi and finally it became Qādiān. His family belonged to the Mughals and descended from Hājī Barlās.* On this account the Founder and his ancestors were called Mirza and for this reason, too, he was reputed as Mirzā Ghulām Āḥmad of Qādiān.

He received his primary education in his own village and then in the town of Batāla, about ten miles away from Qādiān. In his youth, under the instructions of his father, he was occupied with the management of agricultural lands. In this connection he had to conduct law-suits relating to his family estate which were quite repulsive to his nature. He did it only in obedience to his father’s advice. To fulfil his wishes, too, he accepted a Government job at Siālkot and remained there from 1864 C.E. to 1868 C.E. Besides his day’s work, during this period he would spend his time alone in reading the Holy Qur’ān. Nevertheless, he entered into many controversies with Christian Missionaries during his stay at Siālkot. In 1868 C.E. he was called back to Qādiān to attend to the cultivation of land under the instruction of his father. But his heart was not in this work; so he spent most of his time in studying the Holy Qur’ān. He loved solitude and disliked worldly pursuits. To this effect he wrote to his father once mentioning that he would like to spend the rest of his life in solitude.

A new phase in his life and his claim of being a mujaddid

His father died in 1886 C.E. and a new era dawned upon him. He devoted himself completely to the cause of Islam. About that

* The family of the Founder, in fact, was of Persian origin as the name Hājī Barlās suggests. For further details refer to Baḥārāt Āḥmad, Mujaddid-i-ʿAʿẓam, Vol. 1, pp. 1-10. T.
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time a new movement, known as Arya Samaj (founded in 1875 C.E. at Bombay, India), had started among the Hindús. This movement attracted his attention in particular. Articles on religious subjects were published by him in various papers in 1878 C.E. Some of them were in refutation of the beliefs of the Arya Samaj. In his controversies with Swamī Dayānanda Sarasvati (1824-83 C.E.), the founder of the Arya Samaj and some other Arya Samaj leaders, we observe his great enthusiasm and deep scholarship about Islam.

In 1880 C.E. he started his first and renowned book Barahin Ahmadiyyah, the first four volumes of which were published by 1884 C.E. In this work the truth of the teachings of Islam was established by forceful arguments, and the objections against Islam by Arya Samaj, Brahmo Samaj* and Christians, the three great movements of that age, were thoroughly dealt with and their basically wrong principles were powerfully refuted. He emphasised in this book the necessity of Divine Revelation, throwing light on its different aspects. He further showed that revelation was not simply a phenomenon of the past but God also spoke to His chosen ones in this nation. In this connection he referred to his own visions and inspirations and mentioned the fulfilment of some of these. It was in 1880 C.E. while writing this book that the truth shone upon him that he was the mujaddid (renovator) of the fourteenth century of Hijrah and was appointed to defend the cause of Islam. This announcement was made in Barahin Ahmadiyyah but he did not form any organisation immediately, and continued his defence of Islam against the Arya Samaj, which was imitating the Christian missionaries in its vituperations against Islam. The announcement of his being a mujaddid, was not only published in Barahin Ahmadiyyah but was also issued in a separate manifesto, 20,000 in number, in which after referring to the publication of Barahin Ahmadiyyah he states:

“This servant of Allāh has given a manifest proof by the grace of Allah the Almighty that many of the true inspirations and signs and wonders and news of the unseen and Divine secrets and visions and prayers that have been accepted are a part of the religious experience of this servant of the faith, the truth of these being borne witness to by many of the religious opponents (the Aryās for

* This society was founded in Calcutta (India) by Rām Mohan Roy in 1828 C.E. The members believed in God but not in Divine revelation. The society later on split into several branches. T.
instance). All these matters have been stated in this book, and the author has been given the knowledge that he is the *mujaddid* of this time and that spiritually his excellences resemble those of Messiah, the son of Mary, and one of them bears a very strong resemblance and a close affinity to the other.”

**The admittance of his piety and righteousness and his unique service to the cause of Islam**

The publication of *Barāḥīn Ahmadiyyah* made a deep impression on the Muslims. They loved its author for his righteousness and piety, for his services to the cause of Islam, for his scholarly writings and for his bold stand against the opponents of Islam. How greatly he was respected by the Muslims of India is evident from a review of the *Barāḥīn Ahmadiyyah* by the Maulawī Muḥammad Ḥussain of Batāla, the leader of the sect Ahl Ḥadīth. The nature of this review is enhanced when it is borne in mind that there were differences between the Ahl Ḥadīth and the Ḥanafi school of thought and it was to the latter group to which the author of the book belonged. I quote below a part of the review:

“In our opinion, this book in this age and in view of the present circumstances, is such that the like of it has not been written up to this time in Islam, and nothing can be said about the future; Allāh may bring about another affair after this. Its author, too, has proved himself firm in helping the cause of Islam, with his property, with his pen and tongue and with his personal religious experience, to such an extent that an example of it is rarely met with among the Muslims who have gone before. If any one looks upon these words of ours as an Asiatic exaggeration, let him point out to us at least one such book as has in it such forceful refutation of all classes of opponents of Islam, especially the Arya Samaj, and let him give us the addresses of two or three persons, the helpers of the cause of Islam, who, besides helping Islam with their properties and their persons and their pens and their tongues, have also come forward with their religious experience and have proclaimed, as against the opponents of Islam and the deniers of revelation, the manly challenge, that whoever doubted the truth of revelation might come to them

13. *Iṣāḥār*, published 1885 C E.
and witness the truth thereof, and who have made non-Muslims taste of the same.”

Announcement for accepting bai’at

At that time there were those who expressed a desire to enter into his bai’at (pledge of fealty) but he refused it by saying that God Almighty had not directed him to do so. At last on the first of December 1888 C.E. he announced that God had commanded him to accept bai’at and form a Jamā’at. This bai’at was not like that of the sufis but its main purpose was to defend and extend the cause of Islam and to place the service of Islam above all considerations. Accordingly out of the ten conditions which have been mentioned elsewhere the following are the words of the eighth condition:

“That he will regard religion and the honour of religion and the sympathy for Islam dearer to him than his life and property and his honour and his children and every one dear to him.”

Later on when he shortened these conditions the following words were retained to convey the whole sense:

“I will hold religion above the world.”

Obviously the work of defence and propagation of Islam could not be carried on without the formation of a strong organisation and this naturally could not be achieved without an adequate pledge, which was made by giving one’s hand into the hand of the Founder. So this is the principal significance of bai’at in the Ahmadiyyah Movement. At this announcement many Muslims entered his bai’at.

The Claim of Messiahship

Hardly a year and half had passed before a third period of his life started when he announced that it was disclosed to him that Jesus Christ was dead and the Messiah whose advent was promised to Muslims would be a mujaddid of this nation and that the prophecies relating to the advent of the Messiah were fulfilled in his own person.


15. “I have been commanded that those who seek after truth should enter my bai’at in order to give up dirty habits and slothful and disloyal ways of life and in order to imbibe faith and a truly pure life that springs from faith and to learn the ways of the love of God.” He also wrote that he had received ilhām (inspiration) in this respect saying:

“Trust in God and make the arc before Our own eyes and according to Our own revelation.”
He further made it known that the reports relating to the appearance of a Mahdi also referred to the coming of the Messiah who would spread Islam in the world, not by the sword as was commonly believed but by arguments and reasoning relating to the spiritual force which underlay the truth of Islam. The coming of a Mahdi who would propagate Islam at the point of the sword, he said, was against the express teachings of the Qur'an.

He was neither desirous of fame nor fortune

What were the reasons that led him to make these new claims? Did he seek cheap popularity, or was it monetary gain that he aimed at? Both these are evidently out of the question. After the lapse of so many years—it is now more than sixty years since he advanced these claims—it is these very claims that are a stumbling block in the way of Muslims acknowledging his great merits. Who can deny the service which Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad had rendered to the cause of Islam? Muslims on the whole were absolutely indifferent to the propagation of Islam and it was only he who stirred them up to activity for this noble task. But many persons would stop here to question, why did he put forward such claims then? Let everyone do the thinking for himself. Did he crave reputation that he put forth such a claim? As a religious leader he enjoyed the highest reputation. He was loved for his righteousness and piety, he was honoured for his learning and scholarship, he was renowned for his strong defence against the opponents of Islam. Such a claim did actually ruin his fame and he knew that a storm of opposition would rise against him, as the world was not easily going to accept such claims. And a storm of opposition did rise. He knew that hatred would take the place of love. And so it happened. The man who was thought to be the champion of Islam a few days before came to be regarded as its worst enemy. He whose talks were listened to with great respect and delight became straightway an object of curses and accusations. It can also be very well realised that, if he had any intention of gaining wealth, all these methods were not in any way conducive to this end. Different is the technique of acquiring fame and fortune. Such a person should never excite the hostility of men around him but always try his level best to maintain good relations with them even if he were to act like a hypocrite.
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Nor was he mad

Had he become mad, then? This is the question. The forceful arguments he advanced in favour of Islam simply nullify this charge. If there were any truth in this allegation during his life, nobody should at least assert it now. The success of his mission shows that he possessed a very strong will and this is sufficient to give the lie to the allegation that he was mad or had a diseased mind. The opposition which he had to face was the severest that any man has ever met with in this age. All communities—Christians, Hindūs and Muslims—were united in their opposition against him. Yet he faced all this storm of opposition with a calmness which is granted to very few. When a mad person has to face opposition, his mental equilibrium, which is already shaken, gets absolutely out of control and his madness becomes more aggravated. But the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement never lost his calmness of mind for a moment, even when he was faced with the most serious situation. In the midst of all trials and afflictions, with even the Government of the day keeping a careful watch on him owing to his claim to be the Mahdī, he was doing the work of the propagation of Islam with a zeal and an energy which one would in vain seek elsewhere.

Passion for the spread of Islam

His own writings also stand a mirror to his inner self. In his first book, Barahīn Ahmadiyyah, the purpose of his being raised as a Mujaddid is the predominance of Islam over all other religions. In his own words:

“The spiritual triumph of the religion of Islam which would be brought about by conclusive arguments and shining proofs whether it is in his life-time or after his death, is destined to be accomplished through this humble servant. Though the religion of Islam has been triumphant from the beginning on account of its strong appeal to the mind of man and though from the earliest times its opponents have met with disgrace and discomfiture, its conquests over the different sects and nations depended on the coming of a time which, by opening the ways of communication, should turn the whole world into a kind of united states.

“Thus God intends, by raising me in this age and by granting me hundreds of heavenly signs and a vision of extraordinary matters relating to the future, and deep knowledge and truths and by giving
me knowledge of hundreds of sure arguments, to spread and propagate the knowledge of the true teachings of the Qur'ān among all nations and in all countries.”

The first book in which he wrote about his claims is *Faith Islaam*. This also deals with the triumph of Islam in the world. The object of his advent is described thus:

"Do not wonder that God the Most High in this time of need and in the days of this deep darkness has sent down a heavenly light and, having chosen a servant of His for the good of mankind in general, has sent him to make uppermost the religion of Islam and to spread the light brought by the most excellent of His creatures, (i.e. the Prophet Muḥammad) and to strengthen the cause of Muslims and to purify their internal condition.”

And again:

"The truth will win and the freshness and light of Islam which characterized it in the earlier days will be restored and that sun (of Islam) will rise again which rose in the full resplendence of its light before. But it is necessary that heaven should withhold its rising till our hearts bleed with labour and hard work and we sacrifice all comfort for its appearance and submit ourselves to all kinds of disgrace for the honour of Islam. The life of Islam demands a sacrifice from us and what is that? That we lay down our lives in this way. And on this death depends the life of Islam, the life of Muslims and the manifestation of the living God. This in other words is called Islam. And the revival of this Islam is the will of the Most High God.”

This book is full of such ideas and at the end verses in Persian will be found that reflect the innermost thoughts of the author. Below I quote a few of them:

"It is fit that the eye of every Muslim should shed tears of blood over the distressed state of Islam and the dearth of Muslims.

"Lo! whose soul is destitute of all goodness and beauty finds faults with the Best of all the Messengers.

"The wicked one, the wretched, flings arrows at one sinless: it is proper that heaven should rain stones on earth.

---

17. *Fath Islaam* (22nd January 1891,) 2nd ed. p. 5.
18. Ibid., pp. 8, 9.
"Unbelief is raging on all sides like the armies of Yazid. The religion of Truth lies diseased and destitute like Zain al-Ábidín.

"The learned are engaged day and night in mutual feuds out of their selfishness and the pious people are absolutely indifferent to the real needs of Islam.

"For the sake of his own lower self everyone goes in a certain direction: the flank of Religion is left with a gap and every foe has sprung up out of his hiding-place.

"O you Muslims! Are these the signs of being Muslims? Distressed is the lot of Islam and you are pledged to the care of the world.

"A hundred thousand simpletons have turned away from the Religion; a hundred thousand have fallen victims to the snares of the cunning.

"All calamities have befallen the Muslims only because for the sake of the Religion of Islam they have no courage.

"Even if the whole world turns away from the Religion of Muṣṭafā (the Holy Prophet) the sense of their honour is not roused and they remain as motionless as the still-born child.

"Their thoughts are all immersed in the direction of this vain world and their wealth is wasted in the cause of their women and children.

"It was by keeping religion in the forefront that Muslims first rose to eminence. Surely they can again rise to eminence by following the same way.

"O God! When shall the hour of Thy help come? When shall we see those blessed days and years again?

"These two worries about the Religion of Aḥmad have melted away my heart, the multitude of the enemies of Islam and the dearth of the helpers of religion.

"Come soon, O God, and shower upon us the rain of Thy Mercy or take me away from this place of fire, O Lord!

"Lord! Bring forth the light of Guidance from the Rising place of Thy Mercy and give light to the eyes of the misguided with Thy clear signs.

"As Thou hast granted me truthfulness in this state of grief, I hope that Thou wilt not cause me to die in failure.
"The work of the truthful is never left incomplete, for them there always lies hidden in the sleeve, the hand of God."

The thought of propagating Islam in the West

All these writings reflect the great passion he had for the propagation of Islam, and his writings of this period are full of hope that the days of the triumph of Islam had come nigh. It is still more astonishing that, while living in a village absolutely cut off from all modern movements, neither knowing the English language nor having any contact with the Western world, he particularly set before himself the task of propagating Islam in the West. He had visions in which he saw himself expounding the truths of Islam in England. The spiritual history of Islam offers many examples of Muslim saints who under the direction of similar visions were successful in spreading the light of Islam in various countries which were shown to them in their visions. It was due to the untiring efforts of such saints that Muslims have grown to such large number in India. Ḥaḍrat Khwājah Mu‘īn al-Dīn Chishti 537—633 A.H.) was one of them who saw in a vision during his stay at Madinah that the Holy Prophet had commanded him to go to India to preach Islam. So he went there and was successful in showing the light of Islam to thousands of non-Muslims. The Mujaddid of the present century in a vision found himself preaching Islam in the West. In one of his books published as early as 1891 C.E. he writes:

"This humble servant has been shown in a vision that the rising of the sun from the West signifies that the Western world which has been involved of old in the darkness of disbelief and error shall be illumined with the sun of Truth, and those people shall have the light of Islam. I saw that I was standing on a pulpit in the city of London and explaining the truth of Islam in a well reasoned address in the English language, and after this, I caught a large number of birds that were sitting on small trees and in colour they were white and their size was probably the size of the partridge. So I interpreted this dream as meaning that, though I may not personally go there, yet my writings would spread among these people and many righteous English men would fall a prey to the truth."

He had such a great faith in it that he mentions it at several

19. Isalat Aūkām (3rd September, 1891,) pp 515-16.
places in this book and at one place he expresses his desire of writing a commentary of the Qur'ān for this purpose. He says:

"At this critical moment a man has been raised by God and he desires to manifest the beautiful face of Islam to the whole world and open its ways to the Western countries." 20

"Then so far as it lies in my power I intend to broadcast, in all the countries of Europe and Asia, the knowledge and blessings which the Holy spirit of God has granted me.........It is undoubtedly true that Europe and America have a large collection of objections against Islam, inculcated through those engaged in Mission work; and that their philosophy and natural sciences give rise to another sort of criticism. My enquiries have led me to the conclusion that there are nearly three thousand points which have been raised as objections against Islam. To meet these objections a chosen man is needed who should have a river of knowledge flowing in his vast breast and whose knowledge should have been specially broadened and deepened by Divine inspiration...........So my advice is that........ writings of a good type should be sent into those countries. If my people help me heart and soul I wish to prepare a commentary of the Holy Qur'ān as well, which should be sent to them after it has been rendered into the English language. I cannot refrain from stating clearly that this is my work and that no one else can do it so well as I or he who is an offshoot of mine and thus is included in me." 21

These are the writings of that period i.e. 1890-91 C.E. when he claimed to be the Promised Messiah. Two years after he wrote a book entitled Nūr al-Ḥaqq in Arabic, and along with it is found its Urdu translation. Here, too, he prophesied about the spread of Islam in Europe, saying that respectable persons and members of the British Government would accept Islam:

"Likewise we observe that eminent members of this Government are gradually inclining towards the unity and abhor these erroneous beliefs...........I know that these persons are like eggs which will ultimately hatch into the young ones of Islam, and their minds will be turned towards the Divine Religion." 22

20. ʻIsājah Aḥām (3rd September 1891) p. 769.
21. Ibid., 771-73.
The burning passion of his heart was to carry the message of Islam to the whole world, particularly to Europe and other Western countries, where only a dark picture of Islam had been drawn. His aspirations were to some extent materialised when he started an English monthly, *The Review of Religions* from Qādiān to present the true picture of Islam before the English-knowing public. This plan was further developed after his death when at first the Woking Muslim Mission was established in England in 1912 C.E., later the German Muslim Mission at Berlin in 1922 C.E. Thence forward the work of promulgating the teachings of Islam was carried from one country to another. Doubtless the passion which was at the back of all these plans originated from the heart of this pious and solitary figure of Qādiān.

**The claim of Messiahship was made to remove an obstacle from the way of Islam**

If the whole matter is scrutinised closely, we mark that there were two great obstacles to the propagation of Islam among the Christian nations.

One was the belief that Jesus Christ was alive in the heavens and that he would come back again and the other was the wrong notion that the Mahdī would appear at the same time to spread Islam by the sword. The belief in the ascension of Jesus Christ and the continuity of his physical existence, definitely strengthened the Christian view in his Divinity or Sonship. Christian missionaries took full advantage of this belief, and advanced them as strong arguments for Jesus Christ’s Godhood. The Qur‘ān, they said, clearly mentioned that the messengers were not given bodies which could exist without food. Many Muslims erroneously believed as the Christians did, that Jesus Christ was taken up to the heavens with this material body and that, though possessing the same body as on this earth, he did not stand in need of food and his mortal body had also not undergone any change. The logical conclusion of such a belief must be that the body of Jesus Christ was not made of the same stuff and stock as the body of other prophets who were human beings and mortals. As his body has not suffered any change during the last two thousand years, he was definitely different from all other human beings and this made him a participant in Divine

23. “Nor did we give them bodies not eating food, nor did they abide.” (21:8).
attributes! Now as long as this mistaken belief in the bodily ascension of Jesus Christ is prevalent among Muslims, Islam can make no appeal to the Christian world; rather Muslims will be carried away by the Christian propaganda. The time had come to dispel all these doubts.²⁴

To spread the light of Islam in Europe it was essential therefore to eradicate such false notions with regard to Jesus Christ; without this Islam could not flourish in Christendom. Moreover, the central and basic doctrine of the Christian faith was that Jesus, having been taken up alive in the heavens, had taken away the sins of his followers, and if, it was shown that Jesus Christ had died a natural death like other mortals, that basic doctrine would fall to the ground. The death of Christ was, therefore, rightly regarded by the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement as taking away the heart out of Christianity.

The belief that Jesus Christ was alive in the heavens was intertwined with the belief in his physical descent in the latter-ages. Unless the truth about the doctrine of his descent was properly explained, the belief in his life could not be adequately shaken. Thus, when God willed that Islam should flourish among Christians, He informed the Mujaddid of the fourteenth century of Hijrah that according to the Qur’ān and reports of the Prophet Muḥammad, Jesus Christ was dead and the descent of the son of Mary did not mean the coming of the same person again but signified only the appearance among the Muslims of a mujaddid who would be specially commissioned to carry the message of Islam to the Christian world as the following couplet shows:

“As I have been given light for the Christian people,
“The name of the son of Mary has been given to me for this reason.”

²⁴ This argument was in fact extensively used by the Christian Missionaries to mislead the Muslims. Thus in a tract called Ḥaṣa’īq Qur’ān issued by the Christian Book Store, Ludhiana (India), it is stated: “Question 6. Again it is written of all the prophets: Nor did We give them bodies not eating food, nor did they abide, i.e., We have not made for them such bodies that they should be able to live for ever without eating and drinking. Therefore one who can live without eating and drinking, notwithstanding a mortal body, is unique and superior to all the other prophets otherwise the statement made in this Qur’ānic verse will have to be admitted as being wrong. Christ who from about two thousand years is alive in the heavens without food and drink cannot be counted as one of the apostles and the prophets whose life depends on eating and drinking. If the Muḥammad does not possess these attributes, is it not manifest that Christ is superior to and by far greater than he?” See also Al-Masih fi’l-Islam (Arabic), printed in Egypt.
The claim of Mahdihood was advanced to remove another obstacle from the way of Islam

Likewise, to clarify the objection that Islam was spread at the point of the sword, it was essential to eradicate the false doctrine of the coming of a Mahdi who would spread Islam by arms. As long as this false belief prevailed among Muslims it was not possible to convince the world that Islam, as its very name showed, was the religion of peace, and that it could bring about a revolution in the world without the use of physical force. Islam never stood in need of violence or coercion for its spiritual conquests. As it did in the past, in future too it will capture the hearts of people by the sheer beauty of its teachings. It was further disclosed to him that the authentic reports did not mention the coming of a Mahdi who would bring a sword upon non-Muslims and convert them to Islam. On the contrary, Mahdi was just another name for the coming Messiah as is stated clearly in a hadith.

“There will be no Mahdi except ‘Isa (Jesus).”

This is the whole significance underlying his claim of being the Messiah and Mahdi, which aimed only at removing the two great obstacles that blocked the advancement of Islam.

Conditions of the ‘Ulama’

Seen against the background of the narrow mentality of the learned in religion (‘ulama’) of this age, the great object of carrying the message of Islam to the world, which the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement set before himself, appears to be inspiration from God. The intellectual occupation of the ‘ulama’ as that time had sunk to such a low level that wranglings on petty differences of religion were thought to be the greatest service of Islam, and declaring one another kafir was regarded as the only means of strengthening Islam. It was indeed a great advance, a complete revolution, to turn the ideas of Muslims from the petty disputes undermining the strength of Islam, in which they were engaged, to the high and noble ideal of serving the whole of humanity by making the truth accessible.

26. When the Mufti Kifayat Allah, President of the Jama’at al-Ulama’, India once came to Lahore at a conference of the ‘ulama’ a delegate of the Ahmadiyyah Movement put before him a proposal that as the kafir making habit of the ‘ulama’, was creating great disruption in the ranks of Islam, therefore, it should be entirely given up. The disappointing reply he gave was that how could the ‘ulama’ abandon the only means they had for setting the Muslims right,
to them and revealing to them the beauties of the last and the perfect Divine message. The energy of the Muslims, which was not only being was‘ed but was also working to their own destruction, had to be given a new direction so as to become a source of strength to Islam.

**Preaching of Islam was declared to be the jihād of this age**

The Founder of the Āhmadiyyah Movement put forth this object of propagating Islam not as an ordinary matter but regarded it as a mujāhada, a means of purification of the soul. Mujāhada is a technical term for the purification of the soul through various spiritual exercises. The spiritual leaders took people into their ba‘at to make them advance spiritually, and would suggest to their disciples (murīds) different adhkār (recitals of the praises of God) and mujāhadāt (pains-taking in remembrance of God). The Founder of the Āhmadiyyah Movement replaced all these adhkār and mujāhadāt by something of real benefit to the cause of Islam, and more in accordance with the Sunnah (practice of the Prophet). Besides, there was no trace found in the life of the Prophet of many of the ‘mystic methods’ which were introduced by these sūfīs with the result that these had brought Muslims into a hopeless state of inertia. The Founder, while taking ba‘at, would ask his followers to strive hard for the cause of Islam and participate with all their might in the jihād for the spread of Islam. And in this way he awakened the dormant powers of the Muslim nation and directed them to the attainment of a higher object. The purification of the soul, he taught, could be attained not by hard exercises which could not be traced to the ways of the Prophet and his companions but by a spiritual jihād of carrying the message of Islam to other people. And with this he clarified the significance of the term jihād, too, and explained that jihād which necessitates fighting with sword is allowed only in particular circumstances while the jihād which is always permissible is the jihād with the Qur’ān.²⁷

**Allegation of claim to prophethood and the anathema of heresy**

It was but natural that people should differ in respect of and protest against such ideas. The first note of dissent against a belief avowed for years and received as a heritage from foregone generations is always unpleasant and repulsive to the generality of people but the religious leaders or the ‘ulamā’ went a step further. Being already

²⁷. “And strive against them a mighty striving (jihād-an habīrā) with it (i.e., with the Qur’ān),” 25 : 52.
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addicted to the bad habit of calling one another kāfir for minor differences they straightway made it a point of kufr versus Islam. The same Maulawi Muḥammad Ḥussain of Batāla who had written six years before, when reviewing the Barāḥīn Ahmadiyyah that the like of it “has not been written before in Islam” and that the example of its author could not be met among the Muslim ‘ulamā before, became the leader of takfīr (denunciation of Muslims as unbelievers) and drafted a long Istiftā (note asking for anathema), on which the ‘ulamā readily declared the Founder as an arch heretic, a kāfir, Dajjāl, etc. This Istiftā was based on the allegation that the Founder was a claimant to prophethood. I quote the words which served as the foundation of this charge:

“Here, if it be objected that the like of Messiah should also be a prophet because the Messiah was himself a prophet, the reply to this in the first instance is, that our Holy Prophet has not made prophethood a condition for the coming Messiah but has clearly stated that he shall be a Muslim and bound by the law of the Qur’ān like ordinary Muslims. Besides this there is no doubt in it that this humble servant has been raised by the Most High God for this community in the capacity of a muhaddath and a muhaddath is in one sense also a prophet. Though he does not possess perfect prophethood, nevertheless he is partially a prophet, for he is endowed with the gift of being spoken to by God, and matters unseen are manifested to him and like the revelations of messengers and prophets his revelations are also made free from the intervention of the devil. And the real kernel of the law is disclosed to him and he is commissioned just like prophets, and it is obligatory on him, like prophets, that he should announce himself at the top of his voice, and anybody who rejects him deserves punishment to some extent. And by prophethood here means nothing but that the above mentioned characteristics are met with in him.

“If the plea is put forward that the door of prophethood has been closed and a seal has been set on the revelation that descends on prophets, I say that neither the door of the prophethood has been closed in all respects nor a seal has been set on every form of revelation. On the contrary, the door of revelation and prophethood has been partially open for this nation ever since. But it should be carefully borne in mind that the prophethood, which is continued for ever is not perfect prophethood, but as I have just mentioned
is only a partial prophethood which in other words is termed muhaddathiyat."

No claim to prophethood

These statements were, however, misrepresented as being a claim to prophethood, and the Founder of the Movement who stood for the revival and propagation of Islam was denounced as a kāfir being outside the pale of Islam. In reply to this, he made his position further clear by repeated announcements in his books and manifestos. The first announcement thus made was a manifesto which he published on 2nd October 1891 C.E., and which was read out by him personally in the great Jum‘a Masjid of Delhi:

"I have heard that some of the leading ‘ulamā’ of this city are giving publicity to false charges against me that I lay claim to prophethood, or do not believe in angels, or in heaven and hell, or in the existence of Gabriel, or in Lailat al-Qadr (the Grand Night), or in miracles and the mi‘rāj (Ascension) of the Holy Prophet. So to make the truth known to all and sundry, I do hereby publicly declare that all this is complete fabrication. I am not a claimant to prophethood, neither am I a denier of miracles, angels, Lailat al-Qadr, etc. On the other hand, I confess belief in all those matters which are in the Islamic principles of faith, and, in accordance with the belief of Ahl Sunnah wal-Jamā‘ah, I believe in those things which are established by the Qur‘ān and Ḥadīth, and regard that any claimant to prophethood and messengership after our Master Muḥammad Muṣṭafā (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, the Last of the messengers) is a liar and an unbeliever (kāfir). It is my conviction that apostolic revelation (wahy risālat) began with Adam, the chosen one of God, and came to close with the Messenger of God, Muḥammed Muṣṭafā (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him)."

A clear refutation of this charge of being a claimant to prophethood has been made in all his books which appeared after that. Below are given a few quotations only:

"There is no claim of prophethood but of muhaddathīyyat which has been advanced by the command of Allāh."

---

29. Iṣlāh Aḥkām (3rd September 1891) p. 421.
"These people have forged a lie against me who say that this person claims to be a prophet."  
"I lay no claim to prophethood. This is only your mistake."  
"If this be the objection that I have laid a claim to prophethood ..........what can I say except that the curse of Allah be upon the liars and impostors."  
"This is an absolute forgery attributed to me .......... that I lay a claim to prophethood."  
"They accuse us unjustly of this calumny that we have laid a claim to prophethood."  

Opposition continues

In spite of all these repeated announcements the 'ulamā' kept on raising a storm of opposition against him, doing their best to denounce him and put him to trouble. Even violence against him was justified. Some went so far as to issue fatwās that he and his followers should not be allowed to enter mosques and that their dead were not to be buried in Muslim graveyards, that their marriages should be considered void and that their property could be taken away with impunity. But the Founder suffered all this with patience and fortitude. On the one hand, he refuted these false charges and, on the other, he stood firmly against Arya Samaj and Christians with the result that Arya Samajists, Christians and Muslims all formed a block against him on religious grounds. Pandit Lekhram, an Arya Samajist, 'Abdullah Atham a Christian missionary and the Maulawi Muhammad Hussain of Batala with a batch of Hanafi, Sunni, Shi'a and Ahl Hadith 'ulamā' fought tooth and nail against him. This opposition was not confined to religious controversies only. False cases were filed against him in courts, too. A well-known case from among these is the charge of abetment to murder brought forward by Doctor Henry Martin Clarke of the Church Missionary Society. The allegation was that the Founder had deputed somebody to murder Doctor Clarke. The Maulawi Muhammad Hussain of Batala acted as a witness and Chaudhry Ram Bhai Dat, an Arya Samajist, conducted the case free of charge.

33. Anjum Atham (22nd January 1897) p. 45.
34. Kitab al-Bariyyah (24th January 1898) p. 182 footnote.
The Cloak of Bābā Nānak, (1469—1538 C.E.) the Founder of Sikhism worn by him in the latter part of his life, is preserved as his sacred relic at Kirtarpur, Dera Bābā Nānak, India. The diagram of this Cloak is given in Sardar Kirtar Singh’s Jughrāfiya Zila‘ Gurdāspūr (Geography of Gurdaspur District) published by Mulk Raj Duggal, Booksellers and Publishers, Batāla, India. According to the Sikh traditions God presented this Chola (Cloak) to Nānak. It is quite possible that Nānak got it made under some Divine Command. The writings on this Cloak consist of some chapters of the Qur‘ān, the Divine names of God, Muslim formulae of faith etc. The existence of this Cloak and what was written on it was fully brought to light by the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement to show that Bābā Nānak really believed in the truth of Islam. With this cloak was also a cap which Nānak wore and it is reported that some Arabic verses have been written on it, the exact text, however, is not known so far. Notwithstanding the political differences between the Sikh and the Muslim community of Indo-Pak sub-continent today, Sikhs in their religious beliefs are still the closest group to Islam than any other Indian community. T. (p. 36)
But for want of evidence the case was dismissed. The Founder was asked if he intended to sue his accusers criminally, but he replied in the negative. He preferred a quiet life from early youth. Even when his father asked him to follow law suits relating to his estate he did it with great reluctance. All the prosecutions in which he was involved now were borne by him with calmness. In spite of all this he kept himself busy in expounding the beauties of Islam. Those who entered into his bai‘at would listen to scorn and sneers and suffer trials and tribulations cheerfully. They were sometimes handled violently and deprived of their rights, too, but they bore all this patiently. On the other hand, they felt a solace and comfort in their troubles, so much so that a very learned scholar of Afghanistan was stoned to death, along with his companion, by the orders of the Amir. They preferred death to denying faith in the Founder in spite of the request and insistence of the Amir of Kabul, who was willing to set them free if they denied the Mujaddid.

Research work

The attention of the Founder was not confined to the religious doctrines only. In the comparative study of religions most of his writings should be regarded as research work. In 1895 C.E. he went to the village of Dera Bābā Nānak to find out the truth about Nānak’s Chola35 (cloak). The Chola is kept at this place as a relic of Bābā Nānak, whose followers now call themselves Sikhs. The Chola was shown to him by the custodian, and to the amazement of all who went with him he found that the writings on the Chola were all verses of the Qur‘ān that bore testimony to the truth of Islam. On his return he wrote a book, called Sat Bachan in which besides giving a sketch of the Chola, he put forth solid arguments showing that Bābā Nānak really believed in the truth of Islam. Similarly, he carried on an investigation about the tribes of Israel and was successful in proving that those tribes had emigrated from Palestine and settled down in Afghanistan and Kashmir. About Jesus Christ, too, it was historically proved that, though he was nailed to the Cross, he did not die on it but journeyed to Afghanistan and Kashmir after the incident of the Cross and that he preached his message to the Israelite tribes that had settled there. The Founder also produced historical evidence that

35. Bābā Nānak (1469-1538, C.E.) was the founder of Sikhism which claims about six million disciples in India, I.
the tomb of Jesus Christ was at Srinagar, (Kashmir) in Mohalla Khanyar.

He also carried on a research to show that Arabic was the mother of languages.

Why the name ‘Ahmadiyyah’ was adopted. Not because Ahmad was a part of the Founder’s name but because it was one of the two names of the Prophet Muhammad

In spite of the great opposition of the ‘ulama‘ and other people his followers went on increasing in number. Before the census of 1901 C.E. thought of knowing the number of his followers. Till that time they were called Mirzais or Qadis by others, the Founder himself having given no name to the Movement. Had he not given any name to his followers one of these names must have found place in the official papers of the Government. Realising this difficulty he made an announcement about his Movement on 4th November 1900 C.E. the following passage of which will suffice for our purpose:

“...As, on the occasion of the official census, arrangements have been made that every section which is distinguished from other sections with regard to its doctrines should be registered in a separate column and whatever name that section likes and suggests for itself should be entered in official documents........therefore the name which is appropriate for this Movement and which we approve for our community is Muslims of the Ahmadiyyah section......This name has been given to this section because our Holy Prophet, peace and the blessings of God be upon him, had two names, one Muhammad and the other Ahmad. The name Muhammad was indicative of his jalal (glory or grandeur) which contained a prophecy that the Holy Prophet would punish with the sword those who took up the sword to annihilate Islam and murdered hundreds of Muslims. But his name Ahmad reflected his jamal (beauty) which meant that the Holy Prophet would spread peace and harmony in the world. So Almighty God made a division of these two names in this manner that in the Makkah period of his life there was a manifestation of his name ‘Ahmad’ where it was taught that Muslims should go on advancing the cause of Islam while suffering all kinds of persecutions, and in his life at Madinah the name Muhammad was manifested when overthrow of the opponents was considered necessary by Divine wisdom and by requirements
of justice. But it was prophesied that in latter ages there would be a manifestation of the name ‘Aḥmad’ again..........Thus, on account of this, it is fit that this section should be called the Aḥmadiyyah section.”

It is quite evident from this that the name ‘Aḥmadiyyah’ was given to this Movement, not because ‘Aḥmad’ was a part of the Founder’s name, but because ‘Aḥmad’ was one of the two names of the Prophet Muḥammad. By referring to the significance of the name ‘Aḥmad’, he showed that the domination of Islam would be effected in this age only by the beauty and attraction of its teachings and the sword would not be needed for its defence as it was not needed in the Makkah period of the Holy Prophet’s life. There was also a reference in this name to the fact that Islam, after gaining glory and temporal power, would once again become feeble and helpless in many respects. The association of the name of the Movement with the name of the Holy Prophet shows that he did not consider it necessary to bring forward his own personality.

The preaching of Islam to the West

In the year 1901 C.E. he laid the foundation of carrying the message of Islam to the West by starting a monthly magazine in English. This was really the beginning of the spread of Islam in Europe. I quote his own words:

“It was always a matter of great anxiety to me and I felt distressed that the great truths and deep knowledge (of the Qur’ān) and strong arguments in support of Islam and matters which brought solace to the mind of man, which have been made manifest to me, had not yet been made known to the educated people of this country or the seekers after truth in Europe. My anxiety in this matter was so great that I could bear it no longer. But as it is the will of God Almighty that before I leave this mortal abode the objects which I have set before myself should all be accomplished so that there may be no regret in my heart when I depart from this world, a way has been suggested to fulfil this real object of my life. Some friends have, after holding a consultation with sincerity of purpose, directed my attention to the bringing out of a monthly journal in the English language for the fulfilment of the object I have stated above...........

36. Manifesto, 4th November, 1900.
And we have decided that this journal should be edited by the Maulānī Muḥammad ‘Alī (M.A.), pleader and Khwājah Kamāl al-Dīn, pleader.”

This journal bearing the name of the Review of Religions was started in the beginning of 1901 C.E. under the editorship of the writer of these lines. It gained popularity very soon and remained for a long time the only journal in English relating to Islamic matters. As is apparent from its very name, comments were also made in this journal about other religions. This magazine was, however, a source of enlightenment to Muslims and non-Muslims alike. A very hostile critic of Islam writes:

“This paper was well-named, for it has given its attention to a remarkably wide range of religions and to a great variety of subjects. Orthodox Hinduism, the Arya Samāj, the Brahma Samāj and Theosophy; Sikhism, Buddhism, Jainism and Zoroastrianism; Bahaism, Christian Science and Christianity have all received attention; as well as Islam in all its ramifications, both ancient and modern, such as the Shi‘īte, Ahl Ḥadīth, Khārijītes, Sufis and such representative exponents of modern tendencies as Sir Syed Aḥmad Kāhān and Syed Amīr ‘Alī.”

The articles which were published in the Review of Religions had drawn the attention of eminent men in Europe, like Count Tolstoy and others. The English and American Press also commented on its articles. To mention only a few of them: the Glasgow Herald, Church Family News Paper, (New York), Commercial Advertiser, Union Sequel, (Chicago), Literary Digest, (New York) Bralington Free Press, Sunday Circle, (London).

**Propagation of Islam among Hindus**

In November, 1904 C.E. the Founder made an announcement at Siālkot (the Panjāb) that as he was Mahdī for Muslims, and Messiah for Christians, he was also raised for Hindūs as a manifestation of Krishnā. In his own words:

“Rāja Krishnā as revealed to me was so great and perfect a man that his equal is not to be found among the Hindū Rishīs and Avatārs. He was an Avatār i.e., prophet of his time and he received the Holy

---

spirit from God........He was a true prophet of his time but many errors were introduced into his teachings afterwards. His heart overflowed with the love of God and he loved virtue and hated evil. Almighty God had promised to raise a spiritual manifestation of his in the latter ages, and He has now fulfilled this promise through me.”9

The main object of this announcement was stated by him in the beginning of this lecture:

“It should also be made clear that Almighty God has raised me not only for Muslims but also for the reformation of Hindūs and Christians.”

Obviously, self-aggrandizement was not the object when he declared to the world that the time had come when all the communities of the world should unite. The argument for this unity he advanced was that all prophecies relating to the advent of a reformer of latter days had been fulfilled in a single person, a humble servant of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad. And this proved that Islam was the only religion where all the nations could unite. If the Promised reformer of Muslims, Christians and Hindūs is only one person, this will remove many of their differences, and lead them towards oneness and harmony which is the greatest object of religion.

Death of the Founder

In December 1905 C.E. the Founder was informed by Almighty God that his end was nigh. Therefore he published a small pamphlet entitled Al-Waṣīyyah (i.e., The Will) and in accordance with that he formed an Anjuman (Society) which was named later on Sadr Anjuman Aḥmadiyyah (the central Society of the Aḥmādīs). This Anjuman was entrusted with full powers to deal with matters relating to the movement and was further declared as his own successor when he died.

Though he knew that his end was quite near he carried on his work of expounding Islamic truths with the zeal of a young man. During the last two years he wrote voluminous books such as Haqīqat al-Wahy, Barāhīn Aḥmadiyyah (Vol. V), Chāṣmān Maʿrifat, etc.

For change of climate at the end of April 1908 C.E. he went to Lahore. Here he was busy in writing his last book *Paighām Sulh* (*The Message of Peace*) which aimed at bringing about friendly relations among Hindus and Muslims when suddenly he fell ill with an attack of diarrhoea, a chronic disease to which he was liable since his youth. He breathed his last on his bed at 10 a.m. on 26th May 1908 C.E. The last words on his lips were "O my beloved God, O......my beloved... God!" The Civil Surgeon of Lahore certified that death was not due to an infectious disease, and it was on the production of this certificate that the authorities permitted the carrying of his body to Qādiān the next day where it was laid to eternal rest.

"Thus ended an eventful life which in the short space of eighteen years—1890 to 1908 C.E.—not only had revolutionized many of the existing religious ideas but had even taken definite steps in an entirely new direction—the presenting of Islam to, and spiritual conquest of, the West. Deep religious mysteries which had baffled human minds for centuries had been unravelled. The second advent of Christ, the tribulation of the Antichrist, the prevalence of Gog and Magog, the coming of the Mahdī and similar other topics were mysteries which affected the two great religions of the world, Christianity and Islam, both contending for the mastery of the world, and an inspired man was indeed needed to lift the veil from the face of these mysteries. Such a man was Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad. He was gifted not only with inspiration to elucidate the deepest mysteries, but also with the faith and energy which enabled him to give a new direction to the dissemination of Islam which had hitherto found the West deaf to its message. Christianity was out to conquer the Muslim world; in temporal matters it had ousted Islam, but, in the spiritual domain, Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad made a bold start and gave a challenge to Christianity in its very home. It is as a result of that challenge that mosques are being built in the greatest centres of Christianity, that a vital change is being brought about in the attitude of Europe towards Islam, and that thousands of cultured and advanced Europeans are finding a haven of peace under its banner."40

Two branches of the Movement

After the death of the Founder all the work of the Movement according to his Will (al-Wasiyyah) remained in the hands of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah and the leadership of the Movement fell to the lot of the Late Maulavi Nur al-Din. This condition existed till his death which occurred in March 1914 C.E. During this period the Movement made rapid progress. Of much more importance besides its progress was that it became increasingly popular among the general body of Muslims. Apparently there were no signs of a split in the Movement. However, on two matters opinions became gradually divergent but did not gain much strength because of the powerful personality of the Late Maulavi Nur al-Din. One of these centred round the relation of the Khalifah (successor) with the Anjuman and the other the takfir of Muslims i.e., denunciation of Muslims as unbelievers.

As the first point was related to the internal management of the Movement, therefore, it did not assume much importance, neither at that time nor afterwards, though it was one of the controversial points at the time of the Split. Nevertheless the second point, which was not only connected with the teachings of the Movement but also with the fundamental principle of Islam, was the final cause of the Split after the death of the Maulawi Nur al-Din. One section kept on adhering to the belief that all those who did not believe in the Founder, whether they had heard his name or not, or if they had heard his name and looked upon him as a Muslim or even accepted him as the mujaddid or the Promised Messiah in their hearts, were to be adjudged among the kafirs and outside the pale of Islam unless they had formally entered into the bai'at of the Founder. The other section believed

41. "All those so-called Muslims who had not entered into his Bai'at formally, wherever they might be living, were Kafirs and outside the pale of Islam, even though they may not have heard the name of the Promised Messiah."—Mirza Baghur al-Din Mahmud Ahmad: The Truth about the Split (Qadian 1924 C.E.) p. 24.

"Not only have those people been deemed to be Kafirs, who openly give the name of Kafir to the Promised Messiah, as well as those who, although they do not give him that name, still decline to accept his claim, but even people who, in their hearts, believe in the truth of the Promised Messiah and do not even deny him with their tongues, but, nevertheless, put off entering into his Bai'at, have been adjudged to be among the Kafirs." (Ibid. p 140-1). A detailed discussion on this subject will be found in the Maulana Muhammad Ali's Radd Takfir Ahi Qiblah published by the Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Ijha'at Islam, Lahore. This book has also been translated into English. See also Annex C entitled 'Today and Yesterday of the Qadiani Doctrine of kufr (unbelief) and Islam' T.
that every professor in the *Kalimah* (*There is but one God, Muḥammad is His Messenger*) was a Muslim though he might belong to any sect of Islam, and nobody went outside the pale of Islam unless he denied himself the messengership of Muḥammad, peace and the blessings of God be upon him. The question of the prophethood of the Founder which is at present conside.red to be the main controversial point between the two sections, has, in fact, arisen out of the question of *takfīr*. This doctrine of kāfīrization of Muslims could not be held valid unless Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad was raised to the status of prophethood. The split was, however, caused in the Movement chiefly on this ground in March 1914 C.E. The first section, which denounced Muslims as kāfīrs and believed that the door of prophethood was open after the Prophet Muhammad, kept their headquarters at Qādiān and the other section established theirs at Lahore. The leadership of the Qādiān group of Ahmādis is in the hands of Mirzā Bashīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad and that of the Lahore group in the hands of the author of this book. Now both these groups are working separately. Although the Qādiān group is greater in number than the Lahore group, the latter exercises more influence among the general Muslims than the number of their adherents would suggest as has been admitted by the Reverend Kraemer in one of his articles, a part of which is quoted below:

"The Lahore group who have seceded from the original community on the ground that they venerate their founder as a *Mujaddid* (renewer of religion) and not as a prophet, are therefore more acceptable to public opinion in Islam. They have the same spirit of opposition against Christianity as the Qādiānīs, but their activity is more exclusively concentrated on the proclamation of Islam as the only religion that is in conformity with reason and nature. The crisis of Christian Europe gives them much material to expose this religion and extol Islam . . . . . . . In their bitter aggressiveness they mete out the same treatment to Christianity that has often been meted out by Christianity to Islam . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Their influence is far wider than the number of their adherents would suggest. Their

---

42. After the partition of the British India in 1947 C. E. it has been shifted to Rabwah, West Pakistan. The present head, since November 1965, is Mirzā Nāsir Aḥmad, the eldest son of Mirzā Bashīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad. T.

42a. The present head since, October 1951 is the Maulāna Saḍr al-Dīn. T.
vindication and defence of Islam is accepted by many educated Muslims as the form in which they can remain intellectually loyal to Islam."\textsuperscript{43}

ANNEXE-I

A. The Anjuman was fully empowered to carry on the work of the Founder

On 24th December 1905 the Founder published his last will, al-Waṣiyyah, in which he wrote:

"As Almighty God has informed me, in various revelations following one another, that the time of my death is near and the revelations in that respect have been so consecutive that they have shaken my being to its foundations and made this life quite indifferent to me, I have, therefore, thought it proper that I should write down for my friends, and for such other persons as can benefit from my teachings, some words of advice."

Below are given some of these revelations:

"The destined time of thy death has drawn nigh, and We shall not leave behind thee any mention which should be a source of disgrace to thee. Very little has remained of the time appointed for thee by the Lord.....And We will either let thee see a part of what We threaten them with or We will cause thee to die.........Very few days have remained, sorrow will overtake all on that day."

A few words of comfort are added for his disciples, and they are told that the Movement will prosper after his death:

"Bear in mind then, my friends, that it being an established Divine law that He shows two manifestations of His power so that He may thus bring to naught two false pleasures of the opponents, it is not possible that He should neglect his old law now. Be not, therefore, grieved at what I have said and let not your heart feel sorrow, for it is necessary for you to see a second manifestation of Divine power, and it is better for you, for it is perpetual and will not be intercepted to the day of judgment."

The arrangements for the carrying on of the Movement are then suggested. The first point was initiation into the Movement. While

"The Decision of the Anjuman in all Matters shall be Final."

(A facsimile reproduction of the writing of the Founder of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement in which he entrusts the Anjuman with the fullest power in all affairs relating the Movement. For the translation of this writing see p. 30. T.)
the Founder was alive, he personally initiated new members into the Movement. After his death, he had directed that members should be initiated by the righteous from among his followers. And he wrote: "Such men will be elected by the agreement of the faithful. Anyone, therefore, about whom forty of the faithful should agree that he is fit to accept bai'at from other people in my name shall be entitled to do so, and he ought to make himself a model for others." 45

The second point was the management of the affairs connected with the Movement, and for this an Anjuman was established with full powers to deal with all such topics. This Anjuman was formed under the name of Sadr Anjuman Aḥmadiyyah and the rules and regulations controlling it were given under Aḥmad's own signature. It began to function immediately after the publication of The Will, exercising full authority over all the affairs of the Movement including its finances. When a dispute arose, about twenty months after the Anjuman was formed, as to the extent of its powers, and the matter was referred to the Founder, he gave his decision in the following words:

"My opinion is that any matter about which the Anjuman comes to a decision that it should be thus, such decision having been taken by a majority of votes, the same should be considered to be the right decision, and the same should be the final decision. Nevertheless, I would add this much that in certain religious matters which are related to the object of my advent, I should be informed. I am fully confident that his Anjuman will not do anything against my wishes. This is written only by way of precaution, for it may be that the matter is one which is ordained by God in a special manner. This rule is to be observed only during my life-time; after that, the decision of this Anjuman in all matters shall be final." 46

45. Al-Wasiyyah, Aḥmadiyyah Anjuman Ijāḥat-Islām, Lahore, footnote p. 14

46. Ruling given in writing on 27th October, 1907 by the Founder (see photostat copy on page 29).

It was, however, not only an isolated writing which dealt with a particular affair, the other statements in Al-Wasiyyah, given below, also show that in financial, legislative and religious matters concerning the Movement the Anjuman was considered to be the supreme head by the Founder himself:

"9. The Anjuman which will hold such funds shall not be entitled to spend them except for purposes of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement and in this respect top priority should be given to the propagation of Islam. It
should also be permissible for the Anjuman, with the unanimity of opinion, to augment the funds by means of commercial enterprise.

"10. All members of the Anjuman shall be those who are members of the Ahmadiyyah Movement, righteous and honest and, in future, if it is felt about anyone that he is not righteous or honest, or that he is cunning and has a taint of the love of this world, it would be the duty of the Anjuman to throw him out forthwith, and appoint someone else in his place."

"11. Since the Anjuman is the successor of the Divinely appointed Khalifah it should therefore, remain absolutely free of all worldly taint and all its affairs should be clean and based on justice.

"14. To strengthen and support this Anjuman it would be permissible to have branches of this Anjuman in far off lands working under it."

"15. Where a person possesses no movable or immovable property, but it can be shown that he is a righteous person, God-fearing and sincere believer, without taint of hypocrisy, love of the world, or fault in his observance (of the Shari'ah), with my permission, or with unanimity of opinion in the Anjuman, after me, he can be given burial in this Cemetery".

"I do not wish to obtain any good from you and become their possessor. On the other hand you will give your money to the Anjuman for the propagation of Islam". (vide Supplement Al-Wasiyyah).

In Rule No. 18 above the words with my permission, or with unanimity of opinion in the Anjuman, after me should be particularly noted. This shows that after the death of the Founder the Anjuman was au horised to deal with such matters. The situation remained the same during the time of the Maulana Nur al-Din. But when Mirza Bashir al-Din Mahmud Ahmad came to power this rule was altered and the words added were:

"In every affair of the General Council and the committees under it, if there are any, and of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah and all its branches the order of Hadrat Mirza Bashir al-Din Mahmud Ahmad, the Khalifah al-Mashit II, will be absolute and decisive."

(see inside cover Mansab-i-Khilafat, 1915 C.E. published Qadiyan).

What a contrast it had with the attitude of the Maulana Nur al-Din who recognized the authority of the Anjuman to such an extent that Mirza Bashir al-Din Mahmud Ahmad felt so much consternated, seeing the shadows of the coming events, that he could not control himself anymore and wrote a long letter to the Maulana Nur al-Din in which he suggested:

"As to your saying that I should publish a poster in which it should be written that in future I (i.e. Nur al-Din T.) would not interfere at all in their (i.e. Anjuman's T.) worldly affairs. About this I may say, Sir, that at this stage whatever service is being rendered by us is apparently in the form of (running) the school, propagation and meetings. If these were handed over to them, it would mean in other words—though not in words but in actuality—that the Khilafat has been handed over to them. And in this way they would become more independent..."

"My object in writing these lines is that this trouble is not of recent origin but it started from the time of the Founder. He used to keep the finances of the Guest House in his hand. You have handed over all this to them as well. Now it has occurred to them—Let us grab the rest also!"

(The text of a letter quoted by the Maulana Muhammad Ali in Haqiqat-i-Ikhla'af (Truth about the Dissensions.) The English translation of the book is also available from the Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Ishaa'at Islam, Lahore).

The italics in the above passages are mine. This was the Maulana Nur al-Din who did not go against Al-Wasiyyah, the will of the Founder and in return he
The Anjuman was thus entrusted by the Founder with the fullest powers in all affairs relating to the Movement, and in his own words "the Anjuman was the successor of the Divinely appointed Khalifah." 47

B. Contribution to the Islamic Thought 48

The contribution made by the Ahmadiyyah Movement Lahore to the Islamic thought is as important as its contribution to constructive work; in fact, that work has sprung from these ideas. It will be seen that all those matters in which the Ahmadiyyah Movement has given a new direction to Muslim thought are closely connected with Islam's advance in the world. They have nothing in common with the sectarian differences of the Muslims: they are vital to the existence and advancement of Islam, as they are meant to wipe off certain blemishes which had been ascribed to Islam, and they reveal that beauty of the Muslim religion which made it so attractive at first and which alone can make it attractive again. It should be further remembered that religion was made perfect in Islam and the Holy Prophet Muhammad is the last Prophet. Therefore any contribution to Islamic thought can only be a revival of the great truths taught by Islam, an interpretation of the Holy Qur'an or what the Holy

enjoyed the confidence of his colleagues. To the authority of such a person the Maula Muhammad 'Ali, Khwaja Kanal al-Din and others submitted. Efforts were made to create misunderstanding between the Maulana Nur al-Din and members of the Lahore Movement as is evident from the above letter. Before his death the Maulana Nur al-Din, however, came to know that he was entirely misled about Muhammad 'Ali. The English translation was completed by then and he asked Muhammad 'Ali to start with the Urdu commentary. His diaries published during that time in the Paigham Sulh show that perfect cordial relations were established between them again. (Haqiqat-i-Ikhlas p. 69). About Khwaja Kanal al-Din he said:

"You are indulging in mistrust. Khwaja Kanal al-Din works only for God the Most High and does not act hypocritically. This is what I believe about him. He is not innocent I admit. I am happy with his works and his works are blessed. Those who spread misunderstandings about him are hypocrites" (Friday sermon printed in Al-Fadl, Qadai, dated 22nd October, 1913 as quoted in Haqiqat-i-Ikhlas p. 21.)

They had accepted the Maulana Nur al-Din as their guide and leader after the death of the Founder but how could they accept Mirza Bashir al-Din Mahmud Ahmad as their leader with whom they differed on a point of principle (viz., his declaring other Muslims as Kafirs) and also disagreed with his attitude towards the Anjuman. Their stand was correct as became evident from the subsequent events which followed the split. T.

47. Al-Wasiyyah, Appendix, Rule No. 13.
CONTRIBUTION TO THE ISLAMIC THOUGHT

Prophet said. It is as such that the Ahmadiyyah Movement has given prominence to many important religious truths. I refer here to a few of them.

1. In the first place, the Ahmadiyyah Movement clarifies the relation of Islam towards other religions. It emphasises the original broad and liberal outlook of Islam which in the course of time has entirely been lost sight of. Through misunderstanding and misrepresentations Islam has come to be looked upon as if it did not tolerate other religions, while as a matter of fact it is extremely liberal in its outlook towards them. It has laid down as one of its basic principles that prophets appeared among every nation of the world: "And there is not a people but a warner has gone among them."49

It goes a step further and lays down that a true Muslim must believe in all these prophets: "(Muslims) believe in that which has been revealed to thee and that which was revealed before thee."50 This truth is reiterated on numerous occasions and belief in every prophet of the world is made essential. It also enjoins the Muslims to be guardians of the holy places of other religions: "And if Allah did not repel some people by others, cloisters, and churches, and synagogues, and mosques in which Allah's name is much remembered, would have been pulled down."51

The protection of monks' cloisters and churches and synagogues along with that of mosques was therefore one of the avowed objects of Islamic wars. Such a broad outlook of religion is not met with elsewhere. The Ahmadiyyah Movement has done immense service to the cause of Islam and to the cause of religion in general by stressing this point.

2. As a corollary to the great truth stated above, the Ahmadiyyah Movement has fought against the false notions of Jihad attributed to Islam. It is generally thought that Islam inculcates the use of sword for converting people to Islam. That is sheer misrepresentation. The basic principle of Islam is that "There is no compulsion in religion."52

49. The Qur'an, 35:24.
50. Ibid., 2:3.
51. Ibid., 22:40.
52. The Qur'an, 2:256.
And war was expressly allowed only in self-defence: "Fight in the way of Allāh against those who fight against you, but be not aggressive. Surely Allāh loves not the aggressors." Islam attained to supremacy by the irresistible spiritual force which it possessed. The Aḥmadiyyah Movement comes as the harbinger of the good news that the spiritual force of Islam which brought about its predominance in the world at its rise is inexhaustible and that even to-day it can effect by spiritual force what it effected at first. And it is itself a witness of that spiritual force, for wherever it has raised aloft the banner of Islam, people have bowed before it.

3. The Aḥmadiyyah Movement has also set in order the house of Islam. Islam at its origin meant allegiance to the word of God first of all, but at the present day, the Holy Book is relegated to the background, and the Muslims seek for guidance first of all from books of law which were compiled more than one hundred years after the Holy Prophet. These books have their own value but things have been set topsyturvy in the house of Islam by placing such books above the Holy Qur'ān in seeking religious guidance. The Holy Qur'ān was revealed to answer the needs of men of all ages and the door to understanding its import and to deduce laws from it to answer new needs was never shut upon men. But to-day Muslims speak of Islam not in terms of the Holy Qur'ān but in terms of Ḥanafī, Shāfi‘ī, Mālikī and Hambali laws. That is practically transferring allegiance from the Word of God to man-made laws or to seat men on the throne of Divinity. In another quarter Ḥadīth or sayings of the Holy Prophet are given authority above the Holy Qur'ān, whereas it is a well-known fact that the Holy Qur'ān has been handed to us intact but not so the Ḥadīth. The true order of things was the Qur'ān first, the Ḥadīth after that and then Fiqh. "Back to the Qur'ān" is the clarion call of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement; back to the pure Islam of the Holy Prophet and his companions; back to the free use of reason and to free interpretation of the Holy Book in the light of new conditions which have been brought about in the world; back to the freedom which our learned and great forefathers enjoyed. In going back to these things lies the real advancement of Islam; these are not so many steps back-

53. Ibid., 2.290.
ward but steps forward, for they take the Muslims back from darkness and mental slavery into which they have fallen, to the light and freedom which is their birthright as Muslims.

4. While thus bringing the Holy Qur’ān into the forefront in the Muslims’ life, the Aḥmadiyyah Movement has further done away with all ideas derogatory to the dignity of the Holy Qur’ān. Thus it has exposed the error of the doctrine of naskh. On the basis of certain traditions none of which can be traced to the Holy Prophet, and which in fact contradict each other, it was thought that there are certain verses in the Holy Qur’ān which cannot be reconciled with others and which therefore have been abrogated by those others, and that there are certain verses which must be accepted as part of the Holy Qur’ān though they are not met with therein. The allegation that certain verses can not be reconciled with others amounts virtually to the admission that there are discrepancies in the Holy Book, an idea denounced by the Holy Qur’ān in plain words: “Will they not then meditate on the Qur’ān? And if it were from any other than Allah, they would have found in it many a discrepancy.”54 Rejecting the doctrine of abrogation, the Aḥmadiyyah Movement stands for a complete Qur’ān, in which nothing is abrogated and from which nothing has been left out.

5. Yet another very important contribution made to Islamic thought by the Aḥmadiyyah Movement is the solidarity of Islam. The liberal attitude of Islam is manifested not only in its relations to the non-Muslim religions, but also in the internal relations of Muslim sects towards each other. “The differences of my ummah are a mercy,” was declared by the Holy Prophet, but the Mullāh has made them a curse by calling the Muslims kafirs. The Aḥmadiyyah Movement lays stress on the fact which has entirely been neglected that in Islam there are no sects worth the name; there are only different schools of thought agreeing in the fundamentals and differing in minor points. Islam stands really for a compact nation spread all over the world. Whether a man calls himself a Sunnī or a Shī‘a, an Ahl Ḥadīth or an Aḥmādī, all are agreed on One God regarding Whose attributes they have no differences, on one Prophet whom they all consider to be the Last Prophet, on one Book which they

54. The Qur’ān, 4 : 82.
believe to be the final revelation. And, further, there is unity among them even on the practical side of religion. All Muslims acknowledge the same five services of prayer at exactly the same times and perform in the same manner; they have the same month of fasting, the same zakāt and the same pilgrimage. The world cannot show another example of a nation spread so wide, with its component parts separated from each other for over thirteen centuries when there were no means of easy communication, and yet agreeing in so many principles in theory as well as in practice. The narrow-minded Mullāh is however blind to this unexampled agreement of the Muslim world and the minor points of differences loom large in his jaundiced eye. The result is that with such a wonderful agreement on so many points of vital importance, the Muslim world is shattered into pieces, and almost every person, every sect, every school of thought is denounced kafir by another.

The Aḥmadiyyah Movement has done immense service to the cause of Islam by denouncing this tendency. It calls attention to the Divine ordinance laid down in the Holy Qur'ān: “And say not to anyone who offers you (Islamic) salutation: Thou art not a believer,”55 and to the injunction of the Holy Prophet: “Whoever says prayer as we say it, and faces our Qiblah... he is a Muslim for whom is the covenant of Allah, so do not violate the Divine covenant.”56 It lays stress on the principle which forms the basis of Islam that everyone is a Muslim who declares his faith in the Kalimalh, Lā ilāhā illallāh Mūḥammadur rasūllullāh, and who owes allegiance to the Holy Qur'ān to whatever sect or school of thought he may belong. It is the acceptance of this principle only which can again restore the wonderful solidarity of Islam.

6. The Aḥmadiyyah Movement of Lahore has again done valuable service to the cause of Islam by its interpretation of the doctrine of the finality of prophethood. There is, no doubt, an agreement that prophethood came to a close with the advent of the Prophet Muḥammad, as expressly laid down in the Holy Qur'ān, but at the same time it is also a unanimous Muslim belief based on a reliable Hādīth narrated by Bukhārī and Muslim that Jesus Christ, an Israelite

55. The Qur'ān, 4:94.
56. Al-Saḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, Ch. al-Saḥāt, H. No. 284.
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prophet, would come after him. Apparently these are two contradictory statements, as the Final Prophet must be the one who comes after all, and if Jesus Christ comes after the Holy Prophet it is he who must be looked upon as the Last Prophet. The Ahmadiyyah Movement reconciles these two statements by interpreting the prophecy of the advent of Jesus Christ in a metaphorical sense, in exactly the sense in which the prophecy of the second advent of Elias was interpreted by Jesus Christ himself. There is a prophecy in the Old Testament that Elias, who was believed by the Jews to have been taken alive to heaven, would appear before the advent of Jesus Christ, but when the latter on his claim to Messiahship was confronted with the question that Elias had not made his appearance as prophesied, his reply was that John the Baptist was the Elias, that was to come because he had come in spirit and power of Elias. 57 Thus the Muslim belief relating to the second advent of Jesus Christ has an exact parallel in the Jewish belief relating to the second advent of Elias. Both are supposed to have been taken alive to heaven, and there is a prophecy for the second advent of both. It Jesus Christ was the true Messiah, as evidently every Muslim believes, then it is a proved fact that the prophecy relating to his second advent means the coming of a person in his spirit and power. This is the interpretation of the prophecy relating to the second advent of Jesus as offered by the Ahmadiyyah Movement.

The doctrine of the finality of prophethood, according to which no prophet can come after the Holy Prophet Muḥammad, is a conclusive proof of the truth of this interpretation, but it is further supported by the very hadith which speaks of the advent of the Messiah. For the hadith related by Bukhārī and Muslim, about the prophecy of the Messiah's appearance among the Muslims is followed by the words wa imamukum minkum 58 or wa imamukum, i.e. he is your Imam from among yourselves. In other words, the Promised Messiah is an individual belonging to the Muslim community and not an Israelite. This conclusion is further corroborated by the hadith related by Bukhārī speaking of two different Messiahs, the Israelite Messiah.

58. Sahih-al-Bukhārī, Ch. “Descent of Jesus.”
59. Bukhārī, op. cit.
as āḥmar (of white complexion) and jaʿd (having curly hair), and the Messiah to come as adam (white tinged with blackness) and sabit (having lank hair). The death of Jesus Christ plainly spoken of in the Holy Qurʿān also shows the Ahmadiyyah interpretation of the prophecy to be the right one.

The only other alternative is to reject all hadith speaking of the advent of the Messiah as maudūʿ or fabricated, but no Muslim having any regard for Ḥadīth would dare to make such an assertion. Maulana Abul Kalam Āzād made certain statements about two years ago which created the impression that he rejected these hadith, but when certain Ahl Ḥadīth put to him a direct question relating to the truth of the hadith speaking of the coming of the Messiah, he made it clear that he believed these hadith to be authentic. And in fact to reject such a large number of hadith which speak of the Messiah and which have been accepted as genuine by the two most reliable collections of Ḥadīth, Bukhari and Muslim, would be too bold a step on the part of a Muslim. The highest Muslim authorities have not dared to reject a hadith so long as it can be reconciled with the Holy Qurʿān or the principles of Islam, and that is the course which the Ahmadiyyah Movement follows in the matter of those hadith which speak of the advent of the Messiah. A Messiah is not needed when we have a perfect guidance for us in the Holy Qurʿān, is the irresponsible remark made sometimes by Muslims holding liberal views, but when the Holy Prophet says that a Messiah is needed and must come, it does not befit a Muslim to reject the Prophet’s words lightly. The prejudice against the Messiah is due, in fact, to the superficial view of things which characterises the Muslim masses to-day. A little reflection would show that a second Messiah was needed not only to carry the message of Islam to the followers of first Messiah, but also to reveal the spirit of Islam to the Muslims themselves who, as predicted by the Prophet, are following in the footsteps of the Jews. Just as Messiah was needed for the Jews when they wrangled about words not caring for the spirit of religion, a Messiah was needed for the Muslims when they adopted the same Jewish mentality. As the late Sayyid Mumtāz ‘Alī says in one of his articles published after his death:

“The Jews added the Talmūd, Midrash, etc., to the Torah, and God sent the Messiah for their correction. It was probably in obe-
dience to that Divine law that \textit{marhūm} and \textit{maghfrūr} (may God have mercy on him and grant him protection) Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad of Qādiān claimed the Messiahship in order to break off the Jewish mentality of the Muslims of this age” (\textit{Tahzīb-i Niswān}, 12 November, 1938).

7. Along with the light thrown on the doctrine of finality of prophethood and that of the advent of the Messiah, the Aḥmadiyyah Movement has cleared the eschatological atmosphere of Islam and changed what appeared to be a blot on the rational and simple religion of Islam into a beauty spot—a prophecy for the triumph of Islam. The advent of the Promised Messiah did not stand alone in eschatological prophecy; it was essentially combined with the idea of the appearance of Antichrist (\textit{Dajjāl}) and, of Gog and Magog (\textit{Yājūj and Mājūj}). The prevalent idea among the Muslims based on certain words of \textit{ḥadīth} was that the \textit{Dajjāl} was a one-eyed man who would make his appearance in the later days with treasures of the world at his command, that he would lay claim to Godhead carrying even paradise and hell with him and that he would traverse the whole earth in forty days, visiting every habitation of men inviting them to accept his divinity and enriching those who followed him, and that Gog and Magog would be an extraordinary creation of God who would spread over the whole earth. The truth about this prophecy flashed upon the mind of the Founder of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement at the very time that he was raised to the dignity of Messiahship. The \textit{Dajjāl} and Gog and Magog, he said, were no other than the Christian nations of the West. In their religious attitude, in contradicting the teachings of Christ and the teachings of all the prophets of God, they represented the Antichrist, while in their material power and materialistic tendencies they represented Gog and Magog. A close study of the Holy Qu’rān and \textit{Ḥadīth} shows that all the signs of the \textit{Dajjāl} and Gog and Magog were met with among these people.

This gave a definite direction to the work of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement, and it was, in one word, the spiritual conquest of the West. Thus the wonderful work of the Islamisation of the West, of which the foundations have been laid by the Aḥmadiyyah Movement, is essentially bound up in its belief relating to the advent of the
Messiah. That the Muslims in general have lost the zeal and energy of the earlier days of Islam for carrying forward the message of Islam is admitted on all hands. Islam’s triumph is, they seem to believe, to be brought by the Messiah and the Mahdi, and they have nothing to do but to wait and see. That the Messiah who was to come has already appeared is an idea which shifts the responsibility to the Muslim’s own shoulders; it brings back to him the zeal to carry forward the message of Islam. If the Messiah has come, the time has also arrived to destroy the Dajjal and conquer the West for Islam. This is the great mental revolution achieved among those who join the Ahmadiyyah Movement, a mere handful of men are carrying the message of Islam to the farthest ends of the world, while the millions of the orthodox are either idle or occupied with their internal dissensions.
CHAPTER II

THE CLAIMS OF THE FOUNDER OF THE AHMADIYYAH MOVEMENT

1. MUJADDID (RENOVATOR) OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY HURAH

The bi' that (appointment) of Mujaddids

God has brought prophethood to an end with the Holy Prophet Muḥammad, (may the peace and blessings of God be upon him). As this has been an undisputable fact among the Muslim ummah (nation), similarly, the raising of mujaddids (renovators) has been agreed upon by all. Accordingly, Abū Dāwūd, the most authentic book of ḥadīth, after al-Bukhārī and al-Muslim, from among the six authentic collections of reports (Ṣiḥṣa Sittah), mentions that:

اَنَّ اللَّهَ الَّذِي يَتَّبَعُ الْدُّنْيَا لِيُزَيَّنَهَا مَا زَيَّنَهَا سَيْتَبَعُ مَا ضَرَّتُهَا

"Most surely Allah will raise for this community at the head of every century one who shall revive for it its faith."⁶⁰ Such savants of Islam are known as mujaddids. Tajdid (renovation) signifies purging Islam of all alien conceptions that have entered into it with the passage of time and resenting the picture of Islam in its original splendour. As time affects everything it affects the religion of the people as well. But this does not mean that the religion itself keeps on changing. What actually happens is, that interested persons introduce such doctrines into it, by ignorance or mischief, which do not belong to the original faith. It is these extraneous matters which bring about a change in its form. The task of a mujaddid is to remove these errors and restore the religion to its pristine purity. This should, however, be borne in mind, that the expression yab'athu—God will raise or appoint—has occurred in the ḥadīth for the advent of a mujaddid, and the appointment of anybody from among human beings only signifies his appointment from God. The same term has also

---

been used in the Qur'ān for the appointment of prophets and messengers.\textsuperscript{61} This means that the appointment of a mujaddid indicates the raising of a particular person who has been gifted with Divine inspiration and communication for a particular purpose. The 'ulamā’ and imāms, no doubt, have always been present among Muslims and they, too, are servants of Islam, but a mujaddid is a servant of Islam who is communicated to by God and is Divinely appointed for a specific object for the eradication of such errors which have weakened and distorted the original form of Islam. A mujaddid, thus, comes for the renovation of true religion and such persons have been appearing at the head of each century.

Authenticity of the ḥadīth of mujaddid

Imām Jalāl al-Dīn Suyūtī (d. 911 A.H. or 1505 C.E.) writes in \textit{Mirqāt al-Sa'ūd}\textsuperscript{62} that all the preservers (ḥuffāz) of ḥadīth have agreed on the authenticity of the report about mujaddid, and the forerunners (mutaqaddimīn) like Ḥākim (d. 405 A.H. 1014 C.E.) and Baihaqi (d. 458 A.H. or 1065 C.E.) and their successors like Abū al-Faḍl of Irāq and Ibn Ḥajār all approve of its genuineness. Ibn ‘Asākir has also written, after accepting the truth of this report, that this proved the coming of mujaddidīs at the beginning of every century.\textsuperscript{63} Shāh Wāli Allāh of Delhi (1114-1176 C.E.) in his books \textit{Izālat al-khīfā} (p. 41) and \textit{Tafhimāt-i-Ilāhiyya} (p. 35) also admits the authenticity of this ḥadīth. The second argument for its correctness is that this ḥadīth is confirmed by other reports of the Prophet. In fact, its basis lies in the Qur'ān, which declares that, in spite of the termination of prophethood, God will continue to speak with the honoured and chosen people of this ummah, and for the eradication of some serious errors He would Himself guide the followers of Muḥammad. Thus

\textsuperscript{61} The Qur'ān, “So God raised (fa-ba’sthallāhu) prophets” 2 : 213 ; “and certainly We raised in every nation a messenger” 16 : 36. See also 3 : 163 ; 10 : 74, 75 ; 17 : 94 ; 25 : 41 ; 62 : 2 etc. T.

\textsuperscript{62} \textit{Mirqāt al-Sa'ūd} added to Abū Dawūd, vol. 2, p. 233. Printed by Nawal Kipnar, Lucknow, India. References about Ḥākim, Baihaqi etc. will also be found in this book. T.

\textsuperscript{63} Under the verse, “He makes the spirit (rūḥ, i.e. Divine revelation) to light by His command upon whom He pleases of His servants” (40 : 15) the author of \textit{Rūḥ al-Ma’ānī} (the commentary of the Qur'ān) writes:

“Continuation of revelation which is expressed by the word yulqāf (He makes to
God's communication with non-prophets and granting of revelation to them is the basis of this report, and God's speaking with non-prophets has been repeatedly mentioned in the Qur'an. For instance, this is acknowledged that Moses' mother was not a prophetess but still the Qur'an clearly says:

And We revealed to Moses' mother⁶⁴, and at another place, it has been stated:

When We revealed to thy mother which that was revealed.⁶⁵ In both these verses Moses' mother has been referred to as the recipient of Divine revelation and this revelation was positive to such an extent that she put her son Moses in the river. Similarly Jesus' mother was also spoken to by angels without her being a prophetess.⁶⁶ Again the disciples of Jesus were not prophets but they, too, are mentioned as having received God's revelation:

When I revealed to the disciples.⁶⁷ About the righteous servants (auliya) of this ummah it has also been mentioned in the Qur'an:

The angels descend upon them⁶⁸ and that:

For them is good news in this world's life.⁶⁹ These mubashshirat (good news) in authentic reports have been called a part of prophethood:

There has remained nothing of prophethood except mubashshirat (good news).⁷⁰ Moreover, in reports that have been unanimously agreed upon, it has been mentioned that as God spoke with the non-prophets from among other nations, so shall He communicate with the followers of the Prophet.⁷¹ Thus, if it is necessary for a mujaddid

⁶⁵. Ibid., 20:38.
⁶⁷. Ibid. 5:111. Detailed discussion on this subject will be found in Muhammad `Ali's The Finality of Prophethood (Ch. 2 and 3), published by the Shah Jehan Mosque, Woking, England, 1966. T.
⁶⁸. Ibid., 41:30.
⁶⁹. Ibid., 10:64.
⁷⁰. Al-Bukhari 92:5.
⁷¹. Ibid., 62:6.
to have Divine communication both the Qur’ān and the genuine reports confirm that this ummah will be favoured with such communications.

Claims of other mujaddids

The third strong argument in favour of the authenticity of this hadith is that many renowned Muslim saints have openly declared themselves, in accordance with this report, to be the mujaddids of their respective centuries. To quote one instance I refer to al-Shaikh Ahmad of Sirhind of India who is known with the title of Mujaddid Alf Thānī (i.e., mujaddid of the second thousand) and among the common people he is referred to as Mujaddid Šāhib. His claim can be found in the following words in his Maktūbāt (Letters):

“This knowledge has been derived from the illumination of the lamp of prophethood......and the possessor of this knowledge and wisdom is the mujaddid of this thousand years......and it must be remembered that a mujaddid has passed at the head of each century but the mujaddid of a thousand years is different from the mujaddid of the century.”

This statement is true as the popularity of Ḥadrat Shaikh Ahmad (in that part of the world) has exceeded all other previous mujaddids.

---

72. Al-Shaikh Ahmad of Sirhind, Maktūbāt, Vol. 2, Letter No. 4
73. THE NAMES OF OTHER MUJADDIDS:

First century  'Umar ibn ʿAbdul ʿAzīz.
Second century  ʿImam Shafiʿi, ʿImam Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal.
Third century  ʿAbū Sharh and ʿAbū al-Hassan Abīʿari.
Fourth century  ʿAbū ʿUbaidullah of Nəshāpur, and Qādi ʿAbū Bakr Bāqilānī.
Fifth century  Al-Ghazālī.
Sixth century  Al-Sayyid ʿAbdul Qādir Jilānī.
Seventh century  Imām ibn Taimiyyah and Khwājah Muʿīn al-Dīn Chishti.
Eighth century  Ibn Ḥajar ʿAsqalānī and Sāliḥ ibn ʿUmar.
Ninth century  Sayyid Muḥammad Jaunpuri.
Tenth century  Imām Suyūṭī.
Eleventh century  Al-Shaikh Ahmad of Sirhind Mujaddid Alf Thānī.
Twelfth century  Shāh Wali Allah Muḥaddas Dehlvi.
Thirteenth century  Sayyid Ahmad Barelvi.
The mujaddid of the fourteenth century of the Hijrah

Thus, when it has been established from the Qur'an, Hadith, sayings and claims of other mujaddids that the coming of a mujaddid


About the fourteenth century it has been said:

"And at the head of the fourteenth century to which there are still ten more years to go if the advent of Mahdī and the descent of Jesus takes place they would be the mujaddid and mujahid (religious directors)" (Ibid., p. 139)

THE CLAIMS OF SOME OF THE MUJADDIDS:

"Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz (first century 61-101 A.H. or 680-719 C.E.): "It is reported from Abū Naʿīm . . . that once 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz was going for his prayers and an old man was walking with him . . . I asked about this old man from 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz. He said it was Khidr, (peace be on him), who came to inform him about his becoming the leader of the ummah of Muhammad and to advise him to act with justice and equity" (Ṭuḏkh al-Khuṭafa by Suyūṭī.)

Al-Ghazālī (fifth century 450-505 A.H. or 1050-1111 C.E.): "On this matter (i.e., a abandoning of retirement from the world which Al-Ghazālī had persevered for about ten years T.), I consulted a number of men skilled in the science of the heart and with experience of contemplation. They unanimously advised me to abandon my retirement and leave the zādiyyah (hospice). My resolution was further strengthened by numerous visions of good men in all of which alike I was given the assurance that this impulse was a source of good, was genuine guidance, and had been determined by God most high for the beginning of this century; for God most high has promised to revive His religion at the beginning of each century. My hope became strong and all these considerations caused the favourable view of the project to prevail.

"God most high facilitated my move to Naysāpur to deal with this serious problem in Dhu'l-Qa'ida, the eleventh month of 499 (July, 1106 A.D.). I had originally left Baghdad in Dhu'l-Qa'ida, 488 (November, 1095), so that my period of retirement had extended to eleven years. It was God most high Who determined this move, and it is an example of the wonderful way in which He determined events, since there was not a whisper of it in my heart while I was living in retirement" (Al-Munqidh min al-Dalā'il as translated by W. Montgomery Watt, The Faith and Practice of Al-Ghazālī, pp. 74-75, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London 1953). (Italics are mine).

In the above two sentences we note that 'Umar ibn 'Abdul Aziz does not mention about the Ḥadīth whereas Imaṁ al-Ghazālī does. The former only refers to a visionary experience in which he is told of his leadership of the Muslim community. It is quite possible that a further study of his life may reveal some positive information about his claim as a mujaddid. It is reported from Imaṁ Aḥmad ibn Hanbal (2nd century hijrah) that after mentioning this Ḥadīth he said that 'Umar ibn 'Abdul 'Aziz was the mujaddid of the first century and Imaṁ Shafiʿi of the second century ('Awn al-Maʿbud : Sharḥ Abū Dunyād, vol. iv p. 148). In the case of Imaṁ al-Ghazālī, he not only refers to the Ḥadīth but also calls this move as determined by God at the same time supported by many visions of the people of the heart which shows that he is fully aware of his role as a mujaddid at the head of the century. So are the other claimants to this office as will be shown below:

Ibn Taimiyyah (seventh century 661-728 A.H. or 1262-1327 C.E.).

In one of his letters Ibn Taimiyyah writes:

"God fulfilled His promise and bestowed upon His servant victory. The
at the beginning of each century is essential, then exactly at the head of the fourteenth century Hijrah the claim of being a mujaddid by Mirza Ghulām Aḥmad of Qādiān was just in accordance with the spirit and traditions of Islam. It is, however, quite simple to understand why the coming of a mujaddid at the head of each century has been considered essential. Had no mujaddid appeared at the beginning of this century it would not only have invalidated the promise of the Ḥadīth, but also the principle of the Qur'ān and would have also created doubts about the claims of the Muslim saints and

Muslim forces achieved success and the enemy was defeated....Islam received new life and the information of the Holy Prophet, that at the head of every century a mujaddid appears, turned out to be true word for word" (as quoted in Imam Ibn Taimiyyah (Urdu) by Ghulām Jilānī Berq, published Lahore).

In another letter he says:

"At the head of each century the Prophet has foretold the coming of a mujaddid" (Ibid., p. 163).

Imām Jalāl al-Dīn Suyūṭī (Tenth century):

"I hope I am a mujaddid" (quoted by Nawāb Siddiq Ḥassan Khān from a Qasida (poem) by Suyūṭī in praise of mujaddids. (vide Ḥujaj al-Kīrah, p. 138, Shah Jehān Press, Bhopal).

Al-Shaikh Aḥmad of Sirhind Mujaddid Alī Thānī (eleventh century 971-1034 A.H. or 1563-1624 C.E.) (Quoted above see p. 44 footnote 73).

Shāh Wali Allāh Muḥaddith Dehlavī (twelfth century 1114-1176 A.H. or 1703-1763 C.E.)

"God honoured me with the robe of mujaddidiyyah" (Tafsīrat Ilahiyyah by Shāh Wali Allāh, vol. p. )

At another place in the same book he says:

"He that would be your enemy would neither partake of the blessings of the heaven nor that of the earth. The people of the East and West are all your subjects and you are their ruler, whether they know it or not. Those who know it will be successful and the ignorant will be in loss" (Ibid., vol. p. ).

About the advent of a muḥaddith he writes:

When he (i.e., muḥaddith T.) comes he is accompanied by revelation (waḥy) and the sciences (ʿulūm) of the messenger" (Ibid., p.136)

This shows that the descent of revelation (which is granted to saints—waḥy wilāyāt) is not forbidden to the followers of the Prophet

Sayyid Aḥmad Barelavī (thirteenth century 1201-1246 A.H. or 1776-1831 C.E.):

"I have been honoured with the rank of Imāmat; and I say this in the capacity of a mujaddid...." (as quoted in Swānī, Aḥmad (Urdu) i.e. Life of Sayyid Aḥmad Barelavī by Muhammad Jaʿfar Thānesarī, p. 245).

W. H. Hunter in his book Our Indian Mussalmans (Published London 1872 C.E.) also writes that Sayyid Aḥmad was a claimant to muḥaddadiyyah.

Some people think that a mujaddid does not or should not make a claim about his office and that it is after his death that people come to know about his rank as a mujaddid and that he is not the recipient of Divine revelation (see footnote 78, p. 50). This view is obviously wrong as has been shown. Many of the acknowledged mujaddids have made known about their claims to the world and were the recipients of Divine communications. Mujaddids, however, could also appear in the middle or any other part of the century. This in no way
imāms. Although more than one mujaddid, appeared sometimes in the past centuries, at the head of the fourteenth century none claimed to be a mujaddid except Mirza Ghulām Aḥmad of Qādīān. There is another strange coincidence. According to the hisāb-ahjad, numerical powers of the alphabet⁷⁴ his name Ghulām Aḥmad Qādīānī gives the number 1300. Leaving aside these points, which are self-evident, if we look into the matter more deeply, his position as a renovator becomes well established. He was gifted with Divine communication even fourteen or fifteen years before his claim and was also champion of the cause of Islam, a great defender of Islam against the onslaughts of other religions. He did not only deal in his writing with the old religions like Christianity and Hinduism but also made a thorough analysis of the new movements in India such as Brahmū Samāj and Ārya Samāj. The name of none else can be cited who stood so firm to defend and extend the cause of Islam at that critical moment. His appearance was like the rising of the sun for the help of Islam in that hour of darkness. And years before his actual claim, his piety, righteousness, devotion to God and his scholarship were admitted on all hands. At the time of his laying claim to mujaddidiyyah the book which was published by him drew the best praise from a person who turned out later to be the worst enemy of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement. It was written about it that the like of it has not appeared in Islam before.⁷⁵ Such a remark was made when the Founder’s claim of mujaddidiyyah had already been

⁷⁴ According to this arrangement letters have different powers from one to one thousand. Letters, when used as numbers, follow the order of the Hebrew alphabet, those peculiar to Arabic coming last. (For details see under ʿobjad Thomas Patrick Hughes: A Dictionary of Islam, W. H. Allen & Co. London 1895. T.)

⁷⁵ Ishāʿīt al-Sunnah, vol. 7, June - November, 1884 C. E. edited by the Maulāví Muḥammad Ḥusain of Batālā, a leader of the Ahl Ḥadīth.
known to the world. This is, in fact, a strong evidence for seekers of truth. Even before his claim he was doing so much for the cause of Islam that it could only be compared with one of the great mujaddids of the past. After proclaiming his mission his work gathered more strength than before. The seed which was sown by him has grown up into a huge tree the branches of which have now spread in the East and the West.

If Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad is not the mujaddid of the fourteenth century who else is the claimant to this office?

Every Muslim, every lover of the Qur'ān and Ḥadīth and every one who has any respect for the righteous servants (auliyyā) of this ummah must consider seriously that, if Mirza Ghulām Aḥmad is not the mujaddid who else is a claimant to this office in this age. The principle of the Qur'ān cannot go wrong, the Ḥadīth of mujaddid cannot be a mere fabrication and those who have already laid claim to be the mujaddids according to this report cannot be looked upon as mere impostors. If all this is true, then true also is the fact that a mujaddid must have been raised at the head of this century. And who is that person except Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad? History to which we are ourselves a witness does not mention the name of any other mujaddid. The name of this person or that is cited in haste at times by some persons but the point worth considering is whether such persons have declared their Divine appointment as mujaddids. Again, is there any person, other than Ḥaḍrat Aḥmad, who has at the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century hijrah done such yeoman's service to the cause of Islam? Service to Islam does not mean the publication of a few books and stirring up the Muslims for some mundane or political cause. The real point is, who was the person who staked his all for the glory of Islam in its grievous struggle against other religions? Who was the person who shielded Islam against the assaults of all other hostile forces? Who placed before the world the beautiful picture of Islam? Who stirred up the religious consciousness of the general body of Muslims and created such a strong movement among his followers that they became the torch-bearers of Islam to different nations of the world? And, above all, who gave the message of hope to the tottering world of today?
On the one hand, nobody has claimed to be the God-sent renovator (mujaddid) of this age, on the other no one else has done so much for the cause of Islam as compared with Ḥadrat Ahmad. Thus, he is alone in his claim as well as in his work. In these circumstances, anybody who rejects him, in fact, rejects the clear saying of the Prophet Muḥammad that: *most surely Allāh will raise for this ummah at the head of every century one who will bring about the revival of their religion.*

If Ḥadrat Mirzā Ghulām Ḵrām is the mujaddid, Muslims must cooperate with him.

If there is no way out except to regard Ḥadrat Mirzā Ghulām Ḵrām as the mujaddid of the fourteenth century, it is also incumbent on every Muslim to join hands with him in the struggle for Islam. To adopt an attitude of indifference or of opposition is, in fact, despising the Divine commandments and the Holy Prophet’s reports. This would mean that according to the will of God a person was raised for the defence and support of Islam, but we do not recognize this need. Apart from this there is a clear direction of God in the Qur’ān:

\[
\text{O ye who believe keep your duty to Allāh and be with the truthful.}^{76}
\]

Here special reference to the truthful is not to those who speak the truth, as every Muslim is expected to do so and in every country thousands of Muslims are found who refrain from telling lies, but the truthful (al-sādiqin) in this verse refers to those who are truthful in their actions; that is to say, they are such persons who stand firm for the cause of the Truth (i.e. Islam) and face all trials and tribulations for its sake. There are, of course, no better persons than mujaddids to whom these words can fully apply. Again the Prophet is reported to have said:

\[
\text{He who dies in a condition that he has not recognized the imām of his age dies a death of ignorance.}^{77}\]

Here the ignorance (al-jāhiliyyah)

76. The Qur’ān 9 : 119.
does not imply *kufr* (unbelief) which results from rejecting a prophet, but the deprivation and ignorance of the wisdom and learning which the *imām* imparts to the world. And a *mujaddid* is certainly the *imām* of his age. He comes with a special mission for the reformation and renovation of religion and, for this purpose, he is particularly enlightened by God, and favourable circumstances are created by God for the success of his work. Thus, indifference towards the *mujaddid* and non-cooperation with his mission is, in fact, doing damage to the cause of Islam; this is just putting obstacles in the fulfilment of Divine Will . . . 78

The *mujaddid*'s first task was to establish the truth of Divine communication

Evidently the removal of vice that have found place in the Muslim nation is the first task of a *mujaddid*. What were such evils

78. It would not be out of place here to quote what Sayyid Abū-l A‘lā Maududi, the founder-leader of the Islāmi Jamā‘at, Pakistan has written about the position and work of a *mujaddid*:

‘*Mujaddid is not a prophet* (nabi) but in his nature (mizāj) is very near to the nature of prophethood’ *(Taijīd wa Iḥyā‘i Din* (Urdī) p. 28, 4th edition, 1940).

Further he states:

‘But a fundamental fact which separates a *mujaddid* from a prophet is that a prophet is appointed to his office by the Command of legislation (āmr *tashrī‘i*) and he knows about his appointment (māmūriyyah). He receives revelation and start his mission by his claim to prophethood. He is supposed to invite people towards himself and the acceptance or rejection of his claim is, in fact, the basis of kufr (disbelief) and *imān* (belief). On the contrary a *mujaddid* does not possess any of these positions. If he is appointed it is by the Command of creation (āmr *taḥwīl*) and not by the Command of legislation. And most of the time he does not know that he is a *mujaddid* himself. People come to know about him as a *mujaddid* after his death by his works and accomplishments. It is not necessary that he should receive inspiration (*iḥlām*) and if he does receive it he need not be conscious of it. He does not start his work with any claim nor has he any right to do so because the question of having belief (*imān*) in him does not arise. However all the good and righteous people (ahl *salāḥ wa Khair*) gradually gather round him and only those people remain separate from him who have some crookedness in their nature. In any case acceptance of him is not a condition for becoming a Muslim. With all these distinctions a *mujaddid*, on the whole, does the same kind of work which is assigned to a prophet’ *(Ibid.*, p. 29)

After this the author discusses the work of some of the *mujaddids*, whom he calls ‘*partial mujaddids*’ (p. 35) viz., ‘Umar ibn ‘Abdul ‘Azīz, the four *Imāms*, and *Imām* al-Ghazālī, Ibn Taimiyyah, Al-Shaikh Aḥmad Sirhindī *Mujaddid Aḥf Thāni*, Shāh Wali Allah Muḥaddath Dehlavi, Sayyid Aḥmad Barelī and Shāh Ismā‘īl Shahid.

Some of the views expressed in the above statement are definitely wrong as has been discussed in footnote No. 73 p. 44 and the text of the translation. See also footnote 37. T.
in this age? Of course the greatest of them, which came in the trail of materialistic civilization and European education, was indifference towards religion and a complete denial of Divine revelation. The denial of God’s speaking with men had shaken the very foundation of religion. Communication of God with man is the real basis of religion which engenders perfect faith in the existence of God, and which creates in man Divine gnosis in its highest form and on which is based man’s relation with his Creator. But the modern education had such an influence on people’s mind that even Muslim leaders of repute began denying the phenomenon of Divine revelation. The first task of the mujaddid of this age, therefore, was to establish the authenticity of the prophetic order (silsilah nubuwwah) and to show that God has been in communication with His righteous servants throughout the ages. This could not, however, be substantiated unless special emphasis was laid upon the Divine attribute of communication with human beings, which, in fact, is just like his other attributes of hearing, seeing and knowing. That is why in his first book Barāḥin Aḥmadiyyah, which is the first and his largest work, Ḥaḍrat Aḥmad, Founder of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement, laid the greatest stress on this aspect of the question. He has proved his point, not only theoretically from the sources of Islamic shari‘ah but also by the evidence of his own personal experience and prophecies. Although the previous mujaddids had also claimed to have received the Divine communication, but the emphasis on this point in the works of Ḥaḍrat Aḥmad cannot be traced in their writings. The only reason for this was the great evil of the negation of Divine revelation in this age. The rejection was sometimes made in the form that Almighty God spoke with His righteous servants in the past, but has ceased to do so now, and sometimes in the form that revelation from God was simply a subjective experience a voice which only rose from man’s own heart. In both these cases the foundation of religion was shaken to the core. The cardinal point is that, if God used to speak before, why has He been deprived of this attribute now? If He spoke before He must speak now, and, if He does not do so, His speaking with the righteous servants before cannot be proved. If revelation is only an inner voice, then God’s existence, faith in Him and Divine gnosis are nothing but mere tales, and the whole prophetic
order reduces itself to naught. To prove the authenticity of the silsilah nubuwwah (prophetic order) and to institute real faith in God's existence it was, however, essential that proper emphasis should be laid on the truth of the phenomenon of Divine communication. To substantiate this point Ḥadrat Ahmad brought forward his own visions and inspirations (ṭḥāmāt), in which future events were foretold. It was this series of prophecies in support of silsilah nubuwwah, which was granted to the God-sent reformer of this age. It was for this reason alone that the word prophet was also used by him because the literal (lughwī) meaning of this word is one who informs of unseen matters or one who makes prophecies. The real object of the use of this word in its literal sense (and not in the terminology of šart'ah) was, to make people know that the faith in the Holy Prophet Muḥammad and other prophets could not be maintained unless the phenomenon of Divine communication was established. If such a communication is denied the whole silsilah nubuwwah becomes dubious. Besides that, real faith in God's existence also depends on this great fact of revelation. The influence of the materialistic civilization of the West had shaken this faith to its core. The first object before the mujaddid of this age, therefore, was to create a perfect faith in God, so that men must again develop real contact and communion with their Creator. A complete and perfect faith in God is the soul of religion. It was lost and could not be regained unless the phenomenon of Divine revelation was established as a living reality.

The mujaddid's second task was to uphold the Qur'ān over everything else

The second great mistake in which most of the Muslims were involved was about the right place of the Qur'ān in their life. It was by following the Qur'ān that they had once become a powerful nation in the world. The Qur'ān was the fountain head of the Islamic šart'ah. It was through the Qur'ān and the practice (sunnah) of the Prophet that Muslim leaders of ĵišhād (exercise of the judgement) derived the solution of their existing needs. But, unfortunately, the education of the Qur'ān among Muslims was gradually neglected, so much so that in Islamic schools and institutions all sorts of sciences were taught except that of the Qur'ān, which formed neither
a part of the education for the 'ulamāʾ nor for Muslims in general. The 'ulamāʾ read some of its commentaries for enlightenment on grammatical points and the Muslim masses recited it for future reward (thawāb). The disappearance of the knowledge of the Qurʾān from among the Muslims in this way made them lethargic in all spheres of life. The most important aspect of the life of the mujaddid of the fourteenth century was his profound knowledge and love of the Qurʾān. Whatever time he could spare from his worldly pursuits, which he undertook in fulfilment of his father's wishes in early life, he spent in reading the Qurʾān and reflecting over its message. Even when he was employed at Sialkot or engaged in his work of cultivation of the land at Qādiān, the Qurʾān always remained uppermost in his mind. What was, after all, the object of his book Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah? Its very name, "arguments in support of the Holy Qurʾān and the prophethood of Muḥammad" suggests the main object for which it was written. It was his practice to go through the whole of the Qurʾān before writing on any important subject. He held the Qurʾān over everything else and placed the three sources of Islamic shariʿah in the following order:

(1) The Qurʾān,
(2) Ḥadīth and
(3) Fiqh (jurisprudence).
II—THE PROMISED MESSIAH

Why the name the Promised Messiah was given to the mujaddid of the fourteenth century Hijrah

There are many who think that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad’s claim of being the Promised Messiah was a later growth upon his claim to mujaddidiyyat (renovation), because he claimed to be a mujaddid (renovator) in 1300 A.H. (1885 C.E.) and his claim to Messiahship was made in 1308 A.H. It has been concluded from this that he put forth new claims by stages. This is, of course, a great misunderstanding about him. These were, however, not two separate claims as will be seen from the statement about his claim to mujaddidiyyah. His claim to Messiahship was in fact another name for his original claim of being a mujaddid. And this was related to his activities with regard to the removal of external dangers against Islam which threatened its very existence. Thus in 1300 A.H. when he claimed to be a mujaddid, he wrote the following words:

“And the author has been given the knowledge, too, that he is the mujaddid of this age and that spiritually his excellences resemble those of Messiah, the son of Mary, and that the one of them bears a very strong resemblance and close affinity to the other.”

In fact the idea underlying this claim was that the mujaddid of the fourteenth century Hijrah enjoyed extreme spiritual resemblance to Jesus Christ. He further clarified this point in his book Ā’īnah Kamālāt Islām:

“This must be remembered, that the claim of being the Promised Messiah is not in any way greater than the claim of being a recipient of Divine communication (mulham min Allāh) or a mujaddid from God. It is evident that anybody who enjoys this status of Divine communication, all his names from Allāh, such as the like

79. Iṣṭihār published 1885 C. E.
of Messiah or the like of Moses, are justified for him. Whosoever attains to the excellence of Divine communication, and is appointed by God for any service in the cause of religion, God Almighty gives him any name in accordance with the need of the time. To give the name Promised Messiah to the mujaddid of this age seems to be based on this expediency, that his great task is to overthrow the supremacy of Christianity and counter their attacks, and to shatter with strong arguments their philosophy which is against the Holy Qur‘ān and to establish fully the evidence of Islam against them. The greatest trial in this age for Islam is the rational and religious vituperations of Christians against Islam which could not be swept away without Divine support and for this purpose it was essential that someone should be raised by God.\footnote{Ā‘īnah Kamālāt Islām (26th February, 1893 C.E.), p. 340.}

**Christianity musters all its resources against Islam**

Islam in this age, no doubt, has to contend with almost all the religions of the world and such a situation, more or less, has existed ever since the inception of Islam but never before has Christianity mustered all its resources to crush Islam out of existence. There had been wars on a large scale between Muslim and Christian powers, known as the Crusades, but the great conspiracy to root out Islam as a religion in this age,—the millions of pounds being spent for the purpose of free distribution of large quantities of literature against Islam and for sending armies of Christian missionaries to Muslim lands etc. —is something the like of which cannot be found in history before. Even the Christian missionaries have felt and openly declared that there are many non-Christian religions in the world but Islam is the only religion which is anti-Christian. A cursory glance over world events shows that in spite of Muslim weakness in all walks of life at present, a keen struggle is still going on between the Muslim and the Christian faith. Although it appears that Christianity has the upperhand in this struggle, as far
as the outward signs and resources are concerned, but a strange spectacle is also being noticed on the other side, that is, the principles of Islam as such are gaining ground in the world and the principles of Christianity are in fact loosening their hold on the minds of the people. This is, however, what we observe today, but the prophetic eye of the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement saw this phenomenon happening about sixty years back and therefore he devoted his special attention to the Christian world. In 1864 C.E., when he was employed at Siālkot, he constantly engaged himself in controversies with Christian missionaries and later on he also kept writing articles about their doctrines and dogmas. This is, however, strange, that at the time of declaring himself a mujaddid he clearly stated that he bore a very strong resemblance to Jesus Christ and in his practical life he also showed the great trend of protecting Islam against the onslaughts of Christian missionaries. And his passion for disseminating the light of Islam in Christendom grew stronger every day with the result that the movement he organized for the defence of Islam predominantly reflected in its activities this strong desire for presenting Islam to the West. In short, he had started his actual work even before he had declared himself to be the Promised Messiah.

The mention of the Messiah in the reports of the Prophet

What is meant by the Promised Messiah and what is its significance according to the Shari'ah is the question which we have to deal with first of all.

The coming of Jesus, son of Mary, has been mentioned in the reports (ahadith) of the Prophet. In al-Bukhari the hadith (report) about the descent of Jesus Christ has been narrated by Abū Huraira thrice, i.e., in (1) Kitāb al-buyū' 34, (2) Kitāb al-maẓā'ilim 46 and (3) Kitāb al-anbiyā' 60. In the reference quoted last the following hadith occurs in the chapter entitled "Descent of Jesus, son of Mary":

"I swear by Him Who holds my life in His hand that the son of Mary will descend among you as Arbiter and Judge and shall break the Cross and kill the swine and postpone the war. Wealth will be multiplied to the
extent that nobody will be there to accept it, that a prostration at that time will be better than this world and whatever is in it."  

And then there is another report which says:

\[\text{i.e., What will be your condition when the son of Mary will descend among you and he will be your imām from among yourselves?}\]

In the first two references the words are almost the same as found in the quotation from *Kitāb al-anbiyāʾ* except that Arbiter (ʾādil) is replaced by (maqṣāta) equitable and he will postpone the war (yaḏʿ al-ḥarb) by he will postpone the poll-tax (yaḏʿ al-jīzyah) and the last part of the report beginning with that a prostration at that time... has also been omitted. Again in *al-Saḥīh* of Muslim reports about the descent of Jesus, son of Mary have been mentioned at various places. At one place the words of the first two reports of *al-Bukhārī* have been repeated and at another place the brief and the last report of *al-Bukhārī* has been mentioned. Still at another place the following words occur:

\[\text{i.e., What will be your condition when the son of Mary will descend among you and he will be your imām?}\]

In another report instead of *fa-amma-kum* we find *fa-amma-kum minkum* (he will be your imām from among you). There is also one report by Jābir ibn ʿAbd Allāh. Similarly many other companions of the Holy Prophet, for instance Ibn ʿUmar, Anas, Thaubān have narrated such reports.

**The coming Messiah shall appear from among the Muslims**

If we look carefully into these reports, to our surprise we find that although the coming of the son of Mary has been described in them, the various words added at the end show that he will be raised from among the Muslims. These words are: *imāmu kum minkum,*

82. Ibid.
83 *Al-Saḥīh* of Muslim as quoted in *Kanz al-ʿUmmāl*, vol. 7, p. 220.
fa-amma-kum, fa-amma kum minkum

The words *imāmu kum minkum* (your imām will be from among you), are supposed to refer to someone else who is thought to be the Mahdi. But there are two very strong arguments against this theory: (1) The reports in which these words occur are found in *al-Bukhāri* and *al-Muslim* and the coming of Mahdi has not been mentioned at all in these two books. When *Bukhāri* and *Muslim* do not even believe in the coming of Mahdi, how could they accept the interpretation that he would be the *imām* of Muslims at the time of the descent of Jesus Christ? (2) The *Muslim* has further clarified the point by repeating the words *wa imāmukum minkum* of *al-Bukhāri* on the one hand and adding alternative words on the other which cannot mean anything else except that the coming Messiah shall be raised from this *ummah* of Muḥammad. These words of the *Muslim* are reported in two ways:

(i)


cīfā' astu'āda'ātul 'ibada'sās tā'īmāra'sa tiqūba

“What will be your condition when the son of Mary will descend in you and he will be your *imām*?”

(ii)


cīfā' astu'āda'ātul 'ibada'sās tā'īmāra'sa tiqūba

“What will be your condition when the son of Mary will descend in you and he will be your *imām* from among yourselves?”

Now the expressions *ammakum* and *ammakum minkum* clearly indicate that Jesus son of Mary, whose descent has been mentioned here, is the *imām* of Muslims and shall be from among the nation of Muḥammad and not from any other nation. Perhaps the words *what will be your condition* (*kaifa antum*) which express surprise, have been used to show that people might be expecting the coming of an Israelite Messiah but his appearance from among the Muslims will astonish them. In short, the words *imāmukum minkum* only signify
the appearance of Messiah from this ummah and it is he who will be the imām of Muslims. Obviously a mujaddid is the imām of his time. Thus this only refers to his being a mujaddid.

The evidence of the Qur'ān that the Messiah shall be raised from the nation of Muhammad

1. Reports are only an exposition of the Qur'ān, the evidence of the Qur'ān being the strongest of them all. When we turn to the Qur'ān we find that it mentions the raising of Khalīfahs (successors) of the Prophet Muhammad from among this ummah. In the chapter the Light we observe:

وَاَلْلَّهُ أَسْتَفَقَّ الْأُمَمَّ لِيُحْكِمُواْ فِيهَا وَأَسْتَمِعُواْ لِأَيْدِيهِ مَا كَأَسْتَفَقَّ الْأُمَمَّ

i.e. Allāh has promised to those of you who believe and do good that He will most certainly make them successors in the earth as He made successors before them."84 Here 'before them' refers to the Israelites. As the Prophet has been compared with Moses and called the like of him, —Surely We have sent to you a Messenger, a witness, against you, as We sent Messenger to Pharaoh— 85 similarly his successors have been likened to the successors of Moses. Thus this verse cannot bear the possibility of the appearance of Jesus Christ in person who was a successor of Moses. The logical conclusion is that as in the nation of Moses, the Messiah was raised by God, similarly a like of the Messiah will appear in the nation of Muḥammad. In other words this verse implies the coming of the like of the Messiah and not Jesus Christ himself in person.

The second evidence of the Qur'ān

2. The second strong evidence is that prophethood has come to an end with Muḥammad (peace and blessings of God be upon him!) and Jesus Christ was a prophet according to the Qur'ān.

84. The Qur'ān, 24: 55.
85. Ibid., 73: 15.
It is, therefore, not possible that he should appear after the Prophet Muhammad. If he does come then Jesus Christ, and not the Prophet Muhammad, will be the khātam al-nabiyyīn (the seal of the prophets). Obviously, prophethood will come to an end with a prophet who comes last of all. The thought, that, although Jesus Christ would appear last of all, as the Prophet Muhammad was the last in his appointment, therefore he was indeed the last of the prophets, is groundless. If a battle has to be fought and won, only that general would be called the last general who has won it irrespective of the date of his appointment. If A and Z were two generals appointed for this post; A being appointed before Z, and A was still alive when Z died and at last it was he who won the battle, then every wise person would call him the last general. Similarly if Jesus Christ, the prophet of God, would come after Muhammad and the final victory and dominance of Islam would take place at his hand, then he would be called the last of the prophets. The correct view, therefore, is that no prophet, neither new nor old, shall appear after the Prophet Muhammad.

Besides this, there is another obstacle in the coming of Jesus Christ. According to the Qur'ān he was a messenger appointed for the Israelites, therefore he cannot be raised for any other nation. Moreover a prophet is only sent for a prophetic mission. If Jesus Christ, the prophet of God, has to come again, this means that even the work of prophethood was not brought to perfection by the Prophet Muhammad, and this is absolutely against the clear Qur'ānic verse:

\[
\text{اليوم أملك لكم من ملكين}
\]

i.e. Today I have perfected your religion for you.

In view of these difficulties the Muslim scholars are forced to admit that Jesus Christ would not appear as a messenger but only in the capacity of a mujaddid as has been mentioned in Fath al-Bayān: When he will descend he will act upon the Shari'ah of Muhammad like other

86. The Qur'ān, 3: 48.
87. Ibid., 5: 3.
followers. And in Ḥāfiz al-Bāri it has been stated: Jesus will judge according to the rules and regulations of this ummah.

But here again we are confronted with several difficulties.

It is obviously meaningless that when there is neither a need of prophethood left nor of a prophet, God should, nevertheless, keep a prophet alive for two thousand years to be sent to the world in the later ages. In this case it has to be admitted that neither the prophethood was brought to perfection nor Islam made perfect by the Prophet Muḥammad. If the Messiah has to come he must, by virtue of his previous office, come in the role of a prophet. And if he has to appear as a mujaddid it is futile for God to keep a prophet alive simply to fulfil the mission of a mujaddid. The second difficulty is that if he would appear as a mujaddid his connection with prophethood will naturally be severed. The dismissal of the Messiah from his office of prophethood is also meaningless. To cause a prophet to die is a Divine practice, to bring his period to termination is also intelligible, but his dismissal is absolutely against the principles of Divine religion.

Besides all this there is yet another problem to be solved. If Jesus Christ were to follow the Shari'ah of Muḥammad and give decisions according to the Qur'ān and Ḥadith, how would he educate himself for this work? In this respect the Divine law only operates in two ways. Knowledge is either obtained by revelation or by acquisition (iktiṣāb). Now if he would receive the knowledge of the Qur'ān and Ḥadith by revelation, what doubt is left as to his being a prophet? and if he would obtain it by acquisition he shall have to spend several years for the study of the Arabic language and the Islamic Shari'ah after his descent from heaven. In short, the appearance of Jesus Christ in person goes against all the clear injunctions of the Qur'ān. The only way out is to interpret it differently.

88. Abu'l Ṭayyib Ṣiddiq ibn Ḥasan, Fath al-Bayān (Maṭbah al-Kubrā al-Miriyyah, Egypt) under the verse 5: 3.
DEATH OF JESUS CHRIST

Evidence of the Qur'an

I have made a detailed discussion about Jesus Christ's death in my book *Masiḥ Mau'ūd (The Promised Messiah)*. Here I quote a few verses of the Qur’ān which clearly establish this point.

(1) *And I was a witness of them as long as I was among them, but when Thou didst cause me to die Thou wast the Watcher over them. And Thou art Witness of all things.*

This is Jesus a Christ's reply to question by God that: *Didst thou say to men, Take me and my mother for two gods besides Allāh?* The question was about the false doctrine of Jesus's followers who made him a god and his reply was that as long as he was among them he was a witness of their condition and that he did not find them holding the belief in his Divinity but when God caused him to die, then he did not know what false doctrines were introduced in his teachings. This verse clearly indicates that, unless Jesus had died, the doctrine of his Divinity would not have been formulated by his people. Thus if before the revelation of the Qur’ān such an alteration had taken place in his teaching, and the Qur’ān provides us with a sufficient evidence to that effect, then Jesus must have passed away from this world. It is not possible to deny such a plain conclusion, but a report in *al-Bukhārī* makes the whole issue further clear. It is reported that on the Day of Resurrection the Prophet would be shown some men from among his *ummah* being dragged towards hell. *I would say, the hadith goes on, what the righteous servant (i.e. Jesus Christ) said: I was a witness among them but when Thou didst cause me to die, Thou wast the Watcher over them.*

---

90. The English translation of this book is also under preparation. That Jesus Christ is dead is accepted by many orthodox *ulama* as is clear from *Annexe II, T.*


92. *Ibid., 5 : 116.*

93. *Al-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-Tafsīr* under the verse 5: 117.
(2) And Muḥammad is but a messenger — messengers have already passed away before him. In the word al-rusul (the messengers) al is of istighrāq (اجترار) exhaustiveness) and does not yield any other meaning except that al-rusul should include all the messengers. It was for this very reason that Abū Bakr argued on the basis of this verse about the death of the Prophet Muḥammad when some of his Companions thought that he was not dead. That is to say, when all the previous prophets had passed away, the demise of the Holy Prophet was also in accordance with the Divine practice. If this verse meant that some of the messengers have in fact died and some were still alive, this argument could not have satisfied the doubters in the Holy Prophet’s death.

(3) The Messiah, son of Mary, was only a messenger; messengers before him have indeed passed away. And his mother was a truthful woman. They both used to eat food. These words, while contradicting the claim of Jesus’s Divinity, show that when they were alive, Mary and Jesus both stood in need of food. As Mary is dead, Jesus must have also passed away from this world. Both have been mentioned together, having in common the most elementary characteristics of human beings, i.e., of taking food. They used to eat food when they were alive; as they do not partake of food now, they are not alive any more.

(4) He has enjoined on me prayer and poor-rate as long as I live. Offering prayers and giving of alms have been made obligatory on Jesus Christ. If in the heavens, let us suppose, Jesus has all the facilities of prayers, ablution and purification, for whom could he be offering poor-rate (zakāh) which was made essential for him as long as he lived?

(5) And those whom they call on besides Allāh, created naught, while they are themselves created. Dead (are they), not living. And they know not when they will be raised. Evidently here those gods are spoken to who have been taken from among human beings because there is a

94. The Qur'ān, 3 : 143.
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96. Ibid., 19 : 31.
mention of their being raised after death. And it is said about all of them that they are dead. Jesus Christ stands first among those who are taken for gods. If he is alive the whole argument becomes null and void. 98 Besides this there are many other verses in the Qur’ān

98. It was in 1896 C.E. when I had not yet joined the Ahmadiyyah Movement that I asked a very prominent Maulavi in confidence what he thought the Qur’ān had mentioned about Jesus Christ. He said: “There are some verses which prove his death and there are others which show he is still alive.” I was greatly astonished at this reply. How could such a thought be ascribed to the Qur’ān that there existed two contradictory statements in it. But unfortunately many Muslims are suffering from such a confusion. As the idea of the physical ascension of Jesus Christ is prevalent among them, therefore many of them do not pay any attention to even verses which mention his death. Their whole emphasis lies on the point that the Qur’ān refers to his ṭafā’ (exaltation), therefore he must be alive. Exaltation (ṭafā’) of believers is one of the attributes of God and al-Ṭafal (the Exalter) is one of His names, the meaning of which according to Lane’s Lexicon is: One of the names of God, meaning the exalter of the believer by prospering (him), and of His saints by teaching (them). Where the ṭafā’ of a man to Allāh is spoken of in the Qur’ān or Ḥadīth it is, without a single exception, in the sense of exalting or making him honourable. This meaning is made plain by the prayer which every Muslim repeats daily i.e. “Exalt me, O Lord!” (Allāh humm arafa‘a) (al-Būkhārī vol. 3, p. 22). Of course no one supposes for a moment that such a prayer is meant for raising or elevating his body to the heavens. And in the reports the expression:

i.e., Allāh exalts him who lowers down for Allāh. (Kanz al-Ummāl, vol. 2, p. 25).
This again does not mean raising of one’s body to the heaven. Again it has been stated that

i.e., Verily God exalts the just ( ).
It has also been mentioned in the Qur’ān:

i.e., And We raised him to an elevated state (9 : 57). Here in spite of the words makan ‘aliyya, ṭafā’ does not mean uplifting the body to a certain height or place. Another verse of the Qur’ān is:

i.e., and if We had pleased We would have exalted him thereby; but he clings to the earth (7 : 176). There is a clear reference to the earth here but the meaning of ṭafā’ by
which indicate that Jesus Christ had died like other prophets. But I leave them for brevity’s sake. In fact no Muslim can deny the point if it is established even from a single verse of the Qur’ān.

Evidence of the Gospels

When we turn to the Gospels we find that:

(1) Jesus remained on the Cross for a few hours only (Mark 15:25; John 19:14), but death by crucifixion was always tardy. (2) The all the commentators has been explained here as nearness to God. But, strangely enough, when the question of Jesus Christ comes people care neither for the lexicon nor for the Qur’ān and Hadith that in what sense this word has been used. In case of Jesus the context is particularly clear, the exalter is God and the exaltation is towards Him: as, (I will) exalt thee in My presence (The Qur’ān, 3:54). And as Divine Being is not limited to a certain place, therefore exaltation towards Him could not mean lifting the body to a certain height whether it is to the fourth or the seventh heaven. Again, the Qur’ān records a saying of Abraham:

إِلَىٰ ذَوَّابَيْنَ رَبِّي

i.e., surely I flee to my Lord (37:99). Fleeting towards Lord does not mean going to Him with this body of clay. Similarly:

نَجِيَّكَ إِلَىٰ رَبِّكَ

i.e., Return to thy Lord (89:28) and again:

إِلَىٰ رَبِّكَ نَجِيَّهُمْ

i.e., To Him we shall return (2:156) only signify spiritual returning. The most astonishing aspect of the story is that the word ṭaf‘ has been used for Jesus Christ after tuwaffi or his death such as:

إِلَىٰ مَتَوَفَّيْكَ رَبِّي إِلَىٰ رَبِّي

i.e., I will cause thee to die and exalt thee in My presence (3:54) and exaltation after death is always spiritual.

99. Muhammad ‘Ali’s English Commentary of the Qur’ān, p. 231 under 4:159.—T

Another argument against the death of Jesus Christ is deduced from the verse:

They killed him not, nor did they cause his death on the Cross (4:157). In fact this
two men crucified along with Jesus were still alive when taken down from the Cross; the presumption is that Jesus too was alive. (3) The breaking of legs was resorted to in the case of the other two criminals, but dispensed with in the case of Jesus (John 19: 32-3). (4) The side of Jesus being pierced blood rushed out, and this was a certain sign argument has not at all a leg to stand on. A person not dying or being killed on the Cross does not mean that he has been alive for the last two thousand years. The only logical conclusion of this would be that he did not die by these two methods but died a natural death especially when the promise of his natural death already exists in the Qur'ān in the words "O Jesus, I will cause you to die (3: 54) (a natural death), and the fulfilment of this promise has also been mentioned at another place: When Thou didst cause me to die (5: 117). These two verses clearly indicate that Jesus Christ escaped death on the Cross and lived on this earth later on dying a natural death. Negation of killing (qatl) or crucifixion (Salb) has been mentioned here because the Jews said:

i.e., We have killed the Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary (4: 157). It must also be borne in mind that Salb does not only mean to hang on the cross but as the compilers of Arabic lexicon have also made it clear that it is one of the types of killing, therefore negation of killing and crucifixion only means that he did not die by these two methods but it does not mean that an attempt was not made to kill him or cause his death on the Cross. As against They killed him not, nor did they cause his death on the Cross the words: Nay, Allah exalted him in His presence have also been mentioned. And God's raf' (exaltation) only means spiritual exaltation, as I have discussed before. The reason of special reference to his raf' is because according to the Old Testament he that is hanged is accursed of God (Deut., 21: 23). The Jews said that they had killed Jesus Christ on the Cross, therefore he was accursed and could not be called honourable in the presence of God. Christians also because of their erroneous belief in Atone. thought that unless Jesus was accursed he could not take away the sins of the people as it has been said: Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written: Cursed is everyone that hangeth on the tree (Gal., 1: 13). And for the redemption of their sins Christians believed that Christ descended into hell for three days. The Qur'ān contradicts the belief of Jews as well as of Christians i.e., neither did they slay him nor cause his death on the Cross but that he was made honourable in the Divine presence.

The words of the Qur'ān, And certainly those who differ therein are in doubt about it. They have no knowledge about it, but only follow a conjecture, and they killed him not for sure (4: 157) in fact fully apply to the condition of Jesus Christ as mentioned in the Gospels. The evidence of the Gospels has been discussed separately. The verse of the Qur'ān, but he was made to appear to them as such (Ibid.) Walakín
of life. (5) Even Pilate did not believe that Jesus actually died in so short a time (Mark 15:44). (6) Jesus was not buried like the two criminals, but was given in the charge of a wealthy disciple of his, who lavished care on him and put him in a spacious tomb, hewn in the side of a rock (Ibid., 15:46). (7) When the tomb was seen on the third day, the stone was found to have been removed from its mouth (Ibid., 16:4) which would not have been the case if there had been a supernatural rising. (8) Mary, when she saw him, took him for the gardener (John 20:15) which shows that Jesus had disguised himself as a gardener. (9) Such disguise would not have been needed if Jesus had risen from the dead. (10) It was in the same body of flesh that the disciples saw Jesus and the wounds were still deep there enough for a man to thrust his hand in (John 20:25-28). (11) He still felt hunger and ate as his disciples ate (Luke 24:39-43). (12) Jesus Christ undertook a journey to Galilee with two of his disciples walking side by side with him (Matt., 28:10) which shows that he was fleeing for refuge; a journey

shubbihala-hum may bear two interpretations: he was made to be like (it); or the matter was made dubious or obscure (Lane's Lexicon). The Ruh al-Ma'ani says the meaning may be that the matter became dubious to them (Muhammad 'Ali's English commentary of the Qur'an, p. 646). The story that some one else was made to resemble Jesus, is not to be found in the Qur'an or the Hadith. This is merely a tell-tale which has no foundation at all.

Sometimes the verse:

wój� یا ثقيل اکثرب، لامع وسر کردن رو گیم، هو قبیل مویه

i.e., And there is none of the people of the Book but will believe in this before his death (4:159) is brought forward as an argument and qabla mawtih, before his death is made to refer to the Messiah and the verse is translated thus: before the death of Jesus Christ n°l the people of the Book will certainly believe in him. But for the last two thousand years Jews have been dying without believing in Jesus Christ. Now this is the first principle of commentary that no interpretation should be made which goes against the clear facts of history. Hence this meaning is by no means acceptable. The fact is that the Jews and the Christians were both doubtful whether or not Jesus was killed on the Cross, the evidence of the Gospels is against their alleged belief in his death. After mentioning their dubious belief, the Qur'an says that in spite of all this they both believe that Jesus had died on the Cross and was accursed (God forbid). A Jew cannot remain a Jew unless he believes in such a
to Galilee was not necessary to rise to heaven. (13) In all the post-crucifixion appearances Jesus is found hiding himself as if he feared being discovered. Arisen Jesus should have made a public appearance and should not have shown any fear of being discovered by the persecuting Jews. (14) Jesus Christ prayed the whole night before his arrest to be saved from the accursed death on the Cross, and he also asked his disciples to pray for him; the prayers of a righteous man in distress and affliction are always accepted. He seems to have even received a promise from God to be saved, and it was to this promise that he referred when he cried out on the Cross: 

*My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me!* (Matt., 27: 46). Heb.,

theory and for a Christian the whole doctrine of Atonement rests on the 'accursed death' of Jesus Christ. This meaning is not only incorrect according to the context of the Qur'ān but also according to the historical evidence. This shows how authentic and full of wisdom the statement of the Qur'ān is. Thus the pronoun in *gabra mautih* refers to the people of the Book. That this interpretation is correct is borne out by the evidence that another reading of *gabra mautih* is *gabra mautihim* (before their death) (Imām Abū J'afar Muhammad ibn Jarir Ṭabari, commentary of the Qur'ān, vol. 6, p. 15) in which case the pronoun necessarily refers to the followers of the Book.

Besides this, misunderstanding also prevails about the word *tuwaffā*. *Tuwaffā-hu Allāh* according to *Līsān al-'Arab* signifies Allāh took his soul or caused him to die. And according to *Ṭāj al-'Arūs* it means: He took his soul. *Tuwaffā-hu Allāh* does not convey any other significance than this in the Qur'ān, Ḥadīth or the Arabic lexicon. This word has been used in the same significance in the Qur'ān as in the verse:

\[
\text{i.e., Allāh takes the (men's) souls at the time of their death, and those that die not, during their sleep (39 : 42). Tuwaffā whether at the time of death or sleep, however, means taking away of soul and does not signify taking away of body or taking away of soul and body together. In al-Bukhārī Ibn 'Abbās is reported to have said *mutawaffi-ka mumiti-ka* i.e., the significance of *mutawaffi* is *I will cause you to die*, which makes the meaning of *tuwaffā* clear beyond the shadow of doubt. Because of the presupposed conception of Jesus being alive this word has been translated by some commentators as *taking away of body or taking in full measure*; this meaning is against the clear verses of the Qur'ān that have been quoted above. It has not been mentioned in any *ḥadīth* as well that Jesus Christ is still alive or that he was taken alive to heaven with his body of clay.} 
\]
5:7 makes the matter still more clear, for there it is plainly stated that his prayer was accepted: *when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him Who was able to save him from death and was heard in that he feared.***

**Evidence of Hadith and other sources**

There is no mention of the physical ascension of Jesus Christ in any of the authentic reports (*ahadith*). On the contrary, there are reports which show that Jesus Christ is dead. The report about the Ascension (*Mi‘rāj*) itself proves this point. According to this the Prophet Muḥammad saw Jesus and John at one and the same place. Now the death of John is agreed upon by all, and of course there are separate conditions and places for the living and the dead. There is not a single version of the report about the Ascension where Jesus is shown in a different condition than that of the other prophets. Besides this it has also been mentioned in a report that:

\[\text{لوكان مولى الرحمن ملكاً سادةً} \]

i.e., *Had Moses and Jesus been alive they would have but followed me* (or they would have been his i.e., the Prophet's followers). The conclusion from these words is obvious. The Holy Prophet considered Moses and Jesus to have passed away from this world. Again, there is another report to the similar effect:

\[\text{إن عيسى ابن مريم عاش عشرابين وما بعده سنة} \]

i.e., *‘Īsā son of Mary lived for a hundred and twenty years.* This is yet another proof that Jesus Christ is dead and his death occurred at the age of one hundred and twenty years. About this report it has been stated in *Zurqānī* that: *this report, whose narrators are trustworthy,*

---

100. Al-Bukhārī, 63:42.
has been mentioned by Tibrānī in the ḥabīr with an authority from ʿĀishā.\textsuperscript{103} and in the beginning of this report it has been ascribed to ʿĀishā that she said that this matter was talked over to Fātimah by the Prophet Muḥammad during his last illness. The last part of the report mentions that he (i.e., the Prophet) was going to leave the world at the end of sixty years. It is obvious that such reports could not be mere fabrications because they mentioned of Jesus Christ’s death who was generally supposed to be alive at that time.

From among the four Imāms, Imām Mālik believed in the death of Jesus Christ as is mentioned in Majma’ Biḥār al-Anwār under the explanation of the word ḥakam: \textit{qāla Mālikun māta}—i.e., (Imām) Mālik said: Jesus Christ died.\textsuperscript{104} And Imām ibn Ḥazm also believed the same as is mentioned in Jalālain ma‘ Kamālāin that:

\begin{quote}
\textit{وَتَسْتَكِينُ بِفَتْحِيَةِ الْحَكَامِ وَكَالْبَصَوَّةُ}
\end{quote}

\textit{i.e., Ibn Ḥazm accepted the apparent meaning of the verse (i.e., (يعسي انی متوفیک) and believed in the death of Jesus Christ.}\textsuperscript{105} The belief of Muḥiyy al-Dīn ibn al-ʿArabī about the descent of the son of Mary was that:

\begin{quote}
\textit{وَجَبَتْ نِورُ الْكَافِرِينَ أَخْرَجَ الْوُلْدُ مِنَ اللَّدُنَى وَيَعْلَمُكُمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْنِ أَحَدَينَ}
\end{quote}

\textit{i.e. His descent in later ages will be with a different body.}\textsuperscript{106} This appearance in the terminology of the mystics is called barāz (manifestation) as the following quotation would make it clear:

\begin{quote}
بعض بر آنند که روح عیسی در مهابید بروز کند و نزول عبارت

بِزن بَروز است
\end{quote}

\textit{i.e., Some believe that the soul of Jesus will manifest in Mahdi and the}

\textsuperscript{103} See also Ḥujaj al-Kirāmah, p. 423.
\textsuperscript{104} Imām Muḥammad Ẓāhir of Gujrat, Majma’ Biḥār al-Anwār (Lucknow, India, Nawal Kishor Press) vol. 1, p. 286.
\textsuperscript{105} Jalālāin ma‘ Kamālāin (Delhi, India, Mujtabā Press), p. 109, footnote.
\textsuperscript{106} Tafsīr ‘Arā’is al-Bayān (Lucknow—India, Nawal Kishor Press) vol. 1, p. 262.
descent only means this barûz. 107 Both these statements make the point about Jesus’ descent abundantly clear.

The descent of Messiah means the appearance of another person

It is evident from the above references that some Muslim saints had also previously held the belief that the descent (nuzûl) 108 of Jesus Christ, as mentioned in the reports, is to be a spiritual manifestation i.e., the spirituality of Jesus will be transformed in another person. In reports quoted earlier the words imâmu-kum minkum and amma-kum minkum point out that the coming Messiah will be the imâm of Muslims, being one of them. And the clear mention of the death of Jesus Christ in the Qur'ân is yet another proof that the coming Messiah is not Jesus Christ himself but a person, having his spiritual characteristics, who would be raised from among this nation of Muḥammad. Other reports which are also mentioned in al-Bukhârî confirm the same view, for instance, the complexion of Jesus Christ and of the coming Messiah are different although the name is the same. It has been stated in al-Bukhârî in the ḥadîth about the Ascension that:

\[ \text{٠١٨٠٨} \]


108. The word nuzûl should not be misunderstood here as it is used in a very wide sense in the Arabic language. “We have indeed sent down (anzûna ʻalaikum) to you clothing to cover your shame,” says the Qur'ân (7:26), although our clothes are made of cotton which is a product of land. Again: “And He has sent down for you (wa anzûla lakum) cattle” (39:6), and “We sent down iron (anzûna ʻl-ḥadîd)” (57:25). Now cattle and iron are not literally sent down from heaven. Even for the appointment of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad the Qur'ân has used the word anzûla:

\[ \text{٠١٨٠٨} \]

i.e., “Allah has indeed revealed to you (gâd anzâl-Allâhu ʻaikum) a reminder, a Messenger who recites to you the clear messages of Allah” (65:10, 11). Hence the nuzûl of the son of Mary simply means his coming and not necessarily his descent from above.
i.e., I met ‘Isā ... he was of fair complexion.\textsuperscript{109} Again in the report of ibn ‘Umar, Jesus Christ has been described as having a white complexion, curly hair and broad chest.\textsuperscript{110} Further when the Messiah, son of Mary has been described with Masih al-Dajjāl the words are: tonight (in dream) I found myself near the Ka‘bah. I saw a man of wheatish complexion, very fair from among the people of wheatish colour, the hair of his head rested on his shoulders below his ears and he had straight flowing hair. I enquired who was he? They said, it was the Messiah, son of Mary.\textsuperscript{111} Along with it the other report reads as follows: in a state of dream I found myself going round the Ka‘bah and there was a person of wheatish complexion having straight flowing hair ...; I asked who he was? ‘It was the son of Mary,’ they said.\textsuperscript{112}

In the first two reports quoted above in connection with the Ascension, the Messiah in the company of the prophets has been described as having white complexion and curly hair. In the latter two reports which mention his going round the Ka‘bah with the Antichrist (Dajjāl), he is of a wheatish complexion with long hair, which shows that this refers to the Messiah of this ummah. Thus according to the Qur‘ān and the Ḥadīth the Messiah, son of Mary and the Promised Messiah are two different persons. A common name has been given to both of them to show their spiritual resemblance and affinity.

**Prophecy of the descent or second advent in previous scriptures**

Another strong evidence in support of what has been stated above is that the descent or the second advent of a person, mentioned in the previous scriptures, does not mean the coming of the same person but only the appearance of another person in the power and the spirit of the person prophesied for. There is no instance mentioned in the previous books about the actual reappearance of the same person. There is a prophecy in one of the books of the Bible that the prophet Elijah would reappear before the advent

\textsuperscript{109} Al-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-Mi‘rāj.
\textsuperscript{110} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{111} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{112} Ibid., Kitāb al-Anbiyā, 46.
of Christ: *behold I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord.* The Jews held the belief that Elijah was taken up alive to the heavens and that he would reappear before the advent of Christ. When Jesus claimed to be the Messiah the Jews raised this objection against him:

"And his disciples asked him, saying, Why then say the Scribes that Elias must first come? And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly shall first come, and restore all things. But I say unto you, That Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed....Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the Baptist."

This incident is described in almost similar words at another place in *Mark.* In *Luke* the following words occur about John: *and he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias.* The Synoptics are thus agreed that there was a prophecy about the reappearance of Elias in the Old Testament. This could not be rejected as a case of alteration because there is a strong evidence of the Old as well as the New Testament on this point. Moreover, this record could not have been altered by Christians for the matter stood as an objection against the claims of Jesus Christ. By adopting this explanation there remains not the least difficulty in connection with the prophecies of the second advent of Jesus Christ himself, for his own explanation settles the point beyond all doubt. And this is another testimony besides the testimonies of the Qur’ān and Hadith that the second advent means the appearance of another person. The coming of Jesus Christ therefore only means the raising of a *mujaddid* in this *ummah* in the power and spirit of Jesus Christ. When the Founder laid claim to be the *mujaddid* of the fourteenth century *Hijrah* his words implied his claim to be the Promised Messiah as well, though the actual position dawned on

113. *Malachi, 4: 3.*
114. 2 *Kings, 3: 1.*
him after a few years. The following words of his are worthy of note:

"The author has been given the knowledge that he is the mujaddid of this age and that spiritually his excellences resemble those of Messiah, son of Mary, and that the one of them bears a very strong resemblance and close affinity to the other." 118

Metaphors in prophecies

These arguments are too strong to be put aside lightly but it is sometimes said that when Jesus son of Mary is clearly spoken of in the reports why should his name be interpreted metaphorically and applied to a person possessing his spiritual characteristics? The reason is obvious. When a statement does not yield to literal interpretation we must take it metaphorically. The literal meaning does not collaborate with the Qur'an, Hadith, nor even with the reports about his descent, therefore we are forced to interpret it metaphorically. If we reflect a little deeply we find that the very words of these reports cannot be explained otherwise. It has been mentioned that Jesus son of Mary will break the Cross and kill the swine. If the apparent significance is accepted, does it mean that after his descent Jesus will break all crosses in the world and slaughter all swines? No prophet or saint or mujaddid has ever been entrusted with such a bewildering task. If God appoints a prophet or a mujaddid, he is assigned the task of reforming his people. Thus we cannot but take the metaphorical meaning of these two characteristics of the coming Messiah. The Cross is a symbol of Christianity, and swine, dirty animal as it is, stands for the impure habits of a nation. Killing the swing means removal of such habits. Otherwise the sole mission of breaking the Cross and hunting the swine is simply against the dignity of a prophet or a mujaddid, or even of an ordinary religious leader. Has God Almighty kept Jesus alive for this 'sacred' task for the last two thousand years? The fact is that metaphors and similes often form a

118. istihrār, published 1885 C.E.
part and parcel of prophecies. Similar is the case about the prophecy regarding the appearance of the Messiah where expressions such as *Jesus son of Mary, breaking the Cross and killing of the swine* have been used metaphorically. Any person who insists on taking the literal meaning of this prophecy does not only assign a meaningless task to an appointed one of God but also invites the world’s ridicule and censure for this office.

**If the prophecy about the Promised Messiah is not interpreted metaphorically, that would only prove the unreliability of āḥadīth**

If these expressions are not taken metaphorically we cannot but consider a large portion of the reports as pure fabrications. This particular report about the descent of Jesus Christ is interrelated with quite a number of āḥadīth such as reports concerning Antichrist, Gog and Magog, downfall of Muslims and so forth. Some of the trials mentioned therein with which Muslims will be faced, refer to the present age and there are prophecies which have been fulfilled so clearly that even Muslims who have not joined the Ahmadiyyah Movement also accept their truth. If these prophecies have come true, it necessarily follows that the prophecy about the advent of Jesus Christ has also been fulfilled. These reports are found in books of Ḥadīth such as *al-Bukhārī* and *al-Muslim*, and have been traced back to as many as fourteen different companions of the Holy Prophet. To shelve these reports is no light matter for a person who believes in God and His Messenger. There may be hundreds of differences in matters of minor importance: one may disagree with one report on the authority of another, this being only the question of accepting one *ḥadīth* and rejecting the other. But reports about the descent of Jesus Christ are intertwined with a host of other subjects such as the appearance of Antichrist, feats of Gog and Magog, trials of Muslims, reports about the signs of the Last Day etc. There are only two possibilities. Either they should be accepted as a whole or rejected as a whole. Accepting them entirely does not mean that every word should be taken literally. These may be accepted literally or metaphorically according to the context or the
canons of testing the Ḥadīth. If we entirely reject them it would amount to the belief that all the reports mentioned above are a collection of lies and falsehoods. No Muslim who believes in God and His Messenger can dare go to such an extent! Moreover such an unreasonable attitude would also set at naught the whole evidence of history and nothing would remain trustworthy in the world. This would be a great injustice to Islam that all the prophecies which have been fulfilled in their real or metaphorical sense and which would have gone to increase the knowledge and faith of Muslims should only be rejected because, otherwise, the descent of Jesus, son of Mary, has to be admitted.
III—MAHDI

In spite of the weakness and discrepancies of the reports about Mahdi their collective evidence cannot be rejected

There is a clear distinction between the two sets of reports one relating to the advent of Messiah and the other to the appearance of Mahdi. The reports about Messiah have been accepted by all the great authorities of Hadith whereas the reports relating to Mahdi have been rejected not only by Imám Bukhārī and Imám Muslim but also by many eminent scholars of Hadith. There is no doubt that all these reports have been greatly tampered with for various reasons, so much so, that even those who believe in the coming of Mahdi only accept the fundamental fact of his advent. Because of the extreme differences and discrepancies found in their details they refuse to approve of these reports in toto. Nawāb Śiddiq Ḥasan (an Ahl Ḥadith scholar of India) who was expecting an early advent of Mahdi, even during his lifetime wrote: There is no doubt in it that the bases of these reports are very often defective. At another place, in the same book, he has written that all the details about the reports of Mahdi only show this much that he would certainly appear, though his appearance may occur in any form. The question here naturally arises: when al-Bukhārī and al-Muslim have not accepted these reports and other scholars of Hadith have also regarded their bases as defective, why should not these be considered as absolutely weak or fabricated and be rejected entirely? The attitude that if there is discrepancy in details the basic fact itself should be rejected does not only go against all the principles of accepting Hadith but also of history. On the other hand, the difference in the details show that there is somewhere a fundamental reality behind all this. If in reports relating to Mahdi different parties for their own ulterior motives have mixed up false reports, this is quite feasible, although this again proves that behind these reports there is something substantial which both the parties had wanted to seize upon to serve

their own ends. The original is, therefore, grossly distorted. When historical reports (and even a non-believer in ahadith gives at least this much status to them) differ in details the common factor among them is at least accepted as true. In reports concerning Mahdi, the appearance of Mahdi himself is such a common factor; therefore this at any rate cannot be put aside. The reason why Bukhari and Muslim did not accept them is the weak and defective way of their reporting. But when weak and defective reports have at least gained historical status, then according to the rules of history we are forced to consider and accept their common and collective testimony as true. Besides that we cannot reject the possibility of different persons being referred to in these reports and that some signs may be fulfilled in one person and others in another as the word mahdi is also used in a very broad sense. It means one who is guided and the heir to all truths and in whom the attribute "Guide" for God is fully represented and thus this word can be applied to every guided person as for instance the first four righteous successors of the Holy Prophet had also been called Mahdis. In his Tariikh, Imam Suyuti has reported a saying of Wahb ibn Munabih: "If there has been any Mahdi in this ummah it is ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-'Aziz." 120 In view of this wide significance if different signs are fulfilled in different persons they can all be called Mahdis.

Common factors in the reports about Mahdi

Abu Dawud and Tirmidhi mention a report by Ibn Mas’ud that The world will not come to an end unless a person from the people of my house becomes the ruler of Arabia whose name will be identical to mine. 121 A report from Umm Salmah reads thus: Mahdi is from me, having bright forehead, high nose and will fill this earth with equity and justice as it was filled with oppression and violence. 122 In Abu Dawud it has been again mentioned that Hadrat ‘Ali looked towards his son Hasan and said: A person will be born from his seed whose name will be

122. Ibid., p. 240.
the name of your Prophet and he will resemble him in disposition but not in outward form.\textsuperscript{123} In Musnad of Ahmad it is again reported from ‘Ali that the Holy Prophet said: Mahdi is from the people of my house.\textsuperscript{124} In another report we find: Even if a day is left from the age of this world, God will certainly raise a person among us who will fill the whole world with justice as it was filled with oppression.\textsuperscript{125} In another report by Ibn Mas‘ūd it has been mentioned that: There will be no Qiyamah unless there is a person from among the people of my house who is raised as a ruler, whose name will be my name.\textsuperscript{126} There are many reports by Abū Sa‘īd Khudrī. In one of them we find: Mahdi will be from my ummah... will fill the earth with fairness and justice,\textsuperscript{127} and in another: I give you the glad tidings of Mahdi who will be raised in my ummah at a time of digression and distress of people. He will fill the earth with equity and justice as it was filled with oppression and violence.\textsuperscript{128} Yet in another it has been stated: He said that we feared that new things would crop up after the Holy Prophet, then we asked him and he said: Mahdi will be raised in my ummah, five, seven or nine (years).\textsuperscript{129} Similarly Ibn ‘Asākir has reported in his Tārīkh: A person from the family of Hasan will appear from the Eastern countries. Even if mountains stood in his way he will demolish them and make his way through.\textsuperscript{130} And in Tibrānī and Abū Na‘īm the following report occurs: I swear by my Lord Who appointed me with truth, that Mahdi of this ummah will be of these two i.e., of Hasan and Husain.\textsuperscript{131} And it is reported from Dār Qutnī that Mahdi will be from the family of my uncle ‘Abbās.\textsuperscript{132} Yet there is another report which reads: O ‘Abbās! God started this matter with me and will end it with a young man of your progeny who will
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\item 123. Sunan Abū Dāwūd, p. 241.
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fill this earth with justice as it was filled with violence.\textsuperscript{13} And there is a report in \textit{Ibn Majāh}:

\begin{center}
\Lā āmūdhārī al-\textit{gāhibī}
\end{center}

\textit{i.e., There is no Mahdī except ‘Isā.}\textsuperscript{134}

Now the common factors in these reports are reduced to this, that a Mahdī would appear in this \textit{ummah} in the later ages having a strong resemblance with the Holy Prophet filling the earth with equity and justice. But these reports differ as to which family he would belong. He might be "from me" (\textit{i.e.}, the Prophet) or from the people of his house, or from the seed of Ḥasan and Ḥusain or of ibn ‘Abbās and it has also been mentioned that he might be only a person from the nation of Muḥammad. The reports of his being from the seed of Ḥasan, Ḥusain or ‘Abbās, definitely contradict one another. Therefore, this part of the reports has to be given up, but the reports which contain expressions such as "from me", "from the people of my house", "from my \textit{ummah}" can easily be reconciled, for they may imply his spiritual resemblance to the Holy Prophet, as the Prophet is reported to have said about Salmān of Persia:

\begin{center}
Salmān wa-ta’āhel al-\textit{bīnī}
\end{center}

\textit{i.e., Salmān is from the people of my house.}\textsuperscript{135} Similar expressions have been used as well for other persons. Thus a member of this \textit{ummah} having strong resemblance to the Holy Prophet can be regarded as from him or from the people of his house. The common factor in these reports, therefore, is that Mahdī will be a person belonging to the nation of Muḥammad. This view is supported by the report in \textit{Ibn Mājah} where only ‘Isā has been called Mahdī.

Another important point which is clear from these reports is about the Divine appointment (\textit{bi’thāt}) of Mahdī. Now the word

\textsuperscript{133}. \textit{Kanz al-‘Ummāl} (Dā‘irat al-Mu’ārif al-Nizāmiyyah Press Hyderabad, 1314 A.H.) vol. 7, p. 188; \textit{Ḥujaj al-Kirāmah}, p. 356.


\textsuperscript{135}. \textit{Qārānī}, vol. 2, p. 126.
appointment for human beings (in Islamic terminology) is used either for prophets or for mujaddids. But as prophethood has come to an end with the Holy Prophet, therefore Mahdi can be raised in this nation only as a mujaddid. As to the reports in which his equity and justice have been mentioned, it must be borne in mind that one type of law and order is the responsibility of the government of the day and the other type of justice is connected with the appointed ones (māmūrīn) of God whether they are in possession of temporal power or not. What type of justice has been referred to in these reports will be discussed later. Oppression and violence which have been particularly mentioned here are the same which have been spread by the followers of the Religion of the Cross. On the one hand, they have raised a humble servant of God to the pedestal of Divinity as the Qur’ān says: The heaven may almost be rent thereat, and the earth cleave asunder, and the mountains fall down into pieces, that they ascribe a son to the Beneficent!136 and, on the other, they have inflicted sufferings on their fellow beings by their peculiar philosophy that it is only the white people who have the right to rule over other nations; the latter being created for the service of the white.

**Whether Mahdi will spread Islam by the sword**

Strangely enough, a common misconception prevalent among Muslims about Mahdi — that he would spread Islam at the point of the sword — has not been mentioned at all in these reports. Not only the Muslims but the non-Muslims as well have come to associate the very name of Mahdi with bloodshed and fighting. The book Iqtārāb al-Sā‘ah, supposed to be written by the son of Nawāb Siddīq Hasan Khān, contains the following words about Mahdi: He will call people towards God with the sword. The one who refuses will be killed.137

When we look into the aḥadīth we find only the words yamlik al-‘Arab (يملك العرب) i.e., he will be the ruler of Arabia, and for the spread of equity and justice the earth has also been mentioned in

these reports. The words *yamlik al-'Arab* which confine his territory to Arabia are either an interpolation of a reporter or meant for other person whose kingdom will be limited to Arabia. Reference to his kingdom on one side and the abundance of wealth on the another may have led people to believe that Mahdī would propagate Islam with force. This view is supported by a statement in *Iqtarāb al-Sā'ah* which says that: *Wars will be waged at his hand, treasures will be dug out, city after city will be conquered from East to West.* It seems that on account of such conjectures the wrong conception of a warrior Mahdī gradually got its way among Muslims. Some reports might have also been fabricated in this connection. But *Ṣiḥah Sittah* (six authentic collections of *ḥadīth*), and *Mustad* of Ahmad which refer to the benevolence of Mahdī do not mention any report to show that Mahdī will wage wars or conquer the whole world or convert unbelievers to Islam at the point of the sword. How was it possible when the coming of such a Mahdī was decidedly against the clear verdict of the Qur'ān that: *There is no compulsion in religion.* How could indeed such a Mahdī come who would act against this injunction and wield the sword to convert the people to Islam?

---

138. Apparently these words seem to apply to 'Abd Allāh ibn Zubair who did not enter into *bait* of Yazid. When Yazid died in 64 A.H. 'Abd Allāh ibn Zubair was elected as the *khalifah*. The people of Hijāz, Yemen and Iraq also submitted to his rule. Mu'āwiyyah ibn Yazid's rule was limited to Egypt and Syria, but after his death the people of these countries also took *bait* of Zubair, but soon after they revolted and separated themselves from him. Thus Zubair's kingdom remained confined to Arabia. In 73 A.H. during the reign of 'Abd al-Mālik, Zubair was attacked by Hajjāj and was martyred by him. Thus his reign was spread over a period of nine years. Reports concerning Mahdī mention seven or nine years of his rule. These words, therefore, may refer to 'Abd Allāh ibn Zubair. If it is kept in view that these *ahadīth* have been greatly tampered with, the part mentioning the period of Mahdī's kingdom for seven or nine years can be applied to him as well.

139. *Nawād Sayyid Nūr al-Ḥasan Khān, Iqtarāb al-Sā'ah*, p. 64.

140. The Qur'ān, 2: 296.
This wrong conception was removed by the Mahdi himself

May God bless Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad of Qādiān who has completely rooted out the false conception of Mahdi’s spreading Islam with the sword which has opened the eyes of Muslims and has made them realize that the story which was forged by their enemies to stem the progress of Islam was unwittingly accepted by Muslims themselves. Had there been no other argument for his being a Mahdī, this alone was sufficient to prove that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad’s claim of being the guided one (mahdi) of God was correct. The greatest obstacle today in the progress of Islam is the world-wide misconception that Islam was propagated at the point of the word. The enemies of Islam made full use of this weapon to scare the people away even from the name of Islam. As for Muslims themselves, instead of removing this blot from the beautiful face of Islam they lent a helping hand to its opponents by their wrong belief in a warrior Mahdī. No doubt there had been other Muslim scholars also who had rejected the reports, about the advent of Mahdi, or doubted their authenticity such as Ibn Khaldūn141 and the Muʿtazalites, but it had no general effect on Muslims. There was also a reason for this attitude, because the complete rejection of these reports meant the rejection of a fundamental reality as well i.e., the coming of Mahdī himself, which was basically true and was a prophecy of the Prophet Muhammad.142 It was necessary, therefore, that unless the truth had manifested itself and the promised Mahdi had come, the total rejection of this prophecy should not have any effect on the general body of Muslims. When the real claimant appeared he sifted out the truth from falsehood and showed in what way the true part of the prophecy was fulfilled. The rest he showed was added either by the carelessness of the reporters or by wilful interpolation. There have been, of course, several other claimants to Mahdīhood also but every one of them was interested in his own person and claim and cared nothing about making Islam free from false objections. Every one picked up certain words and expressions from the reports and tried to apply them to himself but paid no attention to the

141. Muqaddamah.
142. Ḥujaj al-Kirāmah, p. 386.
removal of this false belief that Islam was propagated by the sword. There had been some pious persons from among these claimants as well and they might have identified their own temporal victory with the victory of Islam but the extermination of this outlandish conception of a warrior Mahdī who would wield the sword for the spread of Islam was destined at the hands of Mirzā Ghulām Āḥmad, and thus a great obstacle was removed which stood in the way of the progress of Islam. His claim of being a Mahdī showed to the world that the secret and glory of Islam was correlated with such a claim. Not one, but let hundreds of such claimants appear for the glory and success of Islam, and Muslims should welcome them with open arms. To obstruct their cause, under suspicions and misunderstandings, is to obstruct the cause of Islam and the Muslim nation. Ḥadīr Āḥmad was no doubt a claimant to Mahdīhood but he made his claim a source of the onward march of Islam. The prophecy relating to Mahdī has been fulfilled today with such clarity that the fundamental fact behind it has been gradually accepted by all Muslims. The conception that Islam was, or will be, thrust upon non-Muslims with the sword is loosing its hold on their minds. Islam has never stood in need of violence for its progress, and never shall a time come when such a course will be applied for its propagation. Even non-Muslims have also started realizing that the advancement of Islam was simply due to its spiritual force and not to the use of any sword. And it is indeed a fact that the real success of Islam was brought about not by a powerful emperor but its conquests were mainly due to its dynamic spiritual force. The following passage by an American scholar confirms this view:

“The other great religions won their way slowly, by painful struggle, and finally triumphed with the aid of powerful monarchs converted to the new faith. Christianity had its Constantine, Buddhism its Asoka, its Cyrus, each lending to his chosen cult the mighty and Zoroastrianism force of secular authority. Not so with Islam. Arising in a desert land sparsely inhabited by a nomad race, previously undistinguished in human annals, Islam sallied forth on its great adventure with
the slenderest human backing and against the heaviest material odds.”

In short the real Mahdi of Islam is he who has clarified the real meaning of Mahdihood and has shown to the world that the Mahdi of Islam is a spiritual Mahdi and that Islam’s success depends on its intrinsic spiritual values and not on outward force.

**Messiah and Mahdi are one**

There was yet another great misunderstanding about Mahdi which the Founder of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement removed. Messiah and Mahdi were considered to be two separate persons although it was indicated in a report of Ibn Mājah. (لاَمَيْدَةُ الاَّ عْسِي) *i.e.*, *There is no Mahdi except Isā.*

There is a positiveness about these words that there is no other Mahdi. This can only be interpreted that the Promised Mahdi is another name of the Promised Messiah. If the name Mahdi in some other reports has been given to some one else, it is to be accepted in a general way, as for instance, the first four Khalīfahs have also been called Mahdis. ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, too, has been given this name. Now this report of Ibn Mājah could not be untrue as it was against the general conception among Muslims about Mahdi and such a thought could not have occurred to the reporters. On the other hand this *hadith* supports the reports by Bukhāri and Muslim as they also mention the coming of only one person in later ages and that is Jesus. The coming of any other person is not at all mentioned in these two authentic collections (Ṣahihain). Thus the report of Ibn Mājah has made it clear that if in some reports the appearance of Mahdi is suggested besides the coming of Jesus Christ, this also refers to Jesus. Now here we should stop and think that if we do not try to solve the difficulties involved in the reports about Mahdi in the light of this *hadith* we shall have to admit that besides al-Bukhāri and al-Muslim other works of Ṣihāh Sittah (six authentic collections of reports) have incorporated a lot of fabricated matter in their collections. And if these reports were

not fabricated, why did Bukhārī and Muslim reject a prophecy of such magnitude and did not even care to mention it in their works? The report of Ibn Mājah: *There is no Mahdi except 'Isā* solves both these difficulties. Al-Bukhārī and al-Muslim have only reported the second name of this reformer and other books of Sīhah have mentioned both the names of 'Isā and Mahdi.

This is not the only ḥadīth which shows that Messiah and Mahdi are one, but if we carefully study other reports, they also point towards the same conclusion. Evidently there cannot be two Amīrs (leaders) or Khalīfahs at one and the same time. Ḥāfrat Abū Bakr immediately after the death of the Holy Prophet gave a reply to the Anṣār (helpers) who said: *One leader from us and one from you*\(^{145}\) that this was not possible and there could not be two leaders at the same time. If this report is true, how could there be two leaders i.e., the Promised Messiah and Mahdi, simultaneously? If it is said that one will be an assistant to another we do not find it mentioned in the reports. Both Messiah and Mahdi have been called imāms. In al-Bukhārī and al-Muslim: *imāmu-kum minkum* and *amma-kum minkum* occur for the Promised Messiah who has also been called Arbiter and Judge. Ḥakam and imām are identical. In Musnad of Ahmad he has been clearly referred to as "Arbiter, judge and imām."\(^{146}\) About Mahdi it is a wide-spread belief, that he will be an imām and some think that he will be a king also. In this case Messiah must be his wazīr (aider, assistant). But, on the other hand, this is also acknowledged that the Messiah will be superior to Mahdi as Nawāb Siddiq Ḥasan Khān quotes in his book a saying by imām Shaukānī:

\[
\text{لا ي🐶 إذا علِيَّ أَكَلُّ مِنَ الْمَهْدِيَّ}
\]

i.e., *There is no doubt that Jesus is superior to Mahdi.*\(^{147}\) At any rate there can be only one imām at a time and when Jesus and Mahdi

---


are both called imām then it necessarily follows that Jesus and Mahdi are also one.

The third argument in favour of this view is, that the Promised Messiah has also been called Mahdi in the reports. Accordingly, there is a hadīth from Abū Huraira to the effect that:

\[
\text{i.e., Whoever lives from among you shall meet Jesus, son of Mary who is imām, Mahdi, arbiter and judge.}^{148}
\]

Besides all this if we look deep into the matter we observe many other similarities to show that these are only two different names of one person. The time of their advent is the same, they shall have the same office, the same work and the same complexion, then how could they be two separate persons? That the time of their appearance is the same is acknowledged by all. About their office I have discussed above that both of them have been called Imām, Amir, Khalīfah and Mahdi. Their work and duty is also the same. The making of Islam dominant over other religions is the work of the Messiah and the same has been assigned to Mahdi as well. So much so that the breaking of the Cross and killing the swine, thought to be the special duties of the Messiah, have also been attributed to Mahdi as has been mentioned in Ḥujaj al-Kirāmah:

"The religion of Islam in his time will be established as it had been in the age of grace of the Prophet Muḥammad. He will be a ruler over all the world and shall break the Cross and kill the swine. All these signs have been briefly discussed by Ibn Ḥajar in connection with the coming of Mahdi."^{149}

Spreading of peace and justice has also been assigned to both. It is frequently reported about Mahdi that he will fill the earth with justice and Messiah has also been called arbiter and judge. Their complexion is also the same. The coming Messiah is of wheatish colour, quotation has been given before.\(^{150}\) Mahdi is of the same

\(^{149}\) Nawād Ṣiddīq Hasan Khān, Ḥujaj al-Kirāmah, p. 363.
\(^{150}\) Kanz‘ al-Ummāl, vol. 6, p. 126.
complexion as is found in report by Na‘īm ibn Ḥammād that: *He will be of wheatish complexion from among the people (of the land)*.151

**A prophecy becomes a great miracle after its fulfilment**

The prophecy about the advent of Mahdī is from among those prophecies which are related to this age. The *Mnjaddid* of this century has shed such light on them—that all the darkness which surrounded them has been dispelled and they have become a manifest sign for the truth of the Prophet. These prophecies were buried under so many obscurities that there were many who denied their authenticity and even those who believed in them were also bewildered (at the great contradictory mass of such reports) and were at times inclined almost towards its rejection. Accordingly it was said: *We admit that Mahdī will not appear. What harm is there if he does not?*152 Or: *Leave Mahdī aside. The descent of Jesus is at least unanimously agreed by Christians and Muslims alike. Let him descend.*153 And in another book it has been mentioned that: *We admit that Mahdī may not come. This does not contradict any important belief of the people of Islam. But the son of Mary will indeed appear according to all of them. May God bring him soon, for his coming as well will serve the same purpose for which we expect the advent of Mahdī.*154 That person has indeed rendered a great service to Muslims who has removed all the cobwebs from these prophecies and has thus placed before us a clear evidence of the truthfulness of the Holy Prophet. It is easy to say what difference does it make to Ïslām whether Mahdī comes or not, but the first advantage of Mahdī’s advent has been that it has brought to light a new testimony in favour of Islam or in other words, a miracle of Islam has manifested itself in this age. The miracles of all the prophets have come to an end with their death but the miracles of the Prophet Muhammad have continued to manifest themselves ever since and will remain so till the Last Day. As a matter of fact the faith which the fulfilment of a prophecy creates in one’s heart is not even created at the occurrence of great a miracle, because a

152. *Ḥadīth al-Ghāshiyah*, p. 343.
miracle may contain some elements of doubt in it, but the fulfilment of a prophecy is in fact a 'talking witness' which stands before friends and foes alike. Moreover at the occurrence of a miracle there are only a few persons present who witness its truth but a prophecy after its fulfilment does not stand in need of another evidence. It becomes an evidence itself. Has that person not done any service to Islam who has explained the hidden truths behind these prophecies and has thus helped to strengthen our faith in Islam? Ḥadīrat ʿĀhmād's interpretations concerning the prophecies about Mahdi do not seem to be the result of his intellectual investigations but were the work of Divine light given to him which helped him to discover the truth underlying these reports. This discovery consisted of two great facts. Firstly, it was wrong to associate the name of Mahdi with the sword and to believe, as the opponents did, that Islam was spread at the point of the sword — the authentic reports being devoid of any such mention — and, secondly, that Jesus and Mahdi were not two separate persons but two names of the same reformer.

The significance of the two names

As has been discussed above, there was a profound reality hidden behind these two names, therefore the mujaddid of this age was assigned two great tasks which entitled him to receive the names of Messiah and Mahdi. On the one hand, Islam had a big encounter with Christianity, — for, according to the Qurʾān and Ḥadīth, Christianity was going to attain great power in the world, — and, on the other, the present age was particularly suited for the propagation of Islam among Christians. Islam had won the hearts of millions of people of other religions before, but Christianity had not offered its due quota to Islam. It was, however, destined that the sun of Islām should rise over Eastern countries first. Therefore it was mostly in the East that the light of Islam spread in the beginning but then according to the law of nature this sun was going to shine over the Western countries as well. In a report of the Prophet this had been described as the rising of the sun in the West. Again,
it is to the same effect that the Holy Prophet has referred to:

أُعِطْتُ كَثِيرًا أَحَدَةً وَأَيْضَن

i.e., I have been given two treasures; one red (Eastern nations) and another white (Western nations). As encounter with Christianity and the propagation of Islam in Christendom were the two tasks of the mujaddid of this age, therefore the title Ibn Maryam or 'Isā was given to him. He mentions that fact in the following couplet:

جَوِنَ مَا نُورَتُ بَيْنَ قَومٍ مُسِيِّحِيٍّ دَادٍ أَنَّ مُصَلَّةَ رَأَبِنِمِي مَرْيَمُ نَامَ مِن يَسَادِهِ أَنَّ

i.e., As I have been given light for the Christian people, the name of the son of Mary has been given to me for this reason. Again, because he was commissioned to strengthen the inner solidarity of Islam, save Muslims from going to immoderate extremes, cure them of the habit of takfīr (denunciation of Muslims as heretics) and place before them the sublime object of preaching of Islam, which was in fact the object of the life of the Prophet Muḥammad, therefore the name Mahdi was also given to the mujaddid of this age. The only reality behind all this is that the perfect mujaddid of the fourteenth century was like the full moon that was going to shine in the world. For shedding the light of Islam in the Christian world he was called Messiah or son of Mary and for illuminating the hearts of Muslims with the light of Islam he was called Mahdī. That is why the Holy Prophet declared that: He has been given my name. The point that Mahdi is superior to Jesus, though Jesus was a prophet of God, only means that, as a Mahdī, he will manifest the truth of Muḥammad and, as a Messiah, the truth of Jesus, the former being superior to the latter; it is because of this that Mahdī is superior to Jesus.

Other prophecies about Mahdi

Prophecies about the advent of Messiah and Mahdī have been discussed by me elsewhere. Here I should only like to mention about the place of his advent. There is no doubt in it that some

156. Ibid., Kitāb al-Malāḥim, vol. 2, p. 239.
reports also suggest Makkah or Madinah as the place of his appearance and the sanctity of these places might have turned the attention of the reporters towards these towns. But there are reports which not only indicate the place of his advent in the East but even his companions are also reported to be from among the Eastern people. The reporters’ own imagination in normal circumstances could not have gone to that extent. Accordingly, following are the words of the reports of Abū Na‘īm and Ibn ‘Asākir: *From the offspring of Ḥasan ibn ‘Ali, a person (i.e., Mahdí) will appear from the East. If mountains are in his way he will demolish them and make his way through.*

Here the reference to his being the offspring of Ḥasan ibn ‘Ali has been due to the wrong impression that Messiah and Mahdí were considered to be two different persons. A report in *Ibn Mājah* says: *Some people will come out from the East and will support Mahdí i.e., they will help him in his domination.*

*Nawāb Siddiq Ḥasan Khān* also writes:

> "Men of Divine gnosis will enter into fealty with Mahdí by God’s guidance and Divine visions. Holy people will be with him to strengthen his message and to support him…. These will be nine persons in the footsteps of the Companions (of the Prophet); they would prove their covenant true which they made with Allāh. They would all be non-Arabs (‘ājami) and none would be an Arab from among them."*

If the companions and supporters of Mahdí are non-Arabs it clearly shows that the place of his advent is not Makkah but some other country outside Arabia and it has been just stated that his companions would be coming from the East. Undoubtedly in view of this the place of Mahdí’s advent should also be an Eastern country as has been mentioned in one of the reports:

*قال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم من تارةٍ من الراذلة: قالوا ليس من أثريئة فقلماكَتَكَ فَكَفَّثَكَةَ*  

_i.e., Mahdí will appear in a village the name of which will be Kadi‘ah._

159. *Nawāb Siddiq Ḥasan Khān, Ḥujaj al-Kirāmah*.
160. *Jawāhir al-Aṣrār*, p. 55. The original name of Qādiān was Islām Pūr Qādi
This name is so identical with Qādiān (or Kādi with which Qādiān was formerly known) that, if read with the reports of the general signs of Mahdī, it becomes clear that such reports are only applicable to Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad of Qādiān.

Some of the signs are only in the form of metaphors in the prophecy about Mahdī

There are some signs of course about Mahdī’s advent which do not apply in their literal sense to the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement. For instance, that he will be a king for seven years or that he will possess large treasures. This is, however, accepted on all hands that prophecies are couched in metaphorical language, because the future events are shown in the form of visions and dreams which are subject to interpretation like other prophecies. The Qur’ān has also called ru’yā’ and kushūf as God’s speaking from behind a veil,\(^{161}\) therefore the apparent expressions should not mislead a person. About the Promised Messiah, for instance, it has been mentioned in a report that he would come with two yellow mantles.\(^{162}\) A yellow mantle is interpreted with a disease and this in fact pointed to two diseases with which the Promised Messiah was going to suffer. It is surprising to note that about Mahdī it has also been mentioned that:

\[\text{i.e., On him there will be two shining mantles as if he is from among the men of Israel.}\]

\(^{163}\) About possessions of kunūz (treasures) as well the same mistake is committed and kunūz is taken to mean treasures of gold

\[^{161}\text{The Qur’ān, 42 : 51.}\]
\[^{162}\text{Abū ʻIsā Muḥammad ibn ʻIsā Tirmidhī, al-Ｊāmi‘ al-Tirmidhī, vol. 1, p. 38.}\]
\[^{163}\text{Abū Na‘im, Iṣṣarāb al-sā‘ah, p. 128 ; Ḥujaj al-Kirāmah, p. 360.}\]
and silver. But when the Holy Prophet says:

بِعَضَتَيْنِ كَظَرْفِيّي أَحْزَرَةٍ أَيْبِيّ

i.e., I have been given two treasures, red and white\textsuperscript{164}, no one takes them to be treasures of gold and silver and it is only interpreted as signifying two groups of people. Similarly a saying of Ḥaḍrat ‘Alī has been recorded in Hujāj al-Kirāmah that: Blessings of God be upon the renouncers (ṭaliqān) that at that place are treasures of God, but these are not of gold and silver but consist of people who have recognized God as they should have and they would be the helpers of Mahdi.\textsuperscript{165} When in such reports treasures of Mahdi have been considered as his helpers there should be no difficulty in interpreting metaphorically the expression kunūz appearing in other traditions. It has also been mentioned in a ḥadīth that:

لا حلا و لا قولة كُنْزُ الْجَنَّةِ

i.e., Lā ḥawla wa lā quwwaw (there is no power except His power) is a treasure from among the treasures of paradise.\textsuperscript{166} Now this is not a treasure of gold and silver but only, as it is stated in al-Nihāyah, the reward which has been stored.\textsuperscript{167} Again, it has been mentioned in some of the reports that Mahdi will also dig out treasures from under the Ka‘bah. Now gold and silver are not buried under this holy place. On the other hand it is the riches of knowledge and wisdom which were manifested by the Prophet Muḥammad and have been concealed from the eyes of the world with the lapse of time. The real treasure is, in fact, the wisdom and Divine gnosis which were lost in the Age of Corruption and only letter and form-worship was left with the Muslims. Thus whoever restores the lost glory of wisdom, it is he who really digs out treasures and distributes them among the people. The istikhrāj kunūz (i.e., the


\textsuperscript{165} Nawāb Šiddīq Ḥasan Khān, Hujāj al-Kirāmah, p. 396.

\textsuperscript{166} Ibn al-Ṯūr, al-Nihāyah fi Gharib'l-Ḥadīth wal-ʿĀthari, vol. 4, p. 36.

\textsuperscript{167} Ibid.
digging out of treasures from earth) therefore, in the case of Mahdī does not mean digging of gold and silver but it is only a metaphorical expression which implies the imparting of knowledge and wisdom by Mahdī to his people, which is indeed the task of all God-sent reformers. Their kingdom is also a spiritual one, and, if God wills, He may favour them with temporal power as well. But their actual kingdom is always spiritual. Now, if a person insists on the literal meanings of these reports, it would be impossible for him to accept all the reports which are so contradictory in their details that even those who generally believe in them also entertain doubts as to their literal fulfilment. The contradictions in them are so great that either the whole lot have to be rejected under the principle *when two things contradict, they cut each other*, or only their general and collective testimony should be accepted. A part of them should be interpreted metaphorically and a part, of course, has to be left aside. When we follow this principle these reports invariably apply to Ḥadrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad of Qādiān, the founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement. That Mahdī will not spread Islam with the sword and that he and the Messiah are one, these two points have made it definitely clear that Ḥadrat Aḥmad is indeed the Promised Mahdī. It does not make any difference if a ruler Mahdī may also appear at some future time, but, just for the sake of mere possibility, it is not right to reject the sayings of the Prophet Muḥammad which have been fulfilled.
Annexe—II
A—EXALTATION OF JESUS

(A letter was received by the Senate of the Great Al-Azhar University of Cairo from Abdul Karim Khan, from the Middle East, which contained an inquiry: Is Jesus dead or alive according to the Qur'ān and the Traditions of the Prophet? What do you think of a Muslim who does not believe that he is still alive and what about one who does not acknowledge him in case he comes to the world for the second time? This question was referred to the Senior Professor Shaikh Mahmūd Shalṭut, who later on became Rector of the University. The Fatwah is reproduced verbatim below.)

“. . . Now, the Qur'ān mentions Prophet Jesus in reference to his fate at the hands of his people in three chapters:

1. In the chapter The Family of ‘Imrān it is stated:

“But when Jesus perceived unbelief on their part, he said: Who will be my helpers in Allāh’s way? The disciples said: We are helpers (in the way) of Allāh: We believe in Allāh and bear witness that we are submitting ones. Our Lord: We believe in that which Thou hast revealed and we follow the messenger, so write us down with those who bear witness. And they (the Jews) planned and Allāh (also) planned. And Allāh is the best of planners. When Allāh said: O Jesus, I will cause thee to die and exalt thee in My presence and clear thee of those who disbelieve and make those who follow you above those who disbelieve to the Day of Resurrection. Then to Me shall be your return, so I shall decide between you concerning that wherein you differ.”

1. The original appeared in the Arabic Weekly Al-Risālah of Cairo (Vol. 10, No. 462 at p. 515). The Quranic references given in the footnotes did not appear in the original Fatwah, but are being given for easy reference.

رفع عيسى
ورد إلى مفتيحة الأزهر الجليلة من حضرة عبد الكريم خان بالقيادة العامة لمجوع الشرف الأوسط سؤال جاء فيه:
هل (عيسى) حي أو ميت في نظر القرآن الكريم والسنة للظهرة؟ وما حكم للملل الذي ينكر أنه حي وما حكم من لا يؤمن به إذا فرض أنه عاد إلى الدنيا مرة أخرى؟
وقد حول هذا السؤال إلينا فأجنبنا بالفتوى التالية إلى
نشرها مجلة الرسالة في سنة المعاصرة بالعدد 462.

القرآن الكريم وعظى عيسى
أما بعد، فإن القرآن الكريم قد عرض عليه السلام ذا ينصل
بنهاية شأنه مع قوله في ثلاث سور:
1- في سورة آل عمران قوله تعالى: فَلاَ تَدُرْ عَنْ يَدِيَ الَّذِيٍّ رَكَّزَ
قال: من أصلح إلى الله فshall الجزءين بين أنصار الله كسبًا بالله وفأسه
بنائين مسلمين. بل إننا أنشئنا ما أنشئنا ذاتيًا. الرسول فاكتسبنا مع
الشهدين. وذكرنا وذكر الله وذل الله خير المكررين. إذ قال الله
يا عيسى إلى مدينك وراديك إلى دنياك من الذين كفرنا دعاء
الذين انبعثروا فوق الذين كفرنا إلى يوم القيامة، ثم إلى موضعكم
فأحكم بينكم فيا كنتم فيه تختلفون.»(1)

(1) الآيات من سورة آل عمران.
2. In the chapter The Women Allah says:
   "And for their saying: We have killed the Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, the messenger of Allah, and they killed him not, nor did they cause his death on the cross, but was made to appear to them as such. And certainly those who differ therein are in doubt about it. They have no knowledge about it. But only follow a conjecture, and they killed him not for certain: Nay, Allah exalted him in His presence. And Allah is Mighty, Wise".  

3. And in the chapter The Food says Allah:
   "And when Allah will say: O. Jesus, son of Mary, didst you say to men, Take me and my mother for two gods besides Allah? He will say: Glory be to Thee! it was not for me to say what I had no right to (say). If I had said it, Thou wouldst indeed have known it. Thou knowest what is in my mind, and I know not what is in Thy mind. Surely Thou art the great Knower of the unseen. I said to them naught save as thou didst command me: Serve Allah, my Lord and your Lord; and I was a witness of them so long as I was among them, but when Thou didst cause me to die, Thou wert the watcher over them, and Thou art Witness of all things."

These are the verses of the Holy Qur'an wherein all that Jesus experienced at the hands of his people is related.

In the last verse (from the chapter The Food) there is mention of an incident of the Hereafter when Allah will ask Jesus concerning he and his mother being worshipped in the world. And Jesus in reply would say that he did not say aught to them except what God commanded him viz., Worship Allah Who is your God and my God; and he kept a watch over them, during the period of his stay among them and that he did not know what they did after "Allah caused him to die."

The word tawaffâ is used in so many places of the Qur'an in the sense of death that it has become its foremost meaning. This word is used in a different sense only when there is a clear indi-

3. The Quran, IV: 157-158.
4. Ibid., V: 116-118.
2 - وفي سورة الدامود قوله تعالى:

"أين مرّ موسى رسول الله نما تكبروا وما صلبوا ولكن شبه لكم، فإن الدين استحلل، فهفي كني شبه منه، ما إنهم يه من علما إلا اتباع الفناء وما فتحوه بفيتنا، بل رفعه الله إليه وكان الله عزرا حكماً.

3 - وفي سورة المائدة قوله تعالى:

"فإذا قال الله يا عيسى ابن مريم: أنت قلت للناس إنني نذوري فأنا إلهي من دون الله قال: سبحانك ما يكون لي أن أقول ما ليس لي يحيين إن كنت قلتله فقد عملته، تعلم ما في نفسي ولا أعلم ما في نفسي، إنك أنت علامة الغيوب ما قالت ليه إلا ما أمرتي يه: أن اعبدوا الله ربي وربكم و كنت عليه شيء أنا دمت فيهم فلست توقيتي كنت أنت الرقيب عليهم وأنت على على شهيداً.

وقد وردت في القرآن كثيرة يعنى الموقف حتى صار هذا الموقف النائبه عليها المتباذر منها، ولم تتمل في غير هذا الموقف إلا ويجابها

(1) الآيات 107-108-116-117 (2) الآيات 116-117.
cation as to the other meaning: "Say: The angel of death, who is given charge of you, shall cause you to die;"\(^5\) "(As for) those whom the angels caused to die while they are unjust to themselves;"\(^6\) "And if thou couldst see when the angels will cause to die those who disbelieve;"\(^7\) "Our messengers cause him to die;"\(^8\) "And of you is he who is caused to die;"\(^9\) "Until death takes them away;"\(^10\) "Make me die in submission and join me with the righteous."\(^11\)

The word *tawaffaytani* in this particular verse primarily means natural death which is known to everybody. The Arabic-speaking people understand this and only this meaning of the word with reference to the context. Therefore, had there been nothing else to indicate the end of Jesus in this verse even then it would have been improper and wrong to say that Prophet Jesus was alive, and not dead.

There is no room for the view that the word *waṣfāt* here means the death of Jesus after his descent from the heavens—a view held by some who think that Jesus is still alive in the heavens and would come down from there in the latter days. For, this verse clearly denotes the relation of Jesus with his own people and not with any other people of the latter days. The people of the latter age would admittedly be the followers of Muhammad and not of Jesus.

However, in the chapter *The Women* the words: "Nay: Allâh exalted him (Jesus) in His presence" have been interpreted by some, nay most of the commentators, as "raising him up to the heavens." They observe that Allâh cast his likeness on someone else and Jesus himself was lifted up to the heavens with his body. He is alive there and will descend therefrom in the latter ages. Thereafter he would kill the swine and break the Cross. And they base their story:

Firstly, on those reports in which the descent of Jesus is mentioned after the (appearance of) Anti-Christ. But these reports are at variance with and contradictory to one another in their words and meanings. The difference is so great that there is no room for any reconciliation among them. The scholars of

---

5. The Quran, XXXII: 11.
ما يصرفه عن هذا المفعول المباخر : "قل يأْتُوا فَأَكُلُوا مِنْ نَكْرَيْتِكُمُ الْوُلْدُى وَكُلُّ يَمِينٍ (1) وإنَّ الْمَكْتُوبَ فِي الْكِتَابِ (2) "، "لا يَنْفِرَ الْيَدَ بِالْخَيْرِ (3) "، "تَفْنِّي (4) "، "وَرُسْلَنَاكُمْ (5) "، "وَكُنْتُمْ مِنْ يَوْمِ نَزُولِ الْوُلْدُ (6) "، "نُزِّلَتْ رُسُلُكُمْ مِنْ مُّلُوكِ الْأَلْبَابِ (7) ."

ومن حق كلمة "توفيني" في الآية أن نجعل هذا المفعول المباخر وهو الإمامة المادية التي يبر بها الناس ويذكرها من النظرة والسياق الناطقين بالضاد. وإذا فإن الآية لا ينفع بها غيرها في تقرر نهاية عبدي مع قومه لما كان هناك مبرر لهذا القول بأن عيسى حي لم يمت.

ولا سبيل إلى القول بأن الوتة هذا مراد بها زفة عيسى بعد نزوله من السماء بناء على زعم من يرى أنه حي في السماء، وأنه سباه مما آخر الزمان، لأن الآية ظاهرة في تحديد علاقته بقامة هو لا بالقوم الذين يكونون آخر الزمان وموم محمد باتفاق لا قوم عيسى.

معنى "فَبُعِّرَ اللَّهُ إِلَيْهِ " : وقل هو إلى السماء؟

أما ما الناقة فإنها تقول "ئِلَى رَحِمَةِ اللَّهِ إِلَيْهِ "، وقد ضرها بعض المفسرين بل جهورهم بالرفع إلى السماء، يقولون: إن الله ألبث عليه غيره، وрنه بحجم إلى السماء، فهو حي فيها وسيرحل عنها آخر الزمان، فقيل: الخانز ويكسر الصلب، ويعبدون في ذلك:

أولا : على روايات تنفي نزول عيسى بعد الفج، وهي روايات مضطربة، خائمة في أفاظها وعما بها اختلافا لا مجال له الجمع بينها، وقد نص على ذلك.

- الآية 11 من سورة النساء
- الآية 30 من سورة الأعراف
- الآية 43 من سورة الإخلاص
- الآية 48 من سورة الانعام
- الآية 55 من سورة السجدة
- الآية 101 من سورة يس
Hadith have plainly stated this fact. Moreover they are reported by Wahab bin Munnabba and Ka'b Akbar, who were converts from the People of the Book. And their status is well known to critics of Traditions.

Secondly, on a report by Abū Huraira that mentions the descend of Jesus. If this report is proved to be true, even then it is only an isolated report. And there is a consensus of opinion of the scholars of Hadith that such isolated reports can neither be made the basis of a doctrinal belief, nor can they be trusted with regard to things unseen.

Thirdly, on the report about Mihrāj (i.e., the Ascension of the Prophet to the heavens) which narrates that when the Prophet went up and began to have the gates of the heavens opened one after another and entered them as they were opened, he saw Jesus and his cousin John on the second heaven. For us, it is enough to prove the weakness of this evidence, that many interpreters of the Tradition have taken this contact of the Prophet with other prophets to be a spiritual phenomenon and not a physical one (vide Fath al-Bārī, Zād al-Ma‘ād, etc.).

Strangely enough they interpret the word rafa‘ in this verse in the light of the report concerning the Mihrāj, and deduce therefrom that Jesus was also bodily raised up. And there are others who regard the meeting of the Prophet with Jesus to be a physical one on the basis of this verse, (i.e., Nay! Allāh exalted him in His presence). Thus when these people interpret the Hadith they quote this verse to support their imaginary meaning of the Hadith; and while interpreting the verse they cite this Hadith to support their imaginary explanation of the verse.

When we turn to the revealed words of God: “I will cause you to die and exalt you in My presence,” in the chapter The Family of ‘Imrān along with the words: “Nay! Allāh exalted him in His presence,” in the chapter The Women, we find that the
علماء الحديث. وهي فوق ذلك من رواية وذهب بن منبه وكتب الآخرة وها من أهل الكتب الذين اتبعوا الإسلام، وقد عرفت درجاتها في الحديث عند علماء المرجع والتعديل.

ثانياً: على الحديث مروى عن أبي هريرة اقتصر فيه على الإباير بنزول عبده، وإذا صح هذا الحديث فهو حديث آخاذ. وقد أجمع العلماء على أن أحاديث الآحاد لا تفيد عقيدة ولا يصح اعتقادها فيما في شأن الغيال.

ثالثاً: على إجابة في حدث المرجع من أن محمدًا صل الله عليه وسلم حين صلى إلى السماء، وأخذ ينصحها واحدة بعد واحدة ففتح له ودخله، رأى عيسى عليه السلام هو ابن خالته بني في السنة الثانية. وقيامنا في نوحي هذا المسند، ما قرر كثير من شراح الحديث في شأن المرجع ونفي شأن اجتاع محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم بالدنيا، وأنه كان اجتاعًا روحيًا لا حسابًا.

» انظر فتح البارى ورد المد وغريماً.

ومن اللفظ أشهر يستندون على أن سنى الرفع في الآية هو رفع عيسى يسارد إلى السماء بحديث المرجع، بينما ترى رقية منهم يستند على أن اجتاع محمد مبسوب في المرجع كان اجتاعًا حسناً بقوله تعالى: "بِلِ رَقَبَتِكَ رَبِّيْ إِلَيْه" وهم إذا بيندو الآية دليلًا على ما يفهموه من الحديث حين يكونون في تفسير الحديث، ولكنهم ينحدرون الآية دليلًا على ما يفهموه من الآية حين يكونون في تفسير الآية.

النقطة في آخر دعواته:

وهكذا إذا رجعنا إلى قوله تعالى: "إِنَّ مَوْقِعَكَ تَرَايْفُكَ إِلَىٰ".

ихто, إذا رجعنا إلى قوله تعالى: "إِنَّ مَوْقِعَكَ تَرَايْفُكَ إِلَىٰ".
latter verse fulfils the promise that was made in the former one. This promise was about the death and exaltation of Jesus Christ, and his exoneration from the false charges of the disbelievers. Thus even if the latter verse had mentioned just his rafā' towards God and had no reference to his death and exoneration from the false charges even then it should have been our duty to take note of all those matters that are referred to in the former verse; so that both the verses might be reconciled.

The actual meaning of the verse, therefore is that Allāh caused Jesus to die and exalted him and sanctified him against the charges of his enemies. Allāma Alwāsī has interpreted this verse (inni mutawaffika) in many ways. The clearest of these interpretations is that “I will complete the lease of your life and will cause you to die and will not let those people dominate you who try to kill you.” For, completing the period of his life and causing him to die a natural death indicates that Jesus was saved from being slain and from the mischief of his enemies. Obviously rafā' after death cannot mean any physical ascension, but only exaltation in rank, especially when the words “I will clear you of those who disbelieve” are present along with it. This shows that it is a question of spiritual honour and exaltation. The word rafā' has occurred many a time in the Qurān conveying this sense: e.g., “In houses which Allāh has permitted to be exalted (turfa‘a);” 2 “We exalt in dignity (narfau‘) whom We please;” 3 “And We exalted (rafā‘nā) for you your mention;” 14 “And We raised him (rafā‘āhu) to an elevated state;” 15 “Allāh will exalt those of you who believe . . . .” etc. Thus the expressions “I will exalt you in my presence” and “Nay! Allah exalted him in His presence” would yield a sense similar to the one when we say “So and so met the Companion on High,” or “God is with us,” or “With the Powerful King.” All these expressions signify only shelter, protection and coming under His care. So one fails to understand how the word heaven is deduced from the word towards Him (ilaih). By God! it is an outrage on the plain exposition of the Quran. And such an offence is committed simply on account of belief in such stories and narratives which are devoid of accuracy, not to speak of their established unauthenticity.

12. The Quran, XXIV: 36.
13. Ibid., VI: 84; XII: 76.
15. Ibid., XIX: 57.
16. Ibid., LVIII: 11.
الثانية إخباراً عن تحقيق الوعود الذي تضمنه الأول، وقد كان هذا الوعود بالتوفية والرفع والتطهير من الذين كفروا، فإذا كانت الآية الثانية قد جاءت خالية من التوفية والتطهير، وانتصرت على ذكر الرفع إلى الله فإنه يجب أن يلاحظ فيها ما ذكرناه الأولى جمياً بين الاثنين.

والمعنى أن الله تعالى عرسى ورفنه إليه وطهره من الذين كفروا.

وقد فسر الآلود قوله تعالى: "إنُّ الموتِ يِنْتِهِ" بوجوه من هنا - وهو أظهرها - إلى مستوى أفعالهم وميتهم حنف أنك لا أسلط عليك من بقائك، وهو كتابة عن عصمه من الأعداء وما تم بصده من الفتك به عليه السلام؛ لأنه בלزم من استنفائه الله أجله وموتته حنف أنه ذلك.

وأظهر أن الرفع - الذي يكون بعد التوفية - هو رفع المكانة لا رفع الجسد، خصوصاً وقد جاء بجانبه قوله: " وتُطْرُكَ من الذين كفروا " ما بدل على أن الأمر أمر تشريف وتكرم.

وقد جاء الرفع في القرآن كثيراً بهذا المعنى: " في بُوْتَ أذن الله " أن ترفع " وتُرَفَّعْ درجتان من نما " ورفعناً لك ذكرك " ورفعتُهُ مسًّا على " ورفع الله الذين آمنوا " إلخ.

وإذا دعا التأويل قوله " ورأفيك إلى " وقوله " بل رفعه الله إليه " كالتأويل في قولهم له فلان بالريف الأعلى وفي " إن الله معنا " وفي " عليه ملوك مقتدر " وكلا لا يفهم منها سوى من الراية والمخط قصد الكف عنام، فمن أجل تودع كل مها من كفة " إليه " القيم إن هذا نظام للتمييز القرآني واضح خصوصاً لقصص وروايات لم يتم على الظن بها - فضلاً عن اللهين - برهان ولا شيء برهان!"
Moreover, Jesus was merely an apostle and apostles before him had passed away. When the people of Jesus became hostile to him, he like other prophets, turned towards God and He saved him by His power and wisdom, and frustrated the plans of his enemies. The same point has been elaborated in the following verse: “When Jesus perceived unbelief on their part, he said: Who will be my helpers in Allah’s way...” i.e., in this verse God says that His plans were more subtle and effective than the plans of the disbelievers. As against the measures of protection and security from God, the attempts of these people against the life of Jesus were frustrated. In the verse: “When Allah said: O Jesus! I will cause thee to die and exalt thee in My presence and clear thee of those who disbelieve,” Allah gives the glad tidings that He will save Jesus from the machinations of his enemies and that ultimately their plottings will end in futility and that He will complete the period of his life till he dies a natural death neither being slain nor yet crucified and then He will exalt him in His presence.

These verses which relate to the fate of Jesus at the hands of his people will invariably yield this meaning to their reader provided he knows the practice of Allah to which He resorts for the protection of His prophets at the time of the aggressions of enemies, and provided his mind is free from all those fictitious reports that can in no case be placed as an authority over the Holy Quran. Now, I cannot understand how the snatching of Jesus from the hands of his enemies and lifting him up to the heavens can be called a subtle plan and a better one when neither was it in their power nor in the power of anybody else to counter it. In fact, there can be one “plan” (makr) as against another plan when it is contrived in a parallel manner not deviating from the natural course of Allah in such matters. We have a parallel instance in what is said by the Quran with respect of the Holy Prophet:

“And when those who disbelieved devised plans against you that they might confine you or slay you or drive you away; and they devised plans and Allah too had arranged a plan; and Allah is the best of planners.”

17. The Quran, VIII: 30.
الأهمية العبرة من الآيات:

وابعد. فما عبصى إلا رسول قد خلت من قبله الرسل، لاصبه قوته العداء، وظهرت على وجههم بوارد الشر بالنسبة إليه، فاتجاه إلى الله - شأن الأنياب والرسل - فأمره الله بفر عنه وكبح مكر أعبدائه. وهذا هو ماضمه الآيات "قل هو أحسن عيني مثلم الكفر كان من أعدائي إلى الله" إلى آخرها، بين الله فيها قوة مكره بالغة إلى مكرم، وأن مكرم فاغتنال عبصى قد صفع أباب مكر الله في حفظه وعصمه إذ قال "يا عبيد إلى منوًك"، فرانيك إلى ومطرتك من الذين كفروا" فهو يثيره إ(IP إرائه من مكره ورد كدمه في نحورهم، وأنه يبين في أهله حتى يروت حفظه أنه من غير قيل ولا صلب، ثم يرفه الله إليه.

وهذا هو ما يفهمه الفارئ، للآيات الواردة في شأن نهاية عبصى مع قوته في وقت علی سنة الله مع أنبيائه حين يتألب عليهم خصومهم، ومنه خلا ذهنه من تلك الروايات التي لا يبين أنها تجبر في القرآن، ولست أدرى كيف يكون إقلاع عبصى بطرق انتزاعه من بينهم، وفهمه بحسه إلى السما مكره، وكيف يوصف بأنه خير من مكرهم مع أنه شيء ليس في استطاعتهم أن يقاوموا شيء ليس في قدرة البشر؟

لا إنه لا يتحقق مكر في مقاطعة مكر إلا إذا كان جواباً على أسانه غير خراج عن منضوى العادة فيه. وقد جاء مثل هذا في شأن محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم "إنّ مكرك يكن الذين كفروا ليشعروا أو يفظروا أو يفسخوا أن يخرجوا وينكرن وينكر مكر الله خير المكررين".
To sum up:

1. There is nothing in the Holy Quran, nor in the sacred Traditions of the Prophet, which endorses the correctness of the belief to the contentment of heart that Jesus was taken up to heaven with his body and is alive there even now, and would descend therefrom in the latter days.

2. The Quranic verses about Jesus show that God had promised to cause him to die a natural death, then to exalt him and save him from the mischief of the disbelievers and this promise had certainly been fulfilled. His enemies could neither kill him nor crucify him, but God completed the span of his life and then caused him to die.

3. Any person who denies his bodily ascent and his continuance in physical existence in the heavens and his descent in the latter ages, does not deny a fact that can be established by clear conclusive arguments. Thus he is not outside the faith of Islam and it is absolutely wrong to consider him an apostate. He is perfectly a Muslim. If he dies he dies the death of a believer and like believers his funeral prayer must be said and he must be buried in the Muslim cemetery. His faith is decidedly faultless in the eyes of God. And God knows the conditions of His servants.

And as to the other part of the question (that is supposing Jesus returns to the world, how should a disbeliever in him be regarded) after the above statement of ours—this question does not arise at all. And God is the Best Knower.
رفع عيسى ليس عقيدة ينكر منها:

والفلاصة من هذا البحث:

۱ - أنه ليس في القرآن الكريم، ولا في السنة المطهرة مستند يصلح لتكوين عقيدة بطئين إليها القلب بأن عيسى رفع يجلس إلى السماء وأنه حي إلى الآن فيها وأنه سينزل منها آخر الزمان إلى الأرض.

۲ - أن كل ما تفيده الآيات الواردة في هذا التنزل هو وعد الله عز يذر هو منوفي أمه ورافه إليه وعاصبه من الذين كفروا، وأن هذا الوعيد تحقق فلم يقتله أعداؤه ولم يصبره، ولكن وقاؤه أحله ورفنه إليه.

۳ - أن من أنكر أن عيسى قد رفع يجلس إلى السماء، وأنه حي إلى الآن، وأنه سينزل منها آخر الزمان فإن لا يكون بذلك منكرًا مما نبت بدليل قطعي، فلا يخرج عن إسلامه وإيمانه، ولا ينبغي أن يحكم عليه بالرد، بل هو مسلم مؤمن، إذا مات فهو من المؤمنين، يصل عليه كما يصل على المؤمنين، ويديف في مقابر المؤمنين، ولا شبهة في إيمانه عنه الله، والله سبحانه وتعالى.

خير بصير.
Thus, the Quran categorically denies the story of the crucifixion of Jesus. There exist, among Muslims, many fanciful legends telling us that at the last moment God substituted for Jesus a person closely resembling him (according to some accounts, that person was Judas), who was subsequently crucified in his place. However, none of these legends finds the slightest support in the Quran or in authentic Traditions, and the stories produced in this connection by the classical commentators of the Quran must be summarily rejected. They represent no more than confused attempts at "harmonizing" the Quranic statement that Jesus was not crucified with the graphic description, in the Gospels, of his crucifixion. The story of crucifixion as much has been succinctly explained in the Quranic phrase wa-lākin shubbiha lāhum, which I render as "but it only appeared to them as if it had been so" — implying that in the course of time, long after the time of Jesus, a legend had somehow grown up possibly under the then powerful influence of Mithraistic beliefs to the effect that he had died on the cross in order to atone for the "original sin" with which mankind is allegedly burdened; and this legend became so firmly established among the latter-day followers of Jesus that even his enemies, the Jews, began to believe it — albeit in a derogatory sense (for crucifixion was, in those times, a heinous form of death penalty reserved for the lowest of criminals. This, to my mind, is the only satisfactory explanation of the phrase wa-lākin shubbiha lāhum, the more so as the expression shubbiha li idiomatically synonymous with khuyyila li, "(a thing) became a fancied image to me", i.e., "in my mind" — in other words, "it) seemed to me" see Qāmūs, art. khayala, as well as Lane II, 833, and IV, 1500).

Cf. 3:55; where God says to Jesus, "Verily, I shall cause thee to die, and shall exalt thee unto Me." The verb rafā‘ahū (lit., "he raised him" or "elevated him") has always, whenever
the act of ras' ("elevating") of a human being is attributed to God, the meaning of "honouring" or "exalting". Nowhere in the Qur'an is there any warrant for the popular belief of many Muslims that God has "taken up" Jesus bodily into heaven. The expression "God exalted him unto Himself" in the above verse denotes the elevation of Jesus to the realm of God's special grace—a blessing in which all prophets partake, as is evident from 19:57, where the verb ras'na'hu ("We exalted him") is used with regard to the Prophet Idris. See also MuḥammadʿAbdūh in Manār III, 316 f. and VI, 20 f. The "nay" (bal) at the beginning of the sentence is meant to stress the contrast between the belief of the Jews that they put Jesus to a shameful death on the cross and the fact of God's having "exalted him unto Himself". (The Message of the Qur'an, translated and explained by Muhammad Asad, Vol. I, pp. 177-178, Muslim World League Mecca, European Representative: Islamic Centre, Geneva, 1964).
C—MODERN SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE AND THE QUR'AN'S REJECTION OF JESUS' DEATH ON THE CROSS

In 1955 Dr. J. G. Bourne, a senior anaesthetist of St. Thomas's Hospital and Salisbury Hospital Group, began investigating cases of patients fainting under general anaesthesia in the dentist's chair. This can cause death: a man kept upright in a faint loses blood-supply to the brain. Dr. Bourne published this original research in 1957. Later, turning over his discoveries in his mind, he began to relate certain aspects to the facts of the Crucifixion and Resurrection. The theory that resulted was somewhat startling, but Dr. Bourne, himself a man of strong Christian belief, feels that it could make Christianity more attractive to people unable to accept the supernatural explanation of the Resurrection. He quotes the Archbishop of Canterbury, who wrote on the Resurrection: "There is need for the most scientific approach to historical proof that is possible." This is an abbreviated version of Dr. Bourne's paper on his theory, which is to be published elsewhere in more technical form.

"Normally, discussion of the Resurrection centres on the historical proofs (now generally accepted) of Jesus' subsequent appearances on earth. To question his actual death may be thought heresy — but there is reason to think that Jesus in fact fainted on the Cross, was believed dead, and recovered after a period of coma.

"Dr. C. C. P. Clark, writing in the New York Medical Record in 1908, suggested that Jesus' apparent death might have been a fainting attack. In 1935 Professor S. Weiss, an American authority on fainting, pointed out that fainting was the usual cause of death in victims of crucifixion, and this is now accepted among medical scientists.

"The essential feature of fainting is a fall in arterial blood

pressure, caused by active dilation of the smaller arteries of the body, mainly in the muscles. Blood then gets away from the arterial side of the circulation with greatly decreased resistance. At the same time the heart is slowed, and may stop for several seconds. The onset may come without warning, though not usually, and there may be a sense of impending death.

"Blood pressure falls precipitously, the brain's oxygen supply is reduced, consciousness is lost and the subject falls down. Breathing is shallow, the pupils are dilated, and the appearance death-like: not even the deepest coma so closely resembles death.

"The abolition of muscle power which causes the fall is a safeguard to the brain, which is readily damaged by oxygen-lack. In the horizontal position, blood-pressure is restored, and consciousness returns. However, deathly pallor may continue for an hour or more - due to release of pituitary hormone, part of the reflex response.

"If the subject is kept upright: a blood-pressure may spontaneously return above fainting level; (b) the subject may recover momentarily and faint again, perhaps repeatedly; (c) he may continue in the faint, with progressively falling blood-pressure, but still with a survival chance; or he may die instantaneously because the heart stopped beating at the onset and did not resume. In fatal cases, however, death is usually due to brain damage from lack of oxygen, and may come in two or three minutes, or be delayed even for weeks.

Recovery

"Depending on the blood pressure level and the length of time he is kept upright, the survivor may suffer stupor or coma with recovery after a few hours or days, various degrees or permanent intellectual impairment, or profound dementia and delayed death. Such cases are not uncommon in medicine.

"Some years ago investigation was made by the writer into certain accidents which occurred in dentistry and discovered that patients, under light anaesthesia with nitrous-oxide, might develop a fainting attack. (Dr. Bourne published this research in his book Nitrous Oxide in Dentistry). Under a general anaesthetic, this was unnoticed until, quite suddenly, the patient developed all the
appearances of being dead. At that time the importance of getting the patient flat was not understood, and when eventually lifted from chair to the floor, he would lie pallid and inert until consciousness slowly returned. Many such cases were discovered: the coma lasting half an hour, several hours, a day or two, or in one extreme case, two weeks. Some cases were fatal.

Walking

"The Crucifixion (according to the Gospels and Renan's Life of Jesus) took place around noon, and Jesus' apparent death occurred suddenly about 3 p.m. He was taken down and laid in the tomb, but at dawn on Sunday, forty hours later, was no longer there. Five times that day He was seen walking and talking to people: first with Mary Magdalen just after dawn, who initially did not recognize Him. He also had a long discourse with disciples before being recognized.

"The period that the upright position could be held in a faint and allow recovery of consciousness after relatively few hours' coma would depend on how low blood-pressure fell: this determining the degree of the brain's oxygen-lack. The level in his case cannot be guessed, but it seems the fainting-interval on the cross was short. Some advantage would be gained by the fact that on fainting the head would fall forward, thus lessening the distance from heart to brain, and improving blood flow. St. John says the Jews did not want the bodies to remain on the cross for the coming Sabbath so they asked Pilate to have them taken down. 'The soldiers accordingly came to the first of his fellow-victims and to the second, and broke their legs; but when they came to Jesus, they found that he was already dead, so they did not break his legs. But one of the soldiers pierced his side with a lance, and at once there was a flood of blood and water.'

Sympathetic

"The soldiers were acting under Pilate's orders, and presumably would have forthwith taken down the bodies. (The centurion, sympathetic to Jesus, would probably have seen that it was done promptly.) Renan says that when Joseph asked Pilate for Jesus's body, it had already been taken down. It is certain
that the soldiers did not break his legs — the usual method of applying the coup-de-grace to victims.

"Next, how did it happen that blood flowed from the wound? In a dead body, blood will coze from cut veins, but there is not the flow of blood described by St. John's description. (In operating for cardiac arrest, a flow would rightly be taken as evidence that the heart was still beating, and the surgeon would not proceed to open the chest.) In fainting, this is just what would be expected, with the small muscle arteries dilated. The lance could hardly have failed to pierce muscle, and the wound was probably well below heart level, where blood-pressure would be appreciable even in a faint.

"Apart from the likeness of the faint to death, death is not always easily diagnosed: mistakes are made even today. I know personally of two persons pronounced dead by doctors revived in the mortuary — one of them left hospital thirteen days later on foot. In Jesus, death appears to have been diagnosed by soldiers: what could be more understandable than a mistake during the tumult of this terrible event?"

**Changed**

"Nor is it surprising that close associates should have failed initially to recognize Jesus afterwards. He would have looked an ill man, much changed. It might be argued that during the post-Crucifixion period, his words lacked somewhat their former vigour and brilliance: can it be that cerebral anoxia on the cross had left its mark?

"A great many people must have doubted the reality of Jesus, death upon the Cross, or else the literal truth of the Resurrection. That he fainted, and did not die, was suggested by Dr. Clark three-quarters of a century ago, and according to Renan, recovery after crucifixion was known to the ancients. If there was nothing supernatural about the reappearance of Jesus, need that be an obstacle to the acceptance of His teachings? His life is sublime without physical myths: nothing can take away the miracles of the spirit."

*(The Islamic Review, Woking, England, April 1965.)*
IV. DENIAL OF A CLAIM TO PROPHETHOOD

Strange resemblance to Jesus Christ

A person's denial of a certain charge does not fall within the category of his claims but as a serious misunderstanding has arisen among opponents as well as a section of the followers of the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement about his claim, therefore, it is discussed under the same head. In his books the Founder has not even once claimed to be a prophet. As against this, however strange it may appear, the denial of such a claim has been often mentioned. In spite of this, first his opponents and later a section of his followers declared him to be a claimant to prophethood. There is no such claim, even in ambiguous terms. Rather its denial has been pronounced in a most clear way. But those fond of extremes persist in ascribing a claim of prophethood to him. This bears a strange resemblance to the position of Jesus Christ. His opponents from among the learned Jews declared that as Jesus Christ laid a claim to Divinity, therefore, he must be crucified, while his extremist followers also adhere to the Doctrine that he did indeed lay such a claim. Only a small section, namely the Unitarians, kept to the belief that he never claimed to be God or the son of God. The Qur'an, revealed six hundred years after the death of Jesus Christ, confirmed the belief of this small section as true and declared the belief of other Christians and the Jews to be false. Similar is the case with the Messiah of the Muslim nation. When he claimed to be the Promised Messiah and Mahdi, his opponents straightway declared him a heretic on the wrong assumption that he claimed to be a prophet. After his death a large section of his followers, led by a person who had no Divine authority, adopted the doctrine that he was in fact a claimant to prophethood. The other section, although small in number, adhered to the belief that he never claimed to be a prophet. This, in fact, is the right course. In the case of Jesus Christ an extremist group raised him to the pedestal of Divinity and in our age a majaddid (renovator) was raised to prophethood.
The reason for ascribing a claim of prophethood to the Founder

The reason in both cases is the same. Jesus Christ never said that he was God or the son of God, though he used the term "son of God" in the metaphorical sense which in the same sense, had been used before and it was applied to a righteous person. The following passage makes this clear:

"The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are Gods? If he called them Gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scriptures cannot be broken; Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemer; because I said, I am the son of God?" 1

This shows that the learned among the Jews charged him with blasphemy and unbelief because in their view Jesus had claimed Godhood by declaring himself to be the son of God. Jesus' reply was that in the metaphorical sense, in which he termed himself to be the son of God, the elders of the Jews were called Gods, which implied that the claim of Godhood was different from the mere use of this term in the metaphorical sense. By employing such a term a person cannot be regarded as a claimant to that office. If anybody, only because of the use of a metaphorical expression, ascribes a particular claim to a person he, in fact, follows in the footsteps of the 'ulamā' of the Jews. The Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement has been unfortunately treated in a similar way. When in 1890 C.E. he claimed to be the Promised Messiah he also gave a reply to the objection raised that the Messiah was a prophet, therefore, his like should also be a prophet. In his own words:

"Here, if it be objected that the like of the Messiah should also be a prophet because the Messiah was himself a prophet, the reply to this in the first instance is, that our Holy Prophet

---

1. John 10: 33-36. In some manuscripts the words a son of God are found instead of the son of God—T.
has not made prophethood a condition for the coming Messiah but has clearly stated that he shall be a Muslim and bound by the law of the Qur'ān like ordinary Muslims. He shall not say anything except that he was a Muslim and their leader. Besides this, there is no doubt in it that this humble servant has been raised by the Most High God for this nation in the capacity of a muhaddath and a muhaddath is in one sense also a prophet. Though he does not possess perfect prophethood, nevertheless he is partially a prophet, for he is endowed with the gift of being spoken to by God, and matters unseen are manifested to him and like the revelation of messengers and prophets his revelations are also made free from the intervention of the devil. And the real kernel of the law is disclosed to him and he is commissioned just like prophets, and it is obligatory on him like prophets, that he should announce himself at the top of his voice, and anybody who rejects him deserves punishment to some extent. And this prophethood means nothing but that the above-mentioned characteristics are found in him.

“If the plea is put forward that the door of prophethood has been closed and a seal has been set on the revelation that descends on prophets, I say that neither the door of prophethood has been closed in all respects nor a seal has been set on every form of revelation. On the contrary the door of revelation and prophethood has been partially open for this nation ever since. But it should be carefully borne in mind that this prophethood which will continue for ever is not perfect prophethood (nubuwvah tämmah), but as I have just mentioned is only a partial prophethood (juz’i nubuwvat) which in other words is termed muhaddathiyyah and which one receives by following the greatest and perfect of all human beings, the Holy Prophet Muḥammad, the embodiment of all excellences of perfect prophethood (may the peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him!)”

2. Taudīh Marām (22nd January 1891 c.e.) pp. 9, 10.
Here the Founder had in fact replied to the objection against his being the Promised Messiah, or the like of the Messiah, that as unlike the (earlier) Messiah he was not a prophet, therefore, he could not be the like of him (mathīl Masāḥ), for how could a non-prophet be the like of a prophet! Such an objection was in reality based on ignorance because it has been clearly mentioned in the hadith:

\[
\text{عَلَّمَنَا إِِمَامٍ كَأَمِينَاءِ سَنِينِ إِسْرَارَيْنِ}
\]

i.e. the learned of my nation would be like the prophets of Israel,³ and the Qur‘ān has also referred to the khālisāhs (successors) of Islam as resembling the khālisāhs of Israel who were prophets:

\[
\text{لِيَسْتَوْلِعَ فَتْحَهُمُ في الأَرْضِ كَمَا اسْتَوْلَى الدِّينُ إِلَى نَبِيِّهِمْ}
\]

i.e. He will surely make them successors in the earth as He made those successors before them.⁴ The Founder has refuted the above charge in two ways. Firstly, the Holy Prophet himself has not made prophethood a condition for the coming Messiah. Secondly, as far as the question of likeness (mumāthalat) was concerned, it did not stand as an obstacle in his way because the Founder claimed to be a muḥaddath and a muḥaddath has some resemblance with a prophet. And he has also explained the grounds for such a resemblance, that is to say, both prophet and muḥaddath are spoken to by God, their revelations are free from the intervention of the devil, both are commissioned by God and their rejection by people does involve punishment to some extent.

“'No one could deny these characteristics of a muḥaddath and no one had, in fact, the courage to do so, but the words that followed, that the door of revelation and prophethood has been partially open for this nation ever since and that a muḥaddath is in one sense also a prophet, became a hot bed of controversy. They were considered to be the basis of a claim to prophethood by the Founder. Ascribing meaning to words without reference to the context is against all

---

principles of sound interpretation. When in the beginning of the above reply the Founder has clearly and decisively mentioned that prophethood is not a condition for the coming Messiah and that he will be a Muslim like other Muslims and their leader, how could an opposite conclusion be drawn from the other sentences? Nevertheless if serious thought is given to that part of the statement as well there is nothing objectionable in it. "The door of revelation and prophethood has been partially open to this nation ever since". Is it not a fact? Is it not clearly mentioned in the reports that good visions form a forty-sixth part of prophethood? The Founder has himself explained it a little later:

"And you have read in the books of hadith that good vision is a forty-sixth part of perfect prophethood. Thus when good visions could rank so high what would be the position of revelation which descends on the hearts of muhaddathin. The substance of my talk is this, may Allah guide you, that the doors of partial prophethood (juz'ī nubuwwah) have always been open. But nothing remains of prophethood except mubashhirat (good news), munzirat (warnings), reports of the unseen matters, deep understanding of the Qur'an and Divine knowledge. We believe that prophethood which is perfect and complete and possesses all the excellences of revelation has been intercepted from the day this verse was revealed:

Muhammad is not the father of any of your men, but he is the Messenger of Allah and seal of the prophets."

Who can deny the fact from among this ummah that there have been thousands of Muslim saints gifted with inspiration (ilham) and Divine communication besides good vision? Thus, when good vision (al-ru'ya) is an element of prophethood ilham is also a part of propheth-

---

7. Taudhih Marâm, p. 20.
hood and the recipient of *ilkhām* can be called a partial prophet (*juzī nabi*) but the use of the word 'prophet' here should only be taken literally.

The Anathema of Heresy (*Fatwā Kufī*) against the Founder was issued on the basis of this statement. His clear and straightforward explanations were entirely neglected and some of his words were grossly misinterpreted and thus a servant of Islam was openly declared to be a *kāfir*. If, however, his original statement was ambiguous, the further clarification he made in reply to the *Fatwā* of *Kufī* must have set the opposition at rest, and the excommunicators (*Mukaffirīn*) should have immediately withdrawn their *fatwās*. The following is however the announcement which the Founder made at Delhi on 2nd October, 1891 C.E. in reply to this Anathema:

“I have heard that some of the leading *ulamā*’ of this city are giving publicity to false charges against me that I lay claim to prophethood, or do not believe in angels, or in heaven and hell or in the existence of Gabriel, or in *Lailat al-Qadr* (the Grand Night) or in miracles and the *Miʿrāj* (Ascension) of the Holy Prophet. So, to make the truth known to all and sundry, I do hereby publicly declare that all this is a complete fabrication. I am not a claimant to prophethood, neither am I a denier of miracles, angels, *Lailat al-Qadr*, etc. On the other hand, I profess belief in all those matters which are included in the Islamic principles of faith and, in accordance with the belief of the Ahl Sunnah wal-*Jamāʿah*, I believe in all those things which are established by the *Qurʾān* and *ḥadīth*, and after our lord and master Muḥammad Muṣṭafā (may peace and blessings of God be upon him) — the last of the messengers (*khātṃ al-mursalīn*) — I regard any claimant to prophethood and messengership to be a liar and unbeliever (*kāfir*). It is my conviction that apostolic revelation (*waḥy risālah*) began with Adam, the chosen one of God, and came to a close with the Messenger of God (*i.e.* the Prophet Muḥammad) (may the peace and blessings of God be upon him)... Every one should
hear witness to this statement and God All-Knowing and
Listening is the first of all witnesses — that I declare my be-
lief in all those doctrines by the acceptance of which even a
kāfir becomes a Muslim and a follower of any other religion
too is immediately proclaimed a Musalmān.”

Similarly in a speech on 23rd October, 1891 C.E. in the
Jāmi’ Mosque at Delhi he declared:

“Other charges which are advanced against me that I am a
denier of Lailat al-Qadr (the Grand Night), miracles and
Ascension, and that I am also a claimant to prophethood and
a denier of the finality of prophethood (khatm nubuwwat)
—are entirely untrue and absolutely false. In all these
matters, my belief is the same as that of the other Ahl
Sunnah wal-Jamā’ah and such objections against my books,
Taudīh Marām and Izālah Auhām are entirely the errors of
the fault-finders (themselves). Now I make a plain ad-
mission before Muslims in this house of God of the following
matters that I am a believer in the finality of prophethood
(khatm nubuwwat) of the Seal of the prophets (khātam al-
anbiyā’), (may peace and blessings of God be upon him!),
and I consider the person who denies the finality of pro-
phethood to be a heretic and outside the pale of Islam.
Similarly I am a believer in the angels, miracles, Lailat al-
Qadr, etc.”8

Then in his book Izālah Auhām he has written:

“Question: In the pamphlet Fath Islām a claim has been laid
to prophethood.

“Answer: There is no claim to prophethood but of muḥad-
dathiyyah which has been advanced by God’s command.
However, there is no doubt in it that muḥaddathiyyah also
contains a strong part of prophethood. When a true vision
is considered to be a forty-sixth part of prophethood, then if
muḥaddathiyyah, which is mentioned in the Qur’ān with pro-
phethood and messengership about which there is also a

report in Ṣāḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, be called metaphorically or be regarded as a strong part of prophethood, does this amount to a claim to nubuwwah?  

Again in the year 1892 C.E. a controversy was held between Doctor ‘Abd al-Ḥakīm and the Founder at Lahore during which ‘Abd al-Ḥakīm objected that the Founder had laid a claim to prophethood. To this charge the reply was made in a written statement attested by eight witnesses which brought the controversy to an end. I quote below a part of the statement:

“From the beginning as God knows best, my intention has never been to use this word nabi as meaning a real (haqiqi) prophet, but only as signifying a muhaddath, which the Holy Prophet has explained as meaning one who is spoken to by God... Therefore I have not the least hesitation in the reconciliation of my Muslim brethren, by expressing the same idea in another form, and that other form is that wherever the word nabi (prophet) is used in my writings, it should be taken as meaning muhaddath, and the word nabi should be regarded as having been blotted out.”

The word prophet was used only by way of metaphor (Majāz)

The Founder not only denied repeatedly a claim to prophethood but also clearly stated that the word ‘prophet’ was only used in the metaphorical sense for muhaddath, which in fact was his real claim. His books are full of such references. I quote below only a few:

“The coming Messiah on account of being a muhaddath is also called metaphorically a prophet.”

“If muhaddathiyyah is looked upon as prophethood metaphorically, does this amount to a claim to prophethood.”

“In a metaphorical sense God has the right to speak of an

10. Announcement signed on 3rd February 1892 C.E. at Lahore.
12. Ibid., p. 127.
THE CLAIMS OF THE FOUNDER

inspired servant (mulham) as a prophet or a mursal (the sent one)."\textsuperscript{13}

"This humble servant has never laid claim to prophethood or messengership in the real sense of the term. To apply a word in its non-real (ghair haqiqt) sense or to use it in conversation in its ordinary literal sense does not amount to heresy (kufir).\textsuperscript{14}

"Here the use of the words 'messenger' and 'prophet' in Divine communication is just by way of metaphor and simile."\textsuperscript{15}

"To use the word 'prophet' or 'messenger' for him is not improper but is an eloquent simile."\textsuperscript{16}

"I have been called a prophet of God only by way of metaphor and not by way of reality."\textsuperscript{17}

The claimant to prophethood was accursed and declared to be a kāfir

These references have been taken from his various writings from the beginning i.e., 1891 c.e., till the later days of his life, so that it may not occur to anyone that the Founder's attitude on this point had undergone a change during this period. Now two things are clear from all these references, firstly, that he made an emphatic denial of a claim to prophethood and, secondly, the use of the word 'prophet' in respect of himself was made only by way of metaphor and simile. As Jesus Christ was not a claimant to Godhood but only used the expression 'the son of God' metaphorically, similarly Ḥaḍrat Aḥmad was not a claimant to prophethood but if the word 'prophet' had occurred in some hadith about him or in his revelations, the only interpretation he gave was that such a use was by way of metaphor and simile alone. After this clarification nobody

\textsuperscript{13} Sirāj Munir (1897 c.e.) p. 3.

\textsuperscript{14} Anjām Aḥham (1898 c.e.) p. 27 footnote.

\textsuperscript{15} Arba'īn No. 3 (1899 c.e.) p. 25 footnote and Tuḥfah Golarwiyyah p. 24 supplement.

\textsuperscript{16} Tuḥfah Golarwiyyah (1902 c.e.) p. 24 supplement, footnote.

\textsuperscript{17} Ḥaqīqat al-Wahy (1907 c.e.) p. 65 supplement Iṣṭifā'.
should entertain any doubt about his position. But unfortunately the charge which was laid against him by his opponents in a spirit of enmity was also supported by a group of his followers in the extravagance of their love. The point to remember is whether a person can claim to be a prophet who has repeatedly asserted in his writings:

"We also curse the claimant to prophethood."

"After our lord and master Muḥammad Muṣṭafā, (may peace and blessings of God be upon him!) — the last of the messengers (khatm al-mursalin) — I regard any claimant to prophethood and messengership to be a liar and an unbeliever (kāfir)."

"I look upon anyone who denies the finality of prophethood (khatm nubuwват) to be a heretic and outside the pale of Islam. "It does not behove me that I should lay a claim to prophethood and go outside the pale of Islam and join the party of unbelievers."

"Can an ill-fated fabricator who himself lays claim to messengership and prophethood have any faith in the Qur'ān? And can such a person who has faith in the Qur'ān ... say that he is a messenger and prophet after the Holy Prophet."

Could a writer of these lines lay a claim to prophethood for himself? Or is it possible that, on the one hand, he should curse the claimant to prophethood, declare him to be a liar, an infidel, an ill-fated fabricator and outside the pale of Islam and on the other, should continue advancing claims which he had so vehemently denounced himself?

As against the denial of a claim to prophethood there is an admittance to the claim of muḥaddathīyyat and not of prophethood without a code

It is argued that the opponents accused him of laying a
claim to prophethood with a code (taṣḥiḥi nubuwah) and his denial was mainly directed against this charge. But it should be borne in mind that wherever a denial occurs in these references about prophethood he has not written himself at all that he has made a denial in respect of prophethood with a code or that a claimant to prophethood with a code is an accursed infidel and outside the pale of Islam. On the other hand, he has used the mere (muṣlaq) word of nubuwah. If it be accepted that prophethood is of two kinds, namely, with a code and without a code, even then the mere word ‘prophethood’ should include both these kinds. In all his above writings there is a denial of a claim to absolute (muṣlaq) prophethood and the claimant to muṣlaq nubuwah has been cursed. Moreover, not once but scores of times he has denied a claim to prophethood and, as against this, upheld a claim to muḥaddathiyah, which shows that he has used the word nabi as opposed to muḥaddath. To assert that he always had in view prophethood with a code while refuting the charge of nubuwat and that actually he was claimant to prophethood without a code is simply to flout his clear and decisive writings where he has placed the word nabi against that of muḥaddath and not against any imaginary prophethood without a code.

I quote below a few references to substantiate my point:

"There is no claim of prophethood but of muḥaddathiyah which has been made by the command of Allah."\(^{23}\)

"From the beginning my intention has been that the word prophet does not mean a real (haqiqa) prophet but only a muḥaddath who according to the Holy Prophet is a recipient of Divine communication."\(^{24}\)

"I firmly believe that our Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) is khaṭam al-anbiyya (Seal of the prophets) and after him no prophet, neither new nor old, shall appear for this ummah... Of course muḥaddathin will be raised who are communicated with by God Almighty."\(^{25}\)

\(^{23}\) Izālah Aḥān p. 421.

\(^{24}\) Majmūʿah Ishīḥārāt vol. I p. 98.

\(^{25}\) Nīshān Āsmān (26th May 1892 C.E.) p. 28.
"I am not a prophet but a muḥaddath from God and a recipient of Divine communication so that I may renovate the religion of Muṣṭafā." 26

"Neither did I lay claim to prophethood, nor did I say to them that I was a prophet. But these people made haste and misunderstood me in my statement... I have told the people nothing except that which I had written in my books that I was a muḥaddath and God communicated with me as He did with other muḥaddathīn." 27

"These people did not understand me and said that this person was a claimant to prophethood and God knows that this saying of theirs was quite baseless... I said it is true that muḥaddath contained all elements of prophethood in him in a potential form and not in point of position and if the door of prophethood has not been closed he would have been a prophet in position as well. 28

"I lay no claim to prophethood. This is only your mistake or are you saying it with some other motive? Does a person also become a prophet if he claims to be the recipient of ilhām (inspiration)." 29

"Our master the Messenger of Allāh is khātam al-anbiyā' (the Seal of the prophets) and as no prophet can appear after him, therefore in this Shari'ah, muḥaddathīn have been substituted for prophets." 30

The assertion, therefore, that while denying prophethood the Founder had in view only the denial of prophethood with a code, and not prophethood without a code, is baseless, because wherever he has repudiated the charge of prophethood against him he has not, as opposed to this, declared that he has laid a claim to a prophethood without a code. On the contrary he has stated that he was a claimant to muḥaddathīyyah which shows that to him nubuwwah:

27. Ḥamāmāt al-Bushrā p. 79.
28. Ibid., p. 81.
30. Shahādat al-Qur'ān (22nd September 1893 C.E.) p. 27.
was different from *muḥaddathiyyah*. And whenever he denied claim to prophethood, he denied the claim to absolute prophethood (*muḥaqqaq nubuwwah*), i.e., prophethood to which this word could be applied in the terminology of *Shari‘ah*. Thus, if *prophethood without a code* is not *muḥaddathiyyah* and means a special kind of prophethood, then its denial was also present in the mind of the Founder along with the denial of prophethood with a code. He has cursed the claimants of both these kinds (of prophethoods) and has denounced them as infidels outside the circle of Islam.

**The Anathema of Heresy (Fatwā Kufr) was based on the claim of prophethood without a code**

Had this clarification not been found in his writings even then such a thought — that, by the denial of prophethood, only a denial of prophethood with a code was implied — would have been unjustifiable. The *Fatwā* of *Kufr* (Anathema of Heresy) levelled against him was not based on his claim of prophethood with a code (*tashrīʿī nubuwwat*), but on the alleged basis of his claim to prophethood without a code (*ghair tashrīʿī nubuwwat*) as has been clearly mentioned in the *Fatwā*. It is evident now that his strong denial concerning prophethood came after the publication of the *Fatwā* which accused him of laying a claim to prophethood without a code. When a person is accused of something, he must necessarily clarify his position with particular reference to that point. It is meaningless to clear oneself from a charge which has not been actually laid against one. The opponents admitted it themselves that the Founder was not a claimant to prophethood with a code but that he claimed to be a prophet without a code, and it was for this reason that he should be declared a heretic. Did Ḥāḍrat Ahmad tell them in reply that his opponents were liars and that he did not lay a claim to prophethood with a code but to prophethood without a code? If he had written thus, he would have indeed confirmed the allegation of his opponents. The following are the words of the *Fatwā Kufr*:

"The Qādiānī’s view about the finality of prophethood which limits itself to complete prophethood or prophethood with a code and his assertion of being a *muḥaddath*, thereby proposing
for himself a special kind of prophethood, clearly shows that he regards himself like the prophets of the Israelites (who did not bring new code but followed the previous ones and were called prophets). This is implied in his verses of *Qasidah Ilhāmiyah.*

If there had been no such clarification in the *Fatwā Kufr* and simply a charge of being a prophet was laid against the Founder, the denial of such a charge by him must have included all types of prophethood, whether it was a *new* prophethood with a code or without. Unless he had admitted it himself that his denial was only directed against a prophethood *with* a code and not against prophethood *without*, nobody else had any right to say that, while refuting the charge of a claim to prophethood, he had in view prophethood pertaining to a code. Moreover, when his opponents made it clear that the point at issue was not prophethood with a code but prophethood without a code, the Founder’s refusal to admit such a charge could not mean anything else except the denial of prophethood *without* a code.

**Did he not know the difference between a nābi and a muḥaddath?**

In reply to this, sometimes it is argued that Ḥadrat Ahmad did not at first understand the difference between prophethood and *muḥaddathiyah.* An opponent may say whatever he likes but it is indeed a matter of surprise that his followers should utter such remarks about him. They regard him not only as a *muḥaddath* and a *mujaddid* but also a nābi and still they say about him that he did not understand even his claim. That is to say, all the conditions of a prophet were found and fulfilled in him, but as he did not know the difference between a prophet and a *muḥaddath,* therefore, in his ignorance he refused to be called a prophet and considered such a claimant infidel and accursed. God forbid! How insulting is this position, that after accepting a person an Arbiter, Judge, Messiah, Mahdi, *Mujaddid* and above all as prophet, such derogatory remarks should be made about him. It is indeed true that, as the eyes of his opponents were closed, on account of extreme hatred and enmity against him, his followers’ eyes were also
closed on account of excessive love towards him. This was what happened with the Christian Messiah. The Jews said that he claimed Divinity for himself and his extremist followers also confirmed this statement. Jesus' opponents declared that he descended into hell (God forbid!) and his followers also admitted that it did happen like that.

Below I quote two passages one from the writings of the Founder's followers and the other from one of his most inordinate opponents:

(1) "Although 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 muḥaddath, and not of a prophet, he always called himself a muḥaddath, not knowing 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 refused to be called a prophet." 31

(2) "Although it has been stated by the Qādiānī (i.e., Ahmad T.) that he is a claimant to that kind of prophethood, the door whereof shall remain open unto the Day of Resurrection, and that muḥaddathiyyah is another name of this prophethood whereof he is the claimant, he has, at the same time, put such an interpretation upon the term muḥaddathiyyah, and explained its nature to be such that it cannot mean anything but prophethood." 32

The only difference in the above two statements is that the opponents declared that the Founder used the word muḥaddath intentionally to deceive the people, i.e., he explained it in such a way that it could not mean anything else but prophethood, while a section of his followers asserts that he simply did not know the difference between a muḥaddath and a prophet, which in other words means that neither did he know the reality of a muḥaddath nor of a nabi. But nobody pointed out what was his actual mistake. Was his definition of the term muḥaddath wrong? According to him the

32. Fatwā Kufr pp. 76, 77.
following conditions were found in a muḥaddath (the full text from 
Taūḥīf Marām p. 9 has been given before):

1. Muḥaddath is spoken to by God.
2. He is commissioned just like prophets.
3. Like prophets it is obligatory on him that he should announce himself at the top of his voice.
4. Anybody who rejects him deserves punishment to some extent.

That non-prophets are endowed with Divine communication is an established principle of the Islamic Shari‘ah. The Qur‘ān has itself spoken of the sending of Divine revelation to Moses’ mother:

وَأَرْحَمْنَا إِلَى أُمِّ مُرْسِلٍ

i.e., and We revealed to Moses’ mother. Similarly a mention has been made of Jesus’ disciples receiving revelation:

وَإِذْ أَرْحَمْتُ إِلَى الْعَزِيزِ

i.e., and when I revealed to the disciples. Neither Moses’ mother nor the disciples of Jesus were prophets but they were certainly favoured with the gift of revelation. Some persons are alarmed at the use of the word revelation (wāḥy) and think that a righteous servant of God (aulīyā’Allāh) can have inspiration (iḥām) but not wāḥy whereas the Qur‘ān has clearly used the word wāḥy in the above instances for non-prophets. There is an authentic and unanimous report of the Prophet:

لِفَدِكَانِ فِي مَنْ نَتَّبِعُونَ مِنْ بَني إِسْرَائِيلِ رُجُلٌ يَلُبُّ الْحَرْثَ مِنْ غَيْرِ آنَ يَكُونُ أَبِيَانَا بَنَانَ وَيَكُنُّ مِنَ الْأَمْيَلِ مَهَابُ أَحَدٌ فَمَّـا

i.e. Among those that were before you of the Israelites there used to be men who were spoken to by God, though they were not prophets, and if there is one among my followers, it is ‘Umar. In another version of this hadith

34. Ibid., 5:111.
35. Al-Bukhārī, Kitāb Munāqib ‘Umar.
the words are: *There used to be muḥaddathūn in the nations before you, and if there is any in my nation it is ʿUmar* which makes the point clear that muḥaddath is indeed spoken to by God.

The second point is his being commissioned as a māmūr (the one Divinely raised). The words of the Ḥadīth about mujaddid are a clear evidence to this effect:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَعْتَبُرُ لِهذِهِ الرَّسُولِ وَالْأَصْحَابَ عَلَى رَأْسِ كُلِّ ما أُنْتَيْنَى مِنْ يَتَّبِعُونَهَا وَذُلِّكَ

*i.e.* Most surely Allāh will raise for this nation at the head of every century one who shall revive for it its faith. Here the word ʿayb athu (يَعْبُث) (He will raise or appoint) has been spoken about the mujaddid which refers to his being a māmūr (Divinely ordained), and his declaring himself as such is obviously the result of his appointment. When God would raise him to the status of a māmūr he would naturally declare himself to be so. As to the last point, that anyone who opposes him deserves punishment to some extent, it is evident that when God appoints a person his denial is the denial of a command of God. As the rejection of every Divine command makes a person liable to punishment, the rejection of a mujaddid too is open to some punishment.37

The distinguishing characteristics between a nabi and a muḥaddath

Although Divine communication is common between a muḥaddath and a prophet, there is still a difference in the mode and subject of their communications. The revelation of a muḥaddath does not consist of anything except glad tidings (mubashshirāt) as has been mentioned in the Ḥadīth:

لَمْ يَرَيْنَ مِنَ الْمُتَّبَعِ مِنْ النُّبُوَّةِ إِلَّا الْمُبَاشَشِرَاتِ

*i.e.*, there has remained nothing of prophethood except glad tidings (mubashshirāt).38 The reason for this is that the muḥaddath appears only in support of religion and prophecies are needed for this purpose,

37. See footnotes 14 and 19. 38. Ibid., 92.5, Musnad Ahmad.
therefore, whatever God communicates to him consists of prophecies or secret informations but the revelation which is vouchsafed to the prophets consists of law (shari'ah) as well. It can add to or change the shari'ah, as the Founder has made it clear in one of his books:

"God communes and communicates with His saints (auliya') in this nation and they are imbued with the colour of prophethood but they are not prophets in reality, for the Qur'an has brought the shari'ah to the point of perfection." 39

This means that the righteous servants in this ummah are spoken to by God and they are coloured with the colour of prophets without their being prophets themselves, because the Law has been made perfect by the Qur'an. This shows that prophets were needed till the shari'ah had not attained to a degree of perfection and addition, subtraction or alteration therein was still needed. Thus, Divine communication is common to both a prophet and a muhaddath. The distinction, however, between their revelations is that the revelation of a muhaddath is confined to prophecies or the knowledge of Divine subtleties while in the case of a prophet it also consists of commands of the shari'ah. The second point which is common, in a sense, to both but also distinguishes one from the other is that their denial makes a person liable to punishment. Nobody becomes a kāfir by denying the claim of a muhaddath but the denial of a prophet does make a person kāfir, as has been written by the Founder himself:

"To call a denier of one's claim a kāfir is the privilege of those prophets alone who bring from God shari'ah and new commandments, but as to the inspired ones (mulhams) and the ones spoken to by God (muhaddathin) other than the possessors of shari'ah (sāhib al-shari'ah), however great their dignity in the sight of God and however much they may have been honoured by being spoken to by God, no one becomes a kāfir by their denial." 40

40. Tiryāq al-Qulāb (28th October, 1902) p. 130.
None of the followers or opponents of the Founder has proved his definition of muḥaddath to be wrong

Besides this the Founder has also referred to some other differences between a muḥaddath and a prophet. They are as follows:

(1) A prophet receives prophetic revelation (wahi nubuwah) through the agency of Gabriel, but to non-prophets Gabriel does not personally descend with revelation.

(2) A prophet follows his own revelation, but a muḥaddath obeys the revelation of his master-prophet.

(3) The revelation granted to prophets is a confirmation of the previous prophetic revelation but the revelation granted to saints (wahi wilāyāt) itself derives its verification from the revelation of their master-prophets.

(4) A prophet is a leader (muṭṭa‘) while muḥaddath is one who obeys (muṭṭi‘) and a follower (ummātī).

(5) Prophetic revelation is recited in prayers, whereas the revelation of a muḥaddath does not enjoy this status.

Apart from these I have also discussed in detail about other such distinctions in my book Al-Nubuwah fi‘l Islām (The Prophethood in Islam)41 which I need not repeat here. Now those who consciously or unconsciously accuse the Founder otherwise giving such definition of a muḥaddath as could be applied to a prophet, should have at least shown by a reference to the Qur‘ān and the Ḥadith that this definition was wrong and that the line of distinction drawn between the two was not correct, and that a certain point which he said was found both in a prophet and a muḥaddath was only found in a prophet, therefore he called himself a muḥaddath by mistake in spite of his being a prophet. But neither his opponents nor the section of his followers, who assert that the Founder did not know the definition of a prophet and a muḥaddath and ascribed such conditions to a muḥaddath which were only found in a prophet, have proved so far that the similarities and dissimilarities between a muḥaddath and a prophet as mentioned by him had no valid basis. To his followers I should like to say one thing more. When his opponents said that the meaning

41. See footnote 54 and Annexe II-E
which he attached to the word *muhaddath* could not signify anything else except prophethood, the Founder gave conclusive arguments to prove that such an allegation was false, and insisted that his views were correct according to the *Shari'ah*. He quoted the sayings of Sayyid 'Abd al-Qādir Jilānī, Mujaddid Alf Thānī of Sirhind and other saints in his support. If, however, he had committed a mistake in the beginning, why did not he correct himself when his attention was drawn to it? To say that the Arbiter and the Judge remained involved in such a fatal error about his claim, the denial of which resulted in *kufr*, could not be true in any case. At any rate when he denied a claim to prophethood on solemn oath and cursed such a claimant, whether he did it knowingly or otherwise does not absolve him of the responsibility that the denial of prophethood in all cases is no less than a heresy. Instead of admitting his mistake a special emphasis has been laid on this very point in his writings. I quote below one such passage only:

> إِنَّى كَتِبْتُ إِلَى بُضُع كُتُبٍ مَا مَّقَامَ التَّحْدِيثِ أَسْتُدْلِعُ مَنْ تَشَهَّرُ بِمَقَايِمِ النَّبِيّ لَا فَزْرٌ
> إِلاَّ نَزْرُ الْقُرْآنِ وَالْبَيْلِ وَمَا فَهِّمَهُ عَلَيْهِ وَثَالَثُهُ إِنَّهُ الْرَّجْلُ يَدُّلُّ عَلَى النُّبِيّ رَحْمَةُ اللهِ.

*i.e.* I have written in some of my books that the office of *taḥdith* closely resembles the office of prophethood and there is no difference between them except in potentiality and actuality. But these people did not understand my point and said that this person was a claimant to prophethood. And God knows that this saying of theirs was quite false, and did not have a modicum of truth in it, and did not have any real basis at all.42 It is beyond the dignity of a God-send reformer that he should continue producing arguments one after the other in support of his erroneous doctrines and that he should persist in his mistake so much that those who draw his attention to it should be declared liars and their statements devoid of all truth.

---

42. *Hamāmat al-Baghā* p. 814
The long and the short of the whole story is that the opponents of the Founder had themselves acquitted him of any claim to *prophethood with a code* but accused him of a claim to *prophethood without a code*. The Founder himself countered this allegation by cursing the claimant to prophethood and declaring such a person an infidel and outside the pale of Islam and by asserting that he never claimed to be a prophet at any time.

Let us look at the subject from another angle, i.e. whether he has mentioned anywhere in his writings that his claim was of a prophethood without a code. In his own writings from the begin-

---

43. His speeches published in papers cannot be considered of equal authenticity as compared to his writings. There is only one reference which is brought forward by the Qādiān section of the Aḥmadis about his “claim” of prophethood. This is a part of his diary noted by a reporter. The words which occur in this diary are as follows: *My claim is that I am a prophet and a messenger* (Badr 5th March, 1908 C.E.) The year of the publication of this diary is 1908 C.E. How can it be possible that the author of eighty books does not mention his claim in any one of them and only leaves it to be interpreted by the editor of *Al-Ḥakm*? After a short while he died. This diary should either be interpreted in the light of his other writings or be rejected as untrue. Another quotation is brought forward from *Barāhin Aḥmadiyyah*, Vol. v, p. 53, where the Founder has written: *The difficulties entailed in my call was the claims of risālat, Divine revelation and Promised Messiahship*. Here no mention has been made about the claim to prophethood. *Risālah* (apostleship) like *bi′that* (appointment) is a term which can be applied to every mūmār (appointed one of God) whether he is a muddāth or a nabi. The Founder has himself written:

“In the capacity of being *mursal* (sent one) prophets and *muddāth* have one and the same status. As the Most High God has given the name *mursal* to prophets so has He given it to *muddāth*.” *(Shahādat al-Qurān, p. 27.)*

But the most important point to remember is that whether this quotation from *Barāhin Aḥmadiyyah* carries any weight against hundreds of references which openly speak of his denial of a claim to prophethood. The point under discussion is his claim to prophethood, and this he has repeatedly denied.

The third quotation is brought forward from *Haqiqat al-Wahy*, p. 90 that: *The only claim is that from one aspect I am a follower and from another a prophet through the grace of the prophethood of Muḥammad.* But it is a matter of great regret that no reference is here made to the context. The preceding words are:

“Another stupidity is this that to provoke the ignorant people they say that this person has advanced a claim to prophethood although the charge of theirs is an absolute fabrication.”
ning to the end there is no trace of such a statement. He says: I am a claimant to prophethood or that although I am not a claimant to prophethood with a code but I do claim to be a prophet without a code. On the other hand wherever he has mentioned this point it has been

Has a prophet uttered such words before that to ascribe a claim to prophethood to him is a forgery? And can such a person be called a claimant to prophethood? The words that follow are:

“As against this no such claim has been made of prophethood which seems to go against the Qur’ān. The only claim is that from one aspect I am a follower and from another a prophet through the grace of the prophethood of Muḥammad. By prophet is only meant that I am gifted with the frequency of Divine communion and communication.”

Here is a point of deep reflection. Is it a claim to prophethood or its denial? The allegation of a claim to prophethood has been called by him a pure fabrication and it is the bigoted who accuse him of laying such a claim just to provoke the ignorant and the illiterate people. And afterwards while talking of his claim he did not say that he was a prophet, and how could he do so when he himself had already called such a charge a fabrication, but he wrote instead that from one aspect he was a follower and from another a prophet through the grace of the prophethood of Muḥammad. Now just glance through all the writings of Ahmād to ascertain the real significance of

ئِمَّٰکِ نَّبِيٓ اَنِّی اِلَیْکَ پَیَزُوتُ یَن

i.e. a prophet from one aspect and a follower from another and it would signify nothing else but muḥaddathiyah as is clear from Iṣlāḥ Aḥsān, p. 533:

“So the fact that he has been called a follower as well as a prophet, suggests that he shall possess both aspects of ummatiyyat (the state of being a follower) and prophethood, as it is necessary in a muḥaddath that both these aspects should exist. But the possessor of perfect prophethood (nubuwmat tāmmah) owns one aspect of prophethood only. In short, muḥaddathiyyah is imbeded with both the colours. That is why in Barāḥa Ḥabār Ahmādiyyah God gave this humble servant the epithet of follower as well as prophet.”

Thus he has clearly mentioned here that the charge of prophethood against him was wrong and that he laid a claim to muḥaddathiyyah. Further, to avoid any misunderstanding in the use of the word ‘prophet’ he clarified it by saying: By prophet is meant that I am gifted with frequency of Divine communion and communication. And it is evident that muḥaddath is also frequently spoken to by God as it has been fully explained in the beginning of Ḥaqqiqa’ al-Walī (pp. 15, 50, 51, 55 etc.).
done so in the words that God has given him the name of prophet, i.e. in his inspirations, and in certain prophecies, by way of metaphor and simile or in the literal (lughūt) sense of the word because the word ‘prophet’ in the Arabic language is used for a person who

Similarly in Barāhin Aḥmadiyyah, vol. v, a reference from which has been given above, it has been repeatedly mentioned that he was a follower from one aspect and a prophet from another. “I have received two names,” writes he, “from God Almighty, one ummati (follower) as is evident by my name Ghulām Aḥmad (servant of Aḥmad) and the other prophet by way of zill (p. 188). Thus here also he has laid a claim to muḥaddathiyah.

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

“In short, in this abundance of Divine revelation and matters relating to the unseen I am the one chosen in particular, and all the awliyā’, abūn and aqāb (i.e. the Muslim saints of different orders) that have passed away before me in this nation were not granted this abundance, therefore I have been chosen particularly to receive the name of prophet.”

That he received the name metaphorically and not in a real sense, is later on stated in the same book in the supplement which I have already quoted more than once (pp. 64, 65 i.e. I have been called a prophet of God only by way of metaphor and not by way of reality—T.). Therefore, even this quotation does not entitle us to call the Founder a prophet unless we use the word metaphorically. And it is not difficult to understand what is meant by his being chosen in particular to receive the name prophet, for there he is speaking of the prophecy regarding the advent of the Promised Messiah in which occurs the word prophet which is not spoken of for any other personage among the Muslims. Thus we have before the words quoted above:

“Now let it be known that in the sayings of the Holy Prophet there is a prophecy that from among the followers of the Holy Prophet a person shall be raised who shall be called Jesus son of Mary, and be given the name prophet, i.e. he shall have the gift of being spoken to by God in such abundance, and so largely shall matters relating to the unseen be made known to him as cannot be revealed to any but a prophet”

(Haqiqa al-Wahy, p. 390).

Why the word prophet occurred concerning the Promised Messiah and what is the significance to be attached to it, has already been explained. All that is necessary to state here is that the word prophet occurs in a report in which occur also the words Isā (Jesus) son of Mary, in which it is stated that he shall appear on the eastern minaret of Damascus, which goes on to tell us that he shall appear in two yellow mantles, with his hands on the shoulders of two angels.
makes prophecies. Or sometimes he said that the mantle of the prophethood of Muḥammad was vouchsafed by virtue of his antihi-
lating himself in the Messenger (fanā fi al-rasūl). But with the word “claim” he did neither made a mention of metaphorical prophethood nor of prophethood without a code, whereas his “claim” of being a Messiah, Mahdi, Mujaddid and Muḥaddath was repeatedly mentioned in his works. But whenever a claim to prophethood was referred to, the words of denial were necessarily found with it. In his most early books his claims were in the following words:

“This is the eleventh year by the grace of God since I claimed to be mujaddid and the like of Messiah and the recipient of Divine communication.”

“What do you think of the person who claims to be the Promised Messiah, Mahdi and Mujaddid of this age? Is he a truthful person or a liar?”

“Nobody except this humble servant has claimed to be the mujaddid of the fourteenth century.....And this must be remembered that the claim of being the Promised Messiah is not in any way greater than the claim of being a recipient of Divine communication (mulham min Allāh) or a mujaddid from God.”

If all these names and descriptions are metaphorical, why not the word prophet? Even if the Founder had not written that the word prophet in that report was to be taken metaphorically, we had no other choice, for every expression of that report is metaphorical. And, strangely enough, the word prophet does not occur about the Promised Messiah in the numerous prophecies concerning his appearances, except in this report not a single word of which can be interpreted otherwise than metaphorically. Stranger still this very report as accepted by Tirmidhi, though narrated by the same first narrator of al-Muslim, omits the word prophet altogether.

But besides all these considerations we have the plain words of the Founder himself that the word prophet in that report is to be taken metaphorically and not in the real sense of the word. (The reply to the last objection has been taken from Muḥammad ‘Alī’s Ahmadiyyah Movement-IV, The Split—T.)

44. Nishān Āsmānī (26th May 1892 C.E.) p. 35.
45. Ibid.
And how did he treat this charge of laying a claim to prophethood:

“‘And we also curse the claimant to prophethood.’”\(^{47}\)

“‘After our lord and master Muḥammad Muṣṭafā, (may peace and blessings of God be upon him — the last of the Messengers (khatm al-mursalin) — I regard any claimant to prophethood and messengership to be a liar and an unbeliever (kāfir).’”\(^{48}\)

“I look upon anyone who denies the finality of prophethood to be a heretic and outside the pale of Islam.”\(^{49}\)

“And it does not behove me that I should lay a claim to prophethood and go outside the pale of Islam and join the party of unbelievers.”\(^{50}\)

“Can an ill-fated fabricator who himself lays claim to messengership and prophethood have any faith in the Qur’ān.”\(^{51}\)

“These people have forged a lie against me who say that I have laid a claim to prophethood.”\(^{52}\)

The charge of prophethood is, of course, a calumny against Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad whether it comes from the side of his friends or foes. His own career is, however, free from such blasphemies;

\[
\text{نُسَيَّةُ كُلُّهَا مَصْدِرَاتٌ وَحَرَّاسَاتٌ سَجَانٌ رَقَبَةٌ}
\]

\[
\text{مُتَنَكَّتُ مَثْلَ هَذَا كَانَ هُمُ الَّذّينَ يَتَكَبِّرُونَ}
\]

\[\text{i.e., all these (charges) are mere slanders and perversions. Glory be to my Lord! I did not utter anything like that. This is nothing but falsehood.}^{53}\]

**Some terms explained**

Anybody who is interested in the detailed discussion of this.

---

48. *Iṣṭiḥār* 2nd October, 1891 C.E.
49. *Taqrir Wājib al-īlān* at Delhi
50. *Ḥamāmat al-Buṣhrā* p. 79.
51. *Anjām Āthim* p. 27. footnote.
52. *Ḥamāmat al-Buṣhrā* p. 8.
subject may refer to my book *Al-Nubuwwah fi 'l Islām* (The Prophethood in Islam). Here I should only like to refer to one other point as to the various terms about prophethood which exist in the writings of the Founder. All these terms, however, signify *wilāyah* (sainthood) and *muḥaddathiyah*. These terms are: *majāzī nabi*, *zilli nabi*, *barūzī nabi*, *ummātī nabi*, *ghair tashrī'ī nabi*, *juzī nabi* and *lughwī nabi*. Some of them have also been used by the Muslim saints before.

1. *Majāzī nabi* is a prophet by way of metaphor and not by way of reality. When a person is called a prophet in the metaphorical sense it cannot mean anything else except that he is not a prophet and that he only bears close resemblance to a prophet in some respects or possesses in himself a particular aspect of prophethood. A real prophet would never say that he is a prophet by way of metaphor or simile. The very use of such terms shows that he is not a prophet. The meaning of *majāzī nabi* has been explained by the Founder himself:

> “*Muḥaddathiyah* ... if then this be called metaphorically, or be regarded as a strong part of prophethood, does this amount to a claim to prophethood?”

2. *Zilli nabi* means the shadow of a prophet i.e. a person who has reflected the prophethood of a *nabi* in the mirror of his personality. If he is endowed with real prophethood the question of reflection is simply meaningless. The Founder has written in *Ḥaqtāt al-Wahy* that the hearts of the truthful persons do not only reflect prophethood but also *rabūbiyyat* (Lordhood): *In the pure mirror of these perfect personages, God had reflected Himself*. As by way of Divine reflection they did not attain to Divinity; similarly, reflection of prophethood in their personality did not make them prophets. In the first case they were *zill* of God and in the second *zill* of the prophet. As *zill Allāh* is not God, similarly *zilli nabi* is not a prophet

54. This book has also been translated into English. A part of it entitled *The Finality of Prophethood* has been published by the Shah Jehan Mosque, Woking, Surrey, England. The complete translation will be printed by the Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Ikhā'at Islām, Lahore—T.

55. *Izālah Auhām* (3rd September 1891 C.E.) p. 422.

56. *Ḥaqtāt al-Wahy* (15th May 1907 C.E.) p. 63
but a saint. "Shadow of prophethood (zillî nubuwwah) the meaning of which is," writes the Founder himself, "to receive revelation through the grace of Muḥammad and this will remain in existence till the Day of Ressurrection so that the door of perfection might not be closed for human beings."  

At another place he has clearly stated:

"Such a person is sent in the footsteps of a particular prophet. So he is gifted with the knowledge like the knowledge of his prophet, wisdom like his wisdom, light like his light, and name like his name. God puts the souls of these persons in front of each other like mirrors. The prophet is like the original and the wālî (saint) is like his zill (reflection)."  

Again he says:

"Wilāyah (sainthood) is the perfect reflection (zill) of prophethood."  

3. Barūzî nābī also means the same i.e. the person in whom the prophethood of another person is manifested. Accordingly the Founder writes:

"All the ummah agrees on this that a non-prophet, by way of barūz, becomes the deputy of a prophet. This is what is meant by the hadith:

"The learned savants from my ummah are like the prophets of Israelites."  

4. The term ummatî nābī has already been explained. The following passage is quoted again to emphasise the point.

"So the fact that he has been called a prophet as well as a follower indicates that he shall possess both the aspects of ummatiyyat (followership) and prophethood, as it is necessary that both these aspects should be found in a muḥaddath. But the possessor of perfect prophethood (nubuwwah tāmmah)  

57. Ḥaqiq al-Wahy. p. 28.  
60. Ayyām al-Sulh (January 1899 C.E) p. 163.
owns one aspect of prophethood only. In short muḥaddathiyah is imbued with both the colours. That is why in Barāḥīn Ahmadiyyah God the Most High gave this humble servant the name of follower as well as prophet.”

5. Ghair tashrī'ī nabi also means a wali (saint), because in reality every prophet is a bearer of law—he might bring a new law or only make alterations or additions in the old one—as is clear from the following writing of the Founder:

“God communes and communicates with His saints (auliyā’) in this nation and they are imbued with the colour of prophethood but they are not prophets in reality, for the Qur’ān has brought the needs of shari‘ah to perfection.”

Similar is the statement given in Tiryāq al-Qulūb: “But as for all the inspired ones (mulhums) and the ones spoken to by God (muḥaddathīn) others than the possessors of Shari‘ah (sāhib al-shari‘ah)” which shows that sāhib al-shari‘ah are all prophets and persons who belong to the class of non-prophets are those who can be called inspired ones (mulhams) and muḥaddathīn. Thus whoever is not a possessor of shari‘ah is a muḥaddath. Muḥy al-Dīn ibn al-‘Arabī has used the term law-giver prophet (sharī‘ī nabi) in this sense. And what he calls prophethood without a code is in fact wilāyah or muḥaddathiyah.

6. As to juz‘ī nabi (partial prophet), it is obvious that a part cannot be the whole and partial prophethood cannot be called prophethood; good visions in Tradition have also been called the forty-sixth part of prophethood.

7. Lughwī nabi (prophet in the literal or etymological sense) only means one who makes prophecies or one who is the recipient of Divine communion and communication. When this term is used as compared to the terminology of the Shari‘ah, this would only signify wilāyah and muḥaddathiyah as is clear by the Founder’s announcement on 3rd February 1892 C.E. the opening words of

63. Tiryāq al-Qulūb (28th October 1902 C.E.) p. 130 footnote.
which are:

"It is submitted for the information of all Muslims that all such words as¹ 'a muhaddath is a prophet in one sense' or 'muhaddathiyyah is an imperfect prophethood' which occur in my books Fath Islām, Tauūth Marām, and Izālah Auhām are not to be taken in their real sense, but they have been used simply without any guile in their literal (lughani) significance."⁶⁴

---

⁶⁴. Announcement dated 3rd February 1892 C.E. As to the characteristics of a real prophet in the terminology of Islam, see Annexe II-E. A list of hadith (reports) on this subject will also be found in Annexe II-F together with some discussion on a couple of controversial reports.—T.
THE AHMADIYYAH MOVEMENT

ANNEXE—II-D

THE TWO SECTIONS OF THE AHMADIYYAH MOVEMENT
AND
THE FOUNDER’S CLAIMS

The following question has been raised by Haji S. B. G. Mohideen, a correspondent of the *Light*, in its issue of August 1, 1944:

“My doubt now is, which I request you to clear, if Qadiannis are fabricating records in the name of Mirza Shahib in support of their theory and, if not, if they are putting wrong interpretation to suit their purpose? If the trouble is only about interpretation, will I be wrong to think that some day if the Qadiannis’ interpretations of Mirza Sahib’s sayings, writings and doings turn out to be correct, you all will follow suit with Khalifa Shahib of Qadiian and declare the whole world of non-Ahmadis as kafir.”

I take the question of interpretation first. In this question, it is taken for granted that the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement used certain words on which the Qadiian and Lahore sections put their own interpretations after his death when the split occurred. This is not the case. The fact is that the Founder himself explained the sense in which he used a certain word; he not only used the word but also gave its interpretation in clear words. The actual difference between the two sections is that the Lahore section sticks to the interpretation of the word *prophet* as given by the Founder, while the Qadiian section sticks to the use of the word and rejects the interpretation.

When advancing his claim to have come in fulfilment of the prophecies relating to the appearance of a Messiah among the Muslims, the Founder made a statement that he was a prophet in a certain sense — in the sense in which every *muhammad* was a prophet. Here are his own words:

“If it be objected that the like of the Messiah must also be a prophet because the Messiah was a prophet, the reply to
this, in the first place, is that our Lord and Master has not laid it down that the coming Messiah shall be a prophet; nay, he has made it clear that he shall be a Muslim and shall be bound by the Law of Islam like ordinary Muslims. . . . Besides this, there is no doubt that I have come as a muḥaddath from God, and the muḥaddath is in one sense also a prophet; though he does not possess perfect prophethood, nevertheless he is partially a prophet, for he is endowed with the gift of being spoken to by God, and matters unseen are revealed to him.”

Now clearly the Founder’s claim was that he was a muḥaddath and a muḥaddath in the terminology of Islam is one who is not a prophet but he is spoken to by God. The tradition speaking of the muḥaddathin says clearly that they are persons who are spoken to by God without being prophets.

Nevertheless the use of the word in this recognized sense was a red rag to the bull of mullahdom, and the cry went forth from one end of this continent to the other that the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement was a kāfir and two hundred manlawis set their seals to a fatwā, declaring him to be a kāfir on this ground. On the publication of this fatwā, the Founder made strong protests, saying that he never claimed to be a prophet, but all these emphatic denials fell on deaf ears. Here are two examples:

“I make a public declaration in this house of God, the mosque, that I believe in the finality of prophethood of the last of the prophets, peace and blessings of Allāh be on him, and that I consider the person who denies the finality of prophethood to be a faithless man and one outside the pale of Islam.”

“I have laid no claim to prophethood; my claim is to be a muḥaddath and this I have made by Divine command. If this is called prophethood in a metaphorical sense or if this is stated to be a strong part of prophethood, it does not

65. Taʿdhīth Marām, pp. 9, 10
66. Manifesto.
amount to a claim to prophethood.\textsuperscript{67}

These statements leave no doubt that the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement never laid claim to prophethood but owing to the occurrence of that word in a tradition of the Holy Prophet, he simply offered an explanation of the use of that word in his writings. Still more clearly he gave that explanation in a debate with Mawlāvī 'Abd al-Ḥakīm at Lahore in 1892. The point was raised by the said Mawlāvī that he, the Mirzā Ṣāḥib, laid claim to prophethood, and the following statement signed by eight witnesses was issued by the Founder bringing the debate to an end:

"Be it known to all Muslims that all such words as occur in my writings ... to this effect that the \textit{muhaddath} is in one sense a prophet... are not to be taken in their proper (or technical) sense, but they have been used merely in their literal (or broad) significance. ... 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 wherever the word \textit{nābi} (prophet) is used in my writings, it should be taken as meaning \textit{muhaddath}, and the word \textit{nābi} (prophet) should be regarded as having been blotted out.\textsuperscript{68}

Could he go further in clearing his position? Has he not finally and unmistakably laid down the interpretation of the word? He has gone even to the extent of saying that he agrees to the word \textit{prophet} being deleted wherever it occurs in his writings and the word \textit{muhaddath} substituted instead. It was on this assurance that the other party felt no need of pressing his point any further. The Founder of the Movement assured his opponent that by the use of the word \textit{nābi} he meant nothing but a \textit{muhaddath}, a person spoken to by God though he is not a prophet, a \textit{prophet} in the literal sense of a \textit{prophesier}; and his opponent accepted this explanation and ended the debate because the position was quite in accordance with the \textit{Shari'ah}. But the two hundred mullas would not go back on their

\textsuperscript{67} Izāla Auhām (3rd September 1891 C.E.) pp. 421, 422.

\textsuperscript{68} Manifesto
fatwā; they were true to the well-known adage—mulla band nagardad. In reply to these assurances of his, it was declared in all earnestness that the Mirzā Šāhib was only deceiving the Muslim public, and he did not mean what he said. Excess of hatred blinded their eyes to the clearest facts, and the Muslim public, even educated people with a few honourable exceptions, have blindly followed the blind mullas.

Things went on thus, the Mirzā Šāhib declaring times without number that he never claimed to be a prophet; that he accepted the finality of prophethood in the Holy Prophet Muḥammad, just like all other Muslims; that the allegation that he laid claim to prophethood was a false charge against him; that he used the word prophet in the literal and broad sense of a prophesier; that the word was used metaphorically and not in its real or technical sense; and that he looked upon a claimant to prophethood after the Holy Prophet Muḥammad as a kāfīr and even cursed him. But the mullas remained adamant.

The same state of things continued after the Founder’s death in 1908 C.E. Though the word prophet was now and then used, but it was expressly used in the sense in which the Founder had used it, in a metaphorical sense, in the literal and broad sense of a prophesier, in the sense of one spoken to by God not being a prophet. The finality of prophethood was recognised as a basic doctrine of Islam. Whenever any one took an exception to the use of the word, the same explanation was offered as was offered by the Founder himself in his lifetime. Here I give only two quotations from the writings of men who now hold prominent positions in the Qādiān section. Thus wrote Maulavi Sarwar Šāh, now the head Maulavi in the Qādiān section, in 1911:

“The word nabi (prophet) carries in a literal sense two meanings: 1. One who receives news from God relating to the future; 2. a high personage whom God speaks to frequently and whom He informs of certain future events. Such a person is a prophet, and in this sense in my opinion all the previous mujaddids were prophets of different grades.”

69. Mufti Muḥammad Šādiq, who went

69. Badr, Qādiān (16th February 1911 C.E.).
as a missionary to America later on, and who holds a very high position in the Qâdiân section, wrote the following note relating to his visit to the late Maulânâ Shibli, in the paper of which he was the editor, in 1911:

"Shibli asked if we accepted the Mirzâ Şâhib to be a prophet. I submitted that our belief in this matter was just like other Muslims that the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allâh be on him) is the last Prophet, and no other prophet will come after him, neither a new one nor an old one. It is true that God’s speaking to His servants continues, and that too on account of the Holy Prophet’s blessings. It is through benefits received from the Holy Prophet that in this ummah there have always been men who were favoured with Divine inspiration, and such men will continue to appear in future too. As Ḥadrat Mirzâ Şâhib was also favoured with Divine inspiration, and through Divine inspiration God had informed him prophetically of many coming events which came out to be true, the Mirzâ Şâhib was thus a prophesier and such a person is called a nabi (prophet) according to Arabic lexicology".70

Examples of the faithful acceptance of the Founder’s interpretation of the word prophet even after his death could be multiplied to any extent, but I would add only one more statement made by the present head of the Qâdiân section, in a magazine of which he was the editor. Quoting the well-known verse of the Holy Qur’ān in which the Holy Prophet Muhammad is spoken as Khâtam al-Nabiyyîn, the last of the prophets, Mirzâ Mahmûd Ahmâd wrote:

"In this verse God has said that the Holy Prophet is the last of the prophets, and none shall come after him who may be raised to the dignity of prophethood and he may abrogate his teachings and establish a new law; nay, whatever auliya’ Allâh (saints)* there are and whatever Godfearing and righteous people there are, they will get, whatever they get, through service to him. Thus God has made it clear that his prophethood was meant not only for the age

---

70. Badr, 27th October 1910 C.E.

*This shows clearly that he was then conscious that auliya’ Allâh, and not prophet, was the proper term for the great men who appeared after the Holy Prophet.
in which he appeared, but that no prophet would come after him...

"...During the thirteen hundred years that have passed away since the Holy Prophet's claim, no one who laid claim to prophethood has been successful. Undoubtedly there arose people before him who claimed prophethood and many of them were successful whom we regard to be sure in their claims, but why has this law ceased to work after the appearance of the Holy Prophet? It is clear that it is due to the prophecy that he is the last of the prophets. Now we ask the opponents of Islam what greater sign can there be than this that after the Holy Prophet's claim no one who laid claim to prophethood has been successful? It is in reference to this that the verse ends with the words that 'God knows everything'; that is to say, We have made him the last of the prophets, and We know that no prophet would appear after him, and that even a liar would not lay claim to this office whom We would not destroy. This is a historical prophecy which no one can deny, and if there is any one who denies it, produce him before us."\textsuperscript{71}

By an unparalleled irony of circumstances, the present head of the Qādiān section himself becomes the culprit, the denier of the finality of the prophethood of Muḥammad (peace and blessings of God be on him) who has to be produced before the writer of this memorable article — Maḥmūd of 1910 C.E. is required to sit in judgment over Maḥmūd of 1914, and Caesar the drunk stands convicted by Caesar the sober. A new history is made within the short period of four years; the man who in 1910 C.E. challenged all that no prophet could possibly appear after the Holy Prophet Muḥammad, challenged the whole world in 1914 C.E. that the finality of prophethood was a curse and that \textit{Khātam al-nabiyyīn} meant not the last of the prophets — what it meant in 1910 C.E.— but a prophet with whom a new order of prophethood was established. Within four years, the close of prophethood had come to mean the continuance of prophethood! But stranger still is the fact that the man who challenged the whole world in 1910 C.E. to produce one example of a man having laid claim to prophethood

\textsuperscript{71} \textit{Taṣḥīḥ al-Aḍḥān}, April, 1910, C.E.
during the thirteen hundred years of the rise of Islam who may not have been destroyed on account of his being a liar, challenged the world in 1914 C.E. that his own father was actually a prophet who was successful in his claim to prophethood! Shamelessness could go not further.

What was it that brought about this revolution in the ideas of Mirzâ Maḥmūd Āḥmad? He was an ordinary man in 1910 C.E. the editor of a newspaper, but he donned the garments of a Khalīfah in 1914 C.E. In this year had occurred the death of Maulawī Nur-al-Dīn Ṣāḥīb, the head of the Aḥmadiyyah community after the Founder's death. Mirzâ Maḥmūd Āḥmad had made his calculations beforehand. His ambitions were to be a full-fledged Khalīfah, and this he could not be unless he raised his father to the dignity of a full-fledged prophet! Necessity, they say, is the mother of invention, and Mirzâ Maḥmūd Āḥmad hit upon a new idea. The Founder of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement, he said, undoubtedly denied prophethood up to November 1901 C.E., but a change came over him on that date, and he found that the interpretation he put upon the word prophet was wrong; that he was wrong in claiming finality of prophethood for the Holy Prophet Muḥammad (peace and blessings of Allāh be on him) that he was wrong in denying prophethood for himself; that his writings before 1901 C.E. containing denials of prophethood were full of erroneous statements and must be looked upon as abrogated; and that none could in future enter the fold of Islam unless he believed in his prophethood.

This brings me to Mr. Mohīdīn's first doubt: "My doubt now is, which I request you to clear, if the Qādiānīs are fabricating records in the name of Mirzâ Ṣāḥīb in support of their theory." Call it a fabrication or whatever else you like, all the allegations made in the name of Mirzâ Ṣāḥīb as indicated above are pure and simple falsehood. He never said, not once up to the end of his life, that the interpretation that he put upon the word prophet before 1901 C.E. was wrong, or that his writings before 1901 denying prophethood were full of erroneous statements and must be looked upon as abrogated. All such allegations are fabrications, pure and simple. I have challenged Mirzâ Maḥmūd Āḥmad again and
again to prove the truth of these assertions publicly, but he refused to come into the open. And I again challenge him now to prove:

1. That the Founder of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement ever said that the interpretation which he put upon the word *prophet* before 1901 C.E., meant a *prophesier* in the broad sense, not a *prophet* in the technical sense, was wrong.

2. That he ever said that the statements denying prophethood for himself before 1901 C.E. as met with in his writings were erroneous and must be treated as having been abrogated.

When the head of the Qāḍiān section first made that allegation in 1914 C.E. or 1915 C.E., I at once produced the evidence of seventy witnesses from among the followers of Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ṣāḥib which runs as follows:

"We, the signatories to this manifesto, declare on oath that when Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad of Qāḍiān, the Founder of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement, announced in 1891 C.E. that the prophet Jesus Christ was dead according to the Holy Qur'ān and that he (the Mirzā Ṣāḥib) was the Messiah of this *ummah* whose advent was spoken of in Ḥadīth, he did not lay claim to prophethood. But the Mawlānis misled the public, and declared him to be a *kāfir* on the false ground that he claimed prophethood, after which the Promised Messiah declared time after time, as his writings show, that to charge him with a claim to prophethood was a fabrication against him, that he considered prophethood to have come to a close with the Holy Prophet and that he looked upon a claimant to prophethood after the Holy Prophet as a liar and a *kāfir*..."

"We also declare on oath that we entered into the *bā'ят* of the Promised Messiah before 1901, and that the allegations of Miān Maḥmūd Aḥmad, the head of the Qāḍiān section, that though Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ṣāḥib did not claim prophethood at first but that he changed his claim in 1901 C.E., and laid claim to prophethood on that date, and that his previous writings of ten or eleven years denying prophethood are
abrogated, are entirely wrong and absolutely opposed to facts. We do swear by Allah that the idea never entered into our hearts that the Promised Messiah made a change in his claim in 1901 C.E. or that his previous writings which are full of denials of prophethood were ever abrogated; nor did we hear such words from the mouth of a single person until Miân Maḥmūd Aḥmad made this announcement.”

At the same time, I challenged Mirzā Maḥmūd Aḥmad to produce the same number of witnesses from among his followers who entered into the Promised Messiah’s bai‘at before 1901 C.E. declaring on oath that they had come to know in November 1901 C.E. that the Promised Messiah, after denying prophethood for eleven years, had changed his claim and laid claim to prophethood on that date, his previous writings relating to denial of prophethood being abrogated. But notwithstanding repeated demands, the head of the Qādiān section has not been able to produce a single witness. As being the originator of the idea of a claim to prophethood in 1901 C.E., he himself was finally challenged to make a statement on oath to the above effect, but he dare not do even this much. This is a conclusive proof that his allegation of a change in the claims of the Promised Messiah in 1901 C.E. is a fabrication, pure and simple, as he cannot solemnly confirm his own allegation by an oath.

It may be asked, Is it possible that the leader of a community should make such fabrications? Or, again, Is it possible that the Qādiān community with many intelligent men in its ranks should swallow such fabrications? My answer is that everything is made possible by the unscrupulous selfishness of the leaders and the slavementality of the followers. How was it possible, I ask, that two-hundred Maulavis made a fabrication against the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement, saying that he claimed prophethood, while his original statement, quoted above, on which the fatwā was based, did not contain a shred of evidence on that point? And how was it possible, I ask again, that in spite of his more than a hundred denials in the clearest words that he never claimed prophethood and that he looked upon a claimant to prophethood as a kāfir and a
liar and invoked the curse of God on such a claimant, two hundred Maulawis would not budge an inch from the position which they had originally taken? If two hundred theological leaders of the Muslim Community are capable of making such fabrications, why is not the single theological leader of the Qādiān section capable of making them? And if they could persist in their fabrication notwithstanding the clearest statements to the contrary, why is the one leader of the Qādiān section incapable of persisting in his fabrications?

As regards the community swallowing these fabrications, if the whole Muslim public, including its intelligentsia, follows blindly its Maulawis, not caring a bit for facts, and this in spite of its grave doubts as to the good faith of the Maulawi, it is nothing strange in the Qādiān community following blindly its leader who not only occupies the double role of a Maulawi and a Pir but also claims Divine authority for the most absurd of his deeds. It was one of his first performances, his cleverest move, no doubt, to impress, upon his followers that none of them could open his tongue against him:

"To advance an objection against me even though that objection be true makes a man enter hell."72

The head of the Qādiān community has led his community to the worst form of pirdom, and he can make them submit to anything, however absurd, without a demur. To the ordinary mind the Pir Pagaro represents the worst form of pirdom, because his name is associated with the murder of innocents. But, as a matter of fact, pirdom in any form is a curse inasmuch as it ultimately creates a slavish mentality. There are enlightened pirs whose disciples look upon them as the very incarnations of Divinity. Mirzā Mahmūd Ahmad, in one of his recent public lectures, went so far as to assert that if he ordered a hundred of his disciples to commit suicide there and then, they would readily obey his orders. Does it not show that the blindfolding is perfect? How can such men raise their voices against the fabrications of their leader, when the ordinary

72. Al-Fažl Nov. 4, 1927.
intelligent Muslim is unable to raise his voice against the fabrications of his Maulawīs?

It is by facing facts that the Muslims can get out of this servile mentality. Let them think for themselves and not depend on the diseased views of their Mullas, regarding whom Iqbal has well said that "the brain of even two hundred asses cannot produce the thought of a single man". There were two hundred Maulawīs no doubt, who declared the Founder of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement to be a kāfir on a ground which did not exist that he claimed prophethood for himself. Let the Muslim public even now rise to the occasion and not depend on the opinion of these two hundred, or another two hundred who occupy their pulpits to-day. Let them face the facts. Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Šāhib did not claim prophethood when laying claim to Messiahship. Even the Qādiānis admit this. The most liberal views about the Maulawīs who read a claim to prophethood in his innocent words is that they erred in their judgment. But when he made it clear hundreds of times that he never meant this, and that he looked upon a claimant to prophethood after the Holy Prophet as a liar, and the Maulawīs persisted in their false allegation, it was a clear indication that their original charge was a meditated fabrication. Let the Muslim public rise to the occasion and expose the fabrication. They may reject the claims of the Promised Messiah on a hundred other grounds, but let them not be a party to the fabrication of a few misguided Mullas.

I would make a similar appeal to the Qādiāni intelligentsia. The Promised Messiah did not say in 1901 C.E. that his interpretation of the word prophet as contained in his earlier writings was wrong, that his repeated denials of prophethood were abrogated, that he did not look upon the Holy Prophet as the last of the prophets. All these are fabrications — pure fabrications of Mirzā Maḥmūd Aḥmad. Let them search the whole of the Aḥmadiyyah literature of the time of the Promised Messiah, let them search all his writings and recorded speeches, let them search the whole Aḥmadiyyah literature after the death of the Promised Messiah up to the time of the split in 1914, and they will not find the least evidence, that Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Šāhib ever entertained these ideas.
No! they will not even find that any of his disciples ever entertained the idea that his original interpretation of the word prophet proved wrong in 1901 C.E. or that his repeated denials of prophethood were abrogated in 1901 C.E. Let them in the last resort demand that Mirzâ Maḥmûd Ahmad should declare on oath that he entertained these two ideas in the life-time of the Promised Messiah, and that he had come to know in 1901 C.E. that the Promised Messiah’s interpretation of the word prophet had proved wrong and that all his writings containing a denial of prophethood had been abrogated. These statements of his are simple fabrications, and if the Qâdiânis do not face this fact now, they shall have to face it one day.

I may now add a few quotations from Ḥāḍrat Mirzâ Ṣâhib’s writings after 1901 C.E. To say nothing of having discovered that he gave a wrong interpretation of the word prophet or of having ever said that his repeated denials of prophethood were abrogated, he upheld that interpretation and these denials in the clearest words till his death. He wrote a book called the Mawāhib al-Rahmân in January, 1903 C.E., in which he wrote under the caption, “Some Mention of Our Beliefs”:

“And God speaks to and addresses His auliya’ (saints) in this ummah, and they are dyed with the dye of prophethood, but they are not prophets really, because the Holy Qur’ân has brought the need of the Law to perfection.”

In another book, Tâdhkirah al-Shahâdatain, published in the same year, he writes:

“And since our Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of Allâh be on him) was the last prophet and no prophet was to come after him”.

In his will, which he published in the closing days of 1905 C.E., he wrote:

“There is no need now of following previous prophethoods and previous books, for the prophethood of Muḥammad includes them all and comprehends them all. All ways besides this are now

73. Mawâhib al-Rahmân pp. 64, 65.
74. Tâdhkirah al-Shahâdatain p. 43.
closed. No new truth will be revealed after it nor is there any truth before it which it does not comprehend. Therefore all prophethoods terminate with this prophethood; and so it ought to have been, for anything that has a beginning has also an end.”

In his last great work, the *Haqiqat al-Wahy* he writes in the *Supplement*:

“And prophethood has been cut off after our Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be on him).”

“And God does not mean by my prophethood anything but being spoken to (by Him) frequently, and the curse of God be on him who intends more than this!”

“And our Messenger is the last of the prophets and with him is cut off the chain of messengers.”

“And I have been called a prophet by God only metaphorically, not in a real sense.”

---

75. *Al-Wasiyyah*, p. 10.
CHARACTERISTICS OF A PROPHET ACCORDING TO THE QUR'ĀN

(A person who does not possess these characteristics collectively cannot be called a prophet in the terminology of Islam).

(1) **He is a mortal**

Say: I am only a mortal like you.\(^\text{77}\)

Had there been in the earth angels walking about secure, We would have sent down to them from the heaven an angel as messenger.\(^\text{76}\)

(2) **He is sinless**

They speak not before He speaks, and according to His command they act.\(^\text{79}\)

And it is not for a prophet to act dishonestly.\(^\text{80}\)

3. **Brings guidance (hidāyah) to mankind**

Surely there will come to you a guidance from Me.\(^\text{81}\)

And this was Our argument which We gave to Abraham against his people. . . . And We gave him Isaac and Jacob. Each did We guide; and Noah did We guide before, and of his descendants, David and Solomon and Job and Joseph and Moses and Aaron . . . And Zacharias and John and Jesus and Elias; each one of them was righteous, and Ishmael and Elisha and Jonah and Lot; and each one (of them) We made to excel the people. These are they to whom We gave the Book and authority and prophecy . . . These are they whom God guided so follow their guidance.\(^\text{82}\)

**And when this guidance is not accepted**

And nothing prevents men from believing when the guidance comes to-

---

77. 18 Al-Kahf : 110.
78. 17 Bani Isrāʾil : 95.
79. 21 Al-Anbiyāʾ : 27.
80. Ibid., : 160.
81. 2 Al-Baqarah : 38.
82. 6 Al-Anʿām : 84, 85, 86-87, 90, 91.
them, and from asking forgiveness of their Lord, but that (they wait) for the way of the ancients to overtake them, or that the chastisement should confront them. And We send not messengers but as givers of good news and warning, and those who disbelieve contend with falsehood to weaken thereby the Truth, and they take My messages and the warning for a mockery. 

Messengers, bearers of good news and warners, so that the people may have no plea against God after the (coming of) messengers. And God is ever Mighty, Wise.

4. He is sent with arguments, scripture and book

And We sent not before thee any but men to whom We sent revelation—so ask the followers of the Reminder if you know not—with clear arguments and scripture.

Surely this is in the earlier scriptures—the scriptures of Abraham and Moses.

Certainly We sent Our messengers with clear arguments and sent down with them the Book and the measure, that men may conduct themselves with equity.

Mankind is a single nation. So God raised prophets as bearers of good news and as warners, and He revealed with them the Book with truth, that it might judge between people concerning that in which they differed.

And We gave him Isaac and Jacob. Each did We guide; and Noah did We guide before, and of his descendants, David and Solomon and Job and Joseph and Moses and Aaron. And thus do We reward those who do good (to others); and Zacharias and John and Jesus and Elias; each one of them was righteous, and Ishmael and Elisha and Jonah and Lot; and each one (of them) We made to excel the people. These are they to whom We gave the Book and authority and prophecy.

83. 18 Al-Kahf : 55-56.
84. 4 Al-Nisā': 165.
85. 16 Al-Nahl : 43-44.
86. 87 Al A'ätā : 18-19.
87. 57 Al-Hadid : 25.
88. 2 Al-Baqarah : 213.
89. 6 Al-An'âm : 85-87, 90.
5. Prophets among themselves are like brothers

O ye messengers, eat of the good things and do good. Surely I am Knoever of what you do. And surely this your community is one community, and I am your Lord, so keep your duty to Me. 90

6. Gabriel must descend on him with prophetic revelation

And it is not vouchsafed to a mortal that God should speak to him, except by revelation, or from behind a veil, or by sending a messenger and revealing by His permission what He pleases. 91

Whoever is an enemy to Gabriel — for surely he revealed it to thy heart by God’s command. 92

The Faithful spirit has brought it (i.e., the Qur’ān) on the heart. 93

Under the verse: Surely it is the word of an honoured Messenger. 94

Surely We have revealed to thee as We revealed to Noah and the prophets after him, and We revealed to Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob and the tribes, and Jesus and Job and Jonah and Aaron and Solomon, and We gave to David a scripture. And (We sent) messengers We have mentioned to thee before and messengers We have not mentioned to thee. And to Moses God addressed His word, speaking (to him) — (We sent) messengers, bearers of good news and as warners, so that the people may have no plea against God after the (coming of) messengers. 95

7. A prophet must follow his own revelation

I follow only that which is revealed to me. 96

Say: I follow only that which is revealed to me from my Lord. These are clear proofs from your Lord and a guidance and a mercy for a people who believe. 97

And follow what is revealed to thee. 98

---

90. 23 Al-Muminun 51, 52. 21 Al-Anbiyā’ : 92.
91. 42 Al-Shūrā : 51.
92. 2 Al-Baqarah : 97.
94. 69 Al-Hāqqah : 40.
95. 4 Al-Nisā’ : 163-165.
96. 6 Al-Anṭām : 50 ; 46 Al-Anqūf : 9
97. 7 Al-‘Arḍ : 203.
98. 10 Yūnus : 109.
Say: If I disobey my Lord [in my revelation] I fear the chastisement of a grievous day.  

8. His revelation verifies the previous revelation

Verifying that which is before it (i.e., the Qur'ān).  
We sent after them in their footsteps Jesus, son of Mary, verifying that which was before them of the Torah.

9. His revelation is specially protected

For surely He makes a guard to go before him and after him, that He may know that they have truly delivered the messages of their Lord.

10. He is a Master (muṭā')

And We sent no messenger but that he should be obeyed by God’s command.

11. All his revelation must be communicated to men

O Messenger, deliver that which has been revealed to thee from thy Lord, and if thou do (it) not, thou hast not delivered His message.

But have the messengers any duty except the plain delivery (of the message)? And certainly We raised in every nation a messenger.

12. His revelation can alter the previous law (Shari‘ah)

I (i.e. Jesus) allow you part of that which was forbidden to you.

Whatever message (or verse) We abrogate or cause to be forgotten, We bring one better than it or like it.

13. His revelation is recited in prayers

He raised among them a Messenger from among themselves, reciting to them His messages and purifying them.

99. 79 Al-Zummar : 12.
100. 2 Al-Baqarah : 97; 3 Āl ʻImrān : 3 etc.
101. 5 Al-Mā‘idah : 46.
103. 4 Al-Nisā’ : 64.
104. 4 Al-Mā‘idah : 67.
105. 16 Al-Nahl : 35.
106. 3 Āl ʻImrān : 49.
107. 2 Al-Baqarah : 106.
108. 3 Āl ʻImrān : 163.
14. Belief in him is a part of faith

The Messenger believes in what has been revealed to him from his Lord, and (so do) the believers. They all believe in God and His angels and His Books and His messengers. We make no difference between any of His messengers.\(^\text{109}\)

Those who disbelieve in God and His messengers and desire to make a distinction between God and His messengers and say: We believe in some and disbelieve in others; and desire to take a course in between, these are truly disbelievers.\(^\text{110}\)

(We believe in) that which was given to Moses and Jesus and (in) that which was given to the prophets from their Lord. We do not make any distinction between any of them.\(^\text{111}\)


---


\(^{110}\) 5 *Al-Mā'idah* : 111

\(^{111}\) 2 *Al-Baqarah* : 96.
ANNEXE II-F

1. It is reported from Sa'd son of Abi Waqqas that the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings of God be upon him!) said to 'Ali: You stand to me in the same relation as Aaron stood to Moses except that there is no prophet after me.\[12\]

2. The Day of Judgement will not be set up unless some tribes of my ummah have joined the polytheists and unless they have started worshipping the idols. And surely there shall be among my followers thirty liars, every one of them asserting that he is a prophet, but I am khaṭam al-nabīyīn (the Seal of the Prophets), there is no prophet after me.\[13\]

3. It is reported from Abū Hurairah (may Allah be pleased with him!) that the Messenger of Allah (may peace and blessings of God be upon him!) said: My likeness and the likeness of the prophets before me is the likeness of a person who built a house and he made it beautiful and made it complete except the place of a stone in the corner. So people began to go round about it and to wonder at him and say: Why have you not placed this stone? He (i.e., the Prophet) said: So I am that stone and I am khaṭam al-nabīyīn (the Seal of the Prophets).\[14\]

4. It has been reported from 'A'ishah that the Prophet said: No part of prophethood would be left after me except mubashshirāt. They (the Companions) said: O Messenger of Allah, what are mubashshirāt? He replied: True visions.\[15\]

5. Had there been a prophet after me it would have been 'Umar.\[16\]

6. Prophets have come to an end with me.\[17\]

7. Do you feel aggrieved that I have made you the last (ākhīr) of the prophets?

---

113. Al-Šaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī Kitāb: Al-Tawḥīd; Al-Muslim; Tirmīdhi Abwāb al-Fīn.
114. Al-Šaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-Munāqīb, ch. Khaṭāam al-Nabīyīn; Al-Muslim, Tirmīdhi, abwāb al-Munāqīb, etc.
115. Musnad Ahmad.
117. Nasā'ī, Muslim and Tirmīdhi.
The reply of the Prophet was: I said, O my Lord, no.\textsuperscript{118}

8. I am the first prophet in creation but last in advent.\textsuperscript{119}

Discussion has been made on the above Reports in Chapter V. Some of the other Reports not mentioned by the late Maulānā Muḥammad ‘Ali are given below:

9. It is reported from Jābir that the Prophet said: I am the Leader of the Messengers but I am not proud of it and I am the Seal of the Prophets and I am not proud of it.\textsuperscript{120}

10. I have several names, I am Muḥammad and I am Ḥammad.... and I am al-‘āqib (the one who comes last) after whom there is no prophet.\textsuperscript{121}

11. The prophets used to administer among the Israelites. When a prophet died another prophet became his successor. But there will be no prophet after me. Soon there will be khalifahs and they will be many.\textsuperscript{122}

12. Messengership and prophethood has been cut off. There will be no Messenger after me nor Prophet.\textsuperscript{123}

13. The Prophet used to tell his names. Thus he said: I am Muḥammad and I am Ḥammad and I am al-Muqaffa.\textsuperscript{124}

The commentators of Ḥadīth have explained the word al-muqaffa with al-‘āqib which means the one after whom there is no prophet.

14. I am the last (ākhīr) of the prophets and you are the last of the communities.\textsuperscript{125}

15. There is no prophet after me and there is no ummah (community) after my ummah.\textsuperscript{126}

\textsuperscript{118} Dailmi.
\textsuperscript{119} Mīshkāt al-Musāḥih
\textsuperscript{120} Mīshkāt al-Masāḥih Ch. Excellence of the Messenger.
\textsuperscript{121} Al-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-Munāqib.
\textsuperscript{122} Al-Bukhārī.
\textsuperscript{123} Tirmidhī.
\textsuperscript{124} Al-Muslim.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibn Mājah.
\textsuperscript{126} Al-Baiḥaqī.
16. I am the Last of the Prophets and my Mosque is the last of the mosques.\textsuperscript{127}

The \textit{mosque} here means the Prophet’s Mosque as is clear from the next \textit{hadīth}.

17. I am the Last of the Prophets and my Mosque is the last of the Prophets’ mosques.\textsuperscript{128}

As there will be no prophet after Muḥammad, there will be no Prophet’s Mosque after him as well.

18. If Moses was alive he would have but followed me.\textsuperscript{129}

19. If Moses and Jesus were alive they would have but followed me.\textsuperscript{130}

20. If Joseph would come and you followed him and left me, even then you would go astray.\textsuperscript{131}

21. Surely I am like a father to you.\textsuperscript{131}

Prophets among themselves are like brothers (The Qur‘ān 21:92; 23:51, 52; and \textit{Al-Bukhārī} 60:48) but to their followers they are like fathers. There is only one father for every person in the world. The Prophet Muḥammad is a spiritual father to Muslims. How can they accept another spiritual father (\textit{nabī}) besides him?

22. Reported from Ibn ‘Abbās that when the Prophet was in his tent at Badr he prayed thus: O Lord! I desire from You Your testament and Your promise. O Lord! if You will, You will not be worshipped after this day.\textsuperscript{133}

The Prophet knew that if that small community of Muslims was destroyed there would be none left to worship God as no other prophet was going to be raised after him.

23. The Prophet said to his uncle ‘Abbās: Be contented, O uncle! You are the last of the emigrants (\textit{khātam al-muhājirīn}) in the

\textsuperscript{127} \textit{Al-Muslim}

\textsuperscript{128} \textit{Kanzul ‘Ummāl} Vol. 6, p. 206.

\textsuperscript{129} \textit{Mishkāt al-Maṣābīh}.


\textsuperscript{131} \textit{Kanzul ‘Ummāl} Vol. I.

\textsuperscript{132} Sayūṭī, \textit{Jamā’ al-Jawāmī‘}.

\textsuperscript{133} \textit{Al-Bukhārī}, \textit{Kitāb al-Jihād}. 
Hijrah as I am the Last of the Prophets (khātam al-nabiyyīn) in prophethood.\textsuperscript{134}

The Hijrah that was started by the Prophet came to an end after the conquest of Mecca. There is no Hijrah after the conquest of Mecca. To say that, khātam in this report means the “greatest” is not correct because the greatest emigrants were those who migrated in the beginning as the Qur’ān puts it:

“And the foremost, the first of the Emigrants and the Helpers and those who followed them in goodness — God is well pleased with them and they are well pleased with Him” (9 Al-Taubah: 100).

24. I am Muhammad and I am Ahmad . . . . and I am al-Ḩāshir that is people would be collected after me.\textsuperscript{135}

Ḩāshir is one who congregates and collects people together. With the article the word is applied to Muhammad because he collects people after him to his religion. The commentators of Hadith believe that the term means that there would not be any prophet after Muhammad.

25. The learned from my ummah will be like the prophets of Israel.\textsuperscript{136}

The Prophet Muhammad is the last of the Prophets but it does not mean that the blessings of prophethood have also come to an end. The work which was carried on by the prophets among Israelites would be continued by the truly learned in this ummah, that is why they have been called the like of the prophets.

26. The Prophet is reported to have said: Surely your Lord is One and surely your father is one, and your religion is one and your Prophet is one. And an Arab has no superiority over a non-Arab and a non-Arab over an Arab, nor the red over the black, nor the black over the red.\textsuperscript{137}

\textsuperscript{134} Kanzul ‘Ummāl, Vol. VI, p. 176.
\textsuperscript{135} Tirmidhî, ch. Names of the Prophet.
\textsuperscript{137} Reported by Ibn al-Najjār.
THE HADITH ABOUT THE PROPHET’S SON IBRĀHĪM

Sometimes rather an unauthentic saying of the Prophet is advanced to prove that prophethood has not come to an end. I shall briefly discuss this report below.

After the funeral service of his son Ibrāhīm, the Holy Prophet is reported to have said:

*Lau 'āsha Ibrāhīmu lakāna siddīqan nabiyya*  
i.e. *Had Ibrāhīm lived he would have become a true prophet.*

The argument is that it was the death of Ibrāhīm that prevented him from becoming a prophet otherwise the door of prophethood was not closed. If he had remained alive he would have become a prophet.

Before going further it must be borne in mind that there are other versions of this hadith also which fall in line with the most authentic traditions on the subject, therefore this tradition should not be interpreted in isolation to yield a meaning contrary to the conception of the finality of prophethood.

Just before this *hadith,* Ibn Mājah has recorded a saying by ‘Abdullāh ibn abi Auf:

*Qāla māta wa huwa saghīrun, wa lau qudhiya an-yāhūna ba' da Muḥammadin, sallalāhu 'alaihi wa sallam, nabiyyun 'āsha ibnuhū, wa lākin lā nabīyya ba'dahū*  
i.e. *He said: he (i.e. Ibrāhīm) died while he was young and if it was destined that a prophet should come after the Prophet Muḥammad then he would have remained alive, but there will be no prophet after him.*

This version has been accepted by al-Bukhārī also.

If for the sake of argument the first version is accepted in its entirety as true, one should not forget the circumstances in which these words were uttered. The young Ibrāhīm was already dead and the Prophet had just finished funeral service for him. In the knowledge of God his remaining alive was as much an impossibility

---

138. *Ibn Mājah, Kitāb al-Janā'īz,* ch. Prayer—the Messenger’s Son and the mention of his death.

as the coming of another prophet after Muḥammad. Thus these words were used by the Prophet to refer to Ibrāhīm’s spiritual status and not to prove the continuation of prophethood about which he had clearly stated his position on several other occasions.

The word lau (if) in Arabic is used sometimes as a condition (ṣhārī?) but it could also be used for negation (iṃṭina‘) or for something impossible (māḥāl). Refer to the Qur’ānic verse:

Lau kāna fihimā ālihat until laillāhū lafasadata

i.e. If there were in them gods besides Allāh, they (i.e. heaven and earth) would both have been in disorder.”

The use of the word if (lau) does not mean that there is a possibility of being two gods. To further clarify this point, let us consider the following saying of the Prophet:

Lau kāna Mūsā wa ʿIsā ḥayyain-i lama wasi‘ahumā illat tihā‘i

i.e. If Moses and Jesus were alive they could not have but followed me.

This tradition has several versions. In some only the name of Moses is mentioned, in others only the name of Jesus. Besides the point of Muḥammad’s spiritual rank, as compared to Moses and Jesus, this tradition does not deal with the possibility of the coming of a full-fledged prophet like Moses or Jesus after Muḥammad (peace and the blessings of God be upon all of them).

The logic that it was the death of Ibrāhīm which prevented him from becoming a prophet, otherwise the door of prophethood was open, could be applied to the hadith about Moses as well. This means that an independent prophet like Moses, with Shari‘ah (Law) could appear in the community of Muḥammad, because it is only the death of Moses which negatives such a possibility. Such a reasoning is basically fallacious. In the hadith about Ibrāhīm the Prophet only wanted to emphasize the spiritual status of his son and in the other, his own rank as compared to Moses. Whether any prophet will appear after him is not the theme of these utterances.

140. 21 al-Anbiyā‘: 22.
This point he made clear on another occasion when he said:

Lau kāna ba'dī nabiyyun lakāna ‘Umar

i.e. Had there been a prophet after me it would have been ‘Umar.\textsuperscript{142}

If death prevented Ibrāhim from becoming a prophet, what prevented ‘Umar from attaining to this position? The fact is that because Muḥammad was going to be the Last Prophet, therefore neither Ibrāhim nor ‘Umar became prophets although one died and the other survived him.

\textsuperscript{142} Al-Bukhārī, Tirmidhī, ch. Munāqib ‘Umar.
CHAPTER III

THE ANTICHRIST AND GOG AND MAGOG

The subject dealt with in this chapter is generally considered as relating to eschatology or the end of things, but this impression seems to be the result of Christian influence on Muslim thought. Islamic prophecies of the appearance of the Antichrist and of the predominance of Gog and Magog represent an aspect of the conflict of the spiritual and material forces, of the struggle of truth against falsehood, in which the spiritual forces are represented as being subjugated only temporarily, but as a result of which there would be a general spiritual awakening in the world and truth will ultimately shine in its full resplendence and prevail in the whole world.

Misunderstanding as to the significance of the prophecies referred to above exists not only among non-Muslims but among Muslims as well. In fact, these prophecies are the most misunderstood part of the Islamic religious literature, and some of the best intellects of Islam, being unable to discover the underlying significance, have gone to the extent of declaring all hadith relating to these prophecies as unreliable or fabrications of a later age. As a matter of fact, not only have many of these hadith been accepted by the most reliable collectors of hadith, such as Bukhari and Muslim, but similar prophecies are met with in the Qur'an itself. The reliability of such hadith is, therefore, beyond all doubt. But what is more, fulfilment of these prophecies shines out so clearly in the light of the events that are taking place before our eyes that what was considered to be the darkest spot of Islam forms now its brightest feature.

The need for discussion about the Antichrist and Gog and Magog

It is a remarkable coincidence that whereas in the world of today European powers are pressing forward with a determined programme of action against the world of Islam and are restlessly
anxious to hold an absolute sway over it, we find on the other hand a 
large number of prophecies of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad that 
speak of trials and tribulations that were to befall the Muslims in 
the latter days — prophecies that almost find literal fulfilment in the 
trend of events vis-a-vis the Muslim world before us. It is all the 
more astonishing that these prophecies were recorded at a time 
when temporally Islam was predominant, and the whole world 
was trembling before its onward advance. It is an open secret that 
there is a terrible warfare at the moment between Europe and 
Islam, or to put it more correctly between the material and spiritual 
forces. Christian Europe regards the power of Islam to be an 
awful menace to its material civilization, and on this false apprehen-
sion is bent on crushing it out of existence and thus saving the world 
from its political influence. Its religious section has declared it 
quite openly that whereas other religions are non-Christian, Islam 
is definitely anti-Christian. And although the Christian mission-
aries are found active in every quarter of the globe, preaching to 
all kinds of people, their special objective is the Muslim community. 
Certainly these are facts that no Muslim can afford to look on 
indifferently.

It is lamentable, nevertheless, that Muslims are so hopelessly 
entangled in their own internal differences on minor points of reli-
gious life that they have no thought to spare for the more vital 
aspects of their national life. If they could devote some attention 
to the great struggle that is now going on between the forces of 
materialism and spirituality, they could very clearly see that the 
feats of Dajjāl and the astonishing adventures of Gog and Magog 
are no mere fanciful stories but are a portrayal of a faithful picture 
of the irresistible inroads of materialistic Europe and the Christia-
nity of our own days, which the Ḥadīth literature has drawn in pro-
phetic language. That great seer, the greatest seer this world 
has produced, the Prophet Muḥammad, has so vividly described 
events that were to happen 1300 years after him that one would 
think he was seeing them happening before his very eyes. In view 
of these clear prophetic warnings of the Holy Prophet it becomes 
the imperative duty of every Muslim to give thought to those Ḥadīth 
which speak of the latter-day struggle of Christianity and Islam,
and forget their own differences on small and secondary points, because the very existence and success of Islam in the world depends on the sequel to the contest of the two religions that are before us and of which these hadith speak, and not on those small matters, variations in which do not constitute any very great benefit or loss to the Muslims.

**The significance of the Dajjāl and Gog and Magog**

The mention of Dajjāl occurs repeatedly in ḥadīth, whereas Gog and Magog are mentioned not only in Ḥadīth but also in the Qur'ān, and the appearance of both is connected with the advent of the Messiah. The word Dajjāl is derived from dajala, which means *he covered* (a thing). The Lisān al-ʿArab gives several views why Dajjāl is so called. One view is that he is so called on account of his being a liar and covering or concealing the truth with falsehood; another that he will cover the earth with the largeness of his numbers; a third that he will cover the people with unbelief; a fourth that he will spread over and cover the whole earth. Still another view is that Dajjāl is a community that will carry about its merchandise all over the world, *i.e.*, it will cover the earth with its articles of trade. Finally there is the view that Dajjāl has been given this name because he will say things which are contrary to what is in his mind, *i.e.* he will cover his real intentions with false words.

Yaʾjūj (Gog) and Maʾjūj (Magog) are derived from ajj or ajj̣ in the forms of yaʃtul and miaʃtul and ajj means *the flaming of fire*. But ajja also means asraʾa *i.e.* *he walked fast*. This is the meaning given in the Lisān al-ʿArab. Imām Rāghib says that Yaʾjūj and Maʾjūj have been compared to the flaming fire and surging water because of their intense agitation.

**The Dajjāl and Gog and Magog in the light of the Qurʾān**

The word Dajjāl does not occur in the Qurʾān, but it is mentioned in authentic ḥadīth that the first and the last ten verses of the chapter entitled the Cave afford protection from the trials of Dajjāl, and the Qurʾān, read in the light of these ḥadīth, thus gives the
clue to what Dajjāl is. The following reports occurring in the most reliable works on Ḥadīth bear on this point:

Whoever commits to memory the first ten verses of the chapter entitled the Cave will be immune from (the trials of) Dajjāl.¹

Whoever recites the last ten verses of the chapter entitled the Cave will be safe from the trials of Dajjāl.²

Maybe in, mentioning the first and last ten verses, the object is to refer to the whole chapter which describes the trials of Christianity in its two aspects — one religious and the other temporal. Read the first and the last ten verses, and it is clear as day-light that it is the Christian nations that are spoken of in both places. In the very beginning, the religious aspect is mentioned when the Prophet is first spoken of as giving a general warning to all mankind³, and then as warning the Christian nations in particular⁴, people who have taken a son of God. Thus:

Praise be to Allāh! Who revealed the Book to His servant.... to give warning of severe punishment from Him.... And warn those who say Allāh has taken a son.⁵

This is a clear reference to the Christian nations, the basic doctrine of whose religion is that God has a Son. In the concluding ten verses, there is as clear a reference to the temporal achievements of these very nations:

Do those who disbelieve think that they can take My servants to be friends besides Me?.... Say: Shall We inform you of the greatest losers in respect of deeds? Those whose effort goes astray in this world’s life and they are making good manufactures.⁶

1. Al-Muslim 6 : 42; Abū Dāwūd; Tirmidhī; Musnad Ahmad.
2. Al-Muslim; Tirmidhī; Abū Dāwūd 36 : 12.
4. Ibid., 18 : 4.
5. Ibid., 18 : 1-4.
6. Ibid., 18 : 102-104.
This is a prophetic portrait of the Western nations in the clearest words. Manufacture is the one speciality and pride of the Christian nations, and it is to this distinguishing characteristic that the above verses refer. They are so engrossed in the race of manufacturing goods that the higher values of life are entirely screened away from their eyes. Manufacture and more manufacture—this is the be-all and end-all of life with them. Thus both the first ten verses and the last ten verses of this chapter clearly speak of the tribulations of the Christian doctrine of sonship and the materialistic activities of the Christian nations, and this is what is meant by the trials of Dajjal.

Gog and Magog (Ya’jūj and Ma’jūj) are mentioned twice in the Qur’ān. Once they are mentioned in the eighteenth chapter in association with the description of Dajjal. Towards the end of this chapter, a great potentate, Dhu-l-Qarnain, is spoken of as undertaking journeys in different directions to fortify the frontiers of his empire. This potentate is historically proved to be Darius I, the emperor of Persia. His first journey is spoken of as terminating on the Black Sea:

Until when he reached the setting place of the sun (or the western-

7. Dhu-l-Qarnain literally means the two horned one but it may also mean one whose rule extends over two generations or the lord of two kingdoms. This last significance is given by the great commentator, Ibn Jarir. In the Old Testament, Book of Daniel, we find a mention of a vision of Daniel, in which he saw a ram with two horns. The vision is interpreted in the book itself in these words: “The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Media and Persia” (Daniel, 8:20). Among the kings of Media and Persia, Darius I (521—485 B.C.) is the only one to whom the description of the Qur’ān suitably applies. The Jewish Encyclopaedia says: “Darius was the organiser of the Persian Empire. His conquests served to round out the boundaries of his realm in Armenia, the Caucasus and India and along the Turanian Steppes and highlands of Central Asia.” The following remarks in the Encyclopaedia Britannica strengthen this view: “Darius in his inscriptions appears as a fervent believer in the religion of Zoroaster. But he was also a great statesman and organisers. The time of conquests had come to an end: The wars which Darius undertook only served the purpose of gaining strong natural frontiers for the empire and keeping down the barbarous tribes on its borders. Thus Darius subjugated the wild nations of the Pontic and Armenian mountains and extended the Persian Dominion to the Caucasus”.

most point), he found it going down into a black sea.\textsuperscript{8}

Then there is a reference to his eastern journey:

\textit{Until when he reached the (land of) the rising sun, he found it rising on a people to whom We had given no shelter from it.}\textsuperscript{9}

Still further there is a reference to his northern journey:

\textit{Until when he reached (a place) between the two mountains.}\textsuperscript{10}

The reference here is to the mountains of Armenia and Azarbaijan. In this last northern journey, Dhu-l-Qarnain comes across a people who speak a different language; in other words they do not understand the Persian language. These people appeal to Dhu-l-Qarnain in these words:

\textit{O Dhu-l-Qarnain! Gog and Magog do mischief in the land. May we then pay thee tribute on condition that thou raise a barrier between us and them.}\textsuperscript{11}

Further we are told that Dhu-l-Qarnain actually constructed this wall,\textsuperscript{12} and there is mention of iron and copper in this connection, which were used for the gates:

\textit{Bring me blocks of iron. At length when he had filled up the space between the two mountain sides, he said, Blow. Till when he had made it (as) fire, he said, Bring me molten brass to pour over it.}\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{8} The Qur'\textsuperscript{a}n 18 : 86.
\textsuperscript{9} Ibid., 18 : 90.
\textsuperscript{10} Ibid., 18 : 93.
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 18 : 94.
\textsuperscript{12} The barrier or wall referred to here is the famous wall of Derbent (or Darband), which is to be found on the shore of the Caspian Sea. There is a mention of it in \textit{Marāṣid al-īṭāla\textsuperscript{t}}, a famous book of Geography. Ibn al-Faqih also mentions it in his book. The \textit{Encyclopaedia Biblica} gives the following account of the wall: "Derbent or Darband, a town of Persia, Caucasus, in the province of Daghistan, on the Western shore of the Caspian......to the south lies the seaward extremity of the Caucasian wall, 50 miles long otherwise known as Alexander's Wall.....This, when entire, had a height of 29 ft. and a thickness of about 10 feet, and with its iron gates and numerous watchtowers formed a valuable defence of the Persian frontier".
\textsuperscript{13} The Qur'\textsuperscript{a}n 18 : 96.
In verse 97, we are told that when the wall was completed, they (i.e. Gog and Magog) were not able to scale it, nor could they make a hole in it. In verse 98, Dhu-l-Qarnain is reported as saying that even this wall will be of use only up to a certain time and it will at last collapse. And then we are presented with another scene:

*And on that day We shall let some of them (i.e., Gog and Magog) surge against others.*\(^1\)

**The Dajjāl and Gog and Magog are identical**

Immediately after speaking of Gog and Magog fighting with each other in verse 102, the account reverts to the subject of Dajjāl:

*Do those who disbelieve think that they can take My servants to be friends besides Me?*

This shows that the Qur'ān identifies Dajjāl with Gog and Magog. They are given two different names because of their two different functions. As for the identity of Gog and Magog, the commentators differ. Ibn Kathīr says that they are descendants of Adam, and this view is supported by the hadith in *Muslim* and *Bukhārī*. According to Rāh al-Ma‘ānī, they are two tribes from among the descendants of Noah’s sons Japheth, of whom the Turks form a part, being so called because they were left (turikū) on the other side of the wall. Moreover, the Qur’ān’s own description shows clearly that they are human beings, to ward off whose invasions the wall was constructed.

The second reference to Gog and Magog occurs in 21:96:

*Even when Gog and Magog are let loose and they sally forth from every elevated place.*\(^2\)

Sallying forth from every elevated place evidently means that they will establish their supremacy all over the world. The way the Qur’ān speaks of them in both the places shows that a time will come when these people will overpower all the nations of the world. It also appears that they already existed at the time of the revelation of the Book, but that their movements were to remain checked.

---

until a certain time, after which they would wield uncontrolled authority in the whole world.

The reason why the Qur’ān does not mention Dajjāl

It may, however, be asked that if Dajjāl and Gog and Magog are merely two different names for the same people, why is it that while the Qur’ān mentions Gog and Magog by name, it does not mention Dajjāl by name anywhere. The reason is that the word Dajjāl, as shown above, means a “liar” or a “fraud”; and no one, howsoever great a liar and a cheat he may be, likes to be called by this epithet. Gog and Magog, on the other hand, being the names of the people concerned, no one can take exception to this name. In fact, the English people have installed statues of Gog and Magog in front of the Guildhall in London. That is why the Qur’ān uses the names Gog and Magog and not the word Dajjāl which means a liar. The Books of Ḥadīth, on the other hand, use the word Dajjāl, because the name Antichrist (Dajjāl), as also the prophecies relating thereto are met with in the older Scriptures. It was felt necessary, accordingly, to explain in what manner these prophecies were to be fulfilled.

Besides, the word Dajjāl indicates only one aspect of the question, viz., the lies and deceptions of these people, whether it be in matters religious or in matters worldly. But apart from this dark side of their character, there are bright sides of it as well. From the worldly point of view, their material prosperity must be regarded as one of their good points. It is in view of this that in Ḥadīth, one eye, the worldly eye, of Dajjāl has been described as a shining star. The Qur’ān also speaks of their skill in manufacture. Thus the epithet Dajjāl is only a partial description. In the Holy Qur’ān, the Christian nations are spoken of as People of the Cave and Inscription.16 This description covers both the aspects of the history of Christianity. “The people of the Cave” is an appropriate description of the followers of Christianity in its early history, since monasticism was the predominating feature of Christianity at this stage. They had completely renounced the affairs of the world for their

16. The Qur’ān 18:9
devotional practices. In other words, they had discarded the world for the sake of their religion. The last stage, however, is well described by the expression "People of the Inscription (raqîm)." Raqam in Arabic means a thing written. This word is particularly used in respect of prices written on articles of trade, like cloth etc. This description indicates their deep absorption in matters of the world, a fact referred to further in the Qur'ān by the words, those whose effort goes astray in this world's life. Thus, if in the first stage of their history the Christian peoples renounced the world for the sake of their religion, in the final stage they have totally discarded religion in the interests of the world, and hence they are spoken of as "of Our wonderful signs." The Qur'ānic words quoted above are an appropriate description of their materialistic tendencies. And since they are far in advance of all other nations in matters worldly, the nations of the world, tempted by the worldly advantages secured by these people, have been following them blindly. Thus the Christian nations are misleading the people of the world not only by their false religious ideas of sonship and atonement but also by their blind pursuit of materialistic ideals to the total neglect of the higher values of life. They are therefore given the name of Dajjāl, or arch-deceiver, in the Ḥadīth.

Gog and Magog in the light of the Bible

In the Bible, Gog and Magog are mentioned in very clear terms, and no doubt is left as to their identity:

"And the word of the Lord came unto me saying, Son of man, set thy face against Gog, the land of Magog, the chief Prince of Rosh, Meshech and Tubal, and prophesy against him: And say, thus saith The Lord God, I am against thee, O Gog, the chief prince of Rosh, Meshech and Tubal: And I will turn thee back, and put hooks into thine jaws..."

Here Gog is mentioned clearly and this Gog is the same as Ya'jūj of the Qur'ān. He is spoken of as being the chief of Russia,

17. The Qur'ān 18 : 104.
Moscow and Tubal. And as for Magog (Ma'jūj), only the land of Magog is spoken of.

The three names mentioned in the Bible are Rosh or Russia (Rus), Meshech or Moscow, and Tubal or Tobalsk. While Russia is the name of the country, Omask and Tubal are the names of two rivers to the north of mount Caucasus. On the former is situated Moscow, and on the latter Tobalsk, both these being the most famous cities of Russia. In view of the clearness of the description, no doubt whatsoever is left as to the identity of Gog.

Gog is thus clearly Russia, the habitat of the Slavonic people. And as for Magog, it is of the same land. So, while on the one hand, Gog is spoken of as the chief or master of Russia, on the other he is described as living in the land of Magog. Now the population of the land in which Russia is situated, i.e., Europe, consists of two main races, Slavs and Teutons. The latter includes the British and the Germans. This clearly shows not only that Gog is the name of the Eastern nations of Europe, but also that Magog is the name of the Western nations of that continent, i.e. the nations known as Teutons. It is also clear that in the beginning both these races lived in the same land. Maybe, Gog and Magog were the names or titles of the first ancestors of these two races. Evidence of this is found in the fact that from very ancient times the statues of Gog and Magog are found installed in front of the famous Guildhall of London. If these names had nothing to do with the ancestors of these people, why should their statues be installed in this manner before the chief assembly house of the nation?

The reference to these as given in the Bible, together with the historical evidence as furnished by these statues in London, establishes it with utmost certainty that Gog and Magog are no fictitious names but are the names of two races which inhabit the Continent of Europe and which together cover the whole of its land surface. In view of these clear indications as to the identity of these people, only one meaning can be attached to the Quranic description of them, that they would sally forth from every place of advantage; and this means that Europe will wield supreme authority over
the whole surface of the globe. Nay, the expression *kulli hadab-in,* i.e. *every place of advantage,* shows that their supremacy will not only be in the physical but also in the intellectual sphere, and the other people of the world will be their slaves not only in body but also mentally. The Qur'ān thus gives us a true picture of the political and cultural dominance of Europe over the nations of the world, and the very fact which has brought about the downfall of Muslims in these later days, is strangely enough also a clear proof of the truth of Islam.

**The Dajjāl in Ḥadīth books**

It is necessary to bear in mind certain points in connection with the description of Dajjāl or Antichrist, as it occurs in Ḥadīth. The first of these is that the prophecies of the Holy Prophet in connection with the appearance of Dajjāl are mostly based on his visions. In the well-known ḥadīth of Nawās ibn Sam'ān relating to Dajjāl, recorded by Tirmidhī, we find the following words:

“As if I would liken him (Dajjāl) to ‘Abd al-‘Uzza.” This expression ‘as if’ clearly shows that the Holy Prophet was describing a scene seen in a vision, and makes us feel sure that his prophecies in this regard have their origin in visions (*kashf* or *ru’yā*). But, generally speaking no mention was made of the phenomenon of vision when such prophecies came to be narrated.

Now, the experiences of vision are generally subject to interpretation. The Holy Qur'ān itself narrates some true dreams, the real significance of which is different from what the words of the narration mean. For example, Joseph saw in a dream that the sun and the moon and eleven stars made obeisance to him. The real significance of the dream was, however, that God was to exalt him in rank and position. Again, a king sees in a dream some lean cows swallowing up some fat cows. The interpretation was that the stored corn of surplus years would be used up in lean years. In the ḥadīth also we read of the true dreams of the Holy Prophet,

---

of which the meaning is different from the actual scenes presented. For instance, two bracelets seen in a dream meant two false prophets; long hands meant munificence. Besides, it is universally admitted that prophecies are clothed in metaphorical language.

The first thing, therefore, to remember in connection with the prophecies about the Antichrist is that there is a good deal of metaphor in them. Again, because these prophecies had nothing to do with the injunctions and prohibitions of the Law, they suffered from two drawbacks. In the first place, the narrators were not as careful about the preservation of the actual words of the Prophet's utterances on these questions as they were in preserving those concerning the *shart*'. Secondly, as there are no means of knowing the true significance of a prophecy before it is fulfilled, it is not infrequently that the sense of such utterances is wrongly grasped and these wrong impressions in their turn become a fruitful source of additions and alterations in the words of the reports.

**The menace of the Dajjāl according to the Qur'ān and Ḥadīth**

As stated above, there is no mention of Dajjāl in the Qur'ān by this particular name. But in authentic Ḥadīth we are told that the recital of the chapter the Cave in the Qur'ān is a remedy for the menace of Dajjāl, and this particular chapter deals specially with Christianity and its false doctrines. The first and the last ten verses of this chapter in particular deal with the beliefs and activities of the Christian nations. This clearly shows that according to the Qur'ān, Dajjāl menace is only another name for the predominance of the false doctrines of Christianity and the dominance of the materialistic outlook on life of the Western nations. In other words, what the Ḥadīth describes as the tribulation of Dajjāl is nothing else but the predominance of the concept of life of the Christian West. The Books of Ḥadīth proclaim with one voice that the tribulation of Dajjāl is the greatest of all tribulations, so much so that a Muslim is taught to pray to God in his five daily prayers to be saved from being afflicted with the tribulation of the Dajjāl: "O

---

23. *Muslim* Kitāb al-Ru'ya', Vol. II.
24. *Miḥkāt al-Maṣāḥīḥ* Kitāb al-Ru'ya'.
Allāh! I seek refuge in Thee from the trial of al-Masīḥ al-Dajjāl." We are also told that every prophet warned his nation against this tribulation. Further, it is clearly stated that:

There is no tribulation greater than that of the Dajjāl from the creation of Adam to the day of Resurrection.

All the books of Ḥadīth are agreed on this point and this warning has been repeated in various forms. The question, therefore, arises, Is the Qurʾān silent on an event which is described by the Prophet so emphatically as the greatest of all tribulations?

Before giving an answer to this question, we should look a little deeper into the nature of the two tribulations of which Muslims are warned as coming to pass in the later days. The tribulation of Gog and Magog is spoken of in the clearest words in both the Qurʾān and the Ḥadīth, but instead of Dajjāl, the Holy Qurʾān speaks of another great tribulation in the form of the Christian doctrine relating to Divinity of Christ. It denounces this doctrine in the strongest terms as the greatest of all tribulations for humanity.

The heavens may almost be rent thereat, and the earth cleave asunder, and the mountains fall down in pieces, that they ascribe a son to the Beneficent.\(^{25}\)

It further states that such a doctrine was never taught by Jesus Christ. In fact, it speaks of it as just the opposite of what Christ taught:

And when Allāh will say: O Jesus, son of Mary! Didst thou say to men, Take me and my mother for two gods besides Allāh? He will say: Glory be to Thee! it was not for me to say what I had no right to (say) ... I said to them naught save as Thou didst command me: serve Allāh, my Lord and your Lord.\(^{26}\)

Thus the doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus, according to the Qurʾān, cannot be ascribed to Christ but to Antichrist; and though the Qurʾān does not mention the name of Dajjāl or Antichrist, it

\(^{25}\) The Qurʾān 19:90-91.
\(^{26}\) Ibid., 5:116-117.
speaks of the Antichrist as being the manifestation of the erroneous Christian doctrine of the sonship of God.

If we consider the ḥadīth concerned, these also testify to the truth of what has been said above. The first thing that strikes us in this connection is that almost all ḥadīth speaking of the coming of Jesus allot to him only one task, viz., that “he will break the Cross” (Ar. yaksiru al-ṣalīḥa). It is only rarely that he is spoken of as killing the Dajjāl. This is rather strange, seeing that the menace of the Dajjāl is, according to Ḥadīth, the greatest of all afflictions that can befall the world. This menace was destined to be removed at the hands of the Promised Messiah. But when the advent of the Messiah is spoken of, his great achievement is mentioned as breaking of the Cross, which shows clearly that the breaking of the Cross and the killing of Dajjāl carry one and the same significance. It is really very significant that when Ḥadīth describes the trials and tribulations of the later days, it gives the greatest prominence to Dajjāl, but when it comes to describe the remedy of this affliction it mentions the breaking of the Cross. The fact that the Promised Messiah’s first and foremost task would be the breaking of the Cross, shows decisively that the menace of Dajjāl and the preponderance of the religion of the Cross are but two different expressions for one and the same idea.

Why is the Dajjāl called Masīḥ?

As a matter of fact, a little thought will find this truth indicated in the fact of Dajjāl being given the name of Masīḥ al-Dajjāl. Why should, after all, Dajjāl be called Masīḥ or Messiah? The reason is that Dajjāl shall be setting about his task under the name of “Messiah”, which is a sacred title given by God to Prophet Jesus by revelation. The giving of this title of a righteous servant of God to Dajjāl shows that the latter will be doing his work in the name of this holy man; and it is this which in reality constitutes its da‘īl or fraud, because while he assumes the name of Messiah, who was a prophet and a righteous servant of God, he does things which are directly opposed to his teachings. The Messiah Jesus taught that God is one and that none else but He should be served and worshipped, but Dajjāl raised the Messiah himself to the position of
God. Again, whereas Jesus the Messiah taught that all the prophets of God were His righteous servants, Dajjāl condemned all these holy personages as sinners. The reason is not far to seek. Unless all those people whom God chose from time to time for the guidance of humanity are condemned as sinful, there arises no necessity for a supposed sinless son of God to be an atonement for the sins of humanity. Further, whereas the true Messiah taught that every man receives reward or punishment for his own actions, Dajjāl in the guise of the Messiah teaches that the son of God is a sufficient atonement for the sins of all Christendom. The real Messiah preached that a rich man can not enter the kingdom of heaven; but Dajjāl, pretending to be the Messiah, teaches people but one thing, the accumulation of wealth.

Hadīth about the Dajjāl

The reports about Dajjāl are to be found in such a large number and are ascribed to so many companions of the Holy Prophet that it is not possible to question their collective evidence; although, as I have said, their literal fulfilment in every detail is out of question. These reports have found their place in the most authentic collections, and even Bukhārī and Muslim embody them in very large numbers. The Musnad of Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal also contains as many as about one hundred such ḥadīth, and among their narrators are to be found such companions of eminence as Abū Bakr, ‘Alī, ‘Ā’ishah, Sa’d ibn Abī Waqqās, ‘Abdullāh ibn ‘Abbās, ‘Abdullāh ibn ‘Umar, ‘Abdullāh ibn ‘Amr, Abū Hurairah, Abū Sa‘īd Khudrī, Anas ibn Mālik, Jābir, Hishām ibn ‘Āmir, Samrāh ibn Jundab, Ubayy ibn Ka‘b, Safinah, ‘Imrān ibn Ḥusain, Nawās ibn Sam‘ān, Umm Sharīk, Fātima bint Qais, ‘Ubāda ibn Sāmit, Abū ‘Ubaidah ibn al-Jarrāḥ, Asmā’ bint Yazīd and Mughirah ibn Shu‘bāh.

There are other companions as well who have reported ḥadīth about Dājjāl. All these numerous companions are agreed that the Holy Prophet repeatedly spoke of the Dajjāl, and not the least doubt can be entertained as to the fact that the Prophet himself was the source from whom these prophecies emanated.

Is the Dajjāl a single person or a nation?

It is true that most of the ḥadīth seem to indicate that Dajjāl will
be a single person, who will have only one eye and on whose forehead will be found written the Arabic letters kāf, fā and rā (or kufr meaning unbelief), and who will carry with him an ass and a river and a fire. But if we care to read these reports in the light of the relevant statements in the Qur’ān, it becomes quite clear that Dajjāl is not the name of a person but of a nation or rather of a group of nations. The Qur’ān has definitely identified Dajjāl with the Christian nations, and has moreover indicated that Dajjāl and Gog and Magog are not separate entities, because the trials arising out of both are spoken of together. We have also the evidence of the Bible, which has already been quoted, that Gog and Magog are the nations of Europe. It thus becomes clear that Dajjāl also stands for certain nations. It has further been shown that the trials connected with Dajjāl are to have their source in the predominance of Christianity. This evidence is further corroborated by a ḥadīth in Muslim which shows that just as Rome and Persia are spoken of as a nation, Dajjāl also indicates a people. It reads as follows:

قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّي اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فِي رَجُلٍ عَرَبِيَ كَفَّارٍ أَفَّوْقَانِينَ، فَقَالَ لَهُ الَّذِي تَحْفَظُهَا اللَّهُ رَماَزُونَ التَّوْمَرَ فِي فَتْحُهَا اللَّهُ تَخْفُرُهُنَّ وَرَجُلٍ جَالِلٌ فِي فَتْحُهَا اللَّهُ

The Prophet, peace and blessings of God be upon him, said: You will fight with them (i.e. the Arabs) and Allāh will give you victory over them; then you will fight with Persia and Allāh will give you victory over them; then you will fight with Rome and Allāh will give you victory over them; then you will fight with the Dajjāl and Allāh will give you victory over them.27

Here the war with Dajjāl is mentioned in the same manner as the war with the Arabs, the Persians and the Romans. This shows that the last mentioned are a nation just as the others are nations. The reference in these wars may be to the crusades, or it may have a reference to the events of the world in our own day. One thing, however, is clear from this ḥadīth that like Persians and Romans, Dajjāl stands for a nation or a group of nations.

27. Mishkāt ch. al-Malāḥim.
The fact, however, still remains to be explained that in the Hadith, Dajjal is spoken of as if he were a single person. As I have already shown, these prophecies are all based on visions seen by the Prophet, and a nation could be represented in a vision only as a single person. In fact, it is certain characteristics that mark out a nation, and in a vision these characteristics could only be shown as being met with in an individual. Even in ordinary language a nation is spoken of as if it were a single person. Thus the Qur’ân speaks of the Israelites, addressing them as if it were a single person. Read for example words such as the following:

O Children of Israel! call to mind My favour which I bestowed on you and that I made you excel the nations.\(^{28}\)

Here the people actually addressed are those who were living at the time of the Holy Prophet but events are referred to which took place at the time of Prophet Moses or during long centuries after him. The favours spoken of were bestowed upon generations long past but the words here are addressed to their distant descendants who were now a debased and humiliated people. But all these numerous generations are spoken of as if they were a single person. Even thus a whole nation of Dajjal was shown to the Prophet symbolically in the form of a single person, while its description as given in the Qur’ân shows that Dajjal stood for certain nations which were to be known by certain distinguishing features.

**Description of the Dajjal in Hadith**

Whatever peculiarities we notice today in the Western civilisation, are all found described among the features of Dajjal as seen by the Holy Prophet. No doubt, there are some points in which these nations differ from one another, but there are certainly others which are equally found in all of them. And it is these common features which are described in presenting the picture of Dajjal. I will only quote such of the hadith as speak of the features of Dajjal.

\(^{28}\) The Qur’ân 2 : 47.
Let us start with those recorded in the *Bukhārī*:

1. And I saw a person with short curly hair, whose right eye was blind. I asked: Who is this? I was told that it was al-Masth al-Dajjāl.²⁹

2. Behold! he is blind of one eye . . . and between his two eyes is written kāfir.³⁰

In the *Musnad* of Aḥmad, we come across similar words. And almost in all ḥadīth on this subject, Dajjāl is described as one-eyed. In a report narrated by Ibn ‘Abbās we are told that he will be one-eyed with sparkling white complexion.³¹ And in another, he is spoken of as heavily built, white and shining, whose one eye is brilliant like a shining star.³²

Similarly, in most of the reports, he is stated to have kufr or kāfir or K F R written between his two eyes. Some of these reports add that every believer will be able to read this (inscription) whether he is illiterate or a man who knows writing.³³

---

²⁹. *Bukhārī* 77 : 68; 92.
Again:

A believer will decipher (i.e., the description on Dajjal’s forehead) whether or not he is able to read.35

In these descriptions we notice:

(1) That as to constitution, Dajjal is described as strongly built. (2) That his complexion will be white and sparkling. (3) And that the hair on his head will be short and curly.

And it is noteworthy that all these three are peculiar to the general appearance of the European nations. Generally speaking, these people are rather stoutly built; they are of good size and quite stout and strong. Their hair is short and curly, so much so that now-a-days even the women are cutting their hair short. Their colour is white and shining. Thus these particular points in the description of Dajjal quite fit in with the physical appearance of the nations of Europe.

As for the two remaining items in the description, viz., that his right eye is blind and that kufir or KFR is written large on his forehead, these are really descriptions of his spiritual condition. As has been shown, Dajjal is a figure representative of a people. Now it is evident that a whole people cannot be physically blind. Moreover, while he is described as blind in the right eye, it is written with regard to his left eye that it will be bright like a shining star. In other words, while the light of his right eye will be extinguished, his left eye will be unusually bright. The explanation which Imam Rāghib gives for the blindness of Dajjal in the right eye is a truly scholarly exposition. While explaining the meaning of the word Masih, he says that mas-h also means the expunging of anything, and then adds:

And it has been reported that the right eye of the Dajjāl will be devoid of sight and that the Messiah will have his left eye devoid of sight; and this means that Dajjāl will be bereft of praiseworthy moral qualities, such as knowledge, intelligence and humility, whereas Jesus will be free of ignorance, avarice, greed and other despicable moral vices of the kind.

Imām Rāghib thus interprets the prophecy of Dajjāl being blind in the right eye, not literally but metaphorically, and takes it to mean that he will be lacking in good morals.

The interpretation put upon this prophecy by Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad is still more exquisite. The two eyes of man are those, with one of which he sees the spiritual or religious matters, and the other with which he sees the worldly or material things. And since religion and spirituality occupy a higher position than things physical and material, the lack of vision in the right eye means that Dajjāl will have very little interest in matters religious and spiritual, and this is true of the European nations of today. Their whole interest lies in things physical and material and their progress along these lines is unparalleled. This is what is meant by the statement that his left eye will be like a bright star. That is to say, he will be able to see such things in the world of matter as will elude the understanding of other people. His spiritual eye, however, will be devoid of all lustre, because all his energy will be exhausted in the material world. His unique success in this world will result in his blindness of the other eye. It is indeed a wonderful exposition and exactly in accordance with what the Holy Qur’ān says about the Christian nations:
Those whose effort goes astray in this world's life and they think that they are making good manufactures.\textsuperscript{36}

The sayings of the Holy Prophet describe this very thing in the metaphorical expression that the left eye of Dajjāl, \textit{i.e.} his worldly eye, will be sharp like a bright star. As for the spiritual condition of these nations, the Book says: \textit{Those are they who disbelieve in the messages of their Lord and meeting with Him.}\textsuperscript{37} Hadīth expresses this very idea in its own way when it says that the right eye of Dajjāl will be without any power of vision in it.

Similarly, the other sign of Dajjāl, \textit{viz.}, that he will have \textit{kufūr} or \textit{kāfīr} written on his forehead, appertains to his spiritual condition. To speak of anything as if it is written on one's forehead is equivalent to saying that it is a patent fact about him. So the statement about the inscription on Dajjāl's forehead only means that his unbelief will be quite a patent fact about him. The words of the hadīth itself show that this is the significance. In the first place, it is said that every believer will be able to read it; not that every person will be able to do so. Then there is an additional remark about the believer. It is said that it is immaterial whether the believer be an illiterate person or one able to read and write. That is to say, that every believer will be able to decipher this inscription, whether or not he is a literate person. Evidently a writing which can be read by every believer irrespective of his literacy, cannot be in words and letters. Had it been in words and letters, the question of the reader's belief or unbelief would not have arisen at all, nor could it be stated that a believer would be able to read it even if he were illiterate. The ability to read words or letters has nothing to do with faith or belief. Every one who is literate can read such words; whereas an illiterate person, however great a believer he may be, cannot read them. It must, therefore, be a writing which manifests itself through the works of the being concerned. And the significance of the statement that it will be the believers alone who will be able to read it, is that the unbeliever is never conscious of his unbelief and that it needs a believer's eye to see the ugliness of unbelief.

\textsuperscript{36} The Qur'ān 18:104.
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 18:105.
The abode of the Dajjāl at the Holy Prophet’s time

In the *Musli̇m* there is a report narrated by Fātimah, daughter of Qais, in which it is stated that one day the Holy Prophet detained the people after the congregational prayer and said: “Tamīm Dārī who was previously a Christian has come to me and has embraced Islam, and he now says a thing about Dajjāl which accords with what I have been talking to you”. Then follows the story of Tamīm Dārī which runs as follows:

“He set out on a voyage in the company of some people of the tribes of Lakhm and Juzām. After a month’s journey their boat anchored on an island, where they first met a strange creature, which calls itself Jassāsah (lit., arch-spy). This Jassāsah gives them the whereabouts of a person who lives in a church. They visit the man in the church, whom they find to be a huge figure, whose hands are tied to his neck and whose legs are chained in iron fetters from the knees to the ankles. They start talking to this man, who, incidentally, asks them the news about the Holy Prophet, and concludes by saying “I am Masīḥ al-Dajjāl (Antichrist) and expect to be released before long, when I shall sally forth in the whole world, excepting Makkah and Madīnah.”

The one thing which is very clear in this whole story is that it is not an event of normal experience but a vision. The report has missed the mention of the fact of its being a vision. The proof for this is provided by the fact that Dajjāl here is reported to have asked, “Tell me about the Prophet of the illiterates, i.e., the Arabs, as to what he is doing”. To which they replied: “He has left Makkah and reached Madīnah”.

In another report he is stated to have asked:

“This man who has appeared among you, what has he done?”

After all, how did this person come to know that the Arabian Prophet had already appeared? Should we think that he was also a recipient of revelation? Evidently this could not be. Nor could this be a case of guess work.

Other incidents narrated in this story all support this view. Who tied the hands of Dajjāl to his neck? Who fettered his legs with chains? Are we to think that he came out of his mother's womb in this state? However it might have happened, could not Jassāsah unloose his chains? All these difficulties can be solved only if we regard the story having originated in the vision of Tamīm Dārī. All that came to the knowledge of the Prophet in this connection also came through vision. It never happened that Allāh took him actually to this island and made him see Dajjāl with his physical eyes. On the contrary, it was through various visions that the traits of Dajjāl were revealed to him. He presented this vision of Tamīm Dārī only as a corroboration of what came to his knowledge through his own visions in this matter, in the same manner as he treated the dreams and visions of some other Companions. This hadith, in the first place, gives us a clue as to where the Dajjāl resides:

1. He is an inhabitant of some island.
2. This island is situated at a distance of one month's journey by sail boats from Syria.

Still another thing which one learns from this report is that Dajjāl existed even at the time of the narration but that he was not allowed to make his appearance. I will dilate on this point later on.

The two points noted above give us a clear indication as to the homeland of Dajjāl. Europe, no doubt, has other nations living in it, but the British people have attained a power and glory which has not fallen to the lot of any other nation of that continent. That is why the western island has been particularly spoken of as being the homeland of Dajjāl.

**The religion of the** Dajjāl

In certain hadith we are told that the Jews will be found in the company of Dajjāl. From this it has been supposed that the Dajjāl will profess the Jewish faith. But the Qur'ān states very clearly that these people ascribe a son to God. Hence there is no doubt left as to their being Christians. I will explain later on the significance of the fact of the Jews being with Dajjāl. The fact that the Jews will accompany them does not necessarily mean that they
themselves will be Jews. Had it been so, how are we to explain another statement to the effect that a party from among the followers of the Holy Prophet Muhammad will also join Dajjal and be victims of their deception? The words of this hadith are:

Seventy thousand people from among my followers will follow the Dajjal.39

As a matter of fact, the very title al-Masih al-Dajjal as I have said, shows that these people will claim to follow the Messiah Jesus. The hadith of Tamim Darî, which has already been discussed, is also very clear on this subject. The direction to go to the man in the Church occurring in this hadith is very significant. It is quite obvious that the Church is a symbol of Christianity, and the people whose representative has to be found in a Church can be no other than Christians. Jassasah or the spies of Dajjal have only one function, viz., inducing people to go to the Church, i.e., to become Christian. Here are the actual words put in the mouth of this Jassasah:

“The Church which you see, go into it”.

The place of the appearance of the Dajjal

- It is rather striking that the homeland of Dajjal has been indicated to be to the west of Syria, whereas his place of manifestation has been stated to be in the east. Clear statements to this effect are to be found in Hadith:

“Nay, he will appear in the East; nay, he will appear in the East; nay, he will appear in the East.”40

Leaving aside the details, if we consider what the various reports agree upon, we learn that Dajjal will manifest itself in the East.

39. Miṣkāt Ch. al-Dajjal.
One report says:

"The Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of God be upon him, pointed nearly twenty times towards the East."\(^{41}\)

In a report recorded by *Muslim*, the words "Nay, he will be in the East", are followed by the words: "He also pointed with his hand towards the East". Thus while we are told that the homeland of Dājjāl is an island in the West, we are also informed that his manifestation or rather the manifestation of his mischiefs will be in the East. This shows that the predominance of Dājjāl will harm the people of the East. And it is a patent fact that the mischiefs of Dājjāl do not at all affect the people of his own country, who really get the benefit of his pillaging the East. The Dājjāl’s appearance in the East thus signifies the manifestation of his mischief in the Eastern countries, whose people he will try to enslave, physically as well as morally, temporally as well as spiritually.

As for his existence, it is evident from what the ḥadīth say that he existed even at the time of the Holy Prophet, but that at that time his hands and feet were shackled. This is exactly what we find in the case of European nations. Upto a certain time they were confined to their own native lands, and then they sallied forth to subjugate the rest of the world, so that they are now in actual possession of all other countries or wield such an influence over them that their movements are guided and controlled by Europe. It is for this reason that Dājjāl is spoken of as claiming Divinity, because it is at his bidding that everything is done throughout the world, and Europe, as it were, controls the destinies of other nations. This is again the significance of what is said in another ḥadīth that Dājjāl will give life to people and cause them to die. This is only another way of saying that these people will exalt and abase nation as it suits their purpose.

The greatest trial

According to a ḥadīth in the Muslim,

\[ \text{مَا أَبْنَاءُ الْخَلْقِ أُمِّيِّنَ الْأَمْرِ إِلَى هَيَمَّة} \]

There is no trial greater than that of the Dajjāl since the creation of man up to the coming of the Hour.\(^{42}\)

Similar words are met with in other Ḥadīth collections. For example, in one ḥadīth the Holy Prophet is reported as saying:

\[ \text{O people! There has been no trial greater than that of Dajjāl on the face of the earth since Allāh created the progeny of Adam.} \(^{43}\)\]

Such ḥadīth are by themselves an evidence that the trial of Dajjāl is no other than the present predominance of the European powers and the exaltation of the religion of the Cross. It is a fact that the history of man does not present another trial of such magnitude. There have been conquerors who reduced other nations to subjugation and dominated them in certain aspects of their life, but there is not a single example of such universal predominance as we witness in the predominance of Europe and European civilization over the whole world. Both land and sea are under the invincible sway of Europe. Neither do we find any other instance of the manner in which the nations of the world have been enslaved by these adventurers of the West. What is more, they are equipped with every kind of weapon wherewith people can be led astray from the path of rectitude and purity. Here they mislead people through material education, there they achieve their object through religious propaganda; sometimes they attain their objective by providing physical comfort and luxury at the expense of the soul; at others it is through some other attraction for the world that the spiritual side of life is thrown into the background. Even their science is heading for the destruction not only of the spirit but of humanity itself. In short, there is no parallel to this trial in the whole history of humanity, and the words of the Prophet that there is no trial greater than that of Dajjāl find a clear fulfilment in the dominance of Europe, a dominance

\(^{42}\) Mishkāt Ch. al-Dajjāl.

\(^{43}\) Kanz al-‘Ummāl Vol. 7, H. No. 2028.
which afflicts not only the physical side of life but also its spiritual and moral aspects.

**The signs of the Dajjāl**

Below are given a few quotations from Hadith speaking of the signs accompanying the appearance of the Dajjāl. Their full significance will be discussed later on.

I. (a) "He will come and with him will be something like garden (or paradise) and fire (or hell) then that which he will call garden, will be fire."  

Ibn Talha: "And with him will be water and fire. Then that which people think to be water will be fire that will burn; and that which people think to be fire, will prove to be sweet cold water".

(c) "He will bring with him fire and a stream. So whoever falls into his fire, his reward will become due and his burden will be removed."

(d) "With him will be mountains of bread and streams of water."

(e) "With him will be two rivers, a river of water and a river of fire."

44. *Mishkāt* Ch. al-Dajjāl.
(f) “The Dajjāl will make his appearance and with him will be a stream and fire; whosoever plunges into his stream, his burden becomes due and his reward vanishes; and whoever enters his fire, his reward becomes due and his burden is removed.”

(g) “And among his trials is that with him will be a garden and a fire. His fire will be really a garden and his garden really a fire. So whoever is tried by his fire, he should seek the succour of God and should read the opening verses of the chapter the Cave, and it will become cool and safe.”

(h) “And with him will be something like garden and fire. And his garden will be misty with smoke and his hell will be a green garden.”

(i) “Verily with him will be a garden and a fire. So his fire will be garden and his garden fire. So whoever is tried by his fire should close his eyes and seek the help of God; it will become cool and safe.”

(j) “How would you feel when you will be tried by a man to whom the streams of the world and its fruits will be made

50. Ibid., No. 2028.
51. Ibid., No. 2074.
52. Ibid., No. 2079.
subservient.”

(k) “Two mountains will move with him. One of these will be trees and fruits and water, and on the other will be smoke and fire. He will say: This is heaven and this is hell.”

II. (a) “We said: O Messenger of Allah! How swift will he travel on the earth? He said: As the cloud is carried by the wind.”

(b) “The earth will be rolled up for him; he will hold the cloud in his right hand and will overreach the sun at its setting place; the sea will be ankle deep for him; before him will be a mountain of smoke.”

(c) “He will be jumping about between heaven and earth.”

(d) “And he will have an ass which he will ride, whose two ears will be forty yards apart.”

(e) “The Dajjāl will make his appearance on a white ass, whose two ears will be seventy yards apart.”

(f) “Underneath him will be a white ass, the length of
each of his two ears will be thirty yards, and between one leg of his ass and the other will be the distance of a day and night’s journey.”

II. “And he will pass through a wilderness and will say to it: Bring forth thy treasures. So its treasures will follow him as the bees follow their queen.”

IV. (a) “He will come upon a nation and he will invite it (to follow him) and it will believe in him; so he will command the sky and it will pour down rain and command the earth and it will produce vegetation... Then he will come upon a nation and he will invite it (to follow him), and it will refuse to respond, so he will turn away from it, then it will be stricken with famine and nothing will remain in its hand of its wealth.”

(b) “And among his trials is that as he passes by a people and they refuse to believe in him, nothing will remain of their cattle but all will perish; and that as he passes by another people which will believe in him, he will command the sky

61. *Mīḥkāt Ch. al-Dajjāl*.
and it will rain and command the earth and it will bring forth vegetation.”

(c) “The streams of the world and its fruits will be made subservient to him; so whoever will follow him, he will give him to eat and make him an unbeliever, and whoever will disobey him, he will deprive him of his provisions and stop (his means of livelihood).”

(d) “There will be some people accompanying the Dajjāl who will say, We accompany him so that we may eat from his food and feed our cattle from his trees.”

(e) “And with him will be mountains of bread and people will be in difficulty excepting those who follow him.”

V. (a) “And with him will be raised devils in the form of those that are dead from among the fathers and brothers (of people).”

(b) “With him will be devils assuming the appearance

---

64. Ibid., H. No. 2090.
65. Ibid., H. No. 2092.
66. Ibid., H. No. 2104.
67. Ibid., H. No. 2065.
of the dead, who will ask the living: Do you recognise me? I am thy brother, thy father or some relation."

(68)

(69) "And with him will be raised devils who will speak to people."

(70) "And behind him will be the Dajjāl, with whom will be seventy thousand Jews."

(71) "Most of those who follow him will be the Jews and women and the rustics."

(72) "And most of those who follow him will be the Jews and the women."

(73) "The enemy of God, the Dajjāl, will make his appearance and with him will be an army of the Jews and various kinds of people."

(74) "And the last of those that will go out to him will be women, so much so that a man will return to his mother and his daughter and his sister and his aunt, and tie them fast lest they should go out to him (Dajjāl)."

69. Ibid., H. No. 2104.
70. Ibid., H. No. 2028.
71. Ibid., No. 2065.
72. Ibid., No. 2214.
73. Ibid., No. 2974.
74. Ibid., No. 2116.
VIII. "Beware! Most of the comrades and followers of the Dajjāl will be the Jews and illegitimate children."\textsuperscript{75}

IX. "And the women will assume the appearance of men and the men will assume the appearance of women."\textsuperscript{76}

X. "And he will cure the blind and the lepers and will revive the dead."\textsuperscript{77}

XI. "Whoever hears about the Dajjāl should keep away from him. By Allah! One will come to him and he will think that he is a believer, but he will follow him (Dajjāl) on account of the doubts that he will raise in his mind."\textsuperscript{78}

XII. (a) Then he (Dajjāl) said: If these shackles of mine are unloosened I will leave no land untrodden by these legs of mine, excepting the holy city of Madīnah.\textsuperscript{79}

(b) "And there will be no part of the world left which he will not dominate excepting the cities of Makkah and Madīnah."\textsuperscript{80}

\textsuperscript{75} Kanz al-`Ummāl Vol. 7, H. No. 2998.

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., No. 2998.

\textsuperscript{77} Ibid., No. 2080.

\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., No. 2057.

\textsuperscript{79} Ibid., No. 2991.

\textsuperscript{80} Ibid., No. 2028.
(c) "And very shortly I (i.e., Dajjal) shall be permitted to issue forth; so I will go forth and travel in the land and there will be no habitation which I shall not go through in twenty nights, excepting Makkah and Madinah."\(^{81}\)

1. The paradise and hell of the Dajjal

I have presented these twelve signs of Dajjal as given in the books of Hadith and as collected from different sources by the authors of Kanz al-\'Ummal and Mishkat. I shall now deal with each one of them separately and go into their details. The greatest sign of Dajjal is stated to be his carrying with himself heaven and hell. The very first thing to be remembered in this connection is that if in some hadith the words jannah (garden or paradise) and n\'ar (fire or hell) are used for this heaven and hell of Dajjal, in others their real significance is pointed out by using other words. For example, sometimes instead of jannah and n\'ar, we find the words m\'a\' (water) and n\'ar (fire), and again the words nahr (stream or river) and n\'ar (fire). Then another hadith speaks of two streams, one of water and one of fire. Still others state that with him will be "a mountain of bread and streams of water." Again, there are reports which instead of jannah and n\'ar speak of "two mountains, one of which will have trees and fruits and water while the other will have smoke and fire". It is clear from this that the words jannah and n\'ar do not here actually stand for paradise and hell; nor are the streams of water and fire and mountains of fruits and smoke to be taken literally. These are all metaphorical expressions, jannah standing for amilpeness of the provisions of livelihood, comfort and luxury, and n\'ar standing for deprivation of these material benefits. All that is meant is that whoever will follow the Dajjal will be able to lead a luxurious life, and whoever will be opposed to him will find worldly provisions withheld from him. A comparison of the worldly condition of the two nations, the scanty means of livelihood of the Muslim nations, as compared with the vast wealth of

\(^{81}\) Kanz al-\'Ummal Vol. 7, H. No. 2938.
Christendom, gives us a clear indication of the paradise and hell of Dajjāl. Nor does Dajjāl’s carrying these things with him mean that he will be actually carrying them with him, just as a merchant carries about his merchandise. The idea is that he will have control over them, as explained by another hadīth:

"The streams and fruits of the world will be made subservient to him."\(^{82}\)

This, in fact, is the significance underlying all these words, viz., that all kinds of provisions to lead an easy worldly life with its comforts and luxuries will be in the control of Dajjāl. This is a paradise for superficial observers, but it is spoken of as being hell, in reality, for whoever gets engrossed in the enjoyments of this life such as dancing, amusements and revelries, theatres, cinemas, indiscriminate mixing of the two sexes, drinking, gambling, adultery, cannot be expected to have any thought of God. As a result, he is deprived of spiritual benefits which is really a hell, and which though hidden from the physical eye of man in this life will become manifest in the hereafter. On the other hand, the hell of Dajjāl which stands for the scantiness of worldly pleasures is a paradise really, because the lesser the engrossment in worldly pleasures, the greater the spiritual felicities to which a man can have access through communion with God. The enjoyments of physical life constitute the heaven of Dajjāl, but they can only be had by neglecting the spirit. Whoever drinks the cup of the ‘life of enjoyment’ meets perdition.

2. The speed of the Dajjāl — his conveyances on land, water and air

When the Holy Prophet was asked how swift Dajjāl’s movement will be, he said, “like cloud carried by wind.” At the time when the Prophet spoke these words, to be told that one can move with the quickness of cloud carried by wind, must have appeared as a fairy tale or at best a very great exaggeration. But today

aeroplane moves quicker than even the wind itself. Further, the Holy Prophet said: "The earth will be rolled up for him." This evidently means that his movements would be so quick that it would make the expansion of the earth appear shrunken. Again his rushing through the air is spoken of in the words:

"He will hold the cloud in his right hand."

In other words, he would be moving about in the midst of or above the clouds. The Prophet further elucidated this by saying that "he will jump about between the earth and the sky." All these are clear references to his travelling through the air. Again he is spoken of as being so swift in his movements that

\[
\text{يَسَّرِبُ الشَّمْسَ إِلَىٰ مَّكَيْنِهَا}
\]

"he will overreach the sun in its setting place".

Today it has become actually possible to move swifter than the apparent movement of the sun, and one starting in the morning from an eastern place can reach the west before the sun sets. A flight from Calcutta to Bombay, or from Lahore to Karachi takes but a few hours. And who knows what unthought of speeds may yet be attained by man! We are further told that the Dajjāl "will find the sea ankle-deep for him". We find a literal fulfilment of these words in the movements of submarines under the waters of the seas.

The conveyance of Dajjāl is called an "ass" because the ass was used to convey man from one place to another and also served as a beast of burden for man. But that this was not a real ass is shown by the fact that it is described as having ears seventy yards apart, which an ass could not have, and as being of a white or shining colour. This description really draws the picture of a railway train. As for the statement that Dajjāl's "one step will cover a journey of a day and a night", it evidently means that the distance which can be traversed by a man on foot in the course of 24 hours, will just be one step for Dajjāl. It must be borne in mind that the object in describing these powers of Dajjāl over the forces of nature is not to condemn his conquest of the forces of nature which is really an indication of the greatness of man, and to which
the Qur’ān has again and again drawn attention. The object is to point out that having conquered the forces of nature, the Dajjāl will consider himself as the actual master and forget his real position as a humble servant of God. What is condemned is Dajjāl’s assuming the powers of divinity.

3. The Dajjāl bringing out the treasures of the earth

We are further told that the treasures of the earth will follow Dajjāl. There is a clear reference in this to Europe’s finding out the hidden treasures of the earth. Wherever there is a treasure hidden beneath the surface of the earth, whether it be a treasure of gold, silver, iron or any other mineral, and whether it is a treasure of coal or oil, Europe has undoubtedly found it out. All such treasures, whether they are in the West or in the East, have been exploited by Europe, and after having been extracted from the bowels of the earth, made the means by which Europe exercises power over the rest of humanity. Besides, vast tracts of deserts which were waterless and uncultivated have been irrigated and turned into fertile land yielding enormous wealth through their produce. Needless to say whatever the earth yields, whether minerals or crops or fruits, are all the wealth of Europe. All the enormous treasures follow Dajjāl, and their benefits accrue to the nations of Europe, while the rest of the world is merely to act as their labourers producing raw material for their factories. The whole volume of gold in the world and its other treasures, whether they be in India or in the continent of Africa or in the Eastern islands, are drained away from these countries to be hoarded in Europe and America. What a pure and powerful vision of conditions obtaining in our times was given to the Holy Prophet full thirteen centuries ago! Would that it were given to those who, bewildered by the wealth and worldly attractions of the people of Europe and their mighty powers and resources, have bowed before them in utter humility. They should ponder over the wonderful spiritual vision which could see centuries ahead this whole picture of the world of today in all its details, so as to be able to describe it fully before an illiterate nation.
4. **The easy life of the** Dajjal’s companions and the difficult times for his opponents

One way of paying homage to Dajjal and of keeping his company is obviously to adopt his religion. The hadith which speaks of a life of ease for his followers is fully applicable to the condition of those who have adopted this method of allegiance to him. Take the case of India. The members of the depressed classes who had been living a miserable life before their conversion to Christianity are men of wealth and position today. The wealth which is drawn from all parts of the world and then pooled in Europe and America, when it is allowed to trickle for peoples of other countries of the world, is directed only to those quarters of the East, which have adopted the religion of Dajjal, and handsome salaries and stipends are fixed for such people. What a true picture is drawn of this state of affairs in the words:

\[
\text{\‘\‘With him will be mountains of bread, and people will be in distress except those who follow him.\‘\‘}
\]

Indeed, the best guarantee of economic security in these days is to adopt the faith of Christianity. Those who do not adopt this course and who live side by side with these worldly wise people, find themselves in great hardship and difficulty. How truly did the Prophet draw this picture:

*Whoever follows him, he gives him to eat, but also makes of him an unbeliever.*

But apart from those who undergo complete and formal religious conversions, there are many others, who just play a second fiddle to Dajjal and flatter him only for the sake of monetary benefits. It is with regard to this class of people that the hadith says:

*We keep his (i.e., Dajjal’s) company although we know that he*

\[\text{\‘\‘Kanz al-\'Ummal Vol. 7, No. 2104.}\]
is an unbeliever. We still keep his company so that we may eat of his food."

These are the slaves of the belly; who dance to his music, and do things detrimental to their faith, to their nation and to their country just for the sake of bread. The object of Dajjāl in feeding these people is to make them irreligious by holding before them some kind of temptation, and even if he does not succeed in converting them to Christianity, he makes them at least indifferent to their own faith. What is, after all, the object with which so many colleges and schools are opened by various Christian missions? As a matter of fact, the whole system of education which is imparted to our boys and girls, tends to just one result, viz., that the material education imparted to them cuts them adrift from Religion and God. And what is the incentive for this education? Only this that those receiving it will be entitled to some jobs — the same question of bread again.

5. The Dajjāl meeting with departed souls and his talking to them

But with all these worldly engrossments of his, Dajjāl is not unmindful of that voice of nature which speaks of a life beyond. So we find him showing feats in this direction as well, under the name of "Spiritism." In this particular field he claims to possess the knowledge of methods by which one may meet the departed souls and converse with them. The following hadith speaks of these feats:

"And devils will be raised with him who will assume the appearance of those who have died from among one's parents and brothers."

Also: "They will speak to people".

So these devils apart from assuming the form of men who once lived, will also speak to people. This picture of the so-called Spiritualist movement which the Holy Prophet has drawn, is indeed a wonderful proof of his extraordinary prophetic vision. Those who have been to the centres of this movement know how rooms are specially designed for this contrivance, and light rays specially controlled. Then there are the so-called 'mediums' who can bring about the
appearance of these supposed departed spirits. These ‘mediums’ sometimes exhibit transfiguration, i.e., they themselves assume the appearance of the alleged disincarnate spirits, who speak to the people, who are present for a while and then vanish. And sometimes those who attend these ‘seances’, as such sittings are called, are mentally affected in very much the same way as similar people in India are affected by the appearance of the ghosts of their own imagination. Whether Spiritualism has any reality behind it or not is altogether a different question. What we are concerned with here is that the great Prophet, the greatest seer the world has produced, drew a faithful picture of these feats or magic performances of Dajjāl, in vivid language, full thirteen centuries ago.

6. The strength of the Jews at the back of the Dajjāl

The prophecies of the Holy Prophet about Dajjāl are an eloquent testimony to his extraordinary vision in regard to events in the distant future. It is evident that he pointed to the Church as the place of Dajjāl, and the Qur’ān also gave a clue to his identity in the words:

And to warn those who say: Allāh has taken to Himself a son. 84

As for the spite of the Jews against Jesus Christ the Qur’ān speaks very clearly about it, so much so that it refers to the malicious libels of these people against the sacred personality of his mother, Lady Mary:

And for their uttering against Mary a grievous calumny. 85

Indeed, the enmity of the Jews against Jesus is the greatest of its kind which a nation may harbour against a person. We are further told of the permanent nature of this animosity:

We stirred up enmity and hatred among them to the day of Resurrection. 86

The Jews were being subjected to various kinds of tyranny both in the days of our Prophet as well as before him, and this oppression continued till long afterwards. Rather it can be said

84. The Qur’ān 18:4.
85. Ibid., 4:156.
86. Ibid., 5:14.
that until the appearance of Dajjal they remained subject to these tyrannies of the Christians. But with all this, the Holy Prophet prophesied:

*With him (Dajjal) there will be seventy thousand Jews. Again: Most of those who will follow him will be the Jews. Still again: Dajjal, the enemy of God, will make his appearance and with him will be an army of Jews.*

It should be borne in mind that it is nowhere to be found among the sayings of the Holy Prophet that Dajjal himself will be a Jew. On the contrary, the Christian nations are explicitly identified with Dajjal. What is more, the Qur'an also says that Christianity will always have an upperhand over Judaism:

"And (I will) make those who follow thee (i.e. Jesus) above those who disbelieve to the day of Resurrection". 87

And yet we are confronted with the fact, the strangest of all, that the Christian Governments depend on the support of the Jews. The ministers of the biggest of these empires act at the bidding of the Jews. But the reason for this is not far to seek. The Jews possess the money with which they help these Christian Governments. Even the British Government, with all its power and glory, has been upholding the Jewish cause to ruin the Muslim country of Palestine. The Muslims of that country have become impoverished; their lands are slipping off their hands and passing into those of the Jews, who are settling down there in very large numbers. The expression "seventy thousand" means a very large number. It is universally recognised that in Arabic the numbers seven and seventy are used to indicate a large number. Seventy thousand Jews should thus mean that there would be large numbers of Jews who will co-operate with Dajjal. If the people of the world lacked the knowledge of how the Jews are secretly at the back of the British and other Western powers or how the latter are acting at the beck and call of this community, the British Government's act of colonising Palestine with these people has revealed the truth of the prophecy concerning this secret alliance, as clear as the daylight. And yet the combined forces of Judaism and European Christianity

---

87. The Qur'an 3:54.
should not frighten the Muslims at all, provided they are apprised of the fact that the Holy Prophet of Islam, while giving us the news of this dreadful coalition, also prophesied thirteen centuries ago about the final victory of Islam over all the religions of the world.

7. The influence of the Dajjal on women

We are also told in a clear language that Dajjal will have influence on women in particular. It is a truism to say that although man possesses the potentiality for all virtuous deeds, yet for their realization he must make a positive effort, as if he has to climb up hill. But contrary is the case with vice. Far from any effort, one finds a ready inclination and energy at hand for acts that lead to moral degeneration and bestiality. To our great misfortune present-day Europe has opened the flood-gates of several enticements, through its fashion of unrestricted and immodest mingling of the sexes, the passion-exciting scenes of sexual relationships on the stage and screen, which make these places of excitement so attractive for our young people. Nude pictures, naked dancing, semi-nude costumes of women—the cumulative effect of all these devices of gay life—is that people’s minds have been fast deteriorating in this aspect of their life. As in the physical world, so in the moral. To go down is easier than going up. Such scenes have had a very bad affect upon the character of our own people. The immodest activities of Europe are being seen with less and less abhorrence by our people as time passes. Fornication and acts leading up to it, do not upset us much nowadays. And this weakness, increasing by leaps and bounds in our menfolk, has now begun to affect our womenfolk. Even as the Prophet said:

The last to go out to him (Dajjal) will be women.

Indeed the natural modesty of women resisted these temptations of Dajjal for quite a long time. But today they also have fallen victims to his machinations, and although it has not yet reached that pitch here which is to be found in Europe, yet there are many women in the East today who have already said good-bye to Islamic modesty and have adopted the semi-nudism of the West, and are not only frequenting the clubs but have also started attending ball room dancing. If the influence of the Dajjal is allowed to work
unchecked and Islamic culture allowed to be replaced by the Western culture, a day is bound to come when as in Europe here in our country also fornication and its antecedents will cease to arouse any indignation in the minds of people. It is true Islam does not enjoin that women should observe the seclusion and the veil which is in vogue today. It is also true that Islam permits woman to go out for business and to attend her outdoor needs and to do all such acts that help the satisfaction of legitimate social, economic or any other needs. She can act as a labourer, she can ply her trade and she can take up service. But with all this freedom of action in Islam, it does not approve of indiscriminate intermingling of the sexes; nor does it permit immodest dressing when the sexes are obliged by the exigency of circumstances to meet together in one place. She is not allowed to display her charms in such a way as to excite the passions of the male. It is this kind of display and promiscuous intermingling which constitutes the principal feature of Dajjal in his social affairs and which is exerting such a baneful influence on the higher circles of Muslim womanhood.

8. The Dajjal and illegitimate children

The excessive and undue liberty in sexual relations has led to licentiousness, and this again to large numbers of illegitimate children, which has become a standing feature of all the big cities of America and Europe. The Prophet's visionary eye caught a glimpse of the sexual immorality which materialism was to bring in its train:

أَلْوَّىَ الْرَّجَالُ أَكْثَرًا عَلَىٰ أُمَّيَّةٍ وَأَنْبَثَاءُ اِلْيَدَٰعُ وَأَنْمَئَةُ الرَّكَا

"Behold! Verily the bulk of the people of the Dajjal and his followers will be the Jews and illegitimate children."

A considerable portion of these illegitimate children are screened away from public notice by certain laws which legalize illegality. For instance, if as a result of illicit intercourse the woman becomes pregnant but the pair go through the marriage ceremony before the birth actually takes place, the offspring is considered legitimate. As a matter of fact, the law has gone so far in this
respect that if the adulterous couple get married at any time in their life all their offspring previous to the marriage cease to be regarded as illegitimate. But with all these liberal provisions of the law, in every city of Europe one finds a huge number of children who are known to be illegitimate even from this liberal point of view. As for the children born in the course of war, they receive the honoured title of "war babies"! And if one considers the rapidly worsening condition of intersexual relationship which prevails in Europe and America, one can very well predict that in no distant future people in these countries will turn away from civilized way of life and revert to savagery, behaving like lower animals so far as sexual relations are concerned.

9. Men resembling women and women resembling men

Another characteristic of Dajjāl as mentioned in the traditions, as we have seen, is that women would assume the appearance of men and men of women. This could hardly be understood even a quarter of a century ago. But today this prophecy finds literal fulfilment in that the women have adopted manly fashions and ways such as the shortening of hair and the wearing of man’s dress while men have put on women’s appearance by a clean shaving of the face. This kind of transformation in the respective appearances and occupations have gone so far that at times it becomes difficult to distinguish the one from the other, and the words of the Prophet have proved literally true:

وَكَيْفَانِيَنَّ بِالرِّجَالِ وَكَيْفَانِيَنَّ بِالنِّسَاءِ

"The women would look like men and the men like women".

10. Miraculous cure of diseases

Prophecies contained in these hadith, however, set forth the virtues of these people along with their vices. On the one hand, there is the Qur'ān which speaks of their great efforts relating to this world’s life and to their industrial advancement and their

88. The Qur'ān 18:104.
adorning the surface of the earth, and on the other there is the ḥadīth which speaks of their miraculous cure of diseases:

*He will give cure to the blind and the lepers and will give life to the dead.*

The expression “giving life to the dead” here means giving cure to such incurable diseases that it will almost amount to giving life to the dead. Indeed in the treatment of diseases, these people have shown wonders and this is an achievement worthy of praise. But the Holy Prophet has counted this among the trials of Dajjāl together with the swiftness of his movements and his conveyances on land, on sea and in the air. This is because on account of these achievements, these people think that they are superior to other people and their claim to superhuman powers almost amounts to a claim to Divinity. And also because these material advantages are misleading people away from the spiritual side of life.

**XI. The evil suggestions of the Dajjāl**

From what has been said above it is clear that Dajjāl will not misguide any one by force but will rather entice people by holding out temptation of the glitter of the worldly life and provisions of its comforts and will wield influence over people through his exploitation of the powers of nature and his extraordinary knowledge of things. But the Holy Prophet has further clarified this point by saying:

```
ميّتِيّمًا بِاللّهِ جَالِلًا قَلِيلًا عَنَاءُ وَيَدْرِجُ الْجَنَّةَ لَأَلْبَيْنَا هُوَ جَبِيطٌ
```

“Whoever hears about the Dajjāl, let him keep away from him. For by God, it will so happen that a man will come to him believing that he is a believer, but he will become his follower on account of the doubts he will raise in his mind.”

---
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If one examines the question, it will be evident that the method of mischievous insinuation as employed by the Western nations stands unparalleled in history. They cast evil suggestions into the minds of people in such subtle ways that it makes the imagination stagger. Take the case of education. It is a process through which the thought of people can be either directed or misdirected. But these people have prescribed such courses of study as subtly aim at creating disloyalty in the minds of the students against their own religions and cultures, even though the arguments employed for this purpose may go against the faith of Christianity. They have carried this process so far that believing as they do in the existence of God they try their utmost to raise doubts in the minds of people regarding Divine existence. Themselves believing in the phenomena of revelation and prophethood, of the life beyond death, they yet raise doubts in the minds of people concerning these verities. It is not unoften that they praise an idea or a personality to give one the impression that the writer or the speaker is a fair-minded person, but while expressing such an appreciation they make such insinuations as to make their hearers devoid of all regard for such an idea or personality. In short, all that has been said of these people regarding their characteristics, amounts to this that the Dajjāl will divert people from the path of truth by means of evil suggestions, and this is what constitutes the principal feature of the European nations.

**12. The Dajjāl’s appearance and his prevalence in the whole world**

It has been described as a characteristic of Dajjāl that he will go about in the whole world:

\[ \text{There will be no part in the world which he will not traverse and prevail over.} \]

Again the following words are put in the mouth of Dajjāl:

\[ I \text{ will leave no human habitation unentered by me.} \]

This shows not only the extraordinary power of spiritual vision of the Holy Prophet, but also that the name Dajjāl signifies not a
person but a big party or rather whole nation of people, the members of which will reach every spot in the world. It is absolutely impossible for one man, however swift he may be in his movements, to have all that has been prophesied about Dajjāl, fulfilled in his person. It is physically impossible for one man to exhibit his heaven and hell in all places of the world, and then to advance his claim in every place, and to bestow affluence to whomsoever would accept him and to inflict hardships and calamities on whomsoever would reject his claims, and further to leave no human habitation unvisited. All these feats it is absolutely impossible for one man to perform. It is not a question of speed alone; it involves the additional question of inviting people to accept his claims by some kind of statement, and to award them reward or punishment, as the case may be. Now, all these things must happen in every village and town, and however short the time in which one may move from one place to another, this preaching and its concomitants must take some time in every place. If he has to spend even one hour in each place, he will require one century to dispose of about seven hundred thousand villages of India alone. In this way he will need thousands of years to pass through all the habitations of the world. But if we take all these remarks as applying to a nation, these performances become not only easy to understand and possible for human powers, but reveal themselves as facts accomplished before our very eyes, and they demonstrate to the point of utmost certainty the power of spiritual vision as vouchsafed to the Holy Prophet Muḥammad. On the one hand, we see the quick movements of the European nations; not to speak of forty days, even a few days suffice one to go round the whole world. On the other hand, we notice them visiting and exercising complete control over every human habitation in the world. If at one time we are impressed with the mountains of bread which they carry about with them, at others we are bewildered with their luxuries and gay life. If one witnesses their exploitation of things at one time, at others one sees the snare of their educational institutions which foster immoral and irreligious doubts in the minds of people. If they are found at one place to win the sympathy of people through their hospital services, at others they are seen performing feats of spiritualism. In short, if
we apply these descriptions to a nation or a group of nations, everything appears clear and understandable. But if we take it to apply to one person, the whole thing becomes incomprehensible. Take, for instance, the prophecy about the Dajjāl going about in the whole world and his domination over all. If it be applied to just one person, even then he must need millions of assistants to maintain a hold of this kind over people. Such a power must accordingly, in the last resort, be ascribed to very large numbers of people, instead of one single person. In any case, the prophecy that Dajjāl will pass through all human habitations and will prevail over the whole world has seen actual fulfilment in our days and before our very eyes, in the supremacy of the European nations and their spreading out in all places. How long shall we be shutting our eyes against hard facts and keep on expecting a Dajjāl which exists nowhere but in our own imagination? The idea of Dajjāl’s presence in every habitant of the world and of his acquiring supremacy over the whole world could not possibly occur to the human mind, particularly at such a great distance in the past as the time in which the Holy Prophet lived. But if one just thinks over the matter, one will not find a single human habitant today which has not seen the presence of Dajjāl in its midst. Indeed there is no place either in the deserts and the forests, in the big islands or in the small ones, in hills and dales, which Dajjāl has not ventured through. The wildest human imagination could never have visualised such a state of affairs, and yet we see all these things presented in actual facts before our very eyes. And whoever will consider these happenings with a serious mind will irresistibly bow in respect and admiration before the greatness of the spiritual vision of the Holy Prophet.

**Gog and Magog in Hadith and their identity with the Dajjāl**

I have already shown that the Qur’ān while speaking of the Gog and the Magog towards the end of the chapter entitled — *the Cave*, Reve.t.s to the mention of the Christian nations, which shows that it makes no difference between the two. As for the Bible, it says explicitly, as already shown, that the Gog and the Magog are none others than the Russians and other nations of the same land,
i.e. Europe. A common misunderstanding that is prevalent about Gog and Magog as described in the Books of Ḥadīth, is that they are regarded as a peculiar kind of creation, although many ḥadīth make it quite clear that they are human beings just like ourselves:

 إنَّ بُنيَّتُهم مِمَّا جَعَلَهُم مِّن وَلِيَةٍ أَمْرٍ

Verily Gog and Magog are of the progeny of Adam.\(^\text{92}\)

Another ḥadīth says that God will reveal to the Messiah:

ليَّكُنْ أَخْرَجَتْ عَلَيْهِمُ الْحَكْمَةُ أَن يَعْرَفُوا مَنْ يَأْتِيَهُمْ إِلَيْهِ

Verily I have created some of My servants whom no one can destroy but Myself.\(^\text{93}\)

In the same book vol. 7, we have another ḥadīth (No. 3032) in which it is expressly stated that they are of the progeny of Adam. Perhaps the misunderstanding on this score has its origin in a statement in the ḥadīth which says that they will drink up the whole mass of water in the world. The ḥadīth runs as follows:

ويُشَهِّرُونَ مَاءَ الْأَرْضِ حَتَّى نَتَّقَلُوا مَنْ بَعْضُ هُمْ مَنَعُونَ

They will drink the water of the world so much so that when some of them will pass by a stream they will drink all that is in it and leave it dry.\(^\text{94}\)

Another ḥadīth says that the advance guards of Gog and Magog will cross the gulf of Tiberius and they will drink the whole mass of water in it\(^\text{95}\). And it is remarkable that in the ḥadīth of Tamīm Dārī, Dajjāl also asks Tamīm Dārī about the Gulf of Tiberius:

---
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"Tell me about the Gulf of Tiberius... Is there any water in it?"

This incidentally shows that Dajjāl and Gog and Magog mean the same thing. But their drinking up the water means no more than that all provisions of life will be in their control, because water is the source of life. Again, the fact that the prophecies relating to both Dajjāl and Gog and Magog occur in connection with the expected Messiah, is a further proof that they are identical. A little reflection will reveal that the respective descriptions of the two express practically the same ideas, only in different words. About both it has been said that their earthly power will reach the climax. They will have control over every kind of provisions of life, and "no one will have power to stand against them". They will spread over the whole surface of the earth and will be an object of great trial for the Muslims. All these common features of their appearance show that they are one and the same people, and both apply fittingly to the nations of Europe. As a matter of fact, the two names have been adopted to express two different aspects of their appearance. The name Dajjāl indicates their acts of deception through provisions of life, and Gog and Magog is to express their political and military power. It should be borne in mind that these prophecies about the predominance of the Christian nations came to be recorded by the Muslims at a time when their own power and supremacy had eclipsed all other powers of the world.

The Dajjāl will be recognised by a particular man from among Muslims

It is rather strange that if on the one hand the Hadith describes the signs of Dajjāl in a manner that is intelligible to the least intelligent of people, on the other it tells us that a large number of people will fall a prey to his enticements. If all these things — that Dajjāl will have his right eye devoid of vision, and that his left eye will be shining like a star, that he will have the word Kāfir written on his
forehead which every believer, literate or illiterate, will be able to read, that he will have a strange kind of ass as his conveyance, whose two ears will be seventy yards apart, that he will be carrying heaven and hell, that he will have mountains of bread and streams of water with him, that he will cause clouds to shower rain, and so on and so forth — if all these things were to see their literal fulfilment, no one could have failed to recognize him as soon as he appeared. In that case, there could have been no need at all for a particular man from among the Muslims to recognize him and proclaim to the people that he was actually the Dajjāl against whom the Holy Prophet had warned. But one hadith says:

أَهْوَالِبَلَيْنِ إِنْذَارُهُ إِلَى الْخَلْقِ أَتْمَى نَظَرْنَا
قَالَ الْجَلِّ فَلَا نَظَرْنَا

A person from among the believers would say: I will go up to this man and see whether or not he is the person against whom the Prophet of God had issued a warning.

Indeed if the signs can be seen as the outward meaning of the words of the prophecies would indicate, where was the need for this particular believer to recognise him and proclaim to the people that Dajjāl was there? Dajjāl's own presence with all the patent signs on him would have been enough for such a proclamation. Indeed, any other proclamation would be superfluous. The irresistible conclusion, therefore, is that these signs were to see not a literal fulfilment but a metaphorical one, so that a man of extraordinary vision would be needed to grasp their inner significance and their timely fulfilment in the appearance of Dajjāl in the sense in which it was intended to come about.

Who is it who said: "This is the Dajjāl mentioned by the Holy Prophet"?

It is really strange that the discovery that Dajjāl and Gog and Magog are no other than these nations of Europe, was made by the dweller of a village, a recluse, who had scarcely any knowledge of
the world at large. 97 More than half a century ago, when the people of the world were absolutely ignorant about the identity of Dajjāl and Gog and Magog, no one even suspected that it was these nations that had established their complete supremacy in the world and were ruling this country of ours, who were the Dajjāl and Gog and Magog of the prophecies; when, on the contrary, all minds were obsessed with the idea that Dajjāl would be a strange kind of one-eyed man, who would have a strange sort of ass with him together with other strange things — at a time such as this it was that God enlightened the Mujaddid of this century and granted him the knowledge that Dajjāl and Gog and Magog were no other than these very people who were in complete control of the world, and whose worldly eye was extremely sharp and whose spiritual eye equally blind. It was moreover, a thing, which even if any one had known, he could not have the courage to speak about it. But the solitary recluse of Qādiān, the Mujaddid of the 14th century of Hijrah, proclaimed it to the world with a fearlessness all his own. Neither caring for the opposition of the whole world nor for the possible harm that might come from the Government, nor yet for the influence which the Christian clergy and missionaries in those days wielded over the administrators, he proclaimed in the year 1891 C.E. at the top of his voice: "This is the Dajjāl about whom the Holy Prophet spoke." People had no knowledge that they were face to face with Dajjāl, and were the helpless yet unconscious victims of his machinations exactly in the manner described in Ḥadīth. The Mujaddid of this century told them that Dajjāl was before them and that they should be on their guard. Let us quote some of his utterances on this point:

"How can I make the blasphemous statement, that the one-eyed Dajjāl, like God Himself, will give life to the dead by virtue of his own power, and will show manifest signs of the powers of Divinity? In my opinion the word Dajjāl denotes some flourishing nations and his "ass" may mean the railway

97. Mirza Ghulām Ahmad of Qādiān, the founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement, Mujaddid of the 14th century of Hijrah, who claimed to be the Promised Messiah and Mahdī.
train which one finds running for thousands of miles in the countries of the East and West." 98

"It was necessary that Mashi' al-Dajjal (the Antichrist) should emerge from the Church itself." 99

98. Izālah Auhām p. 478.
99. Ibid., p. 478.

Anti-christ: (Greek antichristos against or instead of Christ) according to Christians would appear in the 'last hour' i.e., before the second advent of Christ. "Jesus himself not only warned his apostles of 'false Christs' (Matt., 24: 5, 23, 24; Mark 13: 21, 22) — by which, however, he meant primarily Jewish Messianic pretenders — but plainly intimated that apostasy would arise within the Church" (John D. Davis, The Westminster Dictionary of the Bible Revised ed., 1944). Further on it is stated: "Thus the N. T. declared that Christian history would not be a pure development of goodness and truth, but that within Christendom apostasy would arise, develop, have many representatives, and finally culminate in Antichrist proper (either a person or an institution, perhaps both)" (ibid.). Notwithstanding that antichristian spirit was going to arise within the Church, efforts have also been made by Christians to discover the Antichrist outside the Church. "The Pope Innocent III (1215) denounced the Saracenes (i.e., Muslims) as Antichrist and Muhammad as the false prophet" (Royston Pyke, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics p. 20, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1951). But it should also be borne in mind that "the Papacy and individual Popes were denounced as Antichrist by Wycliff, Huss, and Luther, and the charge has been frequently restated by ultra-Protestant writers" (ibid., p. 21). An imaginary dialogue between Martin Luther (1483-1546 C.E.) and the Pope may be of some interest to the readers. This is a part of popular ballad written about 1550 C.E.

"Doctor Martin Luther:
Thou anti-Christ, with thy three crowns,
Hast usurped king's powers,
As having power over realms and towns,
Whom thou owestest to serve all hours;
Thou thinkest by thy juggling colours
Thou may'st likewise God's word oppress;
As do deceitful fowlers,
When they their nets craftily dress.

The Pope:
As for scripture, I am above it;
Am I not God's high vicar?
Should I be bound to follow it,
As the carpenter his rule?
“But the Dajjāl who is to emerge from the Church, about whom Muslim has reported in his reliable collection from Fātīmah daughter of Qais, and who is described as of enormous physical strength and shackled in chains, and who has also a spy, this is the Dajjāl whom Tamīm Dārī had seen in a Church in an island.”

“It should be remembered that in the lexicographical sense Dajjāl means ‘a group of liars’, who mix up falsehood with truth and use fraud and deception to misguide the creatures of God.”

“It is evident that these are the magical methods adopted by the Christian nations, the champions of the doctrine of Trinity, the magic of which cannot be excelled in perfection, and that they are not capable of performance by any one excepting by a real Dajjāl, that Dajjāl indeed about whom the prophecies have spoken.”

“The word ‘one-eyed’ is not to be taken literally. Allāh says in the Holy Qur’ān ‘Whoever is blind in this world will be blind in the hereafter.” Blindness here evidently means spiritual blindness. Thus the word under discussion will mean that Dajjāl will have no spiritual sight, although his worldly sight will be very sharp; and along with it, he will discover such subtle methods resulting in such wonderful performances, that he will almost appear as one claiming Divinity. But he will have no spiritual vision whatsoever, as is the case

Nay, nay heretics ye are,
    That will not obey my authority.
With this sword I will declare
    That ye shall all accursed be.”

(English History in Contemporary Poetry, No. III, The Historical Association).

The Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement, however, found the whole institution of the Church, particularly, the part engaged in slandering Islam, going against the true teachings of Jesus Christ and thus it deserved the appellation Antichrist.—T.
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with the people of America and Europe today, who have carried
the physical side of life to perfection."104

"And as for Gog and Magog, it is now beyond all doubt
that these are two prosperous nations of the world, of whom
one is the British and the other the Russians.... Both these
nations are mentioned in the Bible."105

"A similar view should be taken of Gog and Magog.
These are two old nations of the world, who could not openly
overpower others in the previous ages and were found in a
weak state. But Allâh says that both of them will emerge
from this obscurity in the later days. In other words, they
will manifest themselves in their glorious power. Thus He
says in the chapter, the Cave, "And We shall let some of them
surge against the others."106 That is to say, that these two
nations after having overpowered others, will attack one
another."107

The Holy Prophet's saying: "A follower closest to me
in position"

This voice which was raised from Qâdiân, against nations who
because of their supremacy in the world regarded themselves as all-
powerful, if it roused a violent opposition from the Muslims on the
one hand, who considered it as running counter to their traditional
beliefs, on the other, made the Christian missionaries and clergy
exert themselves to their utmost to suppress the man who raised
this voice, because they found in it a mortal blow to their cherished
notions of converting the whole world to Christianity. These
latter went to the extent of planning a capital punishment for him
on a false charge of abetment to murder. And the strangest part
of it all is that the Christians, the Ārya Samājists and the Muslims
all united in this unholy alliance of a mean conspiracy. But this
man of God cared for none and stood like a rock in the midst of
this deluge of opposition. People ridiculed him; even Muslims

105. Ibid., p. 502.
106. The Qur'ān 17: 99.
scoffed at him saying: This man claims to be the Promised Messiah and yet himself rides on the ass of Dajjāl, (meaning the railway train). But truth is a powerful thing and it makes itself felt in the hearts of men. In spite of all this opposition, the truth which God Almighty had revealed to the heart of the Imām of this age, began to find acceptance among the people as days passed. So much so that at the present moment Muslims of all classes, irrespective of their measure of education, openly aver that Dajjāl and Gog and Magog, of which the recorded sayings of the Prophet speak, are no other than the nations of Europe and America, that it is these people who virtually claim to possess the powers of God and that conveyances, like the railway train, constitute the ass of Dajjāl. The Muslim Press has to-day no hesitation in describing Europe as the Dajjāl and as Gog and Magog. And to crown it all, the great national Muslim poet, the late Sir Muhammad Iqbāl, immortalized this idea in his famous couplet:

"The forces of Gog and Magog have all been let loose, Let the Muslim's eye see the commentary on the verse yansilān."

108. Yansilān (i.e. they sally forth) is the last word of the Quranic verse which speaks of Gog and Magog overcoming the whole world: "When Gog and Magog are made to overcome the world and they shall break forth from every elevated place" (21:96). At this juncture one is reminded of Sir Winston Churchill's speech which he made at the Lord Mayor's Banquet at the Guildhall on Friday, 9th November, 1931, at the restoration of the effigies of Gog and Magog. During the course of his speech he said:

"It seems that they (i.e., Gog and Magog) represent none too badly the present state of world politics. World politics, like the history of Gog and Magog, are very confused and much disputed. Still, I think there is room for both of them.

"On the one side is Gog, and on the other is Magog. But be careful, my Lord Mayor, when you put them back, to keep them from colliding with each other, for if that happens, both Gog and Magog would be smashed to pieces and we should all have to begin all over again — and begin from the bottom of the pit" (The Times, London, 10th November, 1931, p. 6).—T.
over four centuries. The present figures replace those destroyed in 1840.

Coe (left) and Malege, the mythical giants who have guarded in Gullihall, London.
All people thus now see, as it were, Dajjāl and Gog and Magog with their own eyes. And yet we must ask ourselves the question who was the man who first disclosed the identity of Dajjāl? Was it not that man of God about whom it is written in the Ḥadīth that he would say, “O people, this is the Dajjāl about whom the Prophet (peace and blessings of God be upon him) spoke”. And as for whom it has been further said: “Then he will proclaim among people: Beware, this is the Messiah the liar, so whoever will follow him, will be in fire, and whoever will disobey him, will be in the garden.” Now if it is true that it is only one man who has raised his voice saying: “This is the Dajjāl about whom the Holy Prophet has spoken,” and if this voice echoes in the hearts of all Muslims today then, it must be remembered that all that is written in the Ḥadīth about this truthful man must also be correct. It is written about him, for example: “This man is the closest follower to me in respect of position.” Again it is written: “He is the greatest man as a witness before the Lord of the world.” To recognise and proclaim the identity of Dajjāl before the world, is stated to be the most important evidence which a Muslim can give, and that evidence was given, first of all, by the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement. Thus we are face to face with a clear proposition. It is no use ignoring the man who has disclosed to us the identity of Masih al-Dajjāl (the Antichrist) and waiting for another person to fulfil the prophecy about the Promised Messiah. Indeed, it is meaningless to keep on waiting, seeing that the person who is described as “the nearest to me among the followers in respect of position”, must, of necessity, be the Messiah of this ummah. This, of course, leaves the position of the Companions, whose unparalleled sacrifices and close association and intimacy with the Prophet are, above all, absolutely untouched.

The Promised Messiah and killing of the Dajjāl

There is scarcely any man who will deny that it was Ḥadrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad who disclosed the identity of Dajjāl and proclaimed: “This is Dajjāl about whom the Holy Prophet spoke.” But some minds feel uneasy when they see that whereas the Promised Messiah was to kill the Dajjāl, the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah
Movement did not actually kill him. True, the books of Ḥadīth do speak of the Promised Messiah killing the Dajjāl, but the question is what is meant by this killing? It is evident that Dajjāl is not a person, but a nation or rather a group of nations. Thus the killing in question could not mean the killing of a single person, nor yet the killing of all the nations of Europe and America, seeing that it is clearly stated in the Qur'ān that these people will continue to exist till the end of the world:

And (We) will make those who follow thee (i.e. Jesus) above those who disbelieve to the Day of Resurrection.\footnote{The Qur'ān 3:54.}

This implies that both the followers of Jesus as well as his opponents will continue to be in existence till the end of the days. It is necessary, therefore, to interpret the killing of Dajjāl in a metaphorical way and not take it too literally. As a matter of fact, all that has been said about Dajjāl is couched in metaphorical expressions: his heaven not meaning actual heaven; his fire not meaning actual hell-fire; his stream of water and fire, his mountains of bread, his ass, his causing showers of rain, his giving life to the dead, are all metaphorical expressions. Hence his killing should also be of a metaphorical nature.

If we read the relevant Ḥadīth, speaking of the killing of Dajjāl, we find therein various indications showing what is really meant. Firstly, the words used in respect of Dajjāl in one Ḥadīth are that he will melt away by himself, as salt melts away in water. If that is so, the question of killing him does not arise at all. Furthermore, it is stated in these same Ḥadīth: “Every unbeliever whom his (the Promised Messiah’s) breath reaches will die; and his (Promised Messiah’s) breath will go as far as his sight goes.”\footnote{The Qur'ān 3:54.}

Still another Ḥadīth related by Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal states that the Muslims will kill the Dajjāl, which shows that the killing of Dajjāl means a hard struggle on the part of the Muslims to uproot his falsehood.

**The Dajjāl is to be killed but not Gog and Magog**

It has been shown that Dajjāl and Gog and Magog are only
two names of the same people. They are called Dajjāl on account of their religious fraud and deception, whereas they are called Gog and Magog on account of their great political power. It is not easy to understand why, while the Hadith speaks of the Promised Messiah killing Dajjāl, it also says that he will not be able to kill Gog and Magog, whereas, as a matter of fact, if Dajjāl is killed, Gog and Magog must also be regarded as killed. But says the hadith:

'It will be revealed to the Messiah that I have raised some of My servants, whom no one will be able to kill but Myself.'

Again, in another hadith recorded in Muslim it is said:

"Then will come to Jesus a people... When he will be in this state, God will reveal to Jesus saying: I have raised some of My servants, to fight with whom nobody has any power; so take My servants to the hills. And God will raise Gog and Magog and they will sally forth from every elevated place."

Now, it is rather strange that although Dajjāl is killed and the breath of the Messiah possesses such an efficacy that whomsoever it reaches from among the unbelievers will be killed instantaneously; and his breath again travels with his sight; yet Gog and Magog are so powerful that those with the Messiah are instructed to take refuge in a mountain. Instead of Gog and Magog dying by the breath of the Messiah the latter seeks safety from their invincible power; and we are told that even the Messiah would have no power to fight with or kill Gog and Magog. What then is the good of Dajjāl being killed when nations more powerful than Dajjāl are there to take his place. A consideration of all such hadith leads to

111. Mīghkāt Ch. al-Dajjāl.
but one conclusion that the killing of Dajjāl does not mean the slaughter of a person, Dajjāl himself not being an individual but a group of nations; nor does it mean even the vanquishment of these nations, because even after the slaughter of Dajjāl these people will continue to exist as before, and the Messiah is told by God through revelation that he cannot overpower them by fighting. All this clearly shows that the mischiefs of these nations on the religious side are termed the menace of Dajjāl, because they will seduce people away from the truth through deception; whereas Gog and Magog represent their mischiefs on the political side. That is why even after the slaughter of Dajjāl, Gog and Magog are found to survive.

It is clear from this that although their religious mischiefs will be put to an end by the Messiah, putting an end to their political mischiefs is not included in the scope of this work. For this latter purpose, other forces will come into play. Possibly this purpose will be attained by their destruction of one another, as stated in the Qur’ān on one occasion: *On that day We shall let some of them surge against others.* In other words, they would destroy one another, as the two World Wars have shown. Or maybe, a considerable part of these people will escape destruction by coming over to Islam, a possibility hinted at in the words of the Prophet that the sun — the sun of Islam — “will rise in the West,” meaning that the truth of Islam will manifest itself among the Western nations. Neither is it unwarranted to hold that the Holy Prophet’s seeing Dajjāl in his vision circumambulating the Sacred House, the Ka‘bah, is in reference to these people becoming Muslims in the long run.

The Holy Prophet’s idea of defeating the Dajjāl by arguments

A careful reading of the hadith will further support this interpretation of the slaughter of Dajjāl. Several hadith contain such words as these:

"When he (Dajjāl) makes his appearance and I am in your midst, I will overpower him by arguments; and if, when he makes his appearance, I am not in your midst, every one should argue with him."\textsuperscript{113}

In another hadith it is said:

\begin{quote}
فَلَيْسَ تَخْرَجُوا أَوْ اتَّخَذُوا أَظْهَارَ ٍفَوْقَاهُ كَأَحْجِمَّةٍ لَّكَ مَسْلِمَيْنِ يَخْرُجُونَ فِي كُرَّةٍ كَأَنْ تَخْرَجَانَ
\end{quote}

"So when he makes his appearance and I am in your midst, I will overpower him with arguments on behalf of every Muslim; but if he appears after me, every one should argue with him on his own behalf."\textsuperscript{114}

These reports clearly show that if Dajjāl had appeared in the life-time of the Holy Prophet, he would have silenced him by arguments. This shows that killing in this case signifies putting an end to Dajjāl’s mischief, and as Dajjāl would mislead people by insinuation and by raising doubts in their minds, his mischief could be put to an end only by arguments. Hence the Prophet speaks of overpowering him by arguments. The Messiah killing Dajjāl must mean the same thing as the Holy Prophet’s overpowering him by arguments. In other words, the Messiah also will defeat him by arguments, or save people from his mischiefs through preaching. This meaning of the word \textit{qatil} is given in Arabic lexicons. Thus in the \textit{Nihāya}, a dictionary of Ḥadīth literature, it is written in reference to the hadith about the incident of Thaqīfā that the meaning of the clause \textit{qatala Allāhu Sa’d-an} (lit., may God kill Sa’d) is \textit{dafa’ Allāhu sharra-hā} i.e. may God ward off his mischief. Again, when discussing the question of taking the oath of allegiance to two rival Khalīfahs, it was said \textit{taqtulū al-akhira} (lit. kill the other one), and by a consensus of opinion it has been taken to mean reject his claims. Thus the word \textit{qatil} means killing as well as the rejection of

\textsuperscript{113} Kanz al-Ummāl Vol. 7, No. 2076.
\textsuperscript{114} Ibid., No. 2025 2079.
claims or warding off the evil; and since the qatîl of Dajjâl cannot mean the slaughter of all the Christian nations, the significance of the killing of Dajjâl is the rejection of his claim and the warding off of his evil.

If we give thought to other relevant hadîth, we meet therein further evidence that the killing of Dajjâl means the warding off of his mischief. There are quite a number of hadîth which say that any one who reads the first or the last ten verses of the chapter, entitled the Cave, will find himself safe from the mischief of Dajjâl. This means that Dajjâl will not go about killing people, but will try to divert people from the path of truth by creating doubts in their minds. This is why in order to be safe from his mischief, one is advised to read certain verses of the Qur’ân.

On one point, at least, hadîth are clear and their evidence unanimous. The mischief of Dajjâl does not consist in killing people, but in misleading them through doubts and evil suggestions. If such is the mischief of Dajjâl, the remedy for it should be of a similar nature. Look again at the words of the following hadîth:

كُفُوَّةُ الرَّجُلِ لِيَكَبُّ وَهُوَ يَجِبُدُ هُمَا يَبِعْثُهُ منَ الْشُّمَهَاتِ

"By God a man will come to him (Dajjâl) confident that he is a Muslim, but he will become his follower because of the doubts he will raise in his mind."

طَعَامُ الْمُؤَمِّنِ فِي يَوْمِ الْجَمِيعِ يَطَعُّمُ الْمُلَكِ الْتَّبَيْنَىَّة. الْتَّبَيْنَىَّةُ وَالْتَقْرِيرُ

"The food of a believer should be the food of the angels viz., glorification of God; so whosoever glorifies and sanctifies God on that day, God will remove from him his hunger."

Still another hadith says:

"Whoever says, God is my Lord, and continues to do so till he dies, God will keep him safe from the mischiefs of the Dajjāl,"\footnote{Kanz al-ʿUmmāl Vol. 7, H. No. 2080.}

Yet another ḥadīth says:

"Verily, God will keep a believer safe through the same thing with which he saves the angels, \textit{viz.}, the glorification of Him."\footnote{Ibid., No. 2090.}

It is evident from this kind of ḥadīth that a believer will be quite safe from the mischief of Dajjāl through the glorification of God. The mention of the believers’ food in the tribulation of Dajjāl refers to spiritual food, because just as physical food maintains the body, spiritual food keeps the spirit alive. We are thus told that people will be saved from the moral and spiritual perils created by Dajjāl by the spiritual preventives of the remembrance of God. It is true, some ḥadīth also speak of fighting with Dajjāl on the lines of fighting with Persia and Rome, but these may have a reference to the Crusades when the whole of Christendom set out to destroy Islam by the sword. One point, which is quite definite and conclusive, is that the remedy prescribed for such mischief of Dajjāl as is connected with religious life is spiritual in character. Sometimes the Prophet said that if he himself be alive at that time he would defeat him by arguments, and instructed his followers to adopt the same method if he appeared after his death. Again, he told them to read the chapter entitled the Cave, which deals with Christian doctrines and the history of Christianity in relation to Islam, and the object is undoubtedly gathering spiritual strength to resist the worldly attractions of Christianity. On other occasions, the Holy Prophet
observed that people should take to the glorification of God, because by this means man attains the nearness of God and finds thereby spiritual strength in himself. The advent of the Messiah has the same objective; viz., the revival of faith and the restoration of the spiritual balance of humanity upset by the one-sided growth of material civilization.

Thus the killing of the Antichrist by the Messiah also means that the message, claims and pretensions of the Antichrist should be rejected and people should be safeguarded from his mischiefs.

**Christian Missionaries are the leaders of religious machinations**

The descent of the Messiah is originally linked up with the eradication of the religious evils. Political or national sufferings would either be removed along with them, or, as it appears from certain reports, God will provide some other means for their remedy. For example they (the Western nations) will be destroyed by their own mutual conflicts. Christian clergymen and missionaries are the harbingers of religious and spiritual calamities in the world, that is why the Founder, in his writings, pays special attention to them. However, there are certain signs which are applied collectively to the Western nations; viz., the sharpness of their worldly sight, speedy means of communications, their control and mastery over the material resources, and their domination in the world. The Founder has specifically singled out the two great nations *i.e.* Russia and Britain, in this respect. He has, however, laid more emphasis on the Christian missionaries as playing the role of the Antichrist. Thus it is not correct to say that the Founder has applied the prophecies concerning the Antichrist, Gog and Magog only to the European nations and not to the Christian missionaries. The prophecies as such are applicable to the Western nations, but as the Founder was specially raised to fight this battle on the religious front, he spotlighted in particular, the part played by the Christian missionaries. If we give a careful thought to the contemporary history we find that in most of the political upheavals in the world (during the colonial age) Christian missionaries have played an effective role. Wherever European nations
have gained political ascendancy, whether in Asia or Africa, it has been achieved through the agency of the Christian missionaries who went to preach their religion and in this way helped their respective nations to establish political power in that country.\footnote{118} The Founder has given special attention to the activities of the Christian missionaries because the Western nations have themselves used them as an advance guard of an army for their secular ends. These missionaries not only did the preaching work and thus lead people into wrong beliefs, but also worked as political auxiliaries. It is evident from this how sharp the Founder’s sight was about the inner machinations of these nations.

**Triumph by means of arguments**

Some people scoff at the idea that a religion can become triumphant on the basis of spiritual proofs and arguments. Materialistic outlook has struck such a hold on the people today, that those who otherwise admit the Antichrist’s having one eye means that he is oblivious of all spiritual insight and his entire philosophy is based on materialism and the worship of matter, are

\footnote{118} “Christian writers would do well to remember that it was in fact Christianity which was spread by the sword, and not Islam, as they would have people believe. As to their other techniques of spreading the religion the reader is referred to *God, Allah and Juju* by Jack Mendelsohn (Thomas Nelson & Sons, New York). Mark the following words:

> ‘When the Englishman wants a new market for his adulterated Manchester goods he sends a missionary to teach the natives the Gospel of Peace. The natives kill the missionary, he flies to arms in defence of Christianity, fights for it, and takes the market as a reward from heaven.’

> “The Christian missionary movement is regarded by many as an attempt to turn Africans into European Christians. Missions remain strangely tolerant of racial discrimination and look down upon local culture wherever the white man has the upperhand. The oft-quoted example of the relationship between the Bible carrying missionaries and empire builders is related:

> ‘The missionaries came to us and said, ‘We want to teach you to pray’. ‘Good’, we said, ‘we would like to learn to pray’. So the missionaries told us to close our eyes. We closed our eyes and learned to pray. When we opened our eyes, there was the Bible in our hands, but our land was gone!’”

so enamoured by this materialism, that when somebody speaks of the triumph of religion through propagation, they at once rebut it by saying: How could mere words make one triumphant in the world? The interpretation of the killing of the Dajjâl with spiritual proofs and arguments seems to them foolish and absurd. I would draw their attention to these words of the Messenger of Allâh:

*If he (i.e., the Dajjâl) makes his appearance and I am amidst you, I will overpower him with arguments.*

That is why anyone else's killing of the Antichrist cannot be interpreted in a different manner. It is true that sometimes God endows prophets and reformers with political supremacy, but this is not a co-requisite of prophethood. Many prophets in the past did not enjoy any political power. For religious and spiritual evils not force but an ideological cure is needed. The Prophet was endowed with both spiritual and political power, but even then he said, that if the Antichrist appeared in his life-time he would overpower him with arguments. The Bible, history and the Qur'ân provide ample evidence that Jesus Christ was not given any political power along with his prophethood. If in his first advent he propagated his message by peaceful means, why is political power considered as an essential part for his second advent. If the killing of the Dajjâl had to be done in its literal sense, why was Jesus Christ selected for this task; his whole life had no association with such a work. The second advent of the Messiah has been so much linked up with the menace of the Antichrist that when 'Umar considering Ibn Șayâyâd as the Antichrist, sought permission from the Prophet to kill him, the Prophet said: "If this is the promised Dajjâl (the Antichrist) then you have nothing to do with him as the son of Mary is his master."\(^{119}\)

Thus on the ideological ground, spiritual arguments and proofs are a force in themselves which can overpower even material forces. In short, it is a grave misunderstanding to consider that the overpowering of the Antichrist shall be by means of the sword. Even Islam became triumphant through its spiritual power alone. And

\(^{119}\). Mîkhât Ch. Ibn Șayâyâd.
as it conquered the hearts and minds of people it gradually gained political power. Islam did not need any sword for its dominance. The sword was needed only for the defence of Muslims when the enemy had resorted to the sword to destroy them. The Prophet has himself regarded Islam's victory as an ideological and spiritual victory.

**Did the Founder achieve such an object?**

To regard the work done by Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad as mere theological disputes akin to those of the maulavis and the previous 'Ulamā' is to deny the bare facts of contemporary history. Before the advent of the Founder it was a common trait of the 'Ulamā’ to spend all their energy in fighting out issues of minor religious importance and, with few exceptions, they even did not know how to face the opponents of Islam. When all the strength of a community is spent on mutual wranglings, how can they face their external enemy. The Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement kept himself above the petty disputes in which Muslim theological leaders were engaged at that time and did not bother much about minor religious differences. From his very youth he was full of zeal for one thing — to defend Islam from the onslaughts of its enemies. Whether they were Christian missionaries or their camp-followers the Ārya Samājists or any one else, he spent all his energy and attention towards this end. There is no doubt that his toughest combat was with the Christian missionaries. He particularly enjoined the members of his community to pay special attention to this work. Even today people ask why the followers of Ḥaḍrat Mirzā devote most of their attention towards the propagation of Islam in Europe. The reason is not far to seek. The main object of his mission was to face the menace of the Antichrist. As I have mentioned earlier, it was his earnest desire which he time and again expressed in his writings that Islam should be propagated in the West, for it is in this way that we can overpower the Antichrist and this is how we can kill him. The Founder was endowed with special means to bring home the truth of Islam to the Christian world. Among these is the belief in the death of Jesus Christ which snatches the heart out of the church beliefs, for the very basis
of Christianity is that Jesus Christ is alive in the heaven. The Founder located the grave of Jesus Christ on this earth (Muhalla Khanyar, Srinagar, Kashmir). It seems proper to mention here the objection of some people who say that all these things should have been accomplished in the very lifetime of the Founder. Such a view is based on a misunderstanding. Religious reforms are not accomplished in a matter of days. The following verse of the Qur'an was revealed to the Prophet:

*He it is who sent His Messenger with guidance and the Religion of Truth, that He may cause it to prevail over all religions though the polytheists are averse.*

Did Islam achieve such predominance in the world during the lifetime of the Prophet? Certainly not. In reality the foundations for such an ultimate predominance were laid down by the Prophet and we find Islam moving towards this end during the past thirteen hundred years of Islamic history. In the lifetime of the Prophet greater part of Arabia entered the fold of Islam. After his death, wherever the message of Islam reached, it was given a warm welcome by other nations. But this was more or less limited to the continents of Asia and Africa. Islam did reach Europe to some extent but it did not have much success there. The battle against the Antichrist was destined to be fought at the hands of the Promised Messiah, that is why Islam did not gain much influence in Europe as it had in Asia and Africa.

The successes of the Promised Messiah against the Antichrist have been effected in many ways. Firstly, it was he who took up a stand against the menace of the Antichrist which had assumed the form of the worst possible charges levelled against the holy personality of the Prophet Muhammad. These calumnies were given wide publicity in the Muslim countries of the East—which is considered to be the original place for the appearance of the Anti-

120. A detailed discussion on this point has been made in his Urdu work *Masih Hindustân mein* (Messiah in India). Its English translation is also available. For further study on this subject see Khwaja Nazir Ahmad’s *Jesus in Heaven on Earth* published by Woking Muslim Mission and Literary Trust, Brandreth Road, Lahore-7 (Pakistan), 1950.—T.

121. The Qur'an 9:3.
christ. This is not a proper occasion to give details of the unique work done in this connection by the Founder. It was due to his high regard for the honour of the Prophet that when Christians crossed all limits of decency and decorum in debasing the holy personality of the Prophet, he was compelled, as a counter-attack, to present the fictitious character of Jesus Christ as depicted in their own holy Scriptures. Consequently this made them realise that such offensive writings or speeches directed towards the person of the Prophet had hurt the feelings of the Muslims, and the Christians changed their attitude in this respect to a great extent. There is still another way in which the Christian propaganda has been successfully met with in the East, and this is with the steady spread of the literature produced by the Founder and his followers presenting the true picture of Islam and the Prophet Muḥammad and refuting the wrong beliefs of the Christian Church. In this way the Muslims are being saved from going over to Christianity or, in other words, from the insinuating influence of the Antichrist. Undoubtedly the spread of Christianity among Muslims today has slowed down. Translations in various languages of this literature by the Founder and his followers are gradually spreading in different countries of the world. Moreover, the establishing of Islamic propaganda centres right in the heart of Europe, and dissemination of Islamic literature in various European languages is a significant achieve-

122. It is alleged that the Founder has at times used strong language against Jesus Christ and this showed scant respect for a messenger of God. The fact is that when Christian missionaries in India did not stop circulating scandalous literature (Ummahāt al-Muʾminīn was one such book) against the Prophet Muhammad (and such literature has been published in other parts of the world as well), the Founder was forced to bring out the "truth" about Jesus Christ from the Bible as a counter measure against the Christian propagandists. The valid picture of Jesus Christ is found in the Qurʾān and not in the Bible. If the biblical viewpoint is refuted from the Bible it does not amount to disrespect to a person who has been mentioned as a messenger of God in the Qurʾān: "He who thinks," writes the Founder, "that I do not respect the Messiah, son of Mary, is a mischievous person and a slanderer" (Kashti-i Nīh p. 16). "There is no doubt in it that he was a righteous person and a prophet. But to call him God is a heresy" (Tadhkirah al-Shahādatain p. 27). See also Anjām-i Aḥīm supplement, footnote, pp. 8, 9; Ayām al-Ṣulh title page; Ḥaḍīqat al-Wāḥib p. 274; Anwār al-Islām p. 34 etc.—T.
ment indeed. The number of persons entering into the fold of Islam has even gone beyond thousands. Again non-Muslims have begun to entertain favourable opinion about the teachings of Islam. The significance of the Prophet's report that 'the sun will rise from the West', is that the sun of the truth of Islam which first manifested itself in the East will one day rise in the West and from there it will shine upon the whole world. This is also the true significance of another report where it is mentioned:

Jesus the son of Mary will come from the West and will verify Muhammad.\textsuperscript{123}

Here it is mentioned that the Promised Messiah will appear from the West, but in most of the hadith the place of his appearance is mentioned to be in the East. This provides a clear indication that the Promised Messiah will establish Islamic centres in the West — the heart of the activities of the Antichrist — and the people there would come into the fold of Islam in large numbers.

One should not look down upon this noble task. Its seed was sown by the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement. Such seeds were sown by the righteous servants of God before and it was after their death that their seeds were nourished and developed. The intelligentsia of the West has started appreciating the principles of the Islamic teachings. The time is not very far when Europe in other aspects of life, will come to realise that it is in Islam alone that its salvation lies. The only thing now needed to achieve this object is that we Muslims should make it the foremost aim of our lives to spend all our energy towards this cause. It should be remembered that all the tasks of the Reformer were not accomplished in his lifetime. The work which he has started is carried on by his followers and is, in fact, the carrying on of his mission. Whatever path he has shown, whatever awakening he has caused, the direction in eradicating the influence of the Antichrist is indeed his work, although he has already passed away from this world.

\textsuperscript{123} Kanz al-`Ummāl Vol. 7, No. 2079.
Dābbat al-Arḍ (Beast from the Earth)

Among the trials reported in the Ḥadīth, the menace of the Antichrist has been given the greatest prominence and after this, the trials of Gog and Magog. Certain other things have also been stated in a very brief manner. Among these is the coming forth of the dābbat al-ard (Beast from the Earth). It is important because we find it mentioned in the Qur’ān also:

And when the word comes to pass against them, We shall bring forth for them a creature from the Earth that will speak to them, because people did not believe in Our messages.\textsuperscript{124}

In the Ḥadīth there is a mention of the coming forth of Dābbat al-Arḍ (Beast from the Earth) under the heading Ashrāf al-Sā‘ah (Signs of the Last Hour). Very few of these reports are reliable, and in those which are reliable, there is not much detail about it. The author of the Qur’ānic commentary Rūḥ al-Ma‘ānī\textsuperscript{125} after quoting some reports containing a few more descriptions about Dābbat al-Arḍ, remarks that these reports so vitally differ from each other in its nature, outward appearance, its place of coming forth etc. that no reliance can be placed on them. The Qur’ān has, however, explicitly said one thing about this Beast that it will speak to people. Since speech is peculiar to human beings, it can be safely said that it will be either a human being or a group from among human beings. The other point which is certain is that it will appear at a time when people will no longer have real faith in the messages of God and as a result of which punishment will overtake them.

In certain reports Dābbat al-Arḍ has been mentioned to be from the species of animals. In some others it is stated that it will come forth from every city. Thus by calling a man or a group of people Dābbat al-Arḍ may signify that he or they will be entirely bent upon the earth or engaged in earthly pursuits. Bringing forth of such people who will be occupied only in mundane affairs of life and who will have predominance over Muslims is a form of Divine

\textsuperscript{124} The Qur’ān 27: 28.
\textsuperscript{125} Abu’l Faḍl Shahāb al-Dīn al-Sayyid Mahmūd al-Ālūsī.
punishment. The word akhrajnā (We made them come out) is an indication towards this reality. It is evident from the Qur’ānic verse (27:82) that the domination of the Western nations over Muslims is a punishment as the Muslims themselves had ceased to believe in the Divine Message. The word yajeen (belief) seems to have been used here for the reason that when one believes in a certain thing, he puts it into practice. In other words, it means that Muslims at the time of the appearance of the Dābbat al-Arḍ will cease to act upon the Qur’ānic injunctions, with the result that other nations possessing material resources will overpower them. There is also a suggestion here that if Muslims once again start believing in the Qur’ān and put its teachings into actual practice, this punishment of dominance by other nations will be taken away, for spiritual forces will definitely overpower the material forces in the end. In fact the only way for Muslims to overcome material forces is to increase their spiritual power by strictly adhering to the Qur’ānic injunctions. That is why it is mentioned in a certain report that it will be the time when Muslims will cease to forbid the wrong and to invite others to good, which also amounts to the negligence of the Qur’ān in their actual lives. Three sections of the Western nations have been mentioned under different names: the Antichrist are the Christian missionaries, Gog and Magog are the people holding political dominance in the world and Dābbat al-Arḍ are their learned leaders who are lost in the worship of matter and the power of matter and have spread this cult all over the world.

Conditions of the ‘Ulamā’

The Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement has regarded Dābbat al-Arḍ as applying to the ‘Ulamā’ also who are solely engaged in the earthly pursuits. There is no doubt about it that the appearance of the Promised Messiah has been fixed at a time when the so-called ‘Ulamā’ will be in a deplorable condition. They will fight among themselves on minor details of religion and will no longer aspire for spiritual ideals for the establishment of which prophets had been raised. Devoid of spirituality and truthfulness they will be seeking only to earn a few cents. In an authentic report
it is stated that the condition of Muslims at that time will be like that of the Christians and Jews:

“You will certainly follow the precepts of those who have gone before, step by step.” They asked: “O Messenger of Allāh, the Jews and the Christians? He said, Who else?” (Bukhārī, Kitāb al-anbiyā).

Descriptions about Jews and Christians and even about their being metamorphosed have been given at several places in the Qur’ān. Thus it was destined that such condition should come over the Muslims too. It is also mentioned in the Hadīth that knowledge “will be confiscated.” This means that people will go far away from truth and spirituality and will worship only the letter. It is stated in some reports that:

“There will be a great number of reciters of the Qur’ān at that time, but very few will be the possessors of knowledge…..Some people of my Ummah at that time will read the Qur’ān, but it will not even pass down their throats.”126

In another report ‘taking up’ of the Qur’ān in the later days has been mentioned thus:

“It (i.e., the Qur’ān) will say that I went forth from you and have come back to you. I am read but I am not acted upon. At that time the Qur’ān will be taken up.”126a

The ‘Ulamā’ of that time are regarded as the worst possible creatures on the earth under the sky.127 Elsewhere it is mentioned: “A time of utter consternation will come over my Ummah and the people will go to their ‘Ulamā’,

126a. Ibid., No. 1801.
127. Mīhkāt Kitāb al-‘Ilm.
but they will find them monkeys and swines.”

This report is corroborated by the one included in the Ṣīhāh Sittah (The six authentic collections of Tradition). In Ṣahih al-Bukhāri it is narrated as: “There will be certainly such people in my ummah who will declare woolen-mixed silk, silk cloth, wine and playing on musical instruments as lawful... Some people will be transformed into swines and monkeys.”

By maskh (metamorphosis) here is not meant the actual physical transformation but it means metamorphosis of their moral condition. About the Jews, who violated the Sabbath, the Qur’ān says: “Be (as) apes despised and hated.”

Similar meanings of maskh (metamorphosis) have been narrated from Imām Mujāhid.

It was not their outward appearance but their moral condition that had changed. Undoubtedly the ‘Ulamā’ of today have become so much degenerated that they spend all their energy...


129. Mishkāt.


131. They were not transformed or metamorphosed; it is only a parable which Allāh has set forth for them, the like of what He has set forth in likening them to asses (62:5), i.e., their hearts were transformed, not that they were metamorphosed into apes. The verse that follows lends support to this explanation as a monkey could not afford a lesson to the generations that came after the metamorphosis had taken place. Imām Rāghib observes in explaining this verse: It is said that He rather made them morally like apes. Compare also 5:60 “(Worse is he) whom Allāh has cursed, and brought wrath upon him, and of whom He made apes and swine, and he who served the devil: these are worse in place and more erring from the straight path.” This description of the same people clearly shows that it is men who imitate apes and swine that are meant. See also 4:47: “Or (We shall) curse them as We cursed the violators of the Sabbath.” Now, in the case of the Holy Prophet’s opponents from among the Jews, who are referred to in the words, We shall curse them, there was no metamorphosis, but here it is stated that the same curse must overtake them as overtook the violators of the Sabbath. A reference to Deut. 28 will show that the curses which Moses prophesied for them meant their being scattered among the nations of the earth, and this was the fate which overtook the Prophet’s enemies from among the Jews. Qiradah is the plural of gird, meaning an ape, and among the Arabs the ape is a proverbially incontinent animal, they say more incontinent than an ape (Lane’s Lexicon).
on issues which ruin the cause of Islam. And in spite of the fact that their activities bring a bad name to Islam they do not change their attitude. There is another report which depicts the condition of the present ‘Ulamā’: “There will be such people in the Latter Days who will curse each other instead of exchanging greetings among themselves.” Is there any doubt in it that this is an exact picture of our ‘Ulamā’! And there is nothing strange about it if such people have been called Dābbat al-Ard (Beast from the Earth) as they have in fact gone far away from the real object of spiritual life.

Rising of the sun from the West

‘Rising of the sun from the West’ is mentioned in the Ḥadīth along with the appearance of the Antichrist or Gog and Magog. If we take these words literally it does not mean anything. The reports do not give details that the rising of the sun will happen on a single day or will continue for several days. If it is going to happen on a single day which will be the day for the destruction of the world no objection can be raised against it. After all, one day the present system of the world will cease to exist, but at that time human life will become extinct as well. And if it means that the sun or the earth will change its course, this does not serve any purpose except that the present East will become the West and vice versa, although on the face of it this is an impossibility. However, we so often use the expression the “resplendence of the sun of Islam” in our language. The one appointed by God at the beginning

Turning to the Bible, we find that the Israelites became apes, in all the senses in which the word is used in Arabic language, by violating the Divine commandments: “Thou hast despised Mine holy things, and hast profaned My Sabbath. In thee are men that carry tales to shed blood: and in thee they eat upon the mountains; in the midst of thee they commit lewdness. In thee have they discovered their father’s nakedness: in thee have they humbled her that was set apart for pollution. And one hath committed abomination with his neighbour’s wife; and another hath lewdly defiled his daughter-in-law; and another in thee hath humbled his sister, his father’s daughter...And I will scatter thee among the heathen and disperse thee in the countries.....(Ezek 22:8-15) — Muḥammad ‘Ali, The Holy Qur‘ān English commentary under 2 : 65.—T.

of the present Ḥijrah century after receiving knowledge from God has disclosed that by the rising of the sun from the West is meant that the sun of Islam will rise from the West. It is a matter of common sense that when the Antichrist, Gog and Magog, with their triumph and predominance in the world, have been described in detail, it was but natural to mention how their authority and ascendancy will come to an end. Therefore it is mentioned that the West from where all these evils have arisen will at last bow its head before Islam. The sun of Islam which has been shedding its light in the Eastern countries will start shining in the West also. The person to whom this knowledge was disclosed was also given the zeal to spread the Message of Islam in the West. Thus the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement in Islam has frequently expressed his earnest desire towards this end and this point has already been discussed in the beginning of this book. At last the stirring of his soul bore fruit and his followers established Islamic centres in the West, a work which was not done by the Muslims before.

No doubt we do find in the hadith that at last the Antichrist and Gog and Magog will be destroyed, yet we should not forget that the mercy of the Prophet who was a ‘mercy unto the nations’ in earlier times was also manifested when the leaders of wickedness were destroyed and most of the remaining people entered into the fold of Islam. And in these prophecies this has been foretold that at that time also the Prophet’s mercy will be manifested in a similar way, that is, the West which will rise to destroy Islam, will one day be illuminated with the light of the sun of Islam.

133. See Chapter 1—T.
Annexe III

Dajjal — The Anti-Christ*

“As soon as the maghrib prayer is over, Shaykh Ibn Bulayhid becomes the centre of an attentive circle of Najdi beduin and townsmen desirous of profiting from his learning and world-wisdom; while he himself is always eager to hear what people can tell him of their experiences and travels in distant parts. Long travels are nothing uncommon among the Najdis; they call themselves ahl ashshidad—‘people of the camel-saddle’—and to many of them the camel-saddle is indeed more familiar than a bed at home. It must certainly be more familiar to the young Harb beduin who had just finished recounting to the shaykh what befell him on his recent journey to Iraq, where he has seen, for the first time, faranji people, that is, Europeans (who owe this designation to the Franks with whom the Arabs came in contact during the Crusades).

“Tell me, O Shaykh, why is it that the faranjis always wear hats that shade their eyes? How can they see the sky?”

“That is just they do not want to see”, replies the shaykh, with a twinkle in my direction, “Perhaps they are afraid lest the sight of the heavens remind them of God; and they do not want to be reminded of God on weekdays…”

We all laugh, but the young beduin is persistent in his search for knowledge. “Then why is it that God is so bountiful towards them that gives them riches that He denies to the faithful?”

“Oh, that is simple, my son. They worship gold, and so their deity is in their pockets...But my friend here,” and he places his hand on my knee, “knows more about the faranjis than I do, for he comes from among them: God, glorified be His name, has led him out of that darkness into the light of Islam.”

“Is that so, O brother?” asks the eager young beduin. “Is it true that thou hast been a faranj thyself?” and when I nod, he

whispers, "Praise be unto God, praise be unto God, Who guides aright whomsoever He wishes...Tell me, brother, why is it that the faranjis are so unmindful of God?"

And as he looks at me with a question in his eyes, I recount, to the visible approval of Shaykh Ibn Bulayhid, the prophecy about the appearance of that apocalyptic being, the Dajjal, who would be blind in one eye but endowed with mysterious powers conferred upon him by God. He would hear with his ears what is spoken in the farthest corners of the earth, and would see with his one eye things that are happening in infinite distance; he would fly around the earth in days, would make treasures of gold and silver suddenly appear from underground, would cause rain to fall and plants to grow at his command, would kill and bring to life again: so that all whose faith is weak would believe him to be God himself and would prostrate themselves before him in adoration. But those whose faith is strong would read what is written in letters of flame on his forehead: Deity of God—and thus they would know that he is but a deception to test man's faith....

And while my beduin friend looks at me with wide-open eyes and murmurs, "I take my refuge with God" I turn to Ibn Bulayhid: "Is not this parable, O Shaykh, a fitting description of modern technical civilization? Is it 'one-eyed': that is, it looks upon only one side of life — material progress — and is unaware of its spiritual side. With the help of its mechanical marvels it enables man to see and hear far beyond his natural ability, and to cover endless distances at an inconceivable speed. Its scientific knowledge causes 'rain to fall and plants to grow' and uncover unsuspected treasures from beneath the ground. Its medicine brings life to those who seem to have been doomed to death, while its wars and scientific horrors destroy life. And its material advancement is so powerful and so glittering that the weak in faith are coming to believe that it is a godhead in its own right; but those who have remained conscious of their Creator clearly recognize that to worship the Dajjal means to deny God..."Thou art right, O Muhammad, thou art right, O Muhammad, thou art right!" cries out Ibn Bulayhid, excitedly striking my knee, "It has never occurred to me to look
upon the Dajjāl prophecy in this light; but thou art right! Instead of realizing that man’s advancement and the progress of science is a bounty from our Lord, more and more people in their folly are beginning to think that it is an end in itself and fit to be worshipped.”

* * * * *

Yes, I think to myself, Western man has truly given himself up to the worship of the Dajjāl. He has long ago lost all innocence, all inner integration with nature. Life has become a puzzle to him. He is sceptical, and therefore isolated from his brother and lonely within himself. In order not to perish in this loneliness, he must endeavour to dominate life by outward means. The fact of being alive can, by itself, no longer give him inner security; he must always wrestle for it, with pain, from one to new moment. Because he has lost all metaphysical orientation, and has decided to do without it, he must continuously invent for himself mechanical allies; and thus the furious, desperate drive of his technique. He invents every day new machines and gives each of them something of his soul to make them fight for his existence. That they do indeed; but at the same time they create for him ever new needs, new dangers, new fears — and unquenchable thirst for newer, yet artificial allies. His soul loses itself in the ever bolder, ever more fantastic, ever more powerful wheelwork of the creative machine: and the machine loses its true purpose — to be a protector and enricher of human life — and envolves into a deity in its own right, a devouring Moloch of steel. The priests and preachers of this insatiable deity do not seem to be aware that the rapidity of modern technical progress is a result not only of a positive growth of knowledge but also of spiritual despair, and that the grand material achievements in the light of which Western man proclaims his will to attain to mastery over nature are, in their innermost, of a defensive character; behind their shining facades lurks the fear of the Unknown.

Western civilization has not been able to strike a harmonious balance between man’s bodily and social needs and his spiritual cravings; it has abandoned its erstwhile religious ethics without
being able to produce out of itself any other moral system, however theoretical, that would commend itself to reason. Despite all its advances in education, it has not been able to overcome man’s stupid readiness to fall a prey to any slogan, however absurd, which clever demagogues think fit to invent. It has raised the technique of “organization” to a fine art — and nevertheless the nations of the West daily demonstrate their utter inability to control the forces which their scientists have brought into being, and have now reached a stage where apparently unbounded scientific possibilities go hand in hand with world-wide chaos. Lacking all truly religious orientation, the Westerner cannot morally benefit by the light of the knowledge which his — undoubtedly great — science is shedding. To him might be applied the words of the Qur’ān:

“Their parable is the parable of people who lit a fire: but when it had shed its light around them, God took away their light and left them in darkness in which they cannot see — deaf, dumb, blind: and yet they do not turn back.”

And yet, in the arrogance of their blindness, the people of the West are convinced that it is their civilization that will bring light and happiness to the world...In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries they thought of spreading the gospel of Christianity all over the world; but now that their religious ardour has cooled so much that they consider religion no more than soothing background music — allowed to accompany, but not to influence, “real” life — they have begun to spread instead the materialistic gospel of the “Western way of life”: the belief that all human problems can be solved in factories, laboratories and on the desks of statisticians.

And thus the Dajjāl has come into his own...”
CHAPTER IV

THE TRUE CONCEPTION OF AHMADIYYAH MOVEMENT

Ahmadiyyat is not a separate religion

Many are the misconceptions prevailing among people about the Ahmadiyyah Movement. The greatest of all is that it is a religion quite separate from Islam like Bábism or Bahá’ism. The basis of this false idea is that Mirza Ghulám Ahmad of Qádián, Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement, has laid a claim to prophethood. This allegation has already been refuted in the foregoing pages. But there are some who go to the extent of declaring that Ahmádis have a different kalimah (formula of Faith), a different form of prayer, a different Book besides the Qur'án and a different Qiblah.¹ All these charges have no foundation at all.

Had Ahmadiyyat been a separate religion, like Bábí or Bahá’í faith, its activities obviously should not have been confined to the spread of Islam. Whatever work has been done in this age about the propagation of Islam, in Europe, America and other countries of the world, the greater part of it is due to the efforts of the followers of the Ahmadiyyah Movement. In this connection the literature produced by Muslims is either the result of the activities of this Movement or has been done under its influence. Had Ahmadiyyat been something different from or hostile to Islam, it should not have laid so much emphasis on establishing Muslim missions and spreading the Islamic literature all over the world. Bábism was in existence fifty years before the inception of the Ahmadiyyah Movement. Had it started any Islamic mission or published any Islamic literature? If Ahmádis had a religion different from Islam, they must have directed their full efforts to the advancement of that ‘new’ faith, but as they are entirely

¹ Sacred House of God at Makkah towards which Muslims turn their faces while offering the prayers.
engaged in the service of Islam, they cannot, and in fact do not, owe allegiance to any other religion except Islam.

It is, indeed true that a group from among the followers of Ahmad, i.e. the followers of the Qādiān section, have ascribed a claim of prophethood to him but they are still in an intermediary state. Although on account of their belief in such a prophethood they have declared all the Muslims of the world to be unbelievers (kāfirs) they have not yet adopted a new formula of faith (kalimah) for themselves. And although according to their creed unless a person accepts Mirza Ghulām Ahmad as a prophet and formally takes an oath of allegiance to that effect, he does not enter the fold of Islam, but so far they have refused to formulate a new kalimah for themselves and adhere only to the Islamic formula of faith:

لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

There is no god but Allah, Muhammad is Allah’s Messenger.

But this is, as I have said, only an intermediary position or a state of indecision. They would either, at last, give up the belief in the Founder’s prophethood or formulate a separate kalimah and a separate religion for themselves. The logical conclusion of


3. These words are rather prophetic in their nature which found partial fulfilment in 1954 c.e. when a written statement by the delegate of the Qādiān section was submitted to the Court of Inquiry that: “A Muslim is a person who belongs to the ummat of the Holy Prophet and professes belief in kalimah ḥaqqīyībah,” (Report of the Court of Inquiry into the Punjab Disturbances of 1953, p. 218). At another place in this report it has been mentioned that:

“On the question whether the Aḥmadis (i.e. the followers of the Qādiān section—T.) consider the other Musalmāns to be kāfirs in the sense of their being outside the pale of Islam, the position taken before us is that such persons are not kāfirs and that the word kufr, when used in the literature of the Aḥmadis in respect of such persons, is used in the sense of a minor heresy and that it was never intended to convey that such persons were outside the pale of Islam” (p. 199).

The above are the remarks by the judges. The actual answers given at the Court were as follows:

“Q. Do you include Mirza Ghulām Ahmad Sahib among the māmūrs (appointed ones of God—T.) whose acknowledgement is necessary to be called a Muslim?
their creed—that anybody who does not accept Mirza Ghulām Ahmād as a prophet is a kāfir and outside the pale of Islam—is that the kalimah is not valid any more. When the acceptance of

“A. I have already answered this question. No one who does not believe in Mirza Ghulām Ahmād Šāhīb can be taken out of the pale of Islam.” (Proceedings of the Court of Inquiry, 84th sitting, dated 14th January 1954 C.E.)

“Q. Please look at page 22 of Dhikr-i-Ilāhī, which contains the following passage:

"My belief is this that there are two groups in the world, viz. one mu'min (believer) and the other kāfir. Thus those who declare faith in the Promised Messiah (i.e. Mirza Ghulām Ahmād—T.) are mu'mins and those who have not believed in him—there may be any reason for their non-belief—are kāfirs—T.). Is not the word kāfir used here in contradiction to the word mu'min?"

“A. In this context the word mu'min means one who believes and the word kāfir means one who does not believe in Mirza Ghulām Ahmād Šāhīb.

“To Court: “Is belief in Mirza Ghulām Ahmād Šāhīb, therefore, a part of imān?"

“A. No. The word mu'min here has been used merely to convey the sense of belief in Mirza Ghulām Ahmād Šāhīb, not of belief in the fundamentals of Islam.” (Ibid. 85th sitting, 15th January 1954 C.E.) Mirza Baṣhir al-Dīn Mahmūd Ahmād, Head of the Ahmadiyyah community at Rabwah, admitted that belief in the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement was not a part of faith (juzw-i imān), but forty years before he had openly declared:

"Belief in the Promised Messiah is a part of faith (juzw-e imān). Thus who can have the heart to say by standing in opposition to him that belief in him is not a part of faith?" (Al-Faṣl, Qādiān, 20th May 1914 C.E.)

4. “That all those so-called Muslims who have not entered into his bā'īat formally, wherever they may be, are kāfirs and outside the pale of Islam, even though they may not have heard the name of the Promised Messiah. “That these beliefs have my full concurrence I readily admit.” (Mirza Baṣhir al-Dīn Mahmūd, The Truth about the Split—Qādiān, India, Second Edition, 1938 C.E. Pp. 55-56).

The contradiction in the above statements is obvious.
the existing kalimah does not keep a person within the fold of Islam, — and even the four hundred million Muslims of the world who declare their faith in it are declared to be kāfirs and outside the pale of Islam — this kalimah must necessarily be considered as abrogated, and the messengership and prophethood of a person whose acceptance has become essential for entering the fold of Islam must form a part and parcel of the new kalimah. If the belief in the prophethood of Aḥmad is not renounced, a time will come when these people shall have to formulate a separate kalimah and a separate religion, and their relation with Islam would become like that of Bābis or Bahāís who regard Islam a genuine religion of the past, but with regard to the present time they consider their own faith alone as true, Islam and its kalimah having been abrogated by them. The Qādiān people have put themselves on the horns of a dilemma. They are trying to sail in two boats at a time. On the one hand they declare four hundred million Muslims — believers in the kalimah — to be kāfirs and on the other they include themselves among Muslims, refusing to adopt a new kalimah and a new faith. But this condition cannot exist for long. Either the repulsiveness of such a doctrine would at last create an aversion in the minds of the majority of these people and they would refrain from attributing a claim of prophethood to the Founder or would accept the ultimate result of their belief, which is that the old kalimah shall have to be discarded to give place to a new one. Aḥmādiyyah Movement, at any rate, was neither a new religion in its original form, nor has it, so far, grown to be a new religion among the followers of Mirza Ghulām Ahmad.

It is not even a sect in the general sense of the term

Every religion in the world is divided into sects which generally differ in their fundamentals with one another. For instance, some Christians regard Jesus Christ as God or son of God and others take him to be a human being and with advancement of knowledge this group is increasing in number. This means that believers in Triune God as well as those who believe in one God are all Christians. Similarly, among Hindus there are many who believe in one God and there are others who worship idols and have faith in three
hundred and thirty million gods. Some consider the Vedas as the spoken word of God and others take them to be the composition of human beings. Such differences, in fact, should be termed as fundamental sectarian differences. There are no differences and no sects in Islam in this respect. All the sects in Islam agree on the fundamentals of religion. All believe in one God, in the finality of the Prophethood of Muhammed. All take the Qur'an as the last revealed Book of God which has not suffered any change in text. All face towards the same Qiblah when praying. But with this uniformity of opinion that all believe in one God, one Messenger, one Qiblah and one Book there have been differences on minor points and details of religion. Some Muslim Imāms after due consideration have arrived at different conclusions with regard to certain matters of religious life. Various groups of Muslims followed these Imāms according to their own choice, and this has resulted in the formation of different schools of thought in Islam. This is the real fact behind the growth of the so-called sects in Islam. Differences among these sects are not differences in the fundamentals of religion, but in matters of jurisprudence, or details of religious practices. And this type of difference of opinion is, in fact, a blessing as the Prophet is reported to have said: Difference in my ummah is a blessing, because along with unity this opens a way for freedom of opinion. Liberty in views, and free exercise of judgement (ijtihād) is, in fact, a great blessing that helps in the advancement of knowledge and learning, and develops in every person the habit of deep thinking. The sectarian differences of Muslims are, therefore, of no real importance. But the foundation of Ahmadiyyah Movement has not been laid on any of such sectarian differences. The chief characteristic of this Movement today has been the same as it was before, viz. the defence and propagation of Islam. Whatever differences this movement has with other Muslims, these are definitely not connected with matters of jurisprudence or details of religious life but only with matters concerning the defence and propagation of Islam. The history of the Movement bears testimony to the fact that when Mirza Ghulam Ahmad founded this organisation and made a declaration for an oath of allegiance, he did not differ with other Muslims on any religious doctrine.
The object of the formation of this organisation was only the protection and propagation of Islam. Although he had been devoting his whole time even before that to this noble object but at this stage under Divine command he set up a permanent basis for the spread of Islam according to the Qur'anic verse:

\[
\text{وَأَتِمُّواَ الْكَوْمِ مِنْهُمَا بِالْمَعَالِمِ أَمَّا مَعَكُمُ الْمَعَالِمُ}
\]

i.e., and from among you there should be a party who invite to good and enjoin what is right. Immediately thereafter he started writing Fath Islām wherein he divided the work of the spread of Islam into five main branches. At this juncture, it was manifested to him that the belief in the physical ascension and continued existence of Jesus Christ was an obstacle in the way of the progress of Islam. It was on this Divine manifestation that his claim was based and it was because of this that Muslims started opposing him.

**Attitude towards jurisprudential problems**

In all the matters of fiqh (jurisprudence) the attitude of Ahmadīs is completely liberal. The details of laws, viz. regulations of marriage, divorce, inheritance, prayer, fasting, ablution etc. which have caused great controversy among Muslim `ulamā’ do not worry them in the least. They enjoy full liberty in these matters. It would be quite correct to say that the Ahmadiyyah Movement is rather a synthesis of the different schools of thought in Islam based on fiqh and invites them towards unity by tolerating and ignoring their differences. Whatever minor differences Ahmadiyyat has with other Muslim sects only relate, as already remarked, to the propagation and defence of Islam. Thus, if Ahmadiyyat is a sect in Islam, it is unlike the sects of other religions, for there are no sects in Islam in that sense. It is again unlike other sects in Islam which are based on differences in fiqh, for in that sense it is a synthesis of all these sects. It is a sect in Islam in the sense that for the furtherance of the cause of Islam it has laid emphasis on certain points and has devised effective means to face the hostile forces working against Islam. The task for the

5. The Qur'ān, 2 : 103.
internal reformation of Muslims itself falls within the scope of its programme.

A Movement for Islam

Because of its distinctive features from other Islamic groups in certain respects, the Aḥmadiyyah group may be called a sect or school of thought in Islam, but it is in fact a great movement within the fold of Islam, the main object of which is to awaken Muslims and consolidate their efforts for the spread of Islam. Its object is not to concentrate on, and retain differences of, minor importance as is done by other schools of thought in Islam. Its ideal is, however, far superior and beyond all sectarianism.

If the only object of this movement is to prove the death of Jesus Christ and establish the truth of the claims of the Founder as the Promised Messiah, Mahdi and Mujaddid, it may perhaps be classed as a sect like other sects in Islam. But that is not for which the Aḥmadiyyah Movement stands. These are only a means to achieve an end. And what is that end? Spreading and strengthening the cause of Islam in the world and rousing up of Muslims for this sacred task.

Death of Jesus Christ

Belief in the death of Jesus Christ is regarded to be the most important feature of the Ahmadiyyah Movement. There have been Muslim divines like Imām Bukhārī and Imām Mālik who believed in the death of Jesus Christ. Imām Bukhārī in his collection of Ḥadīth has reported from Ibn ‘Abbās that the significance of mutawaffī-ka is mumītu-ka (i.e. I will cause you to die). That is he has not accepted the meaning of tuwaffa as the taking of body and soul together as were accepted afterwards by some people. Imām Mālik, similarly, believed in the death of Jesus Christ: wa qāla Mālik-un māla i.e., and Mālik said he died.’

Belief in the death of Jesus Christ by two persons of such

great calibre shows that there must be others also from the earlier Muslim divines who entertained a similar belief. The companions of the Holy Prophet seem to be all agreed upon this point. Because at the death of the Holy Prophet, those companions who could not believe the sad news to be true were silenced by Abū Bakr by the recitation of the verse: And Muḥammad is no more than an apostle; the apostles before him have already passed away. All the companions of the Holy Prophet were thus duly convinced that like all other prophets, their Prophet too had left this mundane life. This was the consensus of opinion of the companions of the Prophet over the death of Jesus Christ. Had anybody believed that Jesus was alive he must have pointed it out.

In this age too the late Sir Sayyid Ahmad of Aligarh, Mufti Muḥammad ‘Abduh and Sayyid Rashid Raḍā of Egypt, believed in the death of Jesus Christ. Many other ‘ulamā‘ of India also share this belief but are afraid of declaring it in public, as such a belief is sufficient to stigmatise them as pro-Ahmadi. People have grown suspicious to the extent that anybody who just mentions it, is considered to have secret alliance with the Aḥmadiyyah Movement. As the claim of the Founder is based on the death of Jesus Christ, the Muslim ‘ulamā‘ and some of the present-day translators of the Holy Qur’ān are much hesitant in accepting this belief as true.

Apparently, the question of the life and death of Jesus Christ is neither one of the fundamentals of Islam nor a part of its furū‘ (lit. branches). Why is it, then, that it has become one of the distinguishing features of this movement? As it has been discussed before, the main object of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement is the propagation of Islam, particularly in the West where it has to face the onslaughts of the Dajjāl (Antichrist); the belief in the corporal existence of Jesus Christ is the greatest obstacle in the propagation of Islam among Christian peoples. If Jesus Christ is alive in heavens with his body of clay for the last two thousand years, and does not

8. The Qur’ān, 3 : 143.
9. See Annexe, Chapter 2 “Ulama of Egypt on the death of Jesus Christ” and passages from the Message of the Quran by Muḥammad Asad.
partake of food and is above the needs and necessities of this material life without suffering any change in his body, he is certainly not of human species. If he is actually endowed with these peculiarities, his body is immortal. This is the argument which is put forth by Christians very forcibly. Muslims who believe in the continued existence of Jesus Christ fall an easy prey to them. The natural corollary of their strange belief is that Jesus Christ is far above a human being, rather a co-sharer in Divinity. It is not worth-while under these conditions to go and preach Islam to Christians. For this reason the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement laid emphasis on eradicating such a false view about Jesus Christ.

**Significance of the Claims**

The true conception of the Ahmadiyyah Movement is only this, that it is a great movement for the propagation, spread and defence of Islam in the world, and all the distinguishing features it possesses are a means to achieve this great end. So much so that accepting the claims of the Founder is also not an object in itself but only a means to achieve the object of the spread of Islam. The greatest thing is that with the acceptance of these claims one feels in oneself a very strong faith which invigorates one to make every sacrifice for the sake of Islam. The logic of this belief may or may not satisfy anybody, but the fact is that those who kept company with the Founder of the Movement or came into spiritual contact with him after his death, felt a real zeal for the propagation of Islam and became fully convinced that Islam was going to overpower the world. It seems something is lacking in us that we do not rise up to the occasion and acquaint the world with the real teachings of Islam, otherwise Islam possesses such a spiritual beauty within it that, whether it is materialism which seems at present to sweep away everything along with it or the net of Christianity which seems to be spreading all over the world today or the dominance of any other force, all of them are going to be subdued by Islam; all heads have to bow down before its invincible principles of peace and spiritual well-being. This faith and this love for the religion of Islam inspire every Ahmadi to do
his best for the cause of Islam. Without faith and love the will to sacrifice cannot exist. The spiritual contact with the Founder stimulates in Ahmadi this faith and love. Thus a change occurs in them as it does in a tree which has been grafted upon. That is why there is a tremendous difference between the attitude of an Ahmadi and that of a non-Ahmadi. The latter is waiting for somebody else to come and help him in the cause of Islam and the former is convinced that this is his work and it is he who is responsible for it and has the power to do it. Difference in the outlook of these two persons is quite obvious. Waiting for Jesus Christ to come down from heaven is an escapist’s refuge. Belief in the claims of the Founder stirs up Muslims and they know once for all that nobody else is coming from above to raise them from the slough of despondency to which they have deeply sunk. They have themselves to struggle hard for their own deliverance.

Those who enter into fealty with the Founder know it full well that the prophecies of the Holy Prophet have come true. It was foretold that the days of the glory of Islam will be followed by poverty and misery among Muslims but again, Islam will rise in its full splendour and overpower the world with its spiritual force and the era of the onward march of Islam will start anew. This is the age when prophecies relating to the dominance of Islam with the advent of Messiah are going to be fulfilled. It is our duty now to carry the message of Islam to all the corners of the world. The power to conquer the hearts is inherent in Islam. But the Muslims must work and sweat for its success.

The acceptance of the claims of the Founder has thus changed the lethargic attitude of his followers. It has given them a new power of faith which is palpable behind all the activities of the Ahmadiyyah Movement. This is the only object in accepting Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as the Promised Messiah, Mahdi and Mujaddid. This does not mean that Islam was incomplete before and by accepting the Founder our religion has been perfected. Islam was indeed perfected at the time of the revelation of the verse: This day have I perfected for you your religion, but the faith in man

10. The Qur’an. 5.3.
keeps on waxing or waning, as we have it in Bukhari: “The faith increases and decreases”. Acceptance of the Founder’s claim is a great source of enhancing our faith in Islam. The uphill task of the propagation of Islam cannot be done without this strong faith, particularly when this path is not strewn with outward honours and glories and it has not the thrills and attractions of an adventurous life like that of a politician.

Visions of the Holy Prophet Muhammad come true

As a matter of fact, if we just give a little thought to the subject, we shall discover that the Ahmadiyyah Movement has opened new avenues for the glory and success of the Holy Prophet’s mission. It has shown to the general Muslims how the prophecies made thirteen hundred years before have come true. This in fact has been a source of great help to increase their faith in the Holy Prophet. We had before our eyes all the events of the world and the foretellings of the Prophet. The ‘ulamā’ read these reports day and night but did not realise their significance. There was only one person who lifted the veil from these reports and interpreted them in our age. That one person was Mirza Ghulām Ahmad of Qādiān. For lifting this veil of darkness one needed the light which came from above. It was, of course, under heavenly guidance that he clarified many wrong notions about these reports. Reports about the Antichrist, Gog and Magog, which reveal the depth of the Prophet’s spiritual insight, discussed elsewhere, are only a part of these prophecies over which the Founder has thrown light. There are other prophecies as well mentioned in the Qur’ān and the Hadith which have come true and the Ahmadiyyah Movement has drawn attention towards them to enhance the faith in the Holy Prophet’s visions. For instance, the great World War has been mentioned as al-muḥāmadat al-‘uẓmā’ which means the Great War. The first World War (1914-1918 C.E.) is exactly known by the same name. It is also reported that Christians (al-rūm) will.

11. Al-Bukhārī, 2 : 92
far exceed the other nations in numbers at that time, and Muslims will be treated most severely at their hands; \(\text{al-rūm}\) in the reports refers to Christian nations. And that Muslims would become weak so much so that it would appear that other nations would completely devour them up. Their internal wranglings, their declaring one another infidels, the disappearance of the knowledge of the Qur’ān from among them, their worship of the outward ceremony, their following in the footsteps of the Jews and the Christians, their mental and moral debasement, all these are mentioned in the Ḥadīth. The absence of faith and religious knowledge, the scarcity of people interested in the spiritual matters have also been repeatedly described therein. The irreligiousness about which the whole material world is proud today has also been foretold by the Prophet thirteen hundred years before. As compared with this, the abundance of the material wealth has also been recorded in the reports. Similarly the Qur’ān also mentions many prophecies relating to this age. The giving up of camels, for instance, for more comfortable and swifter modes of conveyance:

\[\text{وَأَمَّا كَانُوا مَكَارَمًا فَلَا يَمَسُّهُمُ}
\]

\[\text{And when the camels are abandoned.}\]

And it is found in the Ḥadīth also:

\[\text{لَا يَتَّخِذُونَ أَظْلَامًا فَلَا يُمَسُّونِ}
\]

\[\text{The camels shall certainly be neglected so that they shall not be used for going swiftly (from place to place).}\]

14. Ibid.
Barbarous nations will be civilized:

\[
\text{وَلَا أَلْحَوَّلُ وَلَا إِذْهَابُ}
\]

And when the wild nations are assembled.\(^{18}\)

And all the nations of the world will come into close contact with one another:

\[
\text{وَلَا أَتْقَرُّ وَلَا رَجُتُ}
\]

And when men are united.\(^{19}\)

Magazines, newspapers, pamphlets etc. will be published in abundance:

\[
\text{وَلَا أَلْصُقُ وَلَا نَرَتُ}
\]

And when the books are spread.\(^{20}\)

These and many other prophecies like these are found more or less about every age, but most of them can particularly be applied to our own times. The detailed description of the age we live in, which distinguishes itself from all the previous ages, has been made with such a clarity in these reports that it simply baffles the human intellect. This engenders new faith in the Holy Prophet's visions. By pointing towards all these aspects, the Ahmadiyyah Movement has, in fact, opened up a new path for the truth of Islam and of Islamic traditions.

**Ahmadiyyat is the only interpretation of these visions**

The Holy Prophet was not only shown, thirteen hundred years ago, what was going to happen to Islam but also what catastrophe the world was going to face. He mentioned all these events in his reports. Similarly the appearance of the Promised Messiah and the coming in existence of the Ahmadiyyah Movement is also a link in the chain of these events. As all other things indicate the truthfulness of the Holy Prophet, a similar purpose is served by

\(^{18}\) The Qur'an, 81: 5.
\(^{19}\) Ibid., 81: 7.
\(^{20}\) Ibid., 81: 10.
the existence of Ahmadiyyat in this age. All the events mentioned
above were intimately connected with the appearance of the Pro-
mised Messiah. The coming of the Messiah before the fulfilment
of these signs was not possible. If such signs have been fulfilled,
Messiah should also come, as these happenings are intertwined
with his appearance. But if only a few signs have come true and
for the fulfilment of the rest we have to wait, then we could also
wait for the coming of the Messiah. If all such events have taken
place, why should the coming of Messiah, the nucleus of the whole
evidence be delayed indefinitely? The prevalence of Islam over
other religions according to Hadith is related with his advent. If
Gog and Magog have dominated the globe we inhabit and they
have captured all the wealth and power of the world, if Antichrist
is leading humanity astray, and if Muslims have entirely lost
touch with the Qur’an and are lamentably involved in wranglings
and are slinging mud at one another on minor differences, if
their ‘ulama’, devoid of all understanding of truth and reality, are
engaged in letter worship, and the real faith, as the tradition goes,
has been raised up to the Pleides, if all this has happened and
Islam has been completely surrounded with all sorts of misfortunes,
then can it be the work of God Almighty and All-wise that Islam
should suffer on all sides but His promise of its deliverance should
remain unfulfilled till this dire hour of need? This is, however, not
possible. If a little thought is given to this point it will be easily
seen that the manifestation of the Promised Messiah is more
evident than all these matters. Because it was he who directed our
attention to these happenings in the world, to show that all these
events go to fulfil the prophecies and visions of the Holy Prophet.
Every sign was before us but we could not see into it; we read
about it in the books of hadith day and night but could not under-
stand it. There was a veil of darkness over our eyes as well as
over the eyes of those who were worldly-wise otherwise, or the
‘ulama’ or the so-called spiritual leaders. It was Mirza Ghulam
Ahmad who tore asunder this veil of ignorance and there appeared
from beneath it, shining proofs for the truthfulness of the Holy
Prophet. Had the Founder not appeared, all these things would
have remained hidden from the world. In spite of the fact that
there are hundreds of events by which the dreams and visions of the Holy Prophet have been fulfilled, but the sole and single interpretation of all of them is Aḥmadiyyat.

**Aḥmadiyyat is a true interpretation of Islam**

Aḥmadiyyat is not only an interpretation of the prophecies and visions of the Holy Prophet but also it is a true interpretation of Islam. It is neither a different religion nor a different sect, as has been explained before, but is only a great movement for the spread of Islam. But as the preaching of Islam demands that Islam should be presented in its true form and all the stains and blots from its beautiful face should be removed to make it a source of attraction to the peoples, Almighty Allah gave this insight to the **Mujaddid** of this age that he saw the visions of the Holy Prophet come true, and favoured him with the spiritual insight of discovering all the erroneous beliefs which stood against the very progress of Islam. Aḥmadiyyat is thus a representation of Islam in the simple and pure form which attracted the world before and is even doing so now. In other words, Aḥmadiyyat is a true interpretation of the teachings of Islam and the Qur'ān. And the thing which distinguishes it from the other sects of Islam is only this that it removes the errors which had found place in Islamic teachings and manifests the inherent beauties of Islam which were thrown into oblivion by Muslims so that Islam may attract the world once again. Islam is a living religion which presents God Who is a living reality, Who spoke to His righteous servants before, and Who speaks with His righteous servants even now and will continue to do so for ever. Like His attributes of hearing and seeing, His attribute of communication with human beings has never been suspended. Although prophethood has come to an end, God's communication with His servants has not been stopped. But Muslims generally thought that God spoke before, but after the Holy Prophet, the doors of revelation were closed for ever. Special stress has been laid by the Aḥmadiyyah Movement on this point of God speaking with man. That religion is dead, by following which man cannot attain the stage of communication with God. And as has been promised in the
Qur'ān and the Ḥadīth, God will always continue to speak with the righteous servants of this ummah.

Islam is a natural religion and appeals to the nature of man, the human nature being spontaneously attracted towards it. Unfortunately some of the Muslim leaders fell under the impression that Islam could be propagated with physical force also. Such thoughts were given free expression about the advent of Maḥmūd, and the objections raised by non-Muslims with regard to the spread of Islam with sword were thus strengthened by Muslims themselves. This caused great hatred among non-Muslims against Islam which subsequently obstructed the way of the propagation of Islam. It was Aḥmadiyyat which clarified the whole issue by emphasising the point that there was no compulsion in religion. Islam has been drawing people under its fold because of its beautiful teachings. It is the natural religion of mankind, a simple religion, devoid of all ethical and ritualistic intricacies. Even an illiterate person can understand its teachings. But Fiqh (jurisprudence) made the whole affair very complex. Simple beliefs and teachings of Islam gave place to hair-splitting logical discussions that did no good, except paralyse the practical life of Muslims. The Aḥmadiyyah Movement regained the lost original simplicity of Islam by placing the Qur'ān above everything else which was the real source of the teachings of Islam. The Ḥadīth comes next wherein the Holy Prophet has explained and interpreted the teachings of the Qur'ān. Fiqh which is not the original source of the details of our life should not be given preference over the Qur'ān or Ḥadīth.

Islam is a rational religion. The Qur'ān very often enjoins its readers to apply their intellect, reason and understanding in matters of faith. But the 'ulamā' in their narrow-mindedness reached the stage that anybody who tried to understand religious matters on an intellectual level was dubbed as heretic. Aḥmadiyyat again threw light on this aspect and proved the authenticity of the principles of faith on rational basis and showed that reason and faith did not stand apart. They both supplemented each other,

Reason proved the necessity and veracity of religion and gave light and guidance to reason. But some 'ulama' of to-day regarded science and scientific knowledge against religion and forbade Muslims to have any secular education. The Ahmadiyyah Movement helped in removing such misunderstandings from Muslim minds and made it clear that the material progress of the world would also, in the long run, lead mankind to higher spiritual progress beneficial to the cause of humanity. The denial of spiritual values was only due to lack of real knowledge of faith. With the progress of knowledge Islam would also progress, for it was a rational religion, a religion that encouraged scientific outlook on life.

Islam is truly a liberal and tolerant religion. It regards the entire human race as one nation and declares that like physical and natural laws, there is only one spiritual law for the whole of humanity and that every nation had its spiritual leaders who called people to righteousness. But this prominent feature of Islam was completely ignored. It was Ahmadiyyat which threw light on this point as well and laid emphasis on the fact that the prophets were sent to every nation and thus revived the liberal and universal outlook of Islam.

Islam is a progressive religion. Although the principles of Faith have been laid down in the Qur'ân and their explanations have been given in Hadîth to some extent according to the needs, but as Islam is universal in its concept and man is faced with a host of new problems with the advancement of civilization, the doors of 'ijtihâd (exercise of judgment) in Islam have not been closed. That is according to the needs of every age and every country people have the right to work out their own laws best suited to their own requirements under the guidance of the Qur'ân and Hadîth.

Islam is no doubt a religion of unity and fraternity. According to the clear injunctions of the Qur'ân nobody has any right to excommunicate a brother Muslim from Islam who declares his faith in the unity of God and Prophethood of Muhammed. But in this age different sects among Muslims thought that salvation was their exclusive privilege and each declared the other to be
heretics and the inmates of hell. Ahmadiyyat revived the principle again that all the professors in the Kalimah were Muslims and nobody could dub a person kāfir who declared that There is no god but God: Muḥammad is the messenger of God.

Before Islam religion was considered to be a combination of outward rituals and ceremonies, a source of getting future reward or escaping from future punishment. Islam gave a new turn to the conception of religion and associated it with day to day activities of man, and made it a source of development of human faculties. Muslims again had forgotten this great fact about the teachings of Islam to which Aḥmadiyyat drew their attention. The Ahmadiyyah Movement has also thrown light on many other problems concerning Islam. Below I discuss in detail these distinguishing features of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement.

**Distinguishing Features of the Ahmadiyyah Movement**

For common people the question of Jesus Christ’s death is perhaps the only distinguishing feature of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement. This, however, is not correct. There is no doubt in it that this Movement has done a lot to clarify this point: as it was an obstacle in the way of the propagation of Islam, and the claim of the Founder as the Promised Messiah is also based on this. If Jesus Christ is alive, his claim cannot be correct and if he is dead then certainly there is no other Messiah except Mīrza Ghulām Aḥmad of Qādiān in this ummah, but the greatest distinguishing feature of Aḥmadiyyat is that it has revived the almost dead concept of God’s communication with men. The foremost task to which the Founder devoted his attention after his claim of being a mujaddid was to demonstrate this truth once more to the world that God still spoke to His righteous servants. This was, in fact, the main theme of his first book, the Barāhīn Aḥmadiyyah; and even after this he has not laid so much emphasis on Jesus Christ’s death as on this subject. The basis of his claim, in fact, was the point that communion of God with man has been continued and will remain so for ever. His real claim was that of mujaddidiyyat and a mujaddid (renovator) is a muḥaddath whom God appoints to uphold the cause of religion. And muḥaddath is a person who is not a prophet but
God communicates with him frequently. Thus the basis of the Founder’s claim is that, in spite of the finality of Prophethood, God speaks with the righteous persons in this ummah. The claim of his being the Promised Messiah is a part and parcel of his claim to majaddidyyat; it is just one aspect of his claim of being a mujaddid. This aspect, no doubt, is based on the conception of the death of Jesus Christ but the basis of his real claim, that is of his being the renovator, is the phenomenon of Divine communication. If we go through the matter a little carefully we find that for the revival of faith in religion the first point is to prove the authenticity of Divine communication with man as this is what has been most vehemently denied in this age. The conception of a mechanical God in the form of the cause of causes is even admitted by a materialist but the real foundation of religion was, and is, on the fact of God’s communication with man. One book or the other is considered to be the word of God by various nations of the world which shows that the basis of almost all religions is the phenomenon of Divine revelation. But there is no religion except Islam that advocates that even now God communicates with man as He used to do before. It has been expressly mentioned in the teachings of Islam that Gods’ speaking with man is one of His attributes and God’s attributes are never suspended. But this concept was so much weakened even among Muslims that for all practical purposes they had neglected this phenomenon. Wahabism was a strong movement in Islam which appeared before the advent of Ahmadiyyah Movement, but its followers, called Ahl Hadith (people of the Hadith) also believed that God’s communication with men was meant for times gone by, although in authentic hadith it was clearly mentioned that there would be persons in this nation who would not be prophets and yet God would communicate with them. Under the influence of modern education, Sir Sayid Ahmad Khan of Aligarh went rather far in this respect and entirely rejected the conception of God’s revelation to human beings. He thought that revelation only emanated from man’s own heart. This was in fact the ultimate result of that attitude which Muslims had gradually adopted towards religion. If this fundamental fact of revelation was thrown overboard, nothing was left of religion. As has been
discussed before, the whole structure of religion stands on this foundation. If it is said that God used to speak before and has ceased to do so now, then His speaking only becomes a narrative of the past. Such an attitude creates serious doubts as to the very institution of religion. If God spoke before, He speak now. If He does not do so then we have no proof that He ever did so before. If speaking is a Divine attribute it could not be limited to one particular age. The first and the greatest task of Ahmadiyyat was to clarify this point that God the Most High communicates with His righteous servants. Accordingly the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement established this point from the Qur'ān and Hadith that Divine communication had not come to an end. The Qur'ān clearly mentions that besides prophets, the gift of God's revelation was also given to the pious and righteous servants of the previous nations, for instance, to the mother of Moses: And We revealed to Moses' mother, says the Qur'ān, and to the disciples of Jesus Christ: When I revealed to the disciples. At both these places the word wahy has been used. Again, about the righteous persons of the ummah of Muḥammad it has been mentioned:

\[\text{إِنَّ الْمُتَّقَينَ كَالْوَارِقُونَ يَأْتِينَهُمُ الْمَلَائِكَةُ مُبَارَكَةً وَأَلْقَى عَلَى هُمْ أَطْرَافَهُمُ الْمِلَامِحُ وَكَانُونَانَ\]

Those who say, our Lord is Allāh, then continue in the right way, the angels descend upon them, saying: Fear not, nor be grieved.

At another place we find:

\[\text{لاَمَّا أَنَّكُمْ فِي الْحِيْرَةِ الْأَرْضِيَةِ} \]

They shall have good news in this world's life.

23. Ibid., 5:111.
24. Ibid., 41:39.
25. Ibid., 10:64.
THE TRUE CONCEPTION OF AHMADIYYAH MOVEMENT

Again, in an authentic hadith it has been mentioned:

\[\text{مَكَّتِيِّنِ فِي النُّبُوتِ رَبُّ قَدْ خَرَجَ مِنْ الْمُبَشِّرَاتِ}

There has remained nothing of prophet-hood except mubahsharat (good news).\(^{26}\)

In another report we find: Among those that were lived before you of the Israelites, there were men who were spoken to by God, though they were not prophets, and if there is one among my followers, it is ‘Umar.\(^{27}\) All the saints (auliya’) of the ummat have agreed to this point — even Mujaddid Alf Thâni of Sirhind who has been very near to our times has particularly laid stress on it — that God communicates also with muhaddathin as He did with the prophets of yore.

The testimony of the Qur’ân and Hadîth and the saints of this nation could only be an evidence for Muslims but as atheism and materialism were rampant in this age, it became essential that all nations should be provided with a conclusive proof of this living reality. The mujaddid of this age was, therefore, appointed to show that God actually spoke with man, and this favour could be obtained even today by righteous Muslims. So he challenged the followers of other religions to give any proof of such a Divine favour by following their respective religions. He put his own self as an example to make such favours of God known to the world. In the Barâhîn Ahmadiyyah he has mentioned many prophecies which had come true and had also made a very forceful assertion that it was only in Islam that Divine communcication was continued and therefore Islam was the only living religion in the world. All the other religions failed to help their followers to achieve this high stage of communication with God. It was in this way that he put forward his own person as a living example for the truth and supremacy of Islam. The same fact lay concealed under his prophecies, that is to say, that they were advanced in support of the truth of Islam. They were indeed a sign for him but they

\(^{26}\) Al-Bukhârî, 92 : 5.

\(^{27}\) Ibid., Al-Muslim.
were also signs for the truth of Islam.

The second distinction: Islam is not spread by sword

Islam, as pointed out, is a natural religion of man:

\[
\text{فَطَّرَ اللَّهُ الْجِبَارُ الْخَالِقُ}
\]

The nature made by Allāh in which He has made man.\(^{28}\)

By natural religion is meant that its principles are such as have been reposed in man's nature which is voluntarily attracted towards them. So much so that according to a report by the Prophet every child is born in Islam whether it is born in the house of a Jew, a Christian or a polytheist. Obviously, there need not be any compulsion in accepting what is harmonious with man's nature. The next principle, therefore, laid down by Islam is that there is no compulsion in religion.\(^{29}\)

If we search the records of history of the time of the Holy Prophet we find that no historian has made reference even to a single incident where a person was forced to accept Islam by the Prophet or where a war was waged by him against a nation for the purpose of spreading Islam among them. But in spite of all this, European writers have drawn such a picture of Islam and its founder as if people were converted to Islam at the point of sword. The main object of such a propaganda was only to create hatred among the European peoples against Islam. The Western domination in the world has also helped to spread this false view far and wide among all the nations of the world. In India the Arya Samājists lent a helping hand to the Christian missionaries in propagating such calumnies against Islam. On the other hand the conception of the coming of a Mahdī among Muslims also strengthened such misunderstandings. Shi'ah, Sunnī, Ahl Ḥadīth and other sects of Muslims came to believe about the advent of such a Mahdī who was going to propagate Islam by means of the sword. The result was that from Muslims' side no attempt was made to remove the misunderstanding which had resulted in hatred against Islam thus creating formidable obstacles in the way.

\(^{28}\) The Qur'ān, 30 : 30.

\(^{29}\) Ibid., 2 : 256.
of its progress. The Ahmadiyyah Movement used all its resources to clear Islam of such a charge. The removal of this fundamental mistake has rather become a distinctive feature in all its literature. So much so that the Founder's claim of being the Mahdi was to root out this false notion about Islam from the minds of Muslims and non-Muslims alike. This, in other words, means that Islam does not stand in need of any sword whatsoever for its propagation. Islam rejects the idea of the advent of a Mahdi who would wield sword for the spread of Islam. What was not lawful for and practised by the Holy Prophet — that is the spread of religion by force, — how could it be permissible for anybody else?

Ahmadiyyat and the killing of apostates

Islam believes neither in forced conversion nor keeping anybody within Islam at the point of sword. A general misconception prevails among Muslims that those who renounce Islam should be immediately put to death. This means that in a Muslim state if a Muslim goes over to another religion he can do so only at the risk of his life which implies that a sword is hung over the head of every Muslim to keep him in the fold of Islam. Ahmadiyyat made it clear that it is neither lawful to convert a person to Islam by force nor to keep him Muslim under the threat of sword. The firm principle of the Qur'an:

\[\text{لَا إِكْرَاهُ فِي الدِّينِ} \]

i.e., there is no compulsion in religion, applies under both the conditions with equal force. That is to say, if a person wants to come over to Islam from unbelief or wants to go over to unbelief from Islam, in either case, no force and threat can be used against him. The mistake committed by our Jurists was that when some one after recanting Islam murdered a Muslim and he was sentenced to death by Holy Prophet for this crime they did not care to differentiate that this punishment was given to him for the murder and not for apostasy. Similarly anybody who deserted Islam and joined the hostile forces during the time of war was liable to be punished with

30. The Qur'aan, 2 : 256.
death. The chief reason for such an action against him might not have been apostasy but his treachery and going over to the enemy’s camp. Instances of mere apostasy or changing of one’s religion have been referred to in the Qur’ān but the punishment of death was never recommended for them. On the contrary, it was also not always necessary to wage war against such persons. For instance in chapter *The Woman* 31 certain apostates have been mentioned who did not fight against Muslims, and Muslims were also enjoined not to fight against them. In another chapter, *The Family of Amran*, the plans of the Jews of Medinah have been exposed who wanted to dishearten Muslims by accepting Islam in the morning and denouncing it in the evening.32 If apostates were put to death the carrying out of such a plan was impossible. At another place it is mentioned that if anybody renounced Islam the religion of God would not be weakened. If a person turned back from his religion, Allāh would bring a party to Islam instead.33 The Qur’ānic commandments and the historical records make this point clear that mere apostasy was not punishable with death. In this age it is Ahmadiyyat which has clarified this issue and has thus removed the stain from the beautiful face of Islam that it could only maintain and spread itself at the point of sword or that it had no spiritual force to keep itself alive.

**Ahmadiyyat and Jihad**

Emphasis by the Ahmadiyyah Movement on the point that sword has nothing to do with the propagation of Islam has led many people to believe that Ahmadiyyat has abrogated the Islamic doctrine of *jihād*. This charge is absolutely baseless. Every Ahmadi believes in every jot and tittle of the Qur’ān. When the doctrine of *jihād* forms a part of the Qur’ān, no command of which can ever be abrogated, how can Ahmadi Śī holds concede to such a belief. Therefore the doctrine of *jihād* is as valid for them as for other Muslims. *Jihād* was supposed to mean the spreading of Islam with sword and with this conception of course Ahmadiyyat did not agree.

---

31. The Qur’ān, 4 : 89, 90.
32. Ibid., 3 : 71.
33. Ibid., 5 : 54.
It made it clear that the significance of *jihād* was to exert oneself for a cause and sword was not necessary for such an exertion. Carrying the message of the Qur'ān to the world was also declared to be *jihād* by the Qur'ān:

And strive against them a mighty striving with it (the Qur'ān).  

This chapter of the Qur'ān is admittedly Makkan in origin when fighting was not permitted to Muslims and still preaching of the Qur'ān had been called the greatest *Jihād*. Indeed *Jihād* with sword was only meant for the defence of Islam or for the defence of the Muslim nation, the chief condition of which was that the enemy should first attack Muslims by sword. It was then that it became obligatory on Muslims to defend themselves with sword. But contrary to this the killing of non-Muslims without any rhyme or reason was considered to be the real *jihād* by the ignorant people. This was absolutely against the teachings of Islam. Mirza Ghulām Ahmad of Qādiān has thrown light on this point and has explained that there is a *jihād* which man can always carry on for Islam and that is exerting oneself spiritually in the way of God and doing one’s best to preach the message of Islam to others, and there is a *jihād* with sword which can be resorted to under particular conditions for the defence of the nation or of Islam. For instance, the initiative of attack is taken by the other nation, and this condition is mentioned in both the places in the Qur'ān where permission to fight has been given to Muslims:

Permission (to fight) is given to those on whom war is made because they are oppressed, or

Fight in the way of Allāh against those who fight against you.

35. Ibid., 25:52.
36. Ibid., 2:160.
It was this kind of *Jihād* about which Mirza Ghulām Ahmād had written:

*لَا شَكَّ أَنَّ وُجُوهَ الْأُجْهَالِ مَعْنَى هذِهِ الْلَّومِينَ وُهْرَةُ أَيْلِكَ*  

*There is no doubt in this that the conditions of *Jihād* are not to be found in this age and in this country.*

This is true because there is no party at war with Muslims at this time in India. When a Hindu leader *i.e.* Gandhiji showed the path of non-violence to Indians even some of the ‘ulamā’ followed him but when the Founder said that conditions for *jihād* with sword did not exist, these ‘ulamā’ raised a great hue and cry against him. And to-day all Muslims believe that conditions of *jihād* with sword in fact do not exist at the time in this country. *Jihād* by virtue of its being a Qur’ānic command is never abrogated in the sight of an Ahmadi, neither *jihād* in the general sense nor in the particular sense, which is carried on in the form of *qītal* (fighting).

**The third distinction: The Qur’ān must be given precedence over everything else**

All Muslims agree that the Qur’ān is the real source of guidance for Muslims. All the Islamic principles are mentioned in it, and this pure book is in our hands in exactly the same form in which it was revealed to the Prophet Muḥammad. The status of Ḥadīth, though a collection of the reports of the Holy Prophet, is not in any way equal to that of the Qur’ān, and that it has not been so carefully preserved as the Qur’ān. Firstly, because the Ḥadīth gives only the sense of what the Prophet said and his actual words have not been preserved entirely and, secondly, the fabricated reports have also found place in the works of Ḥadīth. Islamic *Fiqh* (jurisprudence) which although the result of the exercise of judgement (*ijtiḥād*) by the great *Imāms*, cannot be held above the Qur’ān or Ḥadīth. A jurist does err, sometimes in spite of his profound knowledge and good intentions. Moreover, *Fiqh* is concerned only with those matters which have not been

expressly mentioned in the Qur'ān or Ḥadīth because it is only then that the need of ijtiḥād arises. As a matter of belief, though Muslims consider the Qur'ān above everything else, practically they attach more importance to Fīqh over the Qur'ān and the Ḥadīth. The general attitude of the Ahl Sunnah wal Jamā'ah relating to all matters of principles of religion or a portion thereof is that they should refer to one of the four Imāms and according to the Ahl Ḥadīth (Wahābīs), reference should be made to the Traditions of the Prophet. The argument brought forward in the first case is that Imāms had a better understanding of the Qur'ān than common Muslims and if perchance there seems to be a difference between the Qur'ān and the ijtiḥād of an Imām, they should better follow the Imām, as his knowledge and understanding of the Qur'ān was much superior to their own knowledge. And according to the Ahl Ḥadīth, if any difference exists between a Ḥadīth and a verse of the Qur'ān it should be solved in the light of the Ḥadīth, the latter being the saying of the Holy Prophet who had again the better understanding of the Qur'ān. Doubtless we should all bow our heads in complete submission to the sayings of the Holy Prophet but the difficulty is that all the words of aḥādīth are not the actual words uttered by the Holy Prophet. Only the sense of his utterances has been conveyed to us and the words of the reports which are at present before us, are in most cases the words of the reporters. As compared to this the words of the Qur'ān are definitely the same which were revealed to the Prophet; therefore, if we place the Ḥadīth over the Qur'ān it would mean that we are giving a higher status to words, which are not certain, over the Divine communication which is absolute and certain in every respect. Besides this, the compilers of Ḥadīth have very often differed themselves about the authenticity of a ḥadīth. One ḥadīth may be accepted by Tirmidhī or Abū Dāwūd but not by Bukhārī and Muslim. Again, a ḥadīth accepted by Muslim may be rejected by Bukhārī. Even the aḥādīth collected in Bukhārī have been criticised although the book has been regarded as the most correct book after the Book of God. It has been, however, declared the most correct book as compared only to the Qur'ān because the authenticity of the Qur'ān, unlike Ḥadīth,
cannot be doubted. Thus if we observe any contradiction between the Qur'ān and a hadith, in all cases the Qur'ān should be given preference over hadith. If a contradiction is found the hadith should be interpreted to make it fall in conformity with the Qur'ān or else it should be rejected. The question of ijtihād of Muslim Imāms is more clear than this. No doubt their knowledge of the Qur'ān and Ḥadith was greater than ours but they were after all not infallible. Was it not possible for them to commit an error at some place while interpreting the Qur'ān? Was their knowledge of the Qur'ān equal to God's knowledge and free from the possibility of all errors? Again many times it happens that an Imām gives a judgement on the basis of a Qur'ānic verse but fails to notice another verse which is more explicit on the subject. The instance of ʿUmar is well known who exhorted Muslims not to exceed a certain limit in fixing up nuptial gifts (mahīr), otherwise the excess amount would be deposited to the Bait al-Māl (Public Treasury). An old lady stood up and argued with him by quoting the verse:

\[\text{And (if) you have given one of them a heap of gold, take nothing out of it\textsuperscript{38}}\]

which proves that even a heap of gold could be offered to a woman in marriage. ʿUmar immediately apologized for his mistake as he had not thought of this particular verse at that time. This does not mean that the woman's knowledge of the Qur'ān was greater than that of ʿUmar. Similarly, if a particular verse escapes any Imām's notice, this does not go to slight his knowledge of the Qur'ān. Again in matters of Ḥadīth also he may err in his judgement, either being unaware of a particular report or forgetting it while contemplating over a subject. The Qur'ān and Ḥadīth, therefore, should always be given preference over fiqh or the ijtihād of the Imāms. This mistake which has been referred to above is found among all the Muslim sects. Practically, all of them give preference to the sayings of their respective Imāms over

the Qur'ān, with the result that this Divine Book has been relegated to the background. It is recited in prayers or for further reward of course but fiqh is considered to be the real Shari'ah of Islam. The natural beauty and simplicity of Islam has been lost in the labyrinth of arduous and nerve-wrecking questions which have ultimately sapped the energy of Muslim nation. The principles of Islam which had arrested the hearts of other peoples have become like riddles by the inclusion of such intricacies, which in the end blocked the progress of Islam. Books depicting the teachings of Islam written by European Christians were chiefly based on the works of fiqh and they tried to excite hatred against Islam among the Europeans by presenting before them a confused and complicated picture of the simple doctrines and beliefs of Islam. To remove all these misunderstandings and revive the movement for the preaching of Islam it was, however, essential that the original simplicity of Islam be restored. This was the work that Ahmadiyyah Movement accomplished by laying due emphasis on the importance of the Qur'ān in a Muslim’s life. The Founder explained not only the right place of the Holy Qur’ān as compared to the hadith and fiqh but also directed his whole attention to the study and teachings of the Qur’ān. For the reformation of Muslims and for the propagation of Islam among non-Muslims he used the Qur’ān as his chief instrument. In his poems along with his expression of love for the Prophet Muḥammad, his love for and devotion to the Qur’ān has also been fully manifested. The object of all this was that Muslims should develop a real thirst for the Qur’ān and consider it a panacea for all their ills and the basis of all their progress. They should go ahead with it to conquer the world as they did before in the early days of Islam. Whatever success the Ahmadiyyah Movement has achieved in its missionary activities is due to the fact that it has placed the Qur'ān above everything else. Although the Ahmadiyyah Movement fully respect the hadith and thereafter the ijtihād of the Imāms and after the Qur'ān they refer to and accept these two as sources of information on religious matters, yet their main energy is spent in disseminating the knowledge of the Qur'ān which was the real source of the life of Muslims before, and it is the Qur'ān which is still capable of giving them
life. The *fiqh* throws light on certain details of our religion and the *hadith*, apart from this, contains valuable teachings for high morals but the Qur'ān is far superior to both of them. It not only lays down the principles of religion, or sheds light on certain fundamental problems or teaches the highest morals to men but also generates faith in God and creates in man the will for action. And this faith is the real source of all religious life. In short, by giving preference to the Qur'ān the Ahmadiyyah Movement has set up the right basis of reformation among Muslims and preaching of Islam among non-Muslims.

**Glory of the Qur'ān manifested**

Ahmadiyyat not only gave preference to the Qur'ān, not only expressed its love for it and not only popularized its teachings but also, above all, proved that it was a book of great knowledge and learning. Mirza Ghulām Aḥmad in his earlier writings based all his arguments on this Divine Book whether these were in support of Islam or for repudiation of some other false doctrines. In important discussions and controversies his usual practice was to go through the whole of the Qur'ān from beginning to end and derive all his conclusions from it. While debating with a Christian Missionary 'Abd Allāh Ātham, in 1893 C.E., he laid before him the principle that whatever claims or arguments were advanced from either party, should be based on their respective religious scriptures. He followed this principle throughout this written controversy and deduced all his claims and arguments in favour of Islam or against Christianity from the Qur'ān.³⁹ But the Christian Missionary could not fulfill this condition. Similarly in his lecture delivered at the Religious Conference held at Lahore in 1897 C.E. in reply to the five fundamental religious questions put forward by the organisers of the meeting, the Founder kept in view the same principle.⁴⁰ This distinctive feature of the Qur'ān not only gives it preference over other sacred Books but also is a strong argument for its being revealed from God. For

---

³⁹. This controversy was published under the title *Jang-i-Muqaddas*—T.
⁴⁰. The *Teachings of Islam* is an English translation of this lecture—T.
it is impossible for a man to comprehend all the claims and furnish all the arguments necessary thereof in establishing the truth and refuting falsehood in every form for all times to come. Thus in this way he firmly established the glory and grandeur of the Qur'ān which cannot be denied by any wise person. The literature published today by the Ahmadiyyah Movement reflects this main characteristic of the Qur'ān that its greatness can be manifested on rational grounds.

The fourth distinction: Islam is an intellectual and scientific religion

From among the sacred scriptures, the Qur'ān is perhaps the only Book that has laid emphasis on the application of reason and intellect. The principles of religion have been undoubtedly taught by Divine revelation. Human intellect does not discover them as their discovery is beyond its reach; these principles are according to the nature of man and are also in conformity with man's intellect. That is why the Qur'ān has enjoined the use of intellect in understanding whatever has been revealed therein. To discover God and His attributes is above the human faculties; because whatever is discovered by intellect is also subjected to it. If man was capable of discovering God and also His attributes, he was also capable of overpowering Him which is, however, not possible. Man can discover the laws of nature and the properties of matter and can overpower and utilize them for his own benefit but God is far above from him. It is God Who is his Lord and Master and it is He Who manifests Himself to man. This manifestation is done in the form of revelation, which is one of the sources of man's knowledge and is superior to his intellect. Nevertheless it is true also that matters which are revealed to man by God are not, and naturally should not be, against human intellect, because intellect after all is also a God-given power in man. Therefore, whatever is unacceptable to man's intellect and his nature cannot be meant for him. Now if we think over it a little carefully we find that the existence of God, His unity, His attributes of Rabūbiyyat (Lordsip), His Beneficence and Mercifulness, His promise of reward and threat of punishment for man's actions etc. all these are under-
standable. But the belief in the Trinity—Three in One and One in
Three—or in the Atonement—the taking of all the sins of humanity
by one person on his shoulders—or transmigration of souls cannot
be accepted when judged on rational grounds.

As the principles of Islam are in harmony with man’s intellect,
therefore it has been enjoined on its followers that they should
also apply their intellect for understanding the details of these
principles. This is indeed what is called the exercise of judgement
(‘ijtiḥād). Islam is thus a rational religion in respect of its principles
and its details. For this reason there was no priestcraft, monkhood
or papacy in Islam, but unfortunately in imitation of other religions
a privileged class of the Mullahs also came into existence among
Muslims. If the use of intellect was encouraged, the authority of
such people could not be maintained, therefore they prohibited the
use of intellect in religious matters. Anybody who raised an
intellectual question was dubbed as kāfir and atheist. In the
progress of Islam this again was a great obstacle which was removed
by Ahmadiyyat. Thus it was shown to the world that Islam was,
in fact, the rational religion and its teachings and beliefs were open
to intellectual criticism.

Intelect and knowledge go side by side. When man applies
his intellect to a matter he advances in his knowledge too. Thus,
when Islam enjoined its followers to make use of their reasoning
faculties and even in matters religious its use, unlike other religions,
was not forbidden, the result was that the Arabs who were an
illiterate people became the torch-bearers of scientific knowledge to
mankind and the light that was shown in Arabia illuminated the
whole world. The Holy Qur’ān itself is a source of great know-
ledge and wisdom, that is why it has been named al-Qur’ān al-Ḥakīm
i.e., the Qur’ān full of wisdom, for it has set up the very foundation
of religion on science and has given a rational basis to the principles
of religion. All the baffling problems of religion such as existence
of God, His Unity, Divine revelation, reward and punishment of
actions, conception of hell and heaven etc., have been explained
in a philosophical way. It is not only the religious truths that
have been explained rationally but also attention has been drawn
to material sciences. By the use of his knowledge man can over-
power the forces of nature and utilize them for his own benefit. Whatever is between heaven and earth is subservient to him. It has been repeatedly mentioned in the Qur'ān that man can control the seas, mountains, winds and other forces of nature. At one place such persons have been called "men of understanding" in the Qur'ān, that is the possessors of wisdom who also remember Allāh and reflect on the creation of heaven and earth. It is evident that the starting-point of all the material sciences is the reflection on God's creation. The religious narrow-mindedness has often stood in the way of scientific progress several examples of which can be met with in Christian history. When Western scholars opened new avenues for scientific discoveries, after getting light from the Islamic sources, the priestly class declared them the worst kind of infidels, followers of Satan and heretics, and tortured them in every possible way. Contrary to this, in Islam, with the progress of spiritual and religious teachings, Muslims did not lag behind in scientific and philosophical knowledge. We find a group of historians, philosophers, and scientists working along with the group of religious teachers, Imāms and jurists. It is a curious fact of history that when Muslims gave up Islam for worldly gains their material progress also came to a halt. Disgrace, illiteracy and ignorance followed in its wake and their condition became like those Christians who once declared scientific progress to be a great heresy. This brought on their heads all sorts of miseries and misfortunes, and ignorance prevailed on a large scale among them. Ahmadiyyat once more established a healthy relation between intellectual and spiritual truths to combat the false conception that knowledge and human intellect were incompatible with religion and spirituality.

New light about interpreting the Qur'ān

The most beneficial work in this respect done by Ahmadiyyat was to interpret the Qur'ān in a scientific and literary manner. There was a time when ordinary matters mentioned in the Qur'ān were interpreted by fanciful and imaginary stories with the result
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that the new generation of Muslims having modern outlook on life thought such fantastic stories to be the part of the Qur'ān and expressed their disgust at them and at the book which incorporated them. The 'ulamā' instead of removing such doubts started levying anathemas of heresy against everybody who differed with them even in minor details of religion or who did not accept the stories of the Qur'ānic commentators as next to the word of God or who gave vent to any objection against religion. At this crucial moment Ahmadiyyat without caring for the fatwās of kufr fought against the ignorance and the narrowmindedness of the 'ulamā'. It showed to the world that the Qur'ān is clear of all such spurious matter and that scientific research in different spheres of knowledge, in fact, does not go against the spirit of religion. Religion was not subjugated by science, as was thought by the educated Muslims of the age, rather science was to follow the higher values of spiritual life to ensure real peace in the world. While interpreting the Qur'ān, the Qur'ān itself should have the priority over everything else and then should come the Ḥadīth, but the Ḥadīth dealing with stories must be accepted after great caution and scrutiny. While consulting Arabic lexicons care should also be taken in selecting meanings of words. If a verse can be interpreted in two ways, according to the literal meaning of the words, preference should be given to that interpretation which does not go against history, human intellect or experience. Thus the Qur'ān at present is deemed as a book of great learning and science and has proved to be a guide and source of healing to ailing humanity. The whole Islamic literature, appearing today, seems to be saturated with this new spirit. As the Moslem World, a Christian quarterly, stated in its July 1931 C.E. issue, the translations of the Holy Qur'ān done by other Muslims resemble very closely the version of Ahmadiyyat.43

The fifth distinction: Revival of Islamic Brotherhood

From the beginning the message of Islam was meant for the whole of mankind. Arabs or non-Arabs, Iranians or Abyssinians,

43. For elaborate quotation see Muhammad ‘Ali’s Preface to the Qur’ān p. vii (fourth edition 1931 C.E.)—Ed.
were addressed by Islam. All these nations and religions, Christians or Jews, in short, all nations and religions who had deep-rooted enmity for one another were given a message of peace, brotherhood and tolerance. No religion can be universal in its teachings unless it is based on broad principles. In this respect no other religion can stand in comparison with Islam. Muslims were required not only to believe that truth was found in the other religions of the world, that the religious savants and the sacred scriptures of other nations were to be respected, that prophets and messengers were sent to every nation and country with Divine directions and revelations, and that there was light and guidance in the previous scriptures but also faith in the prophets and the sacred scriptures was made obligatory on every Muslim like faith in the Prophet Muḥammad and the Qurʾān. This liberal attitude attracted men’s hearts towards Islam. It was not only a theory but Islam in fact wanted to develop among its followers an outlook that all humanity should be considered one family, all mankind as one nation. The Qurʾān thus laid the foundation-stone of the unity of mankind when it declared:

\[
\text{كان الناس امة وحدة}
\]

*All people are a single nation.*

They are, however, not a nation in name only but their Lord is also one:

\[
\text{الحمد لله رب العالمين}
\]

*All praise is due to Allāh, the Lord (Rabb) of the worlds or nations.*

And Rabb is He Who fosters, brings up and nourishes things gradually to make them attain perfection. Thus to make different nations to attain perfection He sent His messengers in every age for their spiritual and moral upliftment. Every community had a

Messenger, every nation had a guide and a prophet, there is not a single nation where a warner has not appeared, such are the teachings of the Qur’ān not met with in any other scripture. Then among its followers Islam created such a spirit of brotherhood that after accepting Islam a monarch and a slave were treated alike in their capacity as Muslims. It was the result of this spirit of equality and fraternity that wherever Islam went, it attracted millions of people under its fold, because after accepting Islam nobody was asked to renounce the prophet or the sacred scripture in which he formerly believed. Thus every Muslim was enjoined to respect the spiritual leaders of every nation and country. This basic aspect of the Islamic teachings was unfortunately lost sight of by the Muslim ‘ulamā’ who started declaring their own brethren-in-faith infidels on minor differences. When narrow-mindedness takes such a strong hold on a nation, that its members fail to tolerate difference of opinion among themselves, how can they be tolerant towards other nations? In short, this mutual takfir (denouncing one another as heretics) destroyed the spirit of Islamic tolerance and liberty which was a source of bringing other people under its fold. Ahmadiyyat, however, revived once again this lost speciality of Islam. As far as other nations were concerned, the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement took another bold step and declared that Ramachandra and Krishna were also prophets of God raised in India according to the Qur’ānic verse:

\[
\text{And (We sent) messengers We have mentioned to thee before and messengers We have not mentioned to thee,}^{48}
\]

and that Vedas were also the revealed books of India.

Obviously, when the Qur’ān has declared it as a matter of principle that prophets have been raised in every nation and country, how is it possible that the Hindu nation which had a
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great civilisation of its own should have also lately remained
neglected by God, and no apostle should have been raised in that
nation? At the time of the conquest of Iran, the companions of
the Holy Prophet, under the same principle, treated the Fire-
worshippers (Zoroastrians) as the People of the Book. The
extension of this Islamic principle harbours the secret of the success
of Islam.

The sixth distinction: the door of ijtihād is open

However good and perfect principles may be given to a
nation, unless that nation has an opportunity for progress, such
principles cannot be of much use. Principles are like the roots of
a tree and the other details like its branches. If there is enough
space for the tree to spread its branches far and wide, its strong
roots indeed become a help for its proper growth. If there is no
scope for its branches to spread, its roots shall also soon shrivel and
cramp and cause an early death to the whole plant. The tree of
Islam had strong roots in the form of sound principles and its
branches had a great scope to spread because of the opening of the
door of ijtihād (exercise of judgment). Ijtihād means to exert one-
self and make use of one’s intelligence for some cause. This door
was kept open in Islam in respect of details of shari‘ah. In matters
of Law where no details were found in the Qur’ān and the Ḥadith,
Muslims could make use of their intellectual faculties for under-
standing and solving the new problems with which they might be
faced from time to time.

Islam is a universal religion in its scope and teachings, free
from and above all limitations of race, colour and nationality.
Although there was no religion to emerge after it, but human
needs are limitless and every age, nation and country is faced
with new problems for the solution and fulfilment of which human
faculties must be utilized. In other words, Divine revelation
existing in the Qur’ān in the form of wahy jalti (ولّى جلتی) or wahy
matluww (revelation which is recited) and in the Hadith in the form
of wahy khafti (inner revelation) man’s intellect has been given the
status for the working out of laws for human needs. It is also
evident that if no use is made of human faculties, they become
obsolete. Thus if Muslims were not guided to make use of their mental powers they would have suffered the same fate. Accordingly as long as they considered the door of *ijtiḥād* open and made use of their faculties of judgment they made progress in all walks of life. But after the death of some great Imāms when the door of *ijtiḥād* was considered to have been closed, their intellectual powers were also paralysed and their spiritual and material progress quickly came to cease. The Founder of the Āhmadiyya Movement removed this fatal misunderstanding from the minds of Muslims and showed them that the door of *ijtiḥād* was opened by the Prophet Muḥammad himself, and no one else has any right to close it. And none of the four Imāms had said anything contrary to it. The world of today has given rise to so many new problems that there is a growing need of rejudication and *ijtiḥād* in details of Law. By opening the door of *ijtiḥād* all over again, Āhmadiyyat has in fact opened new vistas for the progress of Islam and the Muslims.

**The seventh distinction: Unity among Muslims**

Islam which taught forbearance and tolerance to the extent that in spite of many vital differences it accepted the Divine origin of other religions, could not foster the feeling of intolerance and narrow-mindedness among its own followers towards one another. It could not teach them that for minor differences they should declare one another *kāfir*. The Qurʾān has, however, given a clear indication that anybody who accosts another brother Muslim with *assalāmu ‘alaikum* (peace be with you) should not be declared an unbeliever:

![La aṣlāmu ‘alaikum](image)

*Sāy not to any one who offers you (Islamic) salutation, Thou art not a believer.*

This means that we have no right to suspect or investigate his behaviour or go into the details of his beliefs for the sake of laying a charge of heresy against him. A person who accosts

---
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us with assalāmu ‘alaikum, in fact, considers himself to be a member of the Islamic brotherhood, and he who includes himself in this brotherhood cannot be turned out of it by anybody else. This is what has been the practice of the Holy Prophet. ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ubayy, a great hypocrite and a bitter opponent of Islam who never helped Muslims in their campaigns against the unbelievers and always instigated the enemy against Islam, was accepted as a Muslim by the Holy Prophet for the simple reason that ‘Abd Allāh outwardly declared himself to be a member of the Islamic brotherhood. The Holy Prophet said the funeral service for him after his death and prayed for him. In one of the reports the Prophet has said:

\[
\text{لا كفر أهل بيكنك}
\]

Do not declare the people of your Qiblah as kāfirs,\(^{50}\)

which means that as long as a person includes himself among the Ahl Qiblah (People of the Qiblah) nobody has any right to denounce him as a heretic. The object of this teaching and the repeated emphasis on this point was to maintain unity among Muslims, for unity is the basis of a nation’s strength. The nation which is torn within itself can neither make any progress nor face its opponents. The first condition of unity in Islam, therefore, is that its followers should consider one another as brethren. The Holy Prophet also gave various illustrations to make Muslims understand this point. Once he said that Muslims were like one organism; if any part of this organism was injured the whole system was affected.\(^{51}\) Thus if a group or sect of Muslims was suffering it would affect the whole nation. At another occasion he said that a Muslim should refrain from attacking the life, property or honour of his brother Muslim.\(^{52}\) Again, once he compared Muslims to a strong wall every part of which contributed to its strength, and if a part was weakened it would bring the other parts to the ground.\(^{53}\) The

\(^{50}\) Sahīh al-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-Adab.

\(^{51}\) Sahīh Muslim, Kitāb al-Birr, H. No. 66, 67.

\(^{52}\) Sahīh al-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-Harām.

\(^{53}\) Tirmidhī, Kitāb Shafqat ‘alal Muslim, p. 351.
object, of all this advice was to keep the unity among Muslims intact. The only result of *takfir* (denouncing one another heretics) is destruction. By saying that *difference among my followers is a blessing*, Muslims were actually taught to tolerate differences among themselves; but they made every difference an excuse for *takfir* and thus struck at the very root of their unity and strength. It was truly said by the Holy Prophet that their enemies would not be able to destroy them unless they destroyed themselves. And that is what Muslims have done to themselves. For minor differences they have declared one another *kafir* and thus shattered to pieces the unity of Islam. It was in 1891 C.E. that the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement raised his voice against this habit of *takfir*:

"Let this be evident that Jesus Christ came for this work and at such a time when Jews were divided into many sects like Muslims... So the Holy Prophet has informed this nation that in the latter ages the same would be their condition and many sects would spring up among them... And like Jews one group would consider the other one as *kaifir*. And if there were ninety-nine reasons for Islam just one reason for *kufr* would be considered sufficient to declare others *kaifir*. So due to mutual *takfir*, deep hatred, jealousy and enmity would come into play and due to difference of opinion, vindictiveness, rancour and beastly tendencies will prevail among Muslims. And Islamic character which requires a perfect unity as in a single body and is full of mutual love and sympathy would be completely taken away from them. The one would consider the other so strange as not to hesitate to declare the other as *kaifir*.

The Lahore section of the Ahmadiyyah Movement by following such exhortations of the Founder for unity lay particular emphasis on the point that all the followers of the *kalimah* are Muslims and anybody who declares his faith in the unity of God and prophethood of Muhammam cannot be turned outside the pale of Islam. Such a doctrine is now having a wider influence among Muslims,

But as opposed to this, unfortunately, the Qādiān section has made the declaring of all the Muslims of the world kāfirs a basis of their belief.55

The eighth distinction: the significance of paradise and hell properly explained

Belief in the punishment or reward for one’s actions in another life is common to all religions. But Islam has explained this phenomenon in a scientific manner. For instance, paradise and hell are not only meant for the life hereafter but also they have their beginning in this life:

\[\text{And for him who fears to stand before his Lord there are two Gardens.}^{56}\]

The one garden (jannat, paradise) is of this life and the other of the life to come. The soul that attains perfection also sees its own paradise in this life. To the contented soul the Qur'ān says:

\[\text{So enter among My servants and enter My garden.}^{57}\]

Similarly, the fire of hell is described as rising above the hearts of men:

\[\text{It is the Fire kindled by Allāh, which rises over the hearts.}^{58}\]

And the hell in the hereafter is just another form of blindness in this life:

\[\text{And whoever is blind in this world he will be blind in the Hereafter.}^{59}\]

55. *The Truth about the Split*, pp. 55-56, 140 etc. The detailed references have been given in the beginning of this chapter.—Ed.
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But these matters remain hidden from the eyes of the common people and only come to light on the day of Resurrection, therefore on that day hell and heaven would become manifest.

Thou wast indeed heedless of this, but now We have removed from thee thy veil, so thy sight is sharp this day. 

Commencement of paradise and hell in this life shows that the reward or punishment in fact (whether we are conscious of it or not) takes place simultaneously with our deeds. Then another point is emphasized: that every action begets results according to whether the doer is a believer or non-believer. If a non-Muslim does a good work the result will naturally be good and if a Muslim does something bad it will have a bad consequence:

So he who does an atom's weight of good will see it, and he who does an atom's weight of evil will see it.

Again it has been explained that hell is a place for the purge and betterment of human ills and shortcomings. This is a means of purification of man so that for this progress, he may get another opportunity in the life to come which he has wasted in this life. And because this is only by way of remedy, therefore, sooner or later all the inmates of hell will come out of it. According to a saying of the Holy Prophet a time will come when the morning breeze will be striking against the doors of hell; and it will become a devastated place. Similarly about paradise it should be remembered that man is capable of making unlimited progress therein. Those who have once entered into it will never be taken out of it again. This makes it abundantly clear that future reward in Islam means various aspects of man's progress, and punishment (ʻadhāb) the stages of his decline and decadence. But Muslims lost sight of these
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matters of deep wisdom and thought the 'adhāb and thawāb were only meant for future life of the world. They also thought that non-Muslims did not receive any reward for their good actions, and that Muslims will all go to paradise and the kāfirs will burn in the fire of hell for ever. Aḥmadiyyat, however, brought the original teachings of Islam to light and removed all such errors. It also explained that even the worship of God was also meant for man's own advancement, for by worshipping God man in fact tries to come into real contact with God for the purpose of imbuing himself with Divine attributes.

The ninth distinction: Theory of abrogation rejected

There were several other things which Muslims had accepted by mistake although there was no ground for their acceptance. For instance, Muslims had generally come to believe that there were verses in the Qur'ān which were abrogated by other Qur'ānic verses. And on this point they insisted so much that anybody who did not agree with them was not considered to be a Muslim. A verse can abrogate another verse only when it stands in opposition to the other. By accepting such a view it has to be admitted that discrepancy was found in the Qur'ān whereas the Qur'ān clearly indicates:

And if it were from any other than Allāh they would have found in it many a discrepancy.\textsuperscript{63}

Thus to accept discrepancy in the Qur'ān is to accept it from any other source than Allāh. This is where this wrong belief had led the Muslims. But they kept on adhering to such an erroneous doctrine till it was removed by the Founder of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement, who made it clear that there was no verse in the Qur'ān which has been abrogated by another verse, nor does the Qur'ān mention anything like that. Verses\textsuperscript{64} from which such a conclusion was drawn only refer to the abrogation of

\textsuperscript{63} The Qur'ān, 4 : 82.

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., 2 : 106.
some of the commandments *i.e.* previous *Shari'ah*. It was in this way that the dignity of the Qur'an was manifested and established.

**The tenth distinction: faith in the dominance of Islam**

Besides what has been mentioned above there are also other matters in which Ahmadiyyat has differed from other Muslims but none of these differences is related to problems of jurisprudence (*fiqh*). It is evident from the foregoing remarks that wherever Ahmadiyyat has differed from other Muslims it is only in its efforts to restore the original beauty and simplicity of Islam, to make Islam a rational, scientific and progressive religion once again so that its influence may penetrate deep into the hearts of men and so that Islam may rise once more in the world. The Christian scholars have laboured to show that the Ahmadiyyah Movement is the result of the contact of European civilization with Islam. But in the history of modern India we find two separate movements among Muslims. The one started by *Sir* Sayyid Ahmad Khān of Aligarh and the other by Mirza Ghulām Ahmad of Qādiān. The work done by *Sir* Sayyid towards educating Muslims is unique in its own way and nobody should deny its manifold advantages to Muslims. But as far as his religious views are concerned, which are sometimes stigmatized as *naturiyyat*, they mark a clear distinction between the two movements. *Sir* Sayyid and Mirza Ghulām Ahmad both tried to solve problems facing Islam today in a rational way. But the religious movement of *Sir* Sayyid very often took the turn of slavish imitation of the European thought and the movement initiated by Hazart Mirza Sahib had in view the conquest of Europe for Islam. The object of the former movement was also to save Islam from the onslaughts of the West but in this effort Islam was subjected to modern trends. But Mirza Ghulām Ahmad not only wanted to save Islam but also wanted to see it a triumphant religion of the world. This is not a mere presumption. The late *Allāmah* Shibli Numānī who was one of the great admirers of *Sir* Sayyid, writes about him:

"This new thought is of two kinds. Either we find the same rotten stuff or far-fetched problems and arguments originated
by the later Ashʿarites or every European belief or thought is regarded to be the only right standard of judgment. The Holy Qurʾān and the Ḥadīth is later on dragged in to harmonize with these ideas.”

In the writings of Sir Sayyid the Qurʾān is *ipso facto* subjected to the European ideology but the Founder wants Europe to kneel down before the Qurʾān. Sir Sayyid’s movement may be regarded a result of the impact of European thought on Islam in India but this is not true about the Ahmadiyyah Movement. It has on the contrary, helped to remove the effects of European thought on Muslims’ minds. It is in fact a panacea for the poison which the materialistic civilization has brought to the world of Islam. The Founder had a great passion for seeing the cause of Islam dominant in the world. Before his advent Islam in Indian Sub-continent was attacked from three sides. The attack of atheism and materialism in the form of European thought, the attack of Christian missionaries and the attack of the new Hindu sect Ārya Samāj. Whatever Muslims were doing in their defence was quite ineffective. Sir Sayyid came forward to save Muslims from the influence of modern education but he was himself swayed by it and thus he wanted to make an apologetic compromise with it. One or two other persons also stood against the onslaught of Christian missionary activities, but on the whole Muslims remained passive and the Christian missionaries became more severe and menacing in their attacks against Islam. And as to the attack of the Ārya Samāj nobody seemed to care for the defence of Islam. It was at this time that Mirza Ghulām Aḥmad came to the forefront to uphold the cause of Islam. He not only defended Islam but also took an offensive against all these hostile forces within a short time. This made a great change in the circumstances and the invaders themselves were put to their defence. In short, every Ahmādī harbours a feeling in his heart to see Islam a dominant religion in the world. He is fully convinced that, however slender the outward chance may be, Islam will flourish and dominate the world. It is because of this faith and enthusiasm that
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he is ready to sacrifice his all for this object. There lies the secret of the success of Ahmadiyyah Movement in its preaching of Islam.

In brief, Ahmadiyyat is not a sect that differs from other Muslim sects on minor details of Shari‘ah. It is rather above all these petty differences. It is a movement for the spread of Islam and towards this its whole efforts are directed. It has done its best to remove all misconceptions about Islam which were a hindrance in the way of its propagation and progress. For this the Ahmadiyyah Movement has sometimes differed from the current thought of Muslims and only this makes it differ from other Muslim sects. Such differences are not in fact internal but they only relate to those matters which are connected with the propagation and progress of Islam in the world. The Holy Prophet has himself described this age as the “age of corruption” (عمر رجوع) when Islam will be set on a wrong track by its followers and its advancement will come to a standstill, and people will begin to despise this polluted form of Islam. By removing misunderstandings of this age of corruption the Ahmadiyyah Movement has opened new vistas for the success and glory of Islam. Islam is, thus, once again on the march and is arresting the attention of the entire world.
Annexe IV

A. Was the doctrine of Jihad abrogated by the Founder?

[The charge that the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement denied the doctrine of Jihād is baseless as has been discussed at various places in this book (vide chs. I, II, IV and V) but as this allegation is widely circulated by some people against the Founder further clarification of this point would not be out of place here—Tr.]

It is easy to see that any one who accepts the Holy Qur’ān and the Holy Prophet Muḥammad cannot deny jihād, injunctions relating to which occupy a considerable portion of the Holy Qur’ān. The orthodox Muslims believe that some verses of the Holy Qur’ān have been abrogated by others. The Ahmadiyyah movement has long been fighting against this doctrine, and many enlightened Muslims now accept the Ahmadi view that no verse, not even one word or one jot of the Holy Qur’ān was abrogated. Under the heading, “A statement of some of our beliefs”, the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah movement wrote:

“God speaks to His servants in this ummah and they are given the semblance of prophets and they are not really prophets, for the Qur’ān has made perfect the needs of Law, and they are given only an understanding of the Qur’ān, and they cannot add to, or detract from it aught; and whoever adds to, or detracts from it, he is of the devils who are wicked.”

It is therefore impossible that, holding such a belief, Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad could say that he abrogated jihād which was made obligatory by the Holy Qur’ān and which was one of the five fundamentals of Islam. The following passage from his pamphlet entitled The Jihād would show that he differed from the ‘ulamā’ only in his interpretation of jihād as inculcated by the

Holy Qur'ān:

"It should be remembered that the doctrine of jihād as understood by the Muslim 'ulamā' of our day, who call themselves Maulawīs, is not true......These people are so persistent in their belief, which is entirely wrong and against the Qur'ān and Hādidh, that the man who does not believe in it and is against it is called a Dajjal."^{68}

It would appear from this that, according to the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement, the doctrine of jihād as understood by the 'ulamā' was opposed to the true teachings of the Holy Qur'ān and Hādidh. What the Founder rejected was not the doctrine of jihād but the orthodox interpretation thereof which had given rise in the West to grave misconceptions regarding the doctrine of jihād, so that even unprejudiced Western writers thought the word jihād to be synonymous with war undertaken forcing the religion of Islam upon non-Muslims. Thus, in the Encyclopaedia of Islam, the article on "Jihād" opens with the following words: "The spread of Islam by arms is a religious duty upon Muslims in general". Klein, in his Religion of Islam, makes an even more sweeping statement: "Jihād . . . The fighting against unbelievers with the object of either winning them over to Islam, or subduing and exterminating them in case they refuse to become Muslims". In the Muslim popular mind there was an even greater misconception, that the killing of an unbeliever was jihād and that such an act entitled the perpetrator to be called a ghāzi. This conception, coupled with the prevailing belief in the advent of a Mahdi who would put all non-Muslims to the sword if they refused to accept Islam, opposed as it was to the plain teachings of the Holy Qur'ān, was doing immense harm to the cause of the spread of Islam among non-Muslims. With very few exceptions, even educated Muslims were victims of the wrong impression that Islam enjoined aggressive war against non-believers, and the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah movement had to carry on incessant war, not against jihād as inculcated by the Holy Qur'ān but against the false conceptions of it prevalent both among Muslims and non-Muslims.

68. The Jihād, pp. 5-6.
The way was cleared for removing these misconceptions by establishing two principles: 1. That jihad means exerting oneself to the extent of one's ability and power, whether it is by word or deed, and that the word is used in this broad sense, in the Holy Qur'an. 2. That, when it is used in the narrower sense of fighting, it means fighting only in self-defence. If, therefore, all exertions to carry the message of Islam to non-Muslim by simple preaching, or what may be called spiritual warfare, fell within the purview of jihad, a war carried on for the propagation of Islam, if such a one was ever undertaken by a Muslim ruler, was quite outside the scope of its true significance, as it was against the basic principle laid down in the Holy Qur'an that "there is no compulsion in religion."69 If he ever spoke of the abrogation of jihad, it was for this misconception of the word jihad, not of the jihad as inculcated by the Holy Qur'an, every word of which he believed to be a Divine revelation which could not be abrogated till the Day of Judgment. Here is another passage from the pamphlet quoted above:

"Their contention that, since jihad was permitted in the early days (of Islam), there is no reason why it should be prohibited now is entirely misconceived. It may be refuted in two ways; firstly, that this inference is drawn from wrong premises and our Holy Prophet never used the sword against any people, except those who first took up the sword (against the Muslims) ... secondly, that, even if we suppose for the sake of argument that there was such a jihad in Islam as these Maulawis think, even so that order does not stand now, for it is reported that, when the Promised Messiah appears, there will be an end of jihad with the sword and of religious wars."70

It will be seen that the prevalent idea that Islam allowed a jihad for the spread of religion is refuted in two ways. In the first place, it is stated that this conception of jihad is against the Holy Qur'an and Hadith, as the Holy Prophet drew the sword only in self-defence, not for the propagation of religion. Further, it is added that, even if for the sake of argument it is supposed that a

69. The Qur'an, 2: 256.
70. The Jihad, p. 6.
Jihad for the propagation of religion was ever undertaken—that such was never undertaken by the Holy Prophet has been definitely stated in the first part—such jihad cannot be undertaken now, for, it is said of the Promised Messiah that he will put down (religious) wars, yad al-harb, as plainly stated in the Bukhari. What is aimed is really this that a jihad contrary to the teachings of the Holy Qur’an and of the practice of the Holy Prophet, if ever there was one, was undoubtedly the result of some misconception, and, according to the hadith quoted above, the Promised Messiah will remove that misconception and thus put an end to such wars.

This position is made still more clear in an Arabic letter, addressed to the Muslims of the world, and forming a supplement to his book, Tuhfah Golarwiya:

“There is not the least doubt that the conditions laid down for Jihad (in the Holy Qur’an) are not to be met with at the present time and in this country; so it is illegal for the Muslims to fight for (the propagation of) religion and to kill anyone who rejects the Sacred Law, for God has made clear the illegality of jihad when there is peace and security.”71

Here it is made clear that jihad with the sword is allowed by Islam only under certain conditions and, as those conditions are not met with at the present time in the country in which the writer lives, therefore jihad with the sword is illegal here at the present time. This argument leads to the definite conclusion that jihad may be legal in another country in which exist the necessary conditions laid down in the Holy Qur’an, or even here when the conditions have changed. These conditions are expressly stated in the Holy Book: “And fight in the way of God against those who fight against you and be not aggressive, for God does not love the aggressors” (2: 191).

In this connection may be mentioned another charge relative to his attitude towards the British Government in India. The Sikhs, who ruled the Punjab before the advent of the British rule, had not only ousted Hazrat Ahmad’s family from their estate but, in their later days, there was such lawlessness in the country as made

life impossible for the Muslims who were not allowed a free exercise of their religion and whose very culture was on the verge of being swept away. It was at such a time that the British Government stepped in and saved the Muslims from annihilation. Thus, people who with their own eyes had seen the woes of the Muslims, or even their descendants, considered the British Government as a blessing, for through it they were saved. For allowing full liberty of religion and conscience and for establishing peace where before there were anarchy and lawlessness, Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad was not alone in praising the English rule. All writers of that time considered it their duty to give vent to similar expressions of loyalty and thankfulness. Sir Syed Aḥmad Khān, who occupied a position among the Muslims which has not been vouchsafed to any other leader since his time, wrote exactly in the same strain as did Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad. Even the Wahābis, who remained for a long time in the bad books of the Government, declared from the house-tops their loyalty to the Government. Thus wrote Maulawi Muḥammad Jabbār, the famous Wahābi leader:

"Before all, I thank the Government under which we can publicly and with the beat of drums teach the religious doctrines of our pure faith without any interference whatsoever, and we can pay back our opponents whether they are Christians or others in their own coin. Such religious liberty we cannot have even under the Sultan of Turkey."

Another famous Ahl Ḥadīth leader, Maulawī Muḥammad Ḥussain of Batāla, wrote:

"Considering the Divine Law and the present condition of the Muslims, we have said that this is not the time of the sword."

Nawāb Ṣiddiq Ḥasan Khān, another great leader and writer, went even further:

"A perusal of the historical books shows that the peace, security and liberty which all people have received under this rule have never been obtained under any other rule."

72. *Barakāt-i-Islām*, Title page, 2.
"Whoever goes against it (i.e., loyalty and faithfulness to the British rule), not only is a mischief-maker in the eyes of the rulers but also he shall be farthest from what Islam requires and from the way of the faithful, and he shall be regarded as a violater of the covenant, unfaithful in his religion and a perpetrator of the greatest sin, and what his condition will be on the day of judgment will become evident there". 75

There was another reason for Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad's attitude toward the British rule. He claimed to be the Promised Mahdi and, as the name of Mahdi was associated with the sword, the Government for many years regarded the Ahmadiyyah movement with distrust, thinking that the Founder might at any time rise in revolt against it. It was to remove this wrong impression that Hazrat Ahmad laid stress on his faithfulness to the British rule. Moreover, he was laying the foundations of a missionary society with the grand aim of spreading Islam throughout the world, and such a society could do its work only by remaining loyal to the Government established by law in any country and by remaining aloof from all political agitation.

B. Some other misunderstandings removed

Did the Founder make slanderous attack on Jesus Christ and his mother? 76

This again is a gross misrepresentation of what he wrote. How can a man who professes the faith of Islam abuse a prophet of God, when he is required to believe in that prophet? Jesus Christ is expressly mentioned in the Holy Qur'an as a prophet, and every Muslim must honour him as such. In order to understand the nature of the writings to which objection is taken, two points must be clearly borne in mind. The first is the nature of the controversy which was carried on by the Christian missionaries in India in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The preaching of the Christian missionary until a short time ago was of a quite different character from what it is to-day. In those days, the Christian missionary was under the impression that the

darker the picture he drew of the Prophet of Islam, the greater would be his success in winning over converts from among the Muslims; and this impression became stronger as the missionary reviewed the results. Not only some well-to-do people from among the Muslims but even some Maulawīs of great repute went over the Christian camp and, to win the favour of their European masters these new disciples carried the vituperative propaganda against Islam to an extreme which made the Muslim blood boil. Some of the Christian controversial books of those days must indeed be ranked as the filthiest religious literature that has ever been produced, apart from the fact that the founder of the Arya Samāj and some of his blind votaries imitated the Christian missionary, and, later on, the Arya Samājist preacher even surpassed the Christian missionary in the art of vituperation.

It is difficult even to conceive to-day how all those things could be written in the name of religion. The Masiḥ al-Dajjāl by Ramchand (1873), Sirat al-Masiḥ wal Muḥammad by Rev. Thakurdas (1882), Androosa Bible by Abdullah Atham, in which an attempt has been made to show that our Holy Prophet was the anti-Christ and the Dragon of the Revelation, Muḥammad ki Tawārīkh ka Ijmāl by Rev. William (1891), Taftīsh al-Islām by Rev. Rodgers (1870), Nabī-i Maṭhūm published by the American Mission Press of Ludhiana (1884), and dozens of other books and hundreds of tracts, are all strings of abusive epithets heaped upon the Holy Prophet and his companions, each writer trying to outdate the others in scurrility. To call the Holy Prophet an impostor, Dajjāl or anti-Christ, a deceiver, a dacoit, the slave of his sensual passions whose lust knew no bounds, and to attribute every conceivable crime to him became a habit with these Christian controversialists. Page after page of the writings named above and of others of the same type are full of such descriptions as the following:

“If he (the Prophet of Islam) abrogated the Gospels there is no wonder, for all those who are bent low on the world and are worshippers of their lust do like this”.

“Sensual lust... is to be met with in Muḥammad to an excessive degree so that he was always its slave. Muḥammad, like
other Arabs, from his very appearance seems to be a lover of women”.

“The occasion of the law relating to marriage with an adopted son’s wife was the flaming of the lust of Muhammad on seeing Zainab naked”.

“The religion of the Pope and the religion of Muḥammad are two jaws of the Dragon”.

“Ringleader of dacoits, a robber, a killer of people by secret conspiracies”.

“When by chance his eye caught a glance of her beauty, sinful love took possession of his heart, and to have his wicked desire fulfilled he arranged to get permission from Heaven”.

“We cannot give any name to his claim to prophethood except fraud or cunning”.

“All this is the fabrication of Muḥammad, he was a slave of his passions”.

“His character in no way befits the office of a prophet; he was a slave of his passions, full of the spirit of revenge and a selfish man, an extreme follower of his low desires. The Qurān is a falsehood, his own fabrication, which encouraged his slavery to passion and his lust”.

“His speech and his ways increased in wickedness with his age”.

This is only a sample of the writings of the Christian missionaries of those days. In fact, so scurrilous was this literature growing that, when Rev. Imād al-Dīn, a Maulawī who had become a convert to Christianity, published his writings, they were found to be so grossly abusive that even Christians began to complain of them, and the Shams al-Akhbār of Lucknow, itself a Christian missionary paper, was compelled to give a warning against the offensiveness of Imād al-Dīn’s writings, saying that “if there was again a mutiny like that of 1857, it would be due to the abusive and scurrilous language of his writings.” There was not the least exaggeration in the warning given by this Christian paper. The Muslim is never so offended as when his Prophet is abused. He can submit to the greatest insult but the one thing to which he will not submit is the abuse of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad.
Recent years have brought before us many instances of this deep-rooted love of the Muslim for his Prophet. How many young Muslims have lost their mental balance and turned a revolver against the reviler of the Prophet, knowing fully well that they must pay for this with their lives! Nobody can gauge the depth of the love of a Muslim for his Prophet. It is a fact that the sting of the Prophet’s abuse affects the Muslim’s heart so deeply that he gets excited beyond all measure, and cognizance of this fact should be taken by the highest executive authority, even if the High Courts of Justice cannot give a more liberal interpretation to the law of the land and must inflict a death penalty on youths who have become mentally unbalanced by such excitement.

It would have been no wonder if the highly scurrilous tenor of Christian controversialists had excited a Muslim defender of the Faith like the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah movement to such an extent that he made remarks unworthy of himself and of the cause which he supported. Nevertheless, he kept his mental balance and adopted a method of controversy which, within a very short time, made the Christian missionaries realize that their methods needed a change, and this is the second point which must be borne in mind. It was a simple method. What would be the picture of Jesus Christ if he were criticised and found fault with in the manner in which the Christian missionaries criticised and found fault with the Holy Prophet of Islam? In fact, nothing short of this could make the Christian missionary realize how deeply he was offending the Muslim feeling. Therefore, when Hazrat Ahmad first adopted this method he wrote in plain words:

“As the Rev. Fateh Masih of Fatehgarh, Gurdaspur district, has written to us a very scurrilous letter, and in it he has accused our Lord and Master, the Holy Prophet Muhammad, of adultery, and has used about him many other scurrilous words by way of abuse, it is, therefore, advisable that a reply to his letter should be published. This pamphlet has therefore been written. I hope that Christian missionaries will read it carefully and will not be offended by its words, for this method is entirely the result of the harsh words and filthy abuse of Fateh Masih. Still, we have every regard for the sacred glory of Jesus Christ, and in return for the
abusive words of Fateh Masih, only an imaginary Messiah (fardi Masih) has been spoken of.”

This position was again and again made clear by the Founder in his writings, but interested persons carry on false propaganda ignoring the explanation. Thus M. Zafar Ali, of Zamindar, attributes the following words to Hazrat Ahmad:

“Jesus Christ was evil-minded and overbearing. He was the enemy of the righteous. We cannot call him even a gentleman, much less a prophet (Anjām Atham, p. 9).”

Any one who refers to page 9 of the book referred to, will find that the writer is guilty of making a false allegation. The passage as met with in the book runs thus:

“In the same way, the impious Fateh Masih has, in his letter to me, called our Holy Prophet adulterer and has abused him in many other ways. Thus this filthy section . . . compel us to write something about their Yasū‘ (Jesus), and let the Muslims know that God has not made any mention of this Yasū‘ in the Holy Qur’ān. The Christian missionaries say that Yasū‘ was that person who claimed to be God and called Holy Moses a thief and a cheat, and disbelieved in the advent of the Holy Prophet, and said that after him only false prophets would come. We cannot call such an evil-minded, overbearing person and the enemy of the righteous, a gentleman—still less a prophet”.

Between the quotation given by M. Zafar ‘Ali and the passage actually found in the book, there is the difference between heaven and earth. The Founder of the Ahmadiyyah movement never wrote that Jesus Christ was evil-minded and overbearing. On the other hand, adhering to the principle which he had made clear in the Nūr al-Qur’ān, as quoted above, he merely tells his opponent, Fateh Masih, that the imaginary Messiah of the Christians (Fardi Masih), who is not the same as the Messiah of the Holy Qur’ān (the real Messiah), may, on the basis of the Christian writings, be described as an evil-minded and overbearing person, if the method of criticism adopted by the Christians in the case of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, whom they called an adulterer, was to be followed in

the case of their Christ. It is the imaginary picture of the Messiah which the Christian missionary has drawn that is condemned by the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah movement, and not the Messiah himself. Now, according to the Muslim faith, if a man calls himself God and also denounces the righteous servants of God as being thieves and cheats, he is undoubtedly an overbearing and evil-minded man. The Muslims believe, and so did the Founder that Jesus Christ never said that he was God, and he never denounced the other righteous servants of God; therefore they hold that the picture of the Messiah drawn by the Christians is not the picture of a man who actually lived, but that of one who exists only in the Christian imagination. It is this imaginary picture which Hazrat Ahmad denounces, and that too he did merely because the Christian missionaries would not refrain from abusing the Holy Prophet of Islam.

It should be borne in mind that this method of paying back the Christian missionaries in their own coin was adopted by other recognized Muslim leaders before the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah movement. Thus the Maulana Rahmat Allah writes in the introduction to his book, Izala Auham:

"As the Christian missionaries are disrespectful in their speeches and writings towards the best of men, our Holy Prophet, and towards the Holy Qur'an and Hadith of the Prophet, ... so we have been compelled to pay them back in the same coin ... By no means it is my belief that I should speak of a prophet in disparaging terms".

Very recently, even the official organ of the Jamiat al-'Ulama' of Delhi, al-Jamiyya dated 20th Nov. 1932, wrote in reply to certain Christian missionaries: "The person whom the Christians erroneously take for the Messiah was really the enemy of the Messiah and he has nothing to do with Islam and the Qur'an. Nor does any Muslim believe in him."

An example of how false propaganda is being carried on against the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah movement is the statement published very widely by M. Zafar Ali in his paper, the Zamindar, bearing the heading, "An open letter to the King of England" in which he states that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad accused Mary of
adultery and called Christ a bastard. When he was challenged to produce a single quotation in support of this statement, he remained silent, though he continued to repeat the false allegations. It is clear on the face of it that a Muslim who believed in the Holy Qur’ân could not make such a wild statement as that attributed to the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah movement, but the public is being fed on these lies by the sworn enemies of the movement. Far from accusing Mary of adultery and calling Jesus a bastard, Mirzâ Ghulâm Ahmad again and again speaks of the miraculous birth of Jesus Christ. The following three quotations will suffice for this purpose: "One of the doctrines we hold is that Jesus Christ and John the Baptist were both born miraculously... And the secret in creating Jesus and John in this manner was the manifestation of a great sign... And the first thing He (God) did to bring this about was the creation of Jesus without a father through the manifestation of Divine power only." 

"The ground on which this is based in his (Jesus Christ’s) creation without the agency of a human father, and the detail of this is that a certain section of the Jews, i.e., the Sadducees, were deniers of the Resurrection, so God informed them through some of His prophets that a son from among their community would be born without a father, and this would be a sign of the truth of Resurrection." 

"The (Arya Samâjist) lecturer also objected to Mary bearing a child by the Holy Spirit and to Jesus being born from Mary alone. The reply is that this was done by the same God Who, according to the Arya Samâj teachings, creates millions of people in the beginning of every new creation, just as vegetables grow out of the earth. If, according to the Vedic teachings, God has created the world millions of times, nay, times without number, in this manner, and there was no need that men and women should unite together in order that a child should be born, where is the harm if Jesus Christ was born similarly." 

78. Mawâhib al-Rahmân, pp. 70-72.
79. Hamâmat al-Baghârî, p. 90.
80. Châshma Ma’rifah, p. 217.
The above quotations should be sufficient to convince even the greatest enemy of the movement that its Founder sincerely believed that Jesus Christ was born of Mary without her coming into union with a male. The Founder not only states his own belief on this matter but he replies to the objections of the Ārya Samāj, and lays stress on the point that Jesus Christ was born without a human father. How could he then accuse Mary of adultery when he states again and again that she had not even a lawful union with a man before the birth of Jesus Christ? In the face of these clear statements, to say that he regarded Mary as having committed adultery or that he called Jesus Christ a bastard is a barefaced lie, yet it is stuff such as this that the public is expected to take, and actually takes for gospel truth.

C. The Use of Strong Language against the ‘ulama’

Another charge against the Founder is that in his dealing with the orthodox ‘ulamā’, he was very severe. As a matter of fact Ḥazrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad, in this case also, paid back the opposing ‘ulamā’ in their own coin. No sooner had he announced that Jesus Christ was dead and that he himself was the Messiah who was to appear among the Muslims than they denounced him in the most scurrilous terms and applied to him every hateful epithet which they could think of. The following are only a few examples taken from the pages of Ishā‘at al-Sunnah, a periodical issued by Maulawi Muḥammad Ḥusain of Batāla, which had become the mouthpiece of the ‘ulamā’:

“Hidden enemy of Islam”; “The second Musailma”; “Dajjāl”; “a liar”; “have his face blackened, and a rope should be tied round his neck and a necklace of shoes put over him, and in this condition he should be carried through the towns of India”; “a satan, an evil-doer”; “Zindeeq”; “most shameless”; “worse than Dajjāl”; “has the manners of russians and scavengers, nay those of beasts and savages”; “progeny of Ḥalākū Khān and Changez Khān, the unbelieving Turks, this shows that you are really a......”

The literature produced against Hazrat Aḥmad teemed with such scurrilous epithets, and even worse than these; no abusive word could be thought of which was not applied to him merely because
he claimed to be the Promised Messiah. In addition to this, *fatwa* were issued against the Founder and the members of the Aḥmadiyyah movement, declaring them to be too polluted to set foot in a mosque, declaring even their dead bodies to be unfit for a Muslim graveyard, and pronouncing their marriages to be illegal and their property to be a lawful spoil for others, so that it was no sin to take it away by any means.

It was 'ulamā' of this type whom the Founder of the Aḥmadiyyah movement sometimes dealt with severely, and, if he occasionally made a retort in kind and gave a bad name to such irresponsible people who had lost all sense of propriety and decency, he could not be blamed according to any moral code. Thus he writes in one of his latest books:

"Those 'ulamā' of the latter days whom the Holy Prophet has called the *Yahūd* (Jews) of this *ummah* are particularly those Maulwis who are opponents of the Promised Messiah and are his sworn enemies and who are doing everything possible to bring him to naught and call him *kāfir*, unbeliever and *Dajjāl* . . . But those 'ulamā' who do not belong to this category, we cannot call them *Yahūd* of this *ummah".81

Elsewhere, explaining his attitude, he says:

"This our description of them does not apply to the righteous but to the mischievous among them".82

It cannot be denied that a certain class of 'ulamā' is spoken of in very strong words in Ḥadīth itself. Thus, in one Ḥadīth, the 'ulamā' of the latter days are described as "the worst of all under the canopy of heaven", and it is added: "From among them would the tribulation come forth and into them would it turn back".83 According to another Ḥadīth, the Holy Prophet is reported to have said: "There will come upon my *ummah* a time of great trial, and the people will have recourse to their 'ulamā', and lo! they will find them to be apes and swine".84
There is almost a consensus of opinion that what was stated about the evil condition of 'ulamā' had come true in the present age. Writing shortly prior to the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah movement, Nawāb Siddiq Hasan Khān wrote in his book, Kashf al-Lithām, to this effect, admitting clearly that this condition of the 'ulamā' could be plainly witnessed at the present time. It is at least certain that the debasement of the 'ulamā' and the advent of the Messiah are described as contemporaneous events. Equally certain it is that the 'ulamā' in this age have done the greatest disservice to Islam by wrangling among themselves and wasting all national energy in internal dissensions and not caring in the least for the sufferings of Islam itself. They have entirely neglected their prime duty of upholding the cause of Islam as against the opposing forces and have brought further discredit on it by their narrow-mindedness in fighting among themselves on the most trivial points, thus making themselves and Islam itself, whose champions they are supposed to be, the laughing-stock of the world. If these people, when reminded of their duty turned against the man who was commissioned to lead Islam to triumph and heaped all sorts of abusive epithets upon him, thus hampering the great work which he was to accomplish, he was justified in calling them unworthy sons of Islam and, in a spiritual sense, the illegitimate offspring of their great ancestors.

85. A very severe contest has been raging in the Muslim world over the accent of the "Amen" recited after the Fātiḥah in prayers, the majority holding that it should be pronounced in a low voice, and a small minority, the Wahābis, holding that it should be pronounced loudly. How often has the sacred and serene atmosphere of a congregational prayer been disturbed by the taking-up of cudgels to belabour an unfortunate member of the congregation who happened to pronounce the Amen aloud! Cases have gone up to High Courts of Judicature to determine the right of one section to say their prayers in certain mosques which were built by Muslims of another persuasion. Even this becomes insignificant when one finds that a great struggle is carried on over the pronunciation of the letter dzād which some read as ād and others as zād, the real pronunciation lying somewhere midway between the two, and fattāsh of kūfī have been given against one another on a matter of which a man possessing a grain of common sense would not take notice.
CHAPTER V

AHMADIYYAT IN PRACTICE

Jihād with the Qur'ān

The 'ulamā’ were sadiy mistaken in attributing a claim of prophethood to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad, the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement. They persisted in their allegation and tried their utmost to destroy and undermine the cause for which this Movement stood. But the false impression created among the educated Muslims that Ahmadiyyah had abrogated the Qur'ānic conception of jihād was not in any way less prejudicial to this cause. Aḥmadiyyah stood to eradicate the false belief that Jesus Christ, who was a Prophet, could be raised after the Holy Prophet Muḥammad. It made it abundantly clear that no prophet, new nor old, could come after the Holy Prophet but still the belief in the continuity of the prophethood was wrongly ascribed to its Founder. Aḥmadiyyah stood to uphold the Holy Qur'ān over everything else and direct the attention of Muslims towards the great work of jihād with the Qur'ān (jihād bi’l Qur'ān) but it was falsely charged with abrogating the Qur'ānic doctrine of jihād. Both these charges are rather surprising. There is no other group in Islam, besides the Aḥmadiyyah, which has laid so great emphasis on the finality of Prophethood and again there is no other Movement in Islam except the Aḥmadiyyah Movement, which has shown such a great enthusiasm for jihād. These are stark facts but have been unrighteously subverted into two great charges against the Aḥmadiyyah Movement.

The Muslims, however, laboured under a delusion concerning these matters and it was the task of Aḥmadiyyah to undeceive them and put things in their proper perspective. It made it indubitably clear that although prophethood has come to an end, the Divine communication with human beings has not been, and cannot be, intercepted. This was tantamount to a claim to prophethood by the Founder. Aḥmadiyyah also made it clear
that it was wrong to suppose that jihād with the sword could replace the jihād with the Qur'ān. This view was repugnant to the spirit of the doctrine of jihād. Every Muslim knows that there is one command of jihād in the Holy Qur'ān which is general and another which is particular. The general command of jihād is not restricted by any condition. From the time of his advent the Holy Prophet was constantly engaged in carrying on this command in its true Quranic spirit and everybody who accepted Islam took part in this jihād from the moment he became a Muslim. This was the jihād for the spread of the message of Islam. This was the jihād with the Qur'ān. This was the great jihād as has been mentioned in the Word of God: Wa jāhid-hum bikhi jihādan kabīrā i.e. “and strive against them: a mighty striving with it”¹, where the personal pronoun it unquestionably refers to the Qur'ān. But there was a special jihād the need of which arose when the unbelievers took up sword against Islam. The Muslims were allowed to have recourse to it only when the enemy had resorted to sword first. And fight in the way of Allāh, says the Holy Qur'ān, against those who fight against you. Surely Allāh loves not the aggressors.²

This is the jihād with the sword, the jihād for the defence of Islam, the need of which arises on rare occasions — when enemy is bent upon destroying the Muslim nation by sword. Jihād with the Qur'ān is the jihād for the propagation of Islam, the need of which always exists in every country and nation. This was the jihād which engaged the mind of the Prophet and his Companions all their lives. It was carried out for thirteen years at Makka. The occasion for jihād with the sword arose at Medina when the unbelievers wanted to crush Islam out of existence by means of the sword. But in spite of this the jihād with the Qur'ān was simultaneously carried on. Although sword was taken up for the protection of Islam, the propagation of Islam was conducted only by means of the Qur'ān. The jihād with the Qur'ān, was indeed the great jihād, the jihād of the Makkan life of the Prophet.

2. Ibid., 2 : 190.
Muḥammad when there was the manifestation of his name Aḥmad. This is the jiḥād for which the Aḥmadiyyat stands to-day. The name Aḥmad of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad is being deified in the world again. Imām Bukhārī has made a pointed reference to this jiḥād when in the Kitāb al-Jiḥād he has entitled one of its chapters: Invitation of the Prophet to Islam and the prophethood, which signifies that the Holy Prophet’s inviting people to Islam was also jiḥād.

Aḥmadiyyat has not Abrogated the Doctrine of Jiḥād but has revived its True Spirit

As far as the doctrine of jiḥād is concerned, Muslims have either gone to one extreme or the other. As to the jiḥād with the sword they have come to look upon it as an alternative to the jiḥād with the Qur’ān. The belief in the use of sword and a belief in the advent of a warrior Mahdi found currency among Muslims only because of the false impression that conversion at the point of sword was also permissible. It was wrongly thought that Mahdi would spread Islam by sword and thus make Islam dominant in the world. The result was that they absolutely forgot the importance of the jiḥād with the Qur’ān. And as the preaching of Islam with sword was meaningless, therefore this task was left to be accomplished by Mahdi and they themselves sat with folded hands waiting for the miracle to happen. By removing such erroneous views Aḥmadiyyat has given a right place to the jiḥād in the light of the Qur’ān in the life of the Muslims and has thus also clarified the doctrine of jiḥād with the sword. Aḥmadiyyat has not abrogated this doctrine, and if the word abrogated has occurred anywhere about jiḥād it only refers to the wrong conception of jiḥād which had taken its root in the minds of the ignorant people that it meant the conversion of people to Islam by the sword. It was, however, necessary that before re-establishing the true conception of jiḥād the wrong ideas about jiḥād should be removed as they had, in fact, become great obstacles in the way of jiḥād with the Qur’ān. As long as the wrong notion that Islam can be spread by force was prevalent among people, their attention could not be drawn to the real beauties of Islam. Instead of showing love for
Islam they would have shown hatred towards it. The Qur'ānic command of jihād with the sword is as true today as it was during the time of the Prophet, but compliance with this command is possible only when the conditions precedent for it, clearly mentioned in the Qur'ān, also exist. Following is the essence of the teaching of Ahmadiyyat about jhiād:

وجوه الجهاد معدومة في هذا الزمن و هذه البلاد.

"Conditions precedent for jihād are not to be found in this age (i.e. at the time of the appearance of the mujaddid of the fourteenth century) and in this country (i.e. in India)."

Along with the removal of such erroneous ideas the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement has laid great emphasis on the importance of the jihād with the Qur'ān not in theory alone but in practice as well. By his personal example he demonstrated how jihād with the Qur'ān should be carried out and thus instilled the same zest and zeal in his followers. In this way they established the superiority of Islam in the world and showed the way how Muslims in spite of being a subject people could bring their rulers under the yoke of Islam if they would just make the correct use of the weapon which has been given to them in the form of the Qur'ān. Jihād with the Qur'ān and the preaching of Islam are identical expressions. How far Ahmadiyyah has succeeded in the revival of these ideas can be gauged from the fact that in the past when someone talked of the preaching of Islam, he was immediately suspected to be an Ahmadi. Muslims were completely oblivious of the great power which lay with them in the form of the Qur'ān until Ahmadiyyat awakened them to this supreme reality. Jihād is indeed obligatory on all Muslims, in all circumstances, but this is the same jihād which the Holy Prophet and his Companions carried on under all conditions whether they lived at Makkah or Madinah. The bringing home of this great truth to Muslims is the first and foremost task of Ahmadiyyat.

The need for ba'itat and an organization for jihād

As the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement was engaged

3. Mirza Ghulām Ahmad, Tuhfah Golārqiyyah, supplement. p. 32.
in a great jihād, therefore it was essential for him to form an organization. If his main object had only been limited to the reformation of a few matters, this could have been achieved by the publication of books which would have gradually brought the desired changes in the thoughts and minds of Muslims. But the fact is that these reformations were only a means to the attainment of a higher objective, viz., the preaching of Islam to the world which is another name of jihād with the Qur’ān. There can be no jihād without a regular organization members of which should be entirely devoted to its cause and always ready to stand through thick and thin for its sake. It is for this purpose that a pledge (bai‘at) or an oath of loyalty is needed. As jihād with the sword stands in need of a strong and a loyal army, a strong and loyal jamā‘at is also needed for carrying on the jihād with the Qur’ān. It is for this purpose that an oath of allegiance is taken. The taking of this formal pledge has for some people become obstacle in joining the Ahmadiyyah Movement. But without this no real loyalty, which is essential for jihād, can exist in a Jamā‘at. The Prophet himself took bai‘at from his Companions at some grave moments in the history of Islam. For instance the pledge from the Anṣār (Helpers) of Madīnah that they would defend the Prophet against his enemies just as they defended their wives and children⁴, or the pledge that was taken at Ɂudaibiyyah, which in the history of Islam goes by the name of Bai‘at al-Ridwān⁵ on account of which God sent down tranquillity into the hearts of the believers⁶, i.e. their hearts were strengthened and the vast number of the enemy did not perturb them any more. Similarly the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement elicited a pledge or an oath of allegiance from his followers for the cause of Islam. When a person takes a pledge to do something, his determination is not shaken by happenings in times of trial. This being so, man’s determination moves even the mountains. This

⁴. Maulānā Muhammad ‘Ali, Muhammad the Prophet (Lahore 1941, Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Isha‘at Islām) p. 89.
⁵. Ibid., pp. 156, 165.
was the reason that even in the teeth of the strongest opposition from Muslims and non-Muslims alike, Ahmadiyyat continued its onward march. The pledge given by its members that they would give precedence to religion over the world, means that all those who enter the Movement should be willing to sacrifice their all for the sake of Islam. The formation of an organization and the taking of pledge was, thus, in accordance with the need of the great principle of Jihad with the Qur'an which Ahmadiyyat was going to carry on in the world. This was the forgotten lesson of Muslim community revived by Ahmadiyyat. In it lies the life and strength of the Muslim nation.

Opposition from Muslims

The points mentioned above, which have been the foundation-stone of Ahmadiyyat, are such without which all efforts for the preaching of Islam would have remained incomplete and unsuccessful. Though in the absence of these differences Ahmadiyyat would have attracted a large number in its fold yet it could never have produced a lasting result. When Ahmadiyyat started the work of preaching of Islam the first and foremost need in this connection was to remove all the ugly stains and spots from the beautiful face of Islam whether they were caused by the ignorance of Muslims or by the ill-will of non-Muslims. Obviously revivalist movement by its resurgent activities also raises a storm of opposition against itself. There have been, from time to time, movements in Islam which have, of course, met with opposition, but as compared to Ahmadiyyat there has been no other progressive and reformative movement on such a large scale; therefore its opposition has also been in proportion to its scope of work. The movement started by 'Abd al-Wahab (commonly known as Wahabism) also faced great opposition, but its field of activity was comparatively limited to delivering Muslims from the bondage of taqlid (conformity to theological authority) and rousing them out of slumber in which they had fallen. Along with it, there were certain minor problems of jurisprudence which ultimately exhausted the energy of the entire movement. Its attention was attracted by some extremely unimportant matters like the
utterance of *Amen*⁷ and raising of hands (*rafaʿ yadain*⁸) during the prayer. The history of the Ahmadiyyah Movement has been vastly different. If, on the one hand, it has set before itself the task of reformation in matters affecting the preaching of Islam, on the other it has entirely refused to entangle itself in controversies concerning problems of jurisprudence (*fiqh*). It has harnessed all its resources to the work of the preaching of Islam, because that is the real object which should not be lost sight of under any conditions. The *Sajjādah Nashīn*⁹ and the ‘ulamā’ found Ahmadiyyat detrimental to their vested sectarian interests; others who lay under the spell of the conservative ideas also could not accept any new effort at reform. They also fought against it tooth and nail, either under pious delusion or by wilful misrepresentation of the tenets and beliefs of the Ahmadiyyah Movement. In either case they tried their utmost to excite hatred against the Movement among Muslims. Instead of judging its work and assessing whether or not Ahmadiyyat was practically beneficial to the cause of Islam they spent their whole energy in speaking ill of the Movement and its Founder. They resorted to the same unfair means by which non-Muslims had created bad blood against Islam. The result of this incessant false propaganda was that the very name Ahmadiyyat came to be detested by many Muslims. They did not even care to look at the remarkable work in which it was engaged for the cause of Islam. They prevented not only other people from joining the movement but also did their utmost to thwart its work which was undoubtedly a work for the good of Islam. This is, however, the height of ill-will and prejudice. But in spite of this strong opposition Ahmadiyyat has carried out its mission of spreading Islam in the non-Muslim world.

**The preaching of Islam in Europe**

In connection with the preaching of Islam the attention of the

---

7. Whether or not at the end of the recitation of Surah *Fātilah* in prayer "Amen" should be uttered loudly has occupied the attention of some Muslim sects in the past.—T

8. Whether the hands should be raised to the ears only once at the commencement of the prayer or at the change of every posture (kneeling, prostration etc.) has also been made a point of controversy

9. *Sajjādah Nashīn* is a person who inherits the spiritual estate of his leader.
Ahmadiyyah Movement was first drawn to Europe. But it was not done under a pre-planned scheme. It has been pointed out before that the thought of presenting Islam to the West existed in the mind of the Founder from the beginning. He had visions and dreams that many eminent Europeans had embraced Islam. He also wanted the Qur'an to be rendered into English and sent to England and other countries. The *Review of Religions* (English) was started in the beginning of 1902 for presenting the true picture of Islam to the English-knowing world. Thus was opened a new chapter for the propagation of Islam. In the same connection *The Teachings of Islam* which is the translation of a well-known lecture by the Founder delivered in the Conference of Religions at Lahore in 1896 was also printed and spread in Europe. The work of the translation of the Qur'an into English was commenced in 1909 after the death of the Founder. But the real foundation of the propagation of Islam in Europe was laid in 1912 when Khwājah Kamāl al-Dīn went to England to conduct a legal case but, in fact, he was going to conduct the case of Islam in England. After the completion of his work, God put it in his mind that a regular work for the preaching of Islam should be started in England. Members of the Ahmadiyyah Movement responded to his call with great enthusiasm and offered whatever he demanded of them. It was in this way that the propagation of Islam began in London. In February 1913 a monthly journal *Islamic Review*, the first of its kind in Europe, was also started by him. About twenty-five miles away from London the late Professor Doctor W. G. Leitner (former Principal of the Oriental College, Lahore) had built a mosque at Woking, Surrey with the main donation of the late Begum of Bhopal. The mosque remained closed and deserted after the death of Dr. Leitner. With great efforts Khwājah Kamāl al-Dīn got it restored and with the permission of the Trustees of the Mosque transferred his Mission from London to Woking in November, 1913. During this time i.e. on 18th November, 1913, Lord Headley al-Farooq had made a public declaration of his embracing Islam which popularised the Mission not only in England and India but throughout the world. In the modern history of Islam this was the first regular Mission for the propa-
gation of Islam in Europe.

This was a great distinction for the Ahmadiyyah Movement that it devoted its attention to a cause about which Muslims had remained neglectful, in spite of their being the rulers of a part of Europe for a long time. Before that in Britain and Europe a very ugly picture of Islam and the Holy Prophet was drawn. Islam was considered a religion of barbarism and it was generally believed that it was spread everywhere in the world at the point of sword. The Christian Missionaries had made special efforts to excite hatred among Europeans against Islam. They were taken aback when they found an Islamic Mission amidst them. Gradually in twos and fours people started joining Islam. At the death of Hazrat Maulana Nur al-Din, in March 1914, a split occurred in the Ahmadiyyah Movement. The same year the Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Isha’at Islam (Ahmadiyyah Society for the propagation of Islam) was established at Lahore to which the Woking Muslim Mission was also affiliated.

The Mosque at Berlin

The important work of the presentation of Islam in England had many facilities. For instance, there already was a mosque at Woking and the greatest facility was of the language. English was spoken in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent and also in many countries besides Britain where it was the mother-tongue of the people. It was also spoken and understood in many Muslim and non-Muslim countries. Preaching of Islam in English language was, therefore, not a difficult task. The scope and distribution of Islamic literature in English in India and other countries could strengthen the Mission. But circumstances are not very favourable when a Mission is set up in another country. This, however, did not deter the Ahmadiyyah Anjuman from carrying on its activities in other lands. It was in 1922, ten years after the establishment of a mission in England, that another was set up in Germany and the foundations of a mosque were laid at Berlin. Germany is in the centre of Europe and any Movement established there can influence the continent. The problem of language presented a difficulty as German is
considered to be one of the difficult languages of Europe. To prepare and procure men for this work was a difficult task; but in spite of all these obstacles a mission in Berlin (Germany) was established in 1923. It has now become an active Islamic centre in Europe. The beautiful mosque built in the heart of Berlin in the year 1925, is a standing monument of Muslim architecture and the zeal and devotion of the Ahmadis for the cause of Islam in the West. The Mosque has become a place of special interest for the visitors to the historic city of Berlin. It was seriously damaged during the Second World War. Major repairs have been done through voluntary donations from the members of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishā'at-Islām, Lahore and also from the annual contribution by the Berlin City Corporation. A quarterly *Muslimisch Revieu* in German was started in 1925 which attracted attention of the German intelligentsia towards the rational teachings of Islam. Consequently notable German men and women such as Dr. Hamid Marcus, Baron Ehrenfels Rolf Umar, Ph.D., Muhammad Tawfiq Killinger, Said F. Valyi, Abd Al-Rahman Roseler, and Professor A. K. Germanus embraced Islam. So far about five hundred noble souls, through the instrumentality of the Berlin Muslim Mission, have entered the fold of Islam. The German translation of the Quran with Arabic text and commentary was published in 1940. This translation for the first time presented to the Germans the beauties of the Quran from a Muslim point of view. Its reprint offset edition came out in 1964. Numerous booklets and pamphlets on Islam, the life of Prophet Muhammad and the mission of the Ahmadiyyah movement have been published and distributed free of cost.

**Objections about propagation of Islam in Europe**

The beginning of the propagation of Islam in Europe no doubt made the Muslims realize the vital spiritual power which lay dormant in them. But two objections were advanced against such activities. Firstly, that there was a wide-spread irreligiousness in Europe and the propagation of Islam there was a fruitless occupation. Secondly, that these Missions required heavy expenses and if similar Missions were opened in India they would prove more
useful. It may be pointed out that the object of the Ahmadiyyah Movement is not to carry the Message of Islam to Europe and the Western countries alone but the whole world is its field of missionary operations. Besides Europe it has started its Missions not only in Asia and Africa but in Indo-Pakistan subcontinent as well, although there is no doubt that the attention of Ahmadiyyat was at first drawn to Europe. It was, however, essential that any Movement for the propagation of Islam set up on the right principles should turn its attention to Europe, because it was from this place that the greatest onslaught against Islam was made. This onslaught was made in two forms. The one was in the form of irreligious outlook on life under the influence of materialistic education and the other in the form of Christian propaganda through its missionary schools and colleges and sundry other activities in different guises. No movement for the propagation of Islam could succeed which was not effective to repel the two attacks which were wider in their scope and extent. The propagation of Islam in Europe, as a matter of fact, serves two objects at a time. The one is that Muslims themselves are saved from the consequence of irreligion on the one hand and the Christian propaganda on the other. In fact, these two menaces go hand in hand with the Western materialism. The other object is that amidst this centre of opposition against Islam, there comes into existence a group of persons whom God has shown the light of Islam. Moreover, the European thought and ideology has spread its influence in the entire world. Thus if a change occurs there, it is bound to radiate to the rest of the world. Though the change in religion would rather be on a small scale but the change in the thoughts and minds of people would be on a large scale. As misunderstanding about Islam will gradually disappear, those aspects of its teachings which appeal to man’s nature and intellect will certainly cast their spiritual influence on the minds of the Europeans and through them influence the thought of the rest of the world.

The view that Europe is in the grip of the forces of materialism and irreligion hence the propagation of Islam has no
value there, is to all intents and purposes a pathetic fallacy. The Islam itself is a panacea for atheism and irreligion. There is no doubt that atheism has remained in existence in all periods of human history, but in the present age owing to Europe’s extreme inclination towards materialism it seems to have taken an upperhand in human life for the time being. But one must remember that irreligion and materialism cannot be the lasting basis of civilization. If man is to survive, his culture and civilization must have a different basis. If materialism apparently has dominated a land, the actual facts about which are not yet fully known, it does not mean that materialism has become the basis of its civilization. The structure of civilization can stand only on the moral values which have been taught by religion. The effects of irreligious and materialistic outlook on life would be manifest after the total disappearance of the moral values. The present revolt against religion is in fact the outcome of the false teaching of the Christian Church which has presented God in a way that offends human intellect. As long as ignorance prevailed among peoples they adhered to such pervert views on religion, but as soon as human knowledge advanced, man awakened to the irrationality of the Christian concept of God. Consequently the only course left to the thinking man was to abandon Christianity and take shelter in atheism. But it should also be remembered that there is yet another group of people among Christians who are in search of truth and their search has brought them into the fold of Islam. There are men who believe in Islamic principles without knowing that this is Islam. As a matter of fact the European mind had been so poisoned against the teachings of Islam during the last so many centuries that, if God had not kindled inward awareness of the truth of Islam, it would have taken long to pave the path for the spread of Islam. Thus on one side atheism is an obstacle in the progress of Islam; on the other, it is also conducive to the acceptance of Islam in the West, because it has falsified the Christian propaganda against Islam. And it should also be borne in mind that in spite of atheism, religiousness still plays an important role in Europe,
whether it is in the form of orthodox beliefs of the Church or in the form of new and liberal versions of Christianity. Had atheism its full sway throughout Europe, the Christian Missions would not have received millions of pounds for their work in other lands. It is due to this religiousness of Europe that the network of Christian missionaries has expanded throughout the world. There are hundreds of missions and thousands of workers in every country who propagate the message of Christianity. Our Muslim friends naively think that religion has completely lost its hold on Europe. If the number of Church-goers has dwindled it only means that this form of worship does not appeal to them, but it does not mean that the spirit of religion itself has gone out of their life.

No doubt missions in Europe require a lot of expenditure; but if important results are produced by them it means the investment is bringing good dividends. The number of converts to Islam is not of much importance; the real importance at the moment lies in the influence they exercise on others by their acceptance of Islam. They can be of great service to Islam in the world. This does not mean that in preaching Islam, Muslims should devote their attention to a certain class of people only. Islam stands in need of all kinds of people, the rich and the poor, and the so-called members of the low caste as well.

Missions in other countries

Two years after the foundation of a mission in Germany another mission was started in Java where Christian missionaries were active in converting the local pagan population on one hand and attacking Islam with full force on the other. Under these conditions the Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Ishâ’at Islâm Lahore laid the foundations of Java Muslim Mission in 1924 which rendered yeoman’s service to the cause of Islam. It created a great religious consciousness among Muslims which ultimately saved them from going over to Christianity. Considerable literature including the translation of the Qur’ân in Javanese and Dutch was published. In the year 1930 the Lahore Anjuman opened a mission in
Thailand, where the condition of the Muslims was similar to that of the Muslims in Java. Mission was also opened in Trinidad in 1920. A regular mission is also working in Lagos (Nigeria) since 1962. Similarly independent and semi-independent Islamic missions run by members of the Lahore Section of the Ahmadiyyah Movement are working in Indonesia, Guyana, Suriname, Holland, United States of America, Burma, Formosa, and Ghana. Missionary work is also carried on by correspondence and literature, so much so that in about forty-five countries the message of Islam is being broadcast by pamphlets, journals and other kinds of literature.

**Missions in India**

Besides all that, there are many branches of the Ahmadiyyah Jamā‘at in India carrying on the work of broadcasting and preaching Islam in their own respective places. Regular missions were also opened in undivided India. In Ferozpur district a Mission worked for some time and many “untouchables” were converted to Islam. Similarly in Muzaffargarh district a mission worked for five years and about three thousand members of the sweeper-class won over to Islam. A mission also worked in Dera Ghazi Khān district where in Rājan Pūr and the surrounding villages about a thousand persons became Muslims. In 1926 a mission was established in Shillong (Assam) where many people of Khāśī tribe accepted Islam. For two years the Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Ishā‘at Islam bore the expenses of running the Mission but later the management was transferred to Maulavi Abdul Karim Trust. Mission has also been started in Bombay since 1930 for the propagation of the Holy Qur’ān. Both Sections of Ahmadiyyah Movement rendered immensely useful work to check the tide of Shuddhi in undivided India. Among Sikhs also, the preaching of Islam was

1. This book originally written in Urdu was published in 1931. We have not disturbed the main text except that at certain places facts have been brought up to date. For a detailed account of publications and missionary work done after 1931 by Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Ishā‘at Islām, Lahore, see Annexe V—T.

2. Ārya Samājist attempt to reconvert persons to Hinduism. —T.
carried on with success. The basis of this preaching was unique research and discovery of the Founder of the Movement that Gurū Nānak\(^3\) was in fact a Muslim.

**Propagation by Literature**

The greatest contribution of Ahmadiyyat is the religious literature which it has produced and distributed throughout the world. The number of large and small books by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmād comes to about ninety and in them are found discussions about Islam and all the great religions of the world. Islamic teachings have been explained in such a way as to elicit appreciation by many great philosophers, and even by the critics of Islam. His well-known lecture delivered in 1896 at the Conference of Great Religions held in Lahore contained answers to five important religious questions. It was later translated into English and was published with the title of *Teachings of Islam*. During the Conference the whole audience listened to it spell-bound, and Muslims and non-Muslims paid the highest tributes to its superb presentation of Islam. The well-known Russian philosopher Count Tolstoy also wrote a favourable review on this book. The discussion about the philosophy of the principles of Islam has been taken up in *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah, Aʿīnanah Kamālāt Islām* (Mirror of Excellences of Islam), *Barekāt al-Duʿā* (Blessings of Prayer), *Teachings of Islam, Chashmah Mʿarifat* (Source of Divine Gnosis) and *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah, Volume V*. Discussion about Arya Samāj will be found in *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah, Surmah Chashme Ārya, Shahnah Haqq*; *Ārya Dharma* (Arya Religion), *Chashmah Mʿarifat*; about Sikhism, *Sat Bachan*, about Christianity, *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah, Ek Isāī ke tin Sawālon ka Jawāb* (Reply to the three questions of a Christian), *Jang-i-Muqaddas* (Holy Battle) *Nūr al-Haqq* (The Light of the Truth), *Sirāj al-Dīn Isāī ke chār Sawālon kā Jawāb* (Reply to the four questions of Sirāj al-Dīn, a Christian) and in many other books; on Hindu religion in general he has discussed in *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah, Sanatan Dharma* etc. On Buddhism, Judaism, Brahmū Samāj and other religions.

\(^3\) Gurū Nānak (1469-1538 C.E) the Founder of the Sikhism—a monotheistic faith.
discussion is spread over several books. His own claims have been specially discussed in Tauđih Marām, Izālokh Auhām, Ḥamāmat al-Bushrā (Arabic) Sirāj-i-Munjir, Tirāq al-Qulūb, Tuḥfa Golrawiah, Ayyām al-Şulḥ, Kītāb al-Bariyyah, Haqīqat al-Wahy, Nuzūl al-Mashi etc. In short, there is no major religion about which he has not devoted his attention and there is no aspect of Islam on which he has not thrown light. It could be said without any fear of contradiction that to the best of our knowledge there is no other Muslim writer who has dealt with so many subjects and religions so copiously and so convincingly. And this has been admitted even by his opponents that through his unique literary contributions he has rendered lasting service to the cause of Islam. As such he rightly deserves to be called the Mujaddid-i-A’zam (The Greatest Renovator) of the Muslim nation. Again he has earned the rare distinction among those who have rendered great service to Islam by rendering his books in three languages—Urdu, Persian and Arabic—the three most widely spoken languages of the Muslim world. As his books were printed in various sizes, the Anjuman published a library edition of all the works of the Founder on a size in which the page Nos. of the first editions were also given at the margin.4

In the life of the Founder, under his influence and guidance, many members of the Movement produced valuable literature on Islam. The books by Hazrat Maulana Nūr al-Dīn deserve special mention. Faṣl al-khīlāb, Tasdīq Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah and Nūr al-Dīn contain scholarly refutation of all the Christian and the Arya Samājist objections against Islam. Then a monthly Journal, the Review of Religions was started in Urdu and English simultaneously under the auspices of the Founder, and the author of this book was its editor till he took up the work of the English translation of the Holy Qur’ān. This Journal, however,

4. In 1968 Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Isha’at Islam decided to bring out a complete photo-offset edition of all the works of the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement in Islam. Barāhīn-i-Ahmadiyyah, the first and well-known work of the Founder, comprising four volumes with index came out in 1970. The fifth volume is under print and will come out in 1973. It will be followed by other works of the Founder—T.
dealt with a comparative study of Islam with other religions. This was in a way the first step towards the propagation of Islam in Europe. Along with other writers the late Maulawi 'Abd al-Karim also deserves special mention. His forceful articles appeared mostly in the newspapers but his two books *viz.* *Khilāfat Rāshidah*, an elaborate discussion about the Shi'ah doctrines concerning *Khilāfat* and *Sirat-i-Masih Ma'ūd* have been greatly appreciated. The number of writings by Maulawi Syed Muḥammad Aḥsan is enormous but they are all in support of the claims of the Promised Messiah. *Aṣl Muṣaffā* by Mirzā Khudā Bakhsh is like a short encyclopaedia on Ahmadiyyat. Besides all this there were several others who also wielded their pen in support of the Movement.

After the death of the Founder the scope of the literary activities of the Ahmadiyyah Movement was enlarged. The English translation and commentary of the Holy Qur'ān started by the author in 1909 was completed in 1916 and published a year later. The number of copies of the first edition printed were five thousand and eleven thousand of the second edition printed in 1920. The Urdu translation and commentary entitled *Bayān al-Qur'ān* was printed in three volumes in 1922, 1923 and 1924 respectively. The English translation without text was published in 1928. As regards Life of the Holy Prophet *Strāv-i-khair al-Bashar* and *Muḥammad Muṣṭafā* were published in Urdu in 1917 and 1928 and their translations in English, *Muhammad the Prophet* and the *Prophet of Islam* saw the light of the day in 1924 and 1928 respectively. *Muḥammad and Christ* was published in 1922 and


Tarikh-i-Khilafat-i-Rashidah in 1925. The booklet Islam the Religion of Humanity was published and circulated free about 80,000 in number so far and has been translated in eleven languages. On Hadith the Maqam-i-Hadith was printed in 1917. About Ahmadiyyah Movement Al-Nubuwat fi'l Islâm (Prophethood in Islam) and Ahmadiyyah Movement were published in 1917. Besides all that, some small leaflets and pamphlets have been published in large numbers,—ten, twenty or fifty thousand at a time. Thousands of copies of the Life of the Holy Prophet have been distributed among the libraries of Europe and America or presented to several persons of note in India and other countries. Hundreds of copies of the English translation of the Holy Qur'an have also been distributed free. The object achieved is the influence which this literature has produced in the Islamic world. This can be gauged by the fact that many of the above-mentioned books published by the Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Ishâ'at Islâm, Lahore have been translated in twenty-five languages of the world. Some of the languages are of Indo-Pakistan sub-continent such as Urdu, Gurmukhi, Hindi, Sindhi, Bengali, Tamil, Telegu, Malayalam, Khâ i; and some are the languages of foreign countries such as English, German, Hungarian, Dutch, Italian, Albanian, Turkish, Arabic, Persian, Chinese, Malay, Javanese, Indonesian, Siami, Swahili and Polish.

Books by Khwaja Kamal al-Din

The writings by Khwâja Kamâl al-Dîn in Urdu and English are about fifty-five. The books in Urdu which deserve special


10. Its complete translation into English has been done by Maulana S. Muhammad Tufail, M.A, ex-Imam of the Shah Jehan Mosque, Woking, England. The first three chapters of this important work on the conception of prophethood in Islam were published by the Woking Muslim Mission, England under the title The Finality of Prophethood. The Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Ishâ'at Islam Lahore, published an unabridged edition of the same chapters entitled The Prophethood in Islam in 1968—T.
mention are Uswah Hasanah, Nubuwat kā Zahūr-i Atam, concerning
the life of the Prophet, Yanābī‘ al-Maṣḥiyat deals with the sources of
Christianity, Jihād il-Baqā, commentary of the first chapter of the
Qur‘ān, Mujaddid-i-Kāmil, a study of the claims of Mirzā Ghulām
Ahmad, Tanaddun-i-Islām, a summary of some of the teachings of
the Qur‘ān, Darārat-i-Illāh, Islām mā nā koī Firqah Nahīn (There is no
sect in Islam), Rāz-i-Hayāt (The Secret of Life), Tauḥīd fi’l Islām
(The conception of Unity in Islam), Ummu’l alsinah, a discussion
that Arabic is the mother of all languages, Hayāt baa’d al-Maut, a
critical study about the transmigration of soul etc. He has
discussed almost all these subjects in his English books some of
which are: Sources of Christianity, Ideal Prophet, Towards Islam, Islam
and Zoroastrianism, Table-talk, Introduction to the Study of Qur‘ān etc.

Two illustrations of some of the literature published by the
Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Ishā‘at Islām in the form of books,
journals etc. in several languages. A detailed description of the
contents will be found in the following pages.

The Qur‘ān: English translation with text (34), its complete
translation or of some parts have been done in the following
languages: (39) Javanese (40) Telegu (48) Dutch, Tamil.

Bayān al-Qur‘ān (translation and exhaustive commentary of the
Qur‘ān in Urdu) and Hamāil (shorter edition of the Qur‘ān with
translation and brief notes in Urdu).

Islam the Religion of Humanity: (14) English, (20) German
(25) Dutch (31) Polish (35) Albanian (41) Hungarian (44) Siamese
(49) Chinese (55) Persian (65) Malayālam and Urdu.

The Prophet of Islam: (13) English (19) Dutch (24) Albanian
(30) Chinese (43) Urdu (54) Sindhi (63) Gurmukhi, (64) Hindi.


What is Islam? in five languages: (12) English (18) Chinese
(23) Urdu, Gurmukhi (29) Dutch.

D’awat-i-‘Amal (Call for action): (33) English (38) Malay
(42) Urdu.

Back to the Qur‘ān: (14) English (28) Arabic.

Miscellaneous literature

The relations of the Ahmadiyyah Movement: (9) Arabic (37) German.

Islam: (46) Dutch (36) Khāsī.
Principles of Islam: (11) German (32) Khāsī.
Beliefs of the Lahore Ahmadiyyah Movement: (51) Arabic (56) Urdu
(60) English (50) Albanian.
Muḥammad and Christ: (67) Persian.
Ahmadiyyah Movement and Jihad: (61) Dutch.
Mirza Ghulam Ahmad the Man: (52) English (57) Dutch.
What is Islam?: (27) Dutch (45) Khāsī.
Islam and Prayer: (47) Swahili.
Death of the Messiah: (66) Javanese.
Birth of the Messiah: (23) Dutch.
Attributes of God: (16) Dutch.
Islamic Brotherhood: (10) Dutch.
Muhammad the Prophet: Urdu (2) English (3) Bengali (4) Turkish.
Translation of the Qur'ān without text: (1) English.

The weekly or monthly journals:
(1) Paighām Sulh (Urdu) Pakistan.
(2) Al-Rābiṭah al-Islāmiyah (Arabic) Indonesia.
(3) The Light (English) Pakistan.
(4) Islamic Guardian (English) Guayana.
(5) Moslemische Revue (German)
(6) Risālah Ahmadiyyah (Javanese) Indonesia.
(7) Correspondentie Blad (Dutch) Indonesia.
(8) Przegląd Islamski (Polish) Poland.
(9) Mediator Series (English) Cape Town (South Africa)
(10) Islamic Review (Chinese) Taiwan.
(11) Rooh-i-Islam (Urdu) Pakistan.
(12) Islamic Review (English) England.
(13) Al-Haq (Urdu and Dutch) Surinam.
(14) Ḥaqīqat al-Islām (Urdu and Dutch) Surinam.
(15) Jumu'ah (Urdu and Dutch) Surinam.
(16) Al-Fariq (Dutch) Holland.
Annexe—V

This annexure to Chapter V carries supplementary yearwise list of some of the important works and publications done by the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat-i-Islam, Lahore and its branches in foreign countries whether independent or run by the Central Anjuman.

Muslim High School No. 1, Lahore ... 1917
Muslim High School, Baddomalhi (Distt. Sialkot) ... 1921
Muhammad and Christ ... 1921
India in the Balance by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din (Woking Muslim Mission, England) ... 1922
Muhammad the Prophet II ... 1923
Bayanul Qur’an—Urdu translation and exhaustive commentary of the Qur’an with Arabic text in three volumes ... 1922-24
Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishâ’at-i-Islam, Djakarta, Indonesia ... 1924
Fazlul Bari—Urdu translation and commentary of Sahih al-Bukhari in two volumes ... 1926-37
English translation of the Qur’an without text ... 1928
The Islam : Institution of Prayer ... 1929
Ahmadiyya Anjuman, Surinam (South America) ... 1930
The Early Caliphate—valuable contribution to the lives of the four pious Caliphs of Islam ... 1931
History and Doctrines of the Babi Movement ... 1931
Fiji Ahmadiyya Mission ... 1931
Muslim Revival, quarterly, Lahore ... 1932
Muhammad the Prophet (1st revised edition) ... 1932
Introduction to the Study of Hadith ... 1932
Selections from the Holy Qur’an ... 1933
Collection and Arrangement of the Qur’an ... 1933
Young Islam, bi-monthly edited and financed by Dr. Allah Bakhsh, Lahore ... 1934
The Religion of Islam—an encyclopaedic work on the teachings, ordinances and practices of Islam ... 1935

11. Books without the name of an author are those by Maulana Muhammad Ali.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to the Study of the Qur'an</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad—<em>A Mercy to all the Nations</em> by Qasim Ali Jairazbhoy (Woking Muslim Mission, England)</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Muslim Prayer Book</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mujaddid-i-Azam—in three volumes by Dr. Basharat Ahmad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—A comprehensive and authoritative work on the life and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement in Islam</td>
<td>1939-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland Muslim Mission, Hague</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German translation of the Qur'an with Arabic text and commentary</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Maulana Sadr-ud-Din</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Manual of Hadith—a superb selection from the six authentic</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collections of Hadith of Prophet Muhammad dealing with Islamic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husn-i-Bayan—Urdu translation of the Qur'an with brief notes by</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maulana Ghulam Hassan Khan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme of translating the Qur'an into five European languages</td>
<td>1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New World Order—Quranic view-point on the modern social and</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam and Western Socialism by Aftab-ud-Din Ahmad (Woking</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim Mission, Lahore)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running Commentary of the Qur'an by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din (Woking</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim Mission, Lahore)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam or Marxism by Aftab-ud-Din Ahmad (Woking Muslim Mission,</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahore)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of the Prophets—culled and annotated from the Qur'an</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Thoughts of Prophet Muhammad—an excellent treatise on the</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life of Prophet Muhammad and salient features of Islam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayers of the Qur'an</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punj Sura—English translation of Five Chapters of the Qur'an with</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic text and transliteration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Muslim High School No. 2, Lahore12 1948

English translation of the Qur'an without text with brief notes (Revised edition) 1948

The Anti-Christ, Gog and Magog 1949

Chinese Muslim Youth League, Taiwan 1949

Scheme of free gift of eight authentic books on Islam including English translation of the Qur'an to 5000 libraries of the world 1949

English translation of the Qur'an with text (revised edition) 1951

Jesus in Heaven on Earth by Khwaja Nazir Ahmad (Woking Muslim Mission, Lahore)—a remarkable research work on Jesus Christ's escape from the Cross, his travelling to Kashmir and his death there 1951

Bengali translation of The Teachings of Islam 1953

Battlefields of Prophet Muhammad by Dr. Hamidullah (Woking Muslim Mission, England) 1955

English translation of Sahih al-Bukhari part I by Aftab-ud-Din Ahmad 1956

Guyana Ahmadiyya Anjuman, South America 1956

Mediator Islamic Association, Capetown (S. Africa) 1957

English translation of Sahih al-Bukhari part II by Aftab-ud-Din Ahmad 1959

The New Muslim College, Lahore 1961

Islam Our Choice edited by Dr. K. A. Khulusi (Woking Muslim Mission, England). Besides dealing with main features of Islam and the views of non-Muslim scholars on them, it carries stories of Europeans accepting Islam through Woking Muslim Mission, England 1961


Mera Qubool-i-Islam—Urdu translation of the second part of Islam Our Choice (Woking Muslim Mission, Lahore) 1962

12. All the educational institutions have been taken over by the Government under the Presidential Nationalization Ordinance, October, 1972.
Nigeria Muslim Mission, Lagos .......... 1962
Nigeria Muslim Mission, Kano .......... 1962
Ghana Muslim Mission, Kumasi .......... 1962

Mujahid-i-Kabir—compiled and edited by Mumtaz Ahmad Faruqui and Muhammad Ahmad—a detailed and documented account of the life and works of Maulana Muhammad Ali, the Founder-head of Ahmadiyya
Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore .......... 1962

Anecdotes from the Life of Prophet Muhammad by Mumtaz Ahmad Faruqui .......... 1962

East Nigeria Muslim Mission, Okposi .......... 1963
Building for Islamic Seminary, Lahore .......... 1963
Promised Messiah Memorial Hall, Lahore .......... 1963
The New Ahmadiyya Guest House, Lahore .......... 1963
Ahmadiyya Anjuman, Trinidad (West Indies) .......... 1964
Ahmadiyya Market No. 1, Lahore .......... 1964

German translation of the Qur'an by Maulana Sadr-ud-Din (Reprint edition) .......... 1964

Running translation of the Qur'an with Arabic text translated and published by Dr. Khadim Rahmani Nuri of Assam 1964

English translation of Taudhîh-i-Maram of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad by Iqbal Ahmad .......... 1966

Muhammad in World Scriptures (revised edition in three volumes) by Maulana Abdul Haq Vidyarthi—a unique research regarding the prophecies about the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad extant in the holy scriptures of the world .......... 1966-72

Dutch translation of the Qur'an (reprint edition) .......... 1968

English translation of Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya (Abridged edition) by Mirza Masum Beg .......... 1968

Indonesian translation of the Qur'an with Arabic text and commentary .......... 1968

Council of Ahmadiyya Anjuman Western Hemisphere, Trinidad .......... 1969

In 1969 the second Ahmadiyyah Convention was held in San Fernando (Trinidad, West Indies) in which besides the host country, delegates from Guyana

(Contd.)
London Ahmadiyya Mission, England  ..  1969
Daru. Islam—The new Ahmadiyya Colony, Lahore  ..  1970
The Songs of Islam by S. Muhammad Tufail, M.A.  ..  1971
Ahmadiyya Market No. 2, Lahore  ..  1972
Al-Noor Foundation Printing Press, Lahore  ..  1972
English translation of Sahih al-Bukhari part III by Aftab-ud-Din Ahmad  ..  1972
The Religion of Islam (Third revised edition)  ..  1972

Translations in foreign languages

Islam the Religion of Humanity—Italian, Thai.
Prophet of Islam—Tamil, Khasi, Chinese.
Prayer and Three ways to Salvation—Arabic, Urdu.
Institution of Prayer—Chinese, Dutch.
Islamic Law of Marriage & Divorce—Arabic, Chinese, Dutch, German.
Muhammad the Prophet—Arabic, Sindhi, Hindi, Dutch.
Call of Islam—Burmese.
Introduction to the Study of the Qur'an—Dutch, Chinese.
Living Thoughts of Prophet Muhammad—Persian, Chinese.
Death of Jesus (Fatwa)—Burmese.
Two Sections of the Ahmadiyya Movement—Burmese.
The Religion of Islam—Dutch, 1936, 1955, Turkish, Arabic.
Sources of Christianity by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din—Dutch, German.
Secret of Existence—Dutch, Indonesian.
True Conception of Ahmadiyya Movement—Indonesian.
Facts about the Ahmadiyya Movement—Indonesian.
English translation of the Qur'an — Indonesian.

and Surinam also attended. In one of the sessions of that Convention it was decided to constitute a Council of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam for the Western Hemisphere to exelerate propagation work in that part of the world. Since then four other conventions have been held in each country by rotation. Hazrat Ameer Maulana Sadru-ud-Din, present head of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Lahore, attended the third Convention held in 1970 in Surinam (South America). The Council is working on plans to construct centres and cooperative societies in Trinidad, Guyana and Surinam to further the cause of Islam in the Western Hemisphere. —Ed.
The Anti-Christ, Gog & Magog — Indonesian.
Promised Messiah & Mehdi — Indonesian.
Islam by Lovegrove—Indonesian.
Islam is Modern by Maulana Sadr-ud-Din—Indonesian.
Fath-i-Islam, an Urdu book of the Promised Messiah—Indonesian.
Al-wasiyyat, an Urdu booklet of the Promised Messiah—Indonesian.
Marxism Analysed by Aftab-ud-Din Ahmad—Indonesian.
Sayings of Muhammad by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din — Indonesian.
Teachings of Islam—Indonesian.
New World Order—Dutch, Arabic, Urdu, Siamese, German.
Toward Islam by Kh. Kamal-ud-Din — Dutch.
Back to the Quran—Dutch, Arabic, Siamese.
The Ahmadiyya Movement—Dutch, Malay.
CHAPTER VI

MAULANA ABUL KALAM AZAD ON THE AHMADIYYAH MOVEMENT

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad was once drawn by a correspondent of the daily Zamindar of Lahore into the controversy as to the nature of the claims of the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement and the rights of the Ahmadiyya communities to claim a position within Islam. Both these matters were set at rest by the Maulana in the very first passage of his first letter to the said correspondent thus:

"You enquire which one of the two Ahmadi groups follows the true path, the Qadian group or the Lahore one. In my opinion neither is on the true and right path, but the Qadian section has gone too far in its ghuluw, so far that the very fundamentals of Islam have been shaken; for instance, its belief that for faith and salvation the known and admitted doctrines of Islam are not now sufficient and that it is essential to believe in the Mirza Sahib of Qadian. But the Lahore group denies this ghuluw; it neither confesses a faith in the prophethood of the Mirza Sahib nor does it add any new condition to the conditions of faith; where it has stumbled is in the misplaced belief which it has created for the Mirza Sahib."

In this passage Maulana Abul Kalam has made clear the three points: 1. The position which the Mirza Sahib claimed for himself, 2. Whether the Qadian group is outside or within the pale of Islam, and 3. The position of the Lahore group.

Let us consider first the position of the Mirza Sahib in the light of what the Maulana has said. In ascribing ghuluw to the Qadianis, the Maulana has in fact made it clear that the Mirza Sahib never claimed prophethood for himself, for a ghali is one who ascribes a position to its leader higher than that which he claims for himself. For example, the Christians are guilty of

---

1. The daily Zamindar, Lahore, 16 June, 1936.
ghuluww when they ascribe to Jesus Christ a claim to Godhead because he never claimed Godhead for himself. Hence the Qâdiânîs can be said to be guilty of ghuluww only if they ascribe to Mîrzâ Sâhib a claim which he never made for himself.

The above conclusion drawn from Maulânâ Abul Kalâm’s letter is further corroborated by two of his earlier writings on the subject. The first of these is a passage which occurs in the Maulânâ’s well-known book the Tadkhira published in 1919. Writing about Sayyid Muḥammad of Jaunpûr who claimed to be the Mahdi, the Maulânâ says:

“The affair of the Sayyid of whom we are speaking is full of wonder, and various sorts of claims and absurd sayings have been attributed to him. What the followers of a person say need not be paid attention to, for whomever a people take for their religious leader they would raise him to no less a dignity than that of Godhead, and if they are very careful they would not keep him below the position of a prophet. But some recent writers have written things which at first sight cause perturbation. Shah Abdul Haq, the Muhaddath of Delhi, writes: ‘According to Sayyid Muḥammad of Jaunpûr, every perfection possessed by the Holy Prophet Muḥammad was also possessed by Sayyid Muḥammad, the only difference being that there it was in asālat (possessed originally) and here it was by tab ‘iyyat (attained by following), and by following the Holy Prophet he attained to such a place that he became like a prophet.’

“Reading these words of Shâh Sâhib, it occurred to me that in our own days a big section of the followers of the Mîrzâ Sâhib of Qâdiân entertains an exactly similar belief about the Mîrzâ Sâhib and lays the foundation of all its ghuluww (exceeding the bounds) and ighrâq (exaggeration) on this difference of asālat (possessing originally) and tâbe‘iyyat (attaining by following).”

(Tadkhira, pp. 30, 31).

Here the Maulânâ states that the followers of Sayyid Muḥammad and a great section of the followers of the Mîrzâ Sâhib have fallen into the same error and have been guilty of exaggerating the claims of their respective leaders. Evidently he
is referring here to the Qādiānīs and considers them to be guilty of ghuluww, i.e., exaggerating the claims of the Mirzā Sāhib and attributing to him what he never claimed. Thus attributing the claim of prophethood to Mirzā Sāhib is ghuluww on the part of the Qādiānīs; in other words, the Mirzā Sāhib did not claim to prophethood.

As regards the second writing of the Maulānā which exonerates the Mirzā Sāhib of laying claim to prophethood, it is really a fatwa given by him when extracts dealing with the alleged claim to prophethood taken from his different writings were placed before the Maulānā. These extracts were sent to him by me personally, and he returned those papers with the following words: "He is a mu'awwil (one who explains a word as conveying a significance quite different from its ordinary significance) and a mu'awwil is by unanimous decision not a kāfīr."

This shows that after reading all the writings of the Mirzā Sāhib on the question of his alleged claim to prophethood, Maulānā Abul Kalām came to the conclusion that he never laid claim to prophethood and explained his use of the word prophet as conveying a different significance from the usually received one.

Thus Maulānā's letters to the correspondent of the Zamīndār settle at least one question, viz. that the Mirzā Sāhib was not a claimant to prophethood and that he was a Muslim and not a kāfīr.

We will now take the second question whether the Maulānā looks upon the Qādiānīs as Muslims or kāfīrs. The Maulānā considers them to be guilty of ghuluww (exaggeration and exceeding the proper limits), but at the same time he considers them to be Muslims — Muslims who have strayed away from the right path. That is all that one Muslim can say about another. Their error is very great, and it shakes the very foundations of Islam, says the Maulānā, but he has not been carried away by the senseless agita-

2. I am writing this from memory and the original is in my papers at Lahore. But there is not the least doubt in my mind as to the words quoted being in their essence those of the Maulānā.
tion to expel this or that group from the pale of Islam. It is the Holy Prophet’s verdict that they are Muslims—yes erring Muslims—but Muslims all the same. For, does not the Holy Prophet say: “Whoever says prayers as we do, and faces our Qibla and eats our dhabiha,—that one is surely a Muslim and for him is the covenant of Allah and the covenant of the Apostle of Allah, so do not violate the covenant of Allah” (Bukhārī, 8:28). And on a certain occasion when a man abused the Holy Prophet in his face, and the Holy Prophet would not suffer any harm be done to him because, he said, “perhaps he said prayers,” Khalid remarked: “How many people there are who say prayers, yet there is on their lips what is not in their hearts.” But the Holy Prophet rebuked him, saying: “I am not commanded to pierce the hearts of the people or to break open their secret thoughts” (Bukhārī, 65:63).3

The Maulānā is thus a noble exception to the Ulamā of the present day who care neither for the Holy Qur’ān which says: “And say not to any one who offers you the (Islamic) salutation: Thou art not a believer” (4:94); nor yet for the Holy Prophet who clearly commanded that the covenant of God shall not be broken by calling a man Kāfir who said prayers as the Muslims do. The Qādiānis are undoubtedly shaking the very foundations of Islam by attributing prophethood to the Mujaddid of this century and by denouncing four hundred million of Muslims as kāfirs because they do not believe in the prophethood of the Mirzā Sāhib, but with all those grievous errors they are Muslims, just as the Shiās are Muslims though they abuse the companions of the Holy Prophet and denounce them as usurpers and just as so many other extremist sects are Muslims though they raise their leaders to the dignity of Godhead or the dignity of prophethood.

I now come to the third question: the Lahore section of the followers of Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad of Qādiān, or the Ahmadiyyās as they are now generally called as distinguished from the Qādiānis. Maulānā Abul Kalām has, here too, set at rest

ان لم أوَّل مرَّان القُلُوب الناس اواشق بطونهم 3.
one question, viz., that the Ahmadis do not believe in the prophethood of the Mirzā Sāhib, nor do they add any condition to the accepted conditions of the faith of Islam. This clearing of the position of the Ahmadis in Islam is also an important contribution to sane criticism in the Muslim camp, for sanity is a gift which is so rare among the Ulamā, even among the general Muslim public, when they have to deal with Ahmadis. Once, Mufti Kifayatullāh, the head of the Jamī'at-ul-Ulamā of Delhi, committed the mad act of denouncing the Lahore Ahmadis as kāfirs because, he said, “they believed in the prophethood of Mirzā Sāhib,” and this in spite of the fact that we have been carrying on an incessant war against the Qādiānīs regarding their belief in the prophethood of the Mirzā Sāhib and their denunciation of the forty crores of Muslims as kāfirs.

While I am sincerely thankful to Maulānā Abul Kalām for definitely and clearly upholding the truth in these three matters, that the Mirzā Sāhib never claimed to be a prophet, that the Qādiānīs in spite of their grievous errors are Muslims, and that the Ahmadis deny the prophethood of the Mirzā Sāhib and accept him only as a Mujaddid, adding nothing to the accepted doctrines of the faith of Islam, I must say that the Maulānā has not done justice to us. He has every right to say that we are not on the true path, for to differ with others is the Muslim's birthright; the Maulānā has a right to differ with us and we have a right to differ with the Maulānā. But when he says that we have “stumbled” in a “misplaced belief which we have created for the Mirzā Sāhib,” he is unjust to us. We have created no belief for the Mirzā Sāhib except only what the Qur’ān and the Hadith say. For what is our belief regarding Mirzā Sāhib? We accept him as a Mujaddid and we accept him as fulfilling the prophecies relating to the advent of the Messiah among the Muslims. And the coming of Mujaddids and the advent of a Messiah are both based on Hadith.

As regards the first point, the Maulānā was undoubtedly misunderstood as denying the coming of Mujaddids when his two letters to the correspondent of the Zamindār appeared in the press.
But the writer of Tadhkirah who describes the Mujaddid as the centre of all hope in the triumph of Islam could not deny the coming of Mujaddids. His words were surely strong, but he has tried to explain them away in a later statement, and whether we accept or reject his explanation, we have no right to ascribe to him denial of the coming of Mujaddids now that he has reaffirmed his faith in their advent in very clear words. His real views on this point are met with in his famous writing, the Tadhkirah:

"These perfect ones are given the name of muhaddath in the hadith of Bukhari, and in them, too, is fulfilled the hadith relating to the appearance of Mujaddid, which has been narrated through various channels, and about its genuineness, therefore no doubt can be entertained."

(p. 94).

"And these are the clear and manifest characteristics of the place of tajdid (the position of the Mujaddid), the vicegerency of prophethood, about which I have again and again said that the highest of heads must bow there."

(p. 140).

Now when it is accepted that the Mujaddids must come, and the Hadith says that the commencement of every century of Hijra shall see the appearance of a Mujaddid, I fail to see how our belief about the Mirza Sahib being a Mujaddid of the fourteenth century is "misplaced" when there is no one to claim that office, nor has any one else been unanimously accepted as the Mujaddid. In accepting Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as the Mujaddid of the fourteenth century we have bowed only before the Hadith of the Holy Prophet. One of the two positions must be accepted; either the hadith relating to the appearance of the Mujaddid is not genuine, which view is however strongly rejected by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, or Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is the Mujaddid of the 14th century, for there is neither another claimant nor has the Muslim world unanimously declared another man to be the Mujaddid of this century.

Now there remains only one point. Have we created any new belief in accepting the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement
as the Messiah that was to come among the Muslims? Happily Maulâna Abul Kalâm Azâd, whose letters in the Zamindâr raised apprehensions in some minds that he was denying the Ḥadîth referring to the advent of Messiah, has cleared his position in a later statement, and we are glad that he accepts the Ḥadîth. I am further certain that, like us, the Maulâna also believes in the death of Jesus Christ. Now the position is this: The Messiah must come as the Ḥadîth says, but Jesus Christ cannot be that Messiah because he died long ago. There is then no escaping the conclusion that the Messiah that is to come among the Muslims must be a Mujaddid of this ummah. We accept Mirzâ Ghulâm Ahmâd to be that Mujaddid. We have created no new belief. Here again we bow our head before the Ḥadith of the Holy Prophet. What are our arguments for accepting him as such is a different question which cannot be discussed here. The Maulâna has a right to say that Mirzâ Ghulâm Ahmâd is not the Mujaddid and the Messiah, and that we have made a mistake in fixing our choice, just as we have the right to say that the Maulâna is making a mistake in rejecting him, but two conclusions are inevitable: There must be a Mujaddid of this century, and only a Mujaddid can be the Promised Messiah.
CHAPTER VII
DR. MUHAMMAD IQBAL'S STATEMENT
RE THE QADIANS

Dr. Sir Muhammad Iqbal's statement on the controversy between the Qadianis and the orthodox Muslims has both a religious and a political significance, and from both points of view it has its values as well as its defects, but I am concerned only with its first aspect. Sir Muhammad Iqbal has done a great service to the Cause of Islam by appealing to the solidarity of Islam as based on the Finality of Prophethood, but I must say — and this not without regret — that this service to the great cause has been more than neutralized by the remedy which he suggests to maintain that solidarity. In the first place he begs the British Government to interfere in the religious controversy between the Qadianis and the orthodox and to help the majority against an insignificant minority, and in the second place he wants to bring about unity among the Muslims by making as many rifts in their ranks as the Qadiani doctrine of the continuance of prophethood is likely to create, perhaps more.

Solidarity is to-day the greatest need of the Muslim communities whether living in India or elsewhere, and the basis of this solidarity must undoubtedly be laid on the Finality of the Prophethood of Muhammad (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him). One of the greatest changes brought about by the advent of our Holy Prophet—I should call it a revolution—was that

1. Dr. Sir Muhammad Iqbal, who was once a great admirer of the Ahmadiyyah Movement, issued in 1936 a long statement re the Qādiānīs. It was motivated mainly by political reasons and the views of the extremist Qādiānī section were made the basis of this statement. The Maulānā Muhammad 'Ali replied to it and explained the Lahore Ahmadiyyah standpoint and threw light on the correct beliefs and mission of the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement in Islam. The reply first appeared in the Light weekly, Lahore and later in the form of a booklet entitled Dr. Sir Muhammad Iqbal's Statement re. the Qādiānīs. Another detailed commentary was made in Urdu by Syed Akhtar Husain Gilani entitled 'Allāma Iqbal aur Tahrik-i Ahmadiyyat. — Ed.
before him every nation and every age had its own prophet, but the Prophet Muhammad was the Prophet of all nations and all ages, and thus prophyhood was made the basis of the unification of the human race. Different peoples owing allegiance to different prophets meant so many different standards under which the human race was divided into as many different groups, but one prophet for all nations and all ages meant all peoples gathering together under one flag. Finality of Prophethood in Islam did not mean that the sending of prophets for the upliftment of humanity was brought to a close as an arbitrary act; it signified that the racial and national differences which had grown up as a result of sending different prophets to different peoples and had thus divided humanity into water-tight compartments and become a bar to the further advancement of human civilization, should be obliterated, and the whole human race living on this globe should feel as if it were a single unit. Both these ideas go hand in hand in the Holy Qur'ān. On the one hand, we read:

"Blessed is He Who sent down the Furqān upon His servant that he may be a warner to all the nations" (25:1).

"Say, O people! I am the Apostle of Allah to you all" (7 : 158).

"And We have not sent thee but to all the men as a bearer of good news and as a warner" (31 : 28).

And, on the other hand, the significance underlying the advent of a world-prophet in place of the national prophets is thus made clear:

"And peoples are naught but a single nation" (10 : 19).

"And this your community is one community and I am your Lord" (23 : 52).

"All peoples are a single nation" (2 : 213).

"O people! be careful of your duty to your Lord Who created you from a single being and created its mate of the same kind and spread from these many men and women" (4 : 1).

Thus the idea is put forward that the whole human race is but one family, and all tribal and racial differences are minimised by such declaration as the following:
"O you men! We have created you of a male and a female, and made you tribes and families that you may know one another" (48:13).

"And one of His signs is the creation of the heavens and the earth and the diversity of your tongues and colours; surely there are signs in this for the learned" (30:22).

The Finality of Prophethood has thus the unification of the human race as the underlying idea, and Sir Muhammad Iqbal hits the nail on the head when he declares that the solidarity of the Muslims must be based on the Finality of Prophethood in the Holy Prophet Muhammad. The continuation of prophethood would make the whole change brought about by the universality of Muhammad's mission and the consequent finality of Prophethood in him meaningless. He is, however, mistaken in thinking that the idea of the continuance of prophethood before the Holy Prophet Muhammad is a Magian idea and not Islamic. I quote his words:

"The concept of Magian culture, according to modern researches, includes cultures associated with Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Jewish Christianity, Chaldean and Sabian religions. To these creed-communities the idea of the continuity of prophethood was essential, and consequently they lived in a state of constant expectation. The result of the Magian attitude was the disintegration of old communities and the constant formation of fresh ones by all sorts of religious adventures."

I am afraid in the concluding words, Sir Muhammad Iqbal has not spared the prophets who are apparently identified with "religious adventures." I am sure he did not mean this, as the continuance of prophethood before it came to perfection in the person of Muhammad (peace be upon him), is an essentially Islamic idea. All the great prophets were promised and the world kept waiting for them and was thus in a state of expectancy. The Jews had long waited for the advent of Messiah, and both the Jews and the Christians kept on waiting for the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. A state of constant expectation cannot therefore be condemned outright as Sir Muhammad Iqbal has done. In fact, when we speak of finality we admit continuance and consequent
expectation before it. According to the plain teachings of the Holy Qur'an, both, continuance of prophethood till a certain time and its finality, are parts of the same Divine scheme for the upliftment of humanity. A prophet, according to the Holy Qur'an, was sent to every nation when there were scanty means of intercourse, and there were nations to whom prophets were sent generation after generation to help their onward progress. One such nation was that of the Israelites, to whom a large number of prophets were sent, many of whom are named in the Holy Qur'an: "We gave Moses the Book and We sent apostles after him one after another" (2:87). This is further explained by the Holy Prophet himself according to a hadith contained in the Sahih al-Bukhari: "The Israelites were led by prophets; when one prophet died, another was raised after him; after me, however, there is no prophet but there shall be khalifas, i.e., those who would continue my work." It is a grave error therefore to condemn the continued coming of prophets in certain nations as an idea not based on Divine revelation but a Magian idea as is described by Dr. Iqbal.

Sir Muhammad Iqbal is aware that we, the members of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat-i-Islam, Lahore, have kept on fighting with the Qadianis for over twenty years about this very doctrine of the continuance of prophethood and its unavoidable result that all those Muslims who do not believe in the new revelation are kafirs. And therefore we consider his appeal, so far as the doctrine of the finality of prophethood is concerned, timely and opportune. I agree with Sir Muhammad Iqbal when he says:

"Any religious society, historically arising from the bosom of Islam, which claims a new prophethood for its basis and declares all Muslims who do not recognize the truth of its alleged revelation, as kafirs, must therefore be regarded by every Muslim as a serious danger to the solidarity of Islam."

The solidarity of Islam is endangered not by the claims of this or that man or by the claims of a certain section or its leader; it is endangered by the tendency of takfir, by declaring those who believe in the Holy Prophet Muhammad as kafirs. A Muslim is one who declares his faith in the Holy Prophet.

Muhammad and to call him a kāfir is to create divisions in the house of Islam that would shatter the idea of unity which, as already stated, is the idea underlying the finality of prophethood. But if the Qadianis are guilty of the heinous offence of shattering the unity of Islam by calling other Muslims kāfirs, even the orthodox are not free of this guilt. A man of the learning of Sir Muhammad Iqbal should have given the right lead by denouncing the error itself, not by denouncing one section and defending the other when both are guilty of the same error. He should have also shown disapprobation of the campaign of vilification that is being carried on by some orthodox against the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement. No person should be vilified because his followers have gone astray, and Sir Muhammad Iqbal at any rate is not unaware that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement is not responsible for the Qadiani doctrine that those who do not believe in his Mission are kāfirs.

I do not propose to enter into a discussion here as to whether or not the Founder of the Ahmādiyya Movement laid a claim to prophethood and as to whether or not he declared those Muslims to be kāfirs who did not believe in him. This discussion I leave for a separate tract. But I would refer Sir Muhammad Iqbal to an incident which he himself so recently related to me when I paid him a visit during his sickness in October 1934. The Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, he told me, was then in Sialkot — he did not remember the year, but it was the year 1904 as the facts related by him show. Sir Fazl-i-Hussain was then practising as a lawyer in Sialkot, and one day while he (Mian Fazl-i-Hussain Sahib) was going to see the Mirza Sahib, he (Sir Muhammad Iqbal) met him in the way, and after inquiring where he was going he also accompanied him. During the conversation that ensued with the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, Sir Fazl-i-Hussain asked him if he looked upon those who did not believe in him as kāfirs and the Mirza Sahib without a moment’s hesitation replied that he did not. This fact which Sir Muhammad Iqbal himself related to me last year is a clear evidence that the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement is not responsible for the present Qadiani
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Doctrine which, as Sir Muhammad Iqbal has rightly pointed out, is a serious danger to the solidarity of Islam.

Sir Muhammad Iqbal's evidence in this respect is fully borne out by the Mirza Sahib's own writings and by his practice. In one of his writings published in October 1902, he writes in clear words: "From the beginning it has been my belief that no one becomes a kafir or dajiil by denial of my claim" (Tiryâq al-Qulâb, p. 130). And in practice too he followed this view, for no less than four times (twice in writing and twice orally) did he direct or permit his followers to hold a funeral service over the dead Muslims who were not his followers. There is the most reliable evidence that he himself conducted such services in his lifetime, and his followers did the same in all the big centres where their numbers were sufficient, such as Lahore, Sialkot, Simla, etc., and the practice was only stopped by the present head of the Qadian section, the Lahore section being still faithful to the Founder in this respect.

At any rate, Sir Muhammad Iqbal who is personally a witness of the fact that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement was not guilty of calling other Muslims kafirs should have raised his voice against the campaign of vilification that is being carried on against him, especially because such a campaign is against the explicit teachings of the Holy Qur'an which condemns carping and fault-finding even against non-Muslims. The Jews and the Christians were among the bitterest enemies of Islam and they vilified Islam and the Holy Prophet, yet the Muslims were told to call them to the way of the Lord "with wisdom and goodly exhortation and have disputations with them in the best manner" (16:125). A fight on principles would be far more effective than the present campaign of vilification which is undermining the whole strength of Islam. M. Raghib Ahsan, of Calcutta, gives the right lead in the matter in his article published in the Ihsan, dated September 1935. He says: "The question is, when one group is opposed to this basic principle of Islam, and strives against it under the pretence of different interpretations, what is the proper course for the Muslim Community for the protection of self and the defence of the faith? In my opinion it is essential for
the Muslims that they should not only be themselves firm on the doctrine of the Finality of Prophethood but also they should explain its significance and object so lucidly that even their children should become acquainted with it. The best way of subduing the opponents is to invite them to the right way with goodwill, exhortation and wisdom and even if it is necessary to have disputation with them, this best way should not be given up. The Muslims should on all account avoid severity and harshness.” If such noble lead had been given by a man of the position of Sir Muhammad Iqbal, much of the energy of the Muslims could have been spared for some constructive work.

Qadianis do indeed deny the finality of prophethood but even the average Muslim has no real grasp of the idea of finality, as Sir Muhammad Iqbal rightly remarks. And how could he have it when he believes that a prophet, Jesus Christ, must come after the Holy Prophet? It is to be regretted that Sir Muhammad Iqbal has not cleared this point. Perhaps there was the fear of a hue and cry being raised against him by the Mulas and the Mulla-ridden masses. If the Qadianis deny the finality of prophethood in Prophet Muhammad by bringing in a new prophet after him, even the orthodox set no value on finality because they insist on bringing in a past prophet, and one sees no difference between the positions of the two parties, the Qadianis and the orthodox. It was the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement who established the finality of prophethood in Muhammad on a firm basis by announcing in clear words that neither an old nor a new prophet can come after our Holy Prophet.

The following quotations from his writings show how strongly he was opposed to the idea of a prophet appearing after the Holy Prophet Muhammad:

“I have firm belief that our Prophet (peace be on him) is the last of the prophets and after him there will appear no prophet in this umma, neither new nor old........only muhaddath will come.”

(Nishān-i-Āsmāni, p. 28).

“Our Prophet (peace be on him) is the last of the prophets and no prophet can come after him, therefore in the Islamic law the muhaddath takes the place of the prophet.”

(Shahādat al- Qur’ān, p. 27).
"Can a wretched liar who claims prophethood and messengership for himself have any faith in the Holy Qur'an? And can any one who believes in the Holy Qur'an.......say that he is a prophet and messenger after the Holy Prophet Muhammad?"

(Anjâm-i-Atham, p. 27).

It is true that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement has used the word prophet metaphorically regarding a muhaddath and regarding himself, but metaphor and reality are two different things, and he has explained this at many places:

"The Promised Messiah, on account of his being a muhaddath can be called a prophet metaphorically." (Izâla-i-Auḥâm, p. 349).

"If muhaddathiyyat is called prophethood metaphorically, it does not mean a claim to prophethood." (Ibid., p. 422).

"I have never claimed to be a prophet and a messenger in a real sense, and to use a word in a metaphorical sense and in a wider literary sense is no heresy." (Anjâm-i-Atham, p. 27).

"I have been called a prophet by God in a metaphorical and not in a real sense." (Haqiqat al-Wahy, p. 65)

The Lahore section of the Ahmadiyya Movement sticks to that position. I am sure that Sir Muhammad Iqbal and many other enlightened leaders and Ulama believe in a similar finality—a finality barring the coming after our Holy Prophet of any prophet whether old or new, and it is only fear of blind opposition that stands in the way of the true Islamic position being cleared up. It is deplorable indeed that the leaders of the Muslim community should not possess the requisite moral courage to give a lead to the masses. So long as this state prevails, the finality of prophethood cannot be established, and the unity of Islam will remain a mere dream. Let the leaders and the enlightened Ulama take courage in both hands and face the masses with the central fact of Islam, the finality of prophethood. To talk of finality is useless; to establish it in the face of opposition is the real service of Islam.

It is not sufficient to condemn this thing as Magian and that thing as Jewish. Facts must be faced. The Holy Qur'an is clear on the point that religion having been brought to perfection by the message of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, there was no need
of a prophet after him, and he was therefore declared to be the Last of the Prophets. In spite of this, all books of Hadith are agreed that Jesus Christ must come. Many of the companions of the Holy Prophet report as having heard him speak of the advent of the Messiah, and all reliable collections of hadith have accredited these hadith. It is expected of every true Muslim to solve this confusion. Sir Muhammad Iqbal avoids it by condemning "the idea of the continuity of the spirit of Messiah as an absolutely Jewish idea". The question is, who introduced this Jewish idea into Hadith? Nor is the appearance of the Messiah a solitary idea. There are the connected ideas of the appearance of the Anti-Christ and Gog and Magog, the latter also finds expression in the Holy Qur'ān. Either all these ideas must be accepted or they must all be rejected as Jewish or Christian ideas. But if all of them are rejected, the result will be that we will have to reject a very large number of Hadith, accredited by the best authorities, as spurious. This would give a severe blow to the reliability of Hadith as a whole. It is true that there have been some religious adventurers who have denounced the whole collection of Hadith, and who think that all the religious commandments contained in Hadith are mere fabrications, but I am sure Sir Muhammad Iqbal is not one of them. Even European critics would not condemn Bukhari, and Bukhari has a large number of hadith relating to the advent of the Messiah and of Dajjal and Gog and Magog and other allied subjects.

While condemning the continuance of the spirit of Messiah as "Jewish idea," Sir Muhammad Iqbal does not seem to have given a serious thought to Hadith which must entirely be thrown overboard if the prophecies relating to the appearance of the Messiah among the Muslims are to be rejected in toto. He is undoubtedly one Muslim leader whom the masses would follow blindly, and he should have directly faced the question whether Hadith containing prophecies about the Messiah, Dajjal and Gog and Magog, as contained in Bukhari and other reliable collections of Hadith, should be accepted or rejected. But he apparently condemns the idea of the coming of Messiah without saying anything about the Hadith which speak of it. If Sir Muhammad Iqbal
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does not accept the authority of Hadith, he should plainly say so; if he does, he should clear his position. And I may add that the mere fact that the Jews expected the coming of the Messiah does not entitle us to condemn that idea. The Jews also received a revelation, and the Messianic idea can be condemned only if it is shown that among the Jews that idea was not based on revelation. The fact is that the hope of a Messiah was given to the Israelite people by prophet after prophet, and there is not the least ground for supposing that it was not based on revelation.

The only fault of the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement is that like a true son of Islam, he bowed his head before the authority of the Holy Qur’an and Hadith, and when he was satisfied that the finality of prophethood in the Holy Prophet Muhammad was a bar against the coming of Jesus Christ in person, whose death is in fact plainly spoken of in the Holy Qur’an, he, instead of rejecting Hadith, gave it an interpretation which made it conform to the principle of finality laid down in the Holy Qur’an. He did not reject the prophecies relating to the advent of Messiah but said that they meant, not the coming of Jesus Christ in person because he was a prophet and no prophet could come after our Holy Prophet, and also because he died like other prophets; but the coming of a Mujaddid or Muhaddath in the spirit and power of Jesus Christ. And in support of this interpretation he produced evidence both from previous sacred history and from Hadith itself. The Old Testament contained the prophecy that Elijah would appear before the advent of Messiah, and when Jesus Christ was asked where Elijah was if he was the Messiah, he pointed to John the Baptist, explaining that he had come in his spirit and power. This was a clear case where the prophecy of the personal advent of a prophet was declared to be fulfilled in the appearance of quite a different man, because in spirit the two bore a very strong resemblance.

The Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement also gave numerous arguments from Hadith itself showing that it was a mistake to consider the prophecy as meaning the personal advent of Jesus, for where his advent was spoken of it was added by way of explanation, wa imām-u-kum minkum, meaning “And he is your imām from
among yourselves.” The prophecy thus clearly showed that the Promised Messiah was not the Israelite Prophet Jesus but an inam of the Muslims from among themselves. Further corroboration of the two Messiahs being distinct personalities is contained in the hadith Al-Bukhari which gives different descriptions of the two Messiahs. The Israelite prophet Jesus Christ whom the Holy Prophet saw in his Ascension is described as having a white complexion and curly hair, while the Messiah to come as seen in a vision by him is described as being of a brown colour with lank hair. These two entirely different descriptions of the two personages clearly show that they belong to two different races and are entirely two different persons in appearance. They receive the same name, Messiah, because they come in similar conditions and have the same functions, the one among the Israelites and the other among the Muslims. Just as the first Messiah came 1300 years after Moses, the second Messiah comes 1300 years after Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him) who is plainly spoken of as the like of Moses, both in the Mosaic prophecy and in the Holy Qur’ān. Again, as the Jews had lost their temporal power before the appearance of the Israelite Messiah, the Muslims have from a mighty ruling nation of the world been reduced to a condition of slavery in most countries before the coming of the second Messiah. Both nations expected a man with temporal glory who should lead them to material conquests, but both Messiahs were ordained to fill the humbler role of a spiritual reformer. And both were rejected in a similar manner. The Jews not only rejected their Messiah but also crucified him; the Muslims have been no less severe in their opposition. The two Messiahs bear a similarity even in their acceptance. The majority of the followers of the first Messiah raised him from prophethood to the dignity of Godhead, while the majority of the followers of the second Messiah have raised him from mujaddidship to the dignity of prophethood.

I am fully conscious that Islam is a religion which does not ban reason, but at the same time it must be added that Islam is based on revelation and not on reason. The Qur’ān and the Hadith are the foundations of the religion of Islam, and though it is true that hadith which contradict any principle laid down in the
Holy Qur'an cannot be accepted, yet at the same time Hadith being an explanation of the Holy Qur'an given by the Holy Prophet himself cannot be lightly set aside, especially such Hadith as are contained in the Sahih al-Bukhari which by an almost unanimous verdict of the Muslim community is the most reliable book (Asah al-kutub) after the Book of God. It is easy to condemn the coming of the Messiah as a Jewish idea but what about the large number of hadith contained in Al-Bukhari and other reliable collections about the appearance of the Messiah among the Muslims, and the still larger number about other allied subjects such as Dajjal and Gog and Magog? The Holy Prophet's word is the authority before which a Muslim must bow his head, and if the Holy Prophet said, and certainly he did say, that the Messiah must make his appearance among the Muslims, it is flouting the authority of the Prophet to say that the idea of the coming of a Messiah is borrowed from the Jews. The greatest Imams of Islam never thought of throwing off the yoke of Hadith, and that great luminary of Islam, Imam Abû Hanifa, is reported to have said: "Give up my word before the word of the Messenger of God." Even if Sir Muhammad Iqbal may claim the dignity of a mujtahid, he cannot assume a role higher than that of Imam Abû Hanifa, and he must bow his head before Hadith. He is at liberty to give his own interpretation to the words of the Prophet, that being the proper sphere of a mujtahid, but he cannot reject those words simply because the idea of the coming of a Messiah is distasteful to him.

The remedy suggested by Sir Muhammad Iqbal is practical negation of the finality of the prophethood of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). For, as I said at the very commencement, the unity of the human race is the great idea underlying the finality of prophethood which means that there shall be no authoritative revelation after Prophet Muhammad. It must be borne in mind that according to the plainest teachings of the Quran and Hadith, the advent of our Holy Prophet does not make the end of revelation but the end of authoritative revelation, or the Gibraellic revelation, so that Prophet Muhammad shall be the final authority in religion. The great idea was to bring all people under one authority and to gather them under one standard,
in order to bring about the unity of the human race, the greatest requisite of human civilization, not to end Divine communion. As the Holy Prophet has said, "There shall be people among his followers to whom God shall speak though they shall not be prophets."13 If God had ceased to speak to His righteous servants, it would have meant an end of religious experience, and of religion itself. On the other hand, the continuance of prophethood would have meant authority besides that of the Holy Prophet. Prophethood and authority go hand in hand: "And We have not sent a messenger but that he should be obeyed with the permission of God."14 The whole difference lies in this that when God speaks to a man and grants him authority, he is a prophet; and when He speaks to a man but that revelation carries no authority with it, he is called a muhaddath in Islam. And the mujaddid that is promised at the beginning of every century is also a muhaddath. A muhaddath may be called a prophet only metaphorically, because God speaks to him, but he is not a prophet in a real sense, because his revelation is not authoritative and he is himself under the authority of a prophet. The final authority based on revelation rests with the Prophet Muhammad.

Now let us see what this final authority has to say regarding the unity of his followers. Take the Divine revelation first and there it is declared in plain words: "Do not say to him who offers you Islamic salutation (salām), thou art not a believer."1 That is the highest authority, the authority of the final Divine revelation. No Muslim who believes in the Holy Quran can say to another Muslim who accosts him with assalam-u-alaikum that he is a kāfīr and not a Muslim. The Holy Prophet himself on the highest authority—that of Bukhari—is reported to have said: "Whoever says his prayers as we say our prayers (salla salātanā) and faces the Qibla (in his prayers) and eats the animal slaughtered by us, he is a Muslim and for him is the covenant of God and His Messenger, so do not look lightly on the covenant of God."15 Here is the plain verdict of the final authority in religion that any one who says

4. The Qurʾān, 4:64.
5. Al-Bukhari, 8:23.
prayers as directed by the Prophet and faces the Qibla when saying his prayers is a Muslim. Yet our national poet and great philosopher says that the Qadianis must be declared kafirs. Do not the Qadianis say the same prayers as do the other Muslims? Do they not face the same Qibla in their prayers? If they do, and Sir Muhammad Iqbal is aware that they do it, then indeed they have the covenant with God and His Messenger that they are Muslims, and any one who declares them kafirs reject the authority of the Prophet Muhammad.

Sir Muhammad Iqbal makes a fundamental mistake when he compares the Qadianis with the Bahais and declares the latter to be more honest. Error and honesty may often go together. Even a Christian who believes in Trinity and the Atonement of Christ, even an idol-worshipper, may be honest in his convictions, and even a Muslim may be dishonest in his convictions. No human being can decide who is honest in his convictions and who is not; it is only Mulla-mindedness which looks upon everybody differing with it as dishonest. If the Bahais reject the Holy Quran and the Holy Prophet Muhammad as the final authority in religious matters, that is their own concern, they may be honest or otherwise; and if the Qadianis accept Muhammad as the final authority and still believe in the coming of prophets after him against the plain teachings of the Qur’an and Hadith, it is not another Muslim’s business to say that they are dishonest. And even if they are, they are still Muslims and not kafirs on the plain authority of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, because they say their prayers exactly in the manner in which the Prophet said them and they face the Qibla in their prayers. And the Bahais, even with a certificate of honesty from Sir Muhammad Iqbal, are not Muslims because they do not say their prayers in the manner prescribed by the Holy Prophet nor do they face the Qibla, rejecting as they do the Qur’an and the Prophet Muhammad as final authority in religious matters. It is Muhammad’s certificate (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him), that matters in matters religious and not Sir Muhammad Iqbal’s.

In fact, all those people who declare faith in the Kalima—lā ilāha illa Allāh Muḥammad ar-Rasūl Allāh (There is no God but Allāh
and Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah)—are Muslims whatever their differences may be. The person who believes in Muhammad has Muhammad’s authority that he is a Muslim, and to call him a kafir is to deny the authority of Muhammad as the Last Prophet of God. One wonders to see Sir Muhammad Iqbal laying so much stress on the finality of prophethood and at the same time denying the authority of the final Prophet. There were people in the Prophet’s time who were the most dangerous and sworn enemies of Islam, the hypocrites, who would not join the Prophet in defence of Islam, and yet they were looked upon by the Holy Prophet as Muslims because they said that they believed in him and said their prayers facing the Qibla. Even their chief, ‘Abdullah ibn Ubayy, was honoured by the Prophet as being a Muslim. When ‘Abdullah died, the Holy Prophet said funeral prayers over his body in spite of opposition of Hazrat ‘Umar. Nor did the Companions of the Holy Prophet ever declare a believer in the Holy Prophet to be kafir, whatever their differences. The Kharjis were the first group in Islam who called their Muslim brethren kafirs, and they are spoken of as having shattered the unity of Islam—qad shaquq asa-l-Muslimina. And every one who to-day declares a believer in the Prophet Muhammad to be a kafir also shatters the unity of Islam, whether he is one of the orthodox Ulama or a Qadiani or the great Muslimphilosopher Sir Muhammad Iqbal. According to a saying of the Holy Prophet, whoever calls a believer in the Kalimah a kafir, is nearer to unbelief than to Islam. *Man kaffara ahl-a la ilahah ill-Allah fa kuwa ila-l kufri aqrab.*

And why are the Qadianis kafirs? Because, says Sir Muhammad Iqbal, they believe in the coming of a prophet after the Holy Prophet Muhammad. But all the orthodox do the same. The Sunnis and the Shias and the Ahl Hadith set as much value on the finality of prophethood as do the Qadianis, because they all believe in the coming of Prophet Jesus Christ, after the Holy Prophet Muhammad. So strong is this belief that men at the top of opposition to the Ahmadiyya movement who honestly believe that Jesus Christ is dead and that he will not come to guide the Muslims have not the moral courage to say so and face the opposition. But a man of Sir Muhammad Iqbal’s position should not
shirk his duty, if it was the call of duty which prompted him to join in the general uproar against the Ahmadiyya movement and declare the Qadianis as kāfirs because they accept a prophet after Muhammad (peace be on him). With the same force as he has used against the Qadianis he should declare the orthodox Muslims kāfirs because they also believe in the coming of a prophet after the Final Prophet. It is not just to have one balance to weigh the Qadianis and another to weigh the orthodox.

There is yet another point in Sir Muhammad Iqbal’s statement which deserves to be noted here. He not only condemns the Qadianis and applauds the orthodox for one and the same belief, viz., that of the coming of a prophet after the Holy Prophet but also he condemns as kāfir the only group of Muslims, the Lahore Ahmadis, who accept the finality of prophethood in the strict sense, rejecting the coming of either an old or a new prophet after him. It is true that he does not say so in his statement, but he gives unstinted support to the blind opposition and persecution which is being carried on against both, the Qadian and the Lahore sections of the Ahmadiyya Movement. If he really felt that a certain group ought to be condemned on account of its errors, he should also have raised his voice against blind opposition to the Lahore section which neither believes in the coming of a prophet after Muhammad nor calls any Muslim a kāfir.

The Ahmadis are not the first group in Islam who have been declared kāfirs; their predecessors in this line are numerous. It is not yet fifty years when the Ahl-i-Hadith or Wahābis were unanimously declared to be kāfirs by the orthodox, and yet to-day they are a part and parcel of the orthodox. Later still, Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was declared to be a kāfir. It is amusing to hear men of light and learning talk of fatwas of kufr against the Ahmadis obtained not only from Ulama in India but also from Arabia and other Islamic countries as if the disease which has sapped the energy of the Muslim community were peculiar to any one country. Previous fatwas of kufr were also endorsed by the Ulama of Arabia and there is nothing strange in the fatwa of kufr against Ahmadis being so endorsed. The Wahabis and the Naqshis (followers of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan) have met with a similar treatment. It is
a plague which has infected the Ulama of every country.

*Takfīr* or the turning of Muslims into *kāfīrs* is as much the favourite occupation of the Ulama of the later period all over the Muslim world as *tablīgh* or carrying the message of Islam to non-Muslims was that of their great predecessors in the earlier and glorious days of Islam. If, through their noble efforts, people entered Islam in companies, through the efforts of these latter-day upholders of the cause of Islam, Muslims are being turned out of Islam in companies. If all the noble—or ignoble—doings of our Ulama, the *fatwas* of *kufr*, are gathered together, I do not think there will be a single person left who may be called a Muslim! Sir Muhammad Iqbal himself is sure to share the fate of Maulvi Zafar Ali, of *Zamīndār*, who has already been declared to be a *kāfīr*. I have not the least doubt that the moment Sir Muhammad Iqbal makes known publicly those beliefs of his in which he does not agree with the orthodox, he will be in the same camp with the Qadianis.

I do not defend anybody who declares a Muslim to be a *kāfīr*, least of all the Qadianis who with one stroke of pen have turned four hundred or more million of Muslims out of the pale of Islam. But I say that even they are Muslims so long as they fulfil the conditions laid down by the Holy Prophet: "Whoever says prayers as we say and faces our Qibla...... he is a Muslim and has the covenant of God and His Messenger." Every Muslim must bow his head before the authority of the Holy Prophet and honour the covenant of God and His Messenger. It is due to this respect for the Prophet’s covenant that the great Imams have held that even if there are ninety-nine grounds for the *kufr* of a man and only one ground for calling him a Muslim, still he should be called a Muslim and not a *kāfīr*. That one ground is declaration that "there is no God but Allah and Muhammad is His Messenger." If even *kāfīr* can become a Muslim by the Kalima, how can a Muslim be turned out of Islam in spite of this confession?

The most humiliating part—for the whole,—however, is that in which he implores the Government to interfere in the controversy between the orthodox and the Qadianis, and denounces it for not having interfered earlier and handled the Founder of
the Ahmadiyya Movement in a manner similar to that in which Jesus Christ was handled by the Roman Government. I quote him:

"In so far as Islam is concerned, it is no exaggeration to say that solidarity of the Muslim community in India under the British is far less safe than the solidarity of the Jewish community in the days of Jesus under the Romans. Any religious adventurer in India can set up any claim. This liberal State of ours does not care a fig for the integrity of a parent, his loyalty, and his followers are regular in the payment of taxes due to the State."

There can be no two opinions regarding Sir Muhammad Iqbal's meaning. He denounces the British Government because it did not hang the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement and thus rendered unsafe the solidarity of the Muslims under it, while the Roman Government of Jesus's days is praised because it crucified Jesus for differing with the orthodox Jews and thus helped the Jews in maintaining their solidarity. Sir Muhammad Iqbal is a great student of history as well, and he must be sure of the fact stated here that Jewish solidarity was made safe under the Roman Empire by the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. How good the Romans were in Jesus's days, argues Sir Muhammad Iqbal, as they crucified Jesus Christ on the orthodox lodging a complaint that his claim to Godhead endangered their solidarity. That was the proper way of dealing with a "religious adventurer" in his opinion. But religious adventurers are safe under the British rule which did not care a fig for the solidarity of the Muslims and send Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to the gallows!

That this is what Sir Muhammad Iqbal means is clear on the face of it. But he makes himself clearer, if further clarity were needed, by quoting Akbar's couplet:

"Pray for the Government, friends; Say, I am God and you will not be hanged!" Evidently what Sir Muhammad Iqbal means is that the Government should have a heresy law on its Statute Book to hang every heretic; but then there will be a
number of heresy laws, one for the Muslims, another for the Hindus, a third for the Buddhists, a fourth for the Christians, a fifth for the Zoroastrians, a sixth for the Sikhs. Or, maybe, he is of opinion that a heresy law is the special privilege of the Muslims alone whose religion, according to Sir Muhammad Iqbal, knows no tolerance. But even if Islam alone were granted this favour, there are a thousand grounds on which individuals and sects declare one another kāfir, and perhaps there will be a thousand kinds of heresy in which it will be impossible for any judge to discriminate, though Sir Muhammad Iqbal safeguards the interests of the other heretical sects by saying that "their mutual accusations of heresy" are excusable because they do not affect the vital principles. But I do not think there is any vital principle of Islam more important for the solidarity of Islam than that which requires all persons to be treated as Muslims who confess a faith in the Kalima, and that is the very principle which all heresy-mongers, to whatever sect they may belong, aim at destroying.

What pains one most is that one should stoop so low as to invoke the aid of non-Muslim Government to set the house of Islam in order! Islam which, even according to a Christian writer, did not stand in need of temporal support from a Muslim ruler, never needed an Asoka or a Constantine for its onward progress in the world, cannot now maintain its solidarity, according to a Muslim poet and philosopher, without the helping hand of a Christian government. But I assure Sir Muhammad Iqbal that with the present mentality of our Ulama and great leaders to declare every other Muslim a kāfir, even the helping hand of the British rule cannot convert the shattered Muslim community into a solid whole.

6. The other great religions won their way slowly, by painful struggle, and finally triumphed with the aid of powerful monarchs converted to the new faith, Christianity had Constantine, Buddhism its Asoka, and Zoroastrianism its Cyrus, each lending to his cult the mighty force of secular authority. Not so in Islam. Arising in a desert land sparsely inhabited by a nomad race, previously indistinguishable in human annals, Islam sallied forth on its great adventure with the slightest human backing and against the heaviest material odds. (The New World of Islam by Stoddard).
As regards his appeal for a heresy law, I do not think it would appeal to any sensible person in this 20th century. He writes:

"I very much appreciate the orthodox Hindus' demand for protection against religious reforms in the new constitution. Indeed this demand ought to have been first made by the Muslims who, unlike the Hindus, entirely eliminate the race-idea from their social structure. The Government must seriously consider the present situation and try if possible to understand the mentality of the average Muslim in regard to this issue which he regards as absolutely vital to the integrity of his community."

Does Sir Muhammad Iqbal seriously mean that the Government should make laws disallowing any reform in the old religious ideas? He agrees with the Sanatanists, he tells us, that there shall be no reforms in the orthodox religion, but even the Sanatanists have never condemned the Government for not having hanged Swami Dayanand or Keshub Chandra Sen or other reformers of that type, and Sir Muhammad Iqbal would be disappointed to find himself alone in demanding cross for reformers. What the Hindus want is protection against reforms which should be imposed on them by legislatures and they have never demanded that any one who arises with a message of reform among them should be sent outright to the gallows.

Again Sir Muhammad Iqbal blames the Government for its toleration policy:

"Is it then fair to preach toleration to the parent community whose integrity is threatened and to allow the rebellious group to carry on its propaganda with impunity even if that propaganda is highly offensive?"

If any propaganda is really offensive, the Government has already ample powers in its hands to deal with it. One is however surprised that a man of Sir Muhammad Iqbal's extensive reading should be unaware of the scurrilous literature that is being produced by the "parent community," copying the methods of the Christian missionary and the Árya Samajist preacher against Islam, to which may be added the severe persecution of the almost insignificant numbers of the Ahmadiyya community and the boycott movement carried on against it. Boycott and vilification are
both weapons which have always been used against truth, never in support of it, and yet a man occupying such a high position as Sir Muhammad Iqbal justifies the most drastic methods to be adopted to make life impossible for the Ahmadis. I do not think he is unaware of the fact that Ahmadis are being expelled from the Muslim societies where they have worked for years and years; they are being dismissed from services for no other offence than that they are Ahmadis; a complete boycott of them is being carried on; even their dead are not allowed to be buried in graveyards which have been used by them for almost half a century. And yet at this juncture in the life of the Ahmadiyya community, Sir Muhammad Iqbal comes up, not only to defend and further encourage the oppressing and persecuting majority but also to invoke the aid of the government for that majority to completely crush the insignificant minority of one in a thousand.

The main theme of Sir Muhammad Iqbal’s statement is, one is surprised to learn, condemnation of religious tolerance, one of the brightest gems in the crown of Islam. He condemns the so-called enlightened Muslims because “they have gone to the extent of preaching tolerance to their brethren-in-Islam”—a sin, I think, for which they must for ever gnash their teeth in hell; he excuses Sir Herbert Emerson for preaching tolerance to the Muslims only because he has not been brought up in the culture of Islam, as if tolerance were un-Islamic: he condemns the British Government for being tolerant and liberal and praises the Roman Government of old for having no such scruples. What a pity that thoughts like these should be given expression to by a great exponent of a religion which lays down as its basic principle: “There shall be no compulsion in religion.” If these words have any meaning, they mean that no one shall be compelled to adopt a certain religious view. It is the Magna Charta of religious freedom for the Muslim and the non-Muslim alike. And Islam carried the idea of religious tolerance to such an extent that protection of the churches, where idols of Jesus and Mary were kept in those days, and of all other houses of worship was declared to be one of the

7. The Quran, 2:256.
first duties of a Muslim State. Can it be imagined that a religion, which gave such freedom to those who rejected the Holy Qur’an and the Holy Prophet and worshipped human beings and idols, required a Muslim to be hanged because he differed with the majority in his religious views?

However, Sir Muhammad Iqbal does not seem to be very serious about this matter. He speaks of the good old days when men were hanged for claiming Godhead, as it happened in the case of Jesus Christ and Mansur, and yet he considers Jesus a prophet and Mansur a saint! In translating Akbar’s Urdu couplet, he speaks of Mansur as “Persia’s mystic saint”, “a rebel” and “a religious adventurer” deserving to be hanged, and yet a prophet or a mystic saint! It is not impossible that Sir Muhammad Iqbal has a similar conception of the saint of Qadian. It was he who saw in the small band of followers of the saint of Qadian “a pure and unmixed type of Islamic culture” (Islami strat kā taith namūna) and yet he is of opinion that he ought to have been hanged like the mystic saint of Persia.

I am sure Sir Muhammad Iqbal issued this statement in haste. In one respect at least he has corrected himself. His first statement surely blamed the government for not having hanged the Founder and crushed the Ahmadiyya movement in its infancy, but on a second thought he found that this position was untenable and issued another statement that he wanted only that the Government should treat the Qadianis as non-Muslims. A little more consideration is sure to convince him that his new position is also untenable. If a person says he is a Muslim, the government has no business to issue a communique declaring him a non-Muslim even if the Ulama declare him to be a kāfir with all the force at their command. The Qur’an and the Hadith, as already quoted, are against Sir Muhammad Iqbal. The Prophet’s practice is also against him. Even the hypocrites in the Prophet’s time who were the sworn enemies of Islam and who openly dis-

8. This description of the members of the Ahmadiyya Movement was given by Dr. Sir Muhammad Iqbal at Aligarh; see Millat-i-Baidzā per ek Imrānī Nazar, p. 18, published by Marghub Agency, Lahore.
believed in the Prophet were never declared to be non-Muslims by the Muslim State under the Prophet himself, simply because ostensibly they subscribed to the Kalimah. Even the evidence of history is against Sir Muhammad Iqbal, for the heretics of to-day have very often been the saints of tomorrow. Syed Ahmad of Sirhind was thrown into prison by a Muslim ruler on the complaint of Ulama as a rebel of Islam, and yet the whole of India, and Afghanistan as well, accept him as the Mujaddid of the 11th century of Hijra to-day. There are numerous such examples which I need not recounts here. It is therefore not too much to hope that even Mirza Ghulam Ahmad who set on foot a world-wide movement for the propagation of Islam will be accepted as a saint tomorrow.
CHAPTER VIII

THE CALL OF ISLAM

The Spirit of Humanity Knocks at the Door of Islam

There is a demand throughout the world for something which would save humanity from the destruction to which it is hurrying headlong. The faith that unbounded material advancement and unthought of conquests of nature will make humanity reach the haven of happiness has been utterly shattered by the events of the past few years, and there is a void which can only be filled by some secular faith. Material advancement has brought to man material benefits on a vast scale, but it has taken away the one thing which could bring him happiness; it has taken away peace and contentment of mind. Humanity to-day is groping in the dark for that contentment which only faith in God can bring to it. The entire world order stands in need of being reconstructed on the foundation-stone of faith in God and oneness of humanity, and this foundation-stone is in the possession of Islam.

The call comes from the West. "For the fullest development of its cultural life, Europe cannot do without the forces and capacities which lie within Islamic Society." 1

"At the other end Europe too is experiencing a spiritual crisis which is by no means a purely temporary phenomenon, but is indeed in the last resort the inevitable outcome of that force which, since Europe's estrangement from Islam after the Crusades, has dominated its development: exaggerated individualism. The spiritual crisis might possibly lead to the elimination of the greatest of the dangers which are now threatening the Muslim world. . . . Thence, perhaps, new powers might be born among the Oriental people which would check the present decay of Islam, or even turn it into new growth, if Europe were to continue along the lines which it is following just now. Who would deny the possibility at

least of such a new development, after seeing, for instance, how movements like the Ahmadiyya, with its strong ethical powers and its no doubt deep religious feelings, are able to exercise a certain influence far beyond what has so far been considered to be the frontiers of Muslim territory."

The reference in the concluding passage is clearly to the efforts which the Ahmadiyyah Movement is making for carrying the light of Islam to the West. But the writer takes it for granted that Islam's march to the West is a march beyond its frontiers. Not at all. The Holy Prophet Muḥammad was told in clear words that the Western lands were as good a part of the territory of Islam as the Eastern lands. Here are his own words:

"My Lord contracted the earth for me (i.e. showed me a plan of it) so that I saw its Eastern lands and its Western lands, and I was told that the territory of my followers would reach the lands which were shown to me."

The Prophet said this at a time when Islam had no territory at all, neither in the East, nor in the West, nor in fact in Arabia itself. To-day the Prophet's dream regarding the East is a hard reality; tomorrow will see the reality of his dream regarding the West. There is already a demand for Islam in the West and it is now the duty of the Muslims to carry the truth to the West to supply that demand. I know there is despair in some quarters among the Muslims. The West, they say, is lost beyond all hope and it is only waste of time, energy and money to carry the message of Islam to Europe. In other quarters there is despondency due to the material advancement of Europe and the material backwardness of the East. The Muslims should conserve, it is argued, their whole energy for the amelioration of their own community instead of dissipating it on others. There are others who think that the task is too stupendous and the Muslims have not the resources to carry it on. To all these I would say that at the Prophet's advent the whole world was lost beyond hope, yet the

Prophet set to work for its betterment and he succeeded. The scheme to save humanity is a Divine scheme and it does not behave a believer in the goodness and wisdom of God to give way to despair in any circumstances. Just cast a glance at the past history of Islam. When Islam advanced to the East, the East was then materially great and spiritually dead, just as Europe is to-day. Nor was it with material resources that Islam conquered the East. It was the tremendous spiritual force of the Holy Qur'ān and the Prophet which carried it forward to the East and broke down all resistance, and it is the same spiritual force that will make Islam conquer the West. The Holy Qur'ān itself lays claim to being endowed with this mighty force which will break down all material resistance:

"And if there could be a Qur'ān with which the mountains were made to pass away, or the earth were cloven asunder, or the dead were made to speak—nay, the commandment is wholly Allah's."4

"Had We sent down this Qur'ān on a mountain, thou wouldst certainly have seen it falling down, splitting asunder because of the fear of Allah. And We set forth these parables to men that they may reflect."5

The history of the rise and spread of Islam is an illustration of the great truth given expression to in these verses. Islam won the world by its spiritual force, not by material resources. Anyone who has access to Arnold’s *Preachings of Islam* can see it for himself. Another modern author, Stoddard, thus begins his *New World of Islam*:

"The rise of Islam is perhaps the most amazing event in human history. The other great religions won their way slowly, by painful struggle, and finally triumphed with the aid of powerful monarchs converted to the new faith. Christianity had its Constantine, Buddhism its Asoka, and Zoroastrianism its Cyrus, each lending to his chosen cult the mighty force of secular authority. Not so Islam. Arising in

a desert land sparsely inhabited by a nomad race previously undistinguished in human annals, Islam sallied forth on its great adventure with the slenderest human backing and against the heaviest material odds. Yet Islam triumphed with seemingly miraculous ease."

There is no reason to doubt in the face of these two testimonies: the testimony of the Prophet and the testimony of history, that Islam will one day be the predominant religion of the West as it is already the predominant religion of the East, and this dominance will be attained not by material resources but by the mighty spiritual force of the Qur'ān. The Holy Book itself repeats this promise thrice:

"He it is Who sent His Messenger with guidance and the Religion of Truth, that He may cause it to prevail over all religions."\(^7\)

Islam is at present faced with a double fight, against Christianity and Capitalism as prevailing in Europe and America, and against irreligion and Communism as prevailing in Russia and its dependencies. The present is a psychological moment for accepting the challenge of both Christianity and irreligion. If we strike with a united effort at this moment we have every chance of success, but if we are indifferent, Christianity and irreligion will gain further ground in their respective spheres. By a little united effort and by widening our outlook on life, we can render important service to humanity; we may even save humanity from another cataclysm by turning its minds to high spiritual truths as revealed in the Holy Qur'ān. There are only two factors which can save humanity from the destruction to which it is hurling itself down, a strong faith in God and a blotting off of national and racial prejudices, and both these factors can be supplied only by Islam. It was the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement on whose mind the idea dawned first of all that the time had come to carry the message of Islam to the West. It was in 1891, when

opposition to him was at the highest, & he wrote:

"This humble servant has been shown in a vision that the rising of the sun from the West signifies that the Western world which has been involved of old in the darkness of unbelief and error shall be illumined with the sun of Truth and those people shall have a light of Islam... In reality, the Western countries have up to this time shown very little aptitude for spiritual truths, as if spiritual wisdom had in its entirety been granted to Asia and material wisdom to Europe and America. Now Almighty God intends to cast on them the look of mercy." 8

Pledge of Fealty—Its Necessity

There is quite a large number of people who admit the truth of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement, but see no particular reason why they should formally make such declaration and take the pledge of fealty.

The Founder of the Aḥmadiyyah Movement, they contend, was a righteous servant of Islam. He may have been a mujaddid, a Messiah or a Mahdi but why must they acknowledge him as such. True, the acceptance of a mujaddid is not to be taken in the same sense as that of a prophet. Every prophet demands a twofold confession of faith — faith in the Unity of God and faith in his own prophethood. But a mujaddid never asks for a profession of faith in his own person.

Even the extremists of Qādian will admit that the text of the pledge which the Founder took from the members, contained no mention of the mujaddid's supposed prophethood. The only pledge which was asked for was: "I will hold religion above the world." Profession of faith in the Unity of God and in the prophethood of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad was required in the way of faith. The very opening words of the bai'at were:

"I bear witness that there is no object of adoration besides Allah Who is One having no associate, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His servant and His Messenger."

Thus the bai'at consisted in two things: the faith part and the practical part. The faith part was confined to God and the Holy Prophet Muḥammad without the least reference to his own person, whereas the practical part was summed up in one sentence, "I will hold religion above the world."

And this was the chief purpose of the bai'at, the practical pledge to serve the cause of religion. Mujaddids are raised for this sole purpose—the service of religion and so they want around them men who would assist them in that service. So did the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement invite people to join hands with him in fighting the battles of Islam.

To all such persons who are not quite sure of the utility of bai'at the Holy Qurʾān furnishes clear guidance: "Be with the truthful", says the Book. Here is an emphatic injunction to actively co-operate with all those who stand for a righteous cause. Thus, it is a moral duty to respond to the call of the mujaddid, the most truthful personality of the time, standing for the most truthful of causes, the defence and propagation of Islam. Those, however, who do not listen to that call, shirk an imperative duty and disregard the Qurʾānic injunction. In a way they declare a Divine act as vain and idle. God, Who alone knows best how Islam is to triumph, commissions a man for that express purpose. Do those that stand aloof from him mean that they can do without such a guide? Surely, God is above all vain things and a thorough Muslim is one who submits wholeheartedly to all His behests.

Formal bai'at has a psychological value of its own. It tends, undoubtedly, to strengthen the heart of man bringing him Divine peace and content. We have a concrete illustration of this in the life of the Prophet. At the time of the Truce of Hudaibiya, 1,400 companions who were already devoted followers of the Holy Prophet and ready to sacrifice their all at his bidding, were required to make a fresh bai'at. This was done under Divine guidance and when done, God expressed His pleasure at it and infused calm and content into their hearts. Obviously, this bai'at was needed in view of the emergency that had arisen. The

Muslims were in a critical condition and it was time for unparalleled pluck and *bai'at* was necessary. The same was the necessity of *bai'at* in the eye of the *mujaddid* and the same is the necessity to-day. There is the greatest of emergencies calling aloud to be up against the alarming onsiaghts on Islam on all sides, and hence the urgent necessity of the *bai'at*.

*Bai'at* is nothing more than a solemn pledge made in public to stand for and by a certain cause. It does not only bring Divine solace to the heart of man but also it keeps him firm by the cause in thick and thin. By his very nature, man feels ashamed of going back upon his own publicly declared words. So, when in the service of a high cause, he finds himself beset with difficulties and would feel like giving way, this public declaration comes to sustain him. He sticks to it, under trials and tribulations. The service of Islam at the present day must needs entail no small amount of hardship and self-sacrifice. To form a solid band of men, who might uphold the cause of Islam under the most adverse conditions, was, therefore, a pressing necessity. And *bai'at*, a solemn public declaration, must obviously be the very corner-stone of any such organisation. Even an ordinary soldier is required, at the time of enlisting, to make an open profession of loyalty to the rule. The soldiers of Islam who must rally round the standard of the *mujaddid* are, for that sole reason, required to declare in so many words that come what might, they would live and die by Islam. "I will hold religion above the world," everyone has to pledge.

An Appeal

Better late than never. Even now I would call upon every Muslim to volunteer for the service of Islam and enlist in the force of the *mujaddid*. Let not petty objections stand in the way. Men of Abū Bakr and 'Umar's eminent position could not escape the perverted vision of the carper. Their greatness extorts the need of recognition even from those opposed to Islam, yet there are Muslims who are not ashamed of picking holes in them. If the 'Ulamā and some other scholars are to-day finding fault with the *mujaddid* in small things, it is due to their own perverse mentality, and in doing so, they are only stepping in the shoes of the slanderers
of all good men. It has never been the way of good people to speak ill of those who stand for upholding the cause of Truth. As to objections, there can be no limit to them in this world. All you want to test is whether the work done is good and noble. If you find the work such, small things wholly due to misunderstanding, prejudice, political interest, dull vision and numerous other causes must not stand in your way. Do not make mountains out of these mole-hills. Manfully walk over them. It is easy enough to pick a loophole, but real solid work requires some doing. If the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement is not the mujaddid of the fourteenth century, where is another to fill that place? Or, does one presume that the Holy Prophet's authentic promise is not going to find fulfilment any more? And I conclude with an open invitation to one and all to come and join hands with us in the service of Islam.

The Conditions of Bai'at

One who would like to be initiated into the Movement must pledge as follows:

FIRSTLY, that until he is laid in his grave, he will shun all forms and shades of shirk (polytheism).

SECONDLY, that he will guard against falsehood, fornication, evil sight and every form of sin, evil, cruelty, dishonesty, disorder, and rebellion: and that in moments of passion, he will on no account give in, however boisterous that passion may be.

THIRDLY, that without fail, he will say his prayers five times a day as enjoined by God and His Messenger and that, to the best of his power, he will say his midnight prayer, will invoke Divine blessings on the Holy Prophet, will ask forgiveness for his sins and will, with a truly loving heart, recall God's favours and glorify Him.

FOURTHLY, that he will do nothing in any way to injure his fellow human beings in general and the Muslim in particular—neither with the tongue, nor with the hand, nor in any other way.

FIFTHLY, that he will show fidelity to God under all circumstances—alike in prosperity and adversity, in pleasure and pain, in
time of bliss and affliction; that he will resign himself to God under all conditions and will cheerfully bear all hardships and humiliations in His way; that in the hour of calamity he will not turn his back but will step yet onward.

SIXTHLY, that he will eschew observance of evil customs or following the promptings of his lower nature; that he will thoroughly submit to the yoke of the Holy Qur'ān; and that in every walk of life he will hold the Word of God and of His Messenger as his guiding principle.

SEVENTHLY, that he will totally abstain from haughtiness and will live in humility, meekness and mildness.

EIGHTHLY, that he will hold the honour of religion and sympathy for Islam dearer than everything else—dearer than his life, his wealth, his honour, his children, his kith and kin.

NINTHLY, that he will make it a rule of his life to show sympathy towards all human beings out of love for God and that, to the best of his power, he will use all his God-given faculties and blessings for the benefit of humanity.

TENTHLY, that binding himself with me (i.e., Mirza Ghulám Ahmad, Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement in Islam), in a fraternal bond in the way of Allah, he will obey me in everything good, and will live up to his pledge till his death; that in this fraternal bond he will show such sincerity as is not met with in cases of blood relations or other worldly connections.
SUMMARY

Ahmadiyyat in Theory

1. Islam is a living religion whose perfect followers are favoured with Divine communications.

2. Islam is a religion of perfect Unity. All Muslims are brethren and no one becomes a kāfir (unbeliever) on account of some difference of opinion, as long as he professes his faith in the kalimah: "There is but one God, Muḥammad is the Messenger of God."

3. Islam is liberal in its outlook. It recognizes the unity of the whole of mankind, and accepts the raising of prophets among all nations.

4. Islam is a triumphant religion which will ultimately dominate all the other religions. Its principles are gradually gaining ground in the world.

5. Islam is rational in its outlook. Its principles and other details of religion are in conformity with reason.

6. The door of Ijtihād (Exercise of Judgment) remains open in Islam for ever.

7. The Qur’ān, possessing the first and foremost place in Muslims’ life, is the original and unalterable source of the Islamic Law. Hadith comes next which is subordinate to the Qur’ān. Then follow Fiqh (Jurisprudence) and Ijtihād (Exercise of Judgment) by the Imāms which, in their turn, are subordinate to the Qur’ān and the Hadith.

8. The Qur’ān is a source of guidance to mankind for all ages to come. None of its verses has been, nor shall ever be, abrogated.

9. The Qur’ān possesses a great spiritual force. For its spiritual conquests it has neither stood, nor shall ever stand in need of the sword.
10. The Qur'ān is a collection of all the spiritual and religious truths and throws perfect light on them. It does not only advance all the claims concerning religious matters but also produces arguments in their support.

11. Muḥammad, may the peace and blessings of God be upon him, possesses the excellences of all the prophets in him, therefore his nation neither stands, nor shall ever stand in need of any other prophet.

12. Muḥammad, may the peace and blessings of God be upon him, is the seal of all the prophets. No prophet, neither new nor old, shall appear after him. Mujaddids (renovators) will, however, be raised at the head of each century for the removal of errors from among the Muslims and for guiding them to the right path.

Ahmadiyyat in Practice

1. The religious leaders of all the nations and their sacred scriptures should be respected.

2. All the companions of the Prophet, all the Imāms (they may belong to any school of thought) all the saints and mujaddids (renovators) should also be respected.

3. All the schools of thought in Islam should be considered various branches of a tree. There might be several differences on minor points but all of them agree on the Qur'ān and the Prophet Muhammad.

4. Obedience to the law of Sharī'ah and Islamic traditions should be respected. Moreover, one should abstain from all evil customs and habits and accept completely the authority of the Qur'ān.

5. Sympathy should be shown to all men, they may belong to any religion, country, race or nation.

6. One must consider every Muslim as one's brother and should try to help him as far as possible in one's power.
7. The service of Islam should be carried on in cooperation with the Imām and the Mujaddid of the age and under his instructions. For the reformation of all mistakes from the community one should work with great religious zeal and courage.

8. Islam, the Book of Islam and the Messenger of Islam should be defended against all attacks.

9. For the propagation of Islam one should consider oneself as an ambassador in the way of God. The Revelation of God and the message of Islam should be carried to all the nations of the World.

10. One should spend a part of one's time and property for the defence and propagation of Islam.

11. For the Religion of God all kinds of troubles, misfortunes and humiliations should be cheerfully borne.

12. The religion should be held above the World. The love of God and the Prophet Muḥammad, the devotion to the cause of Islam and goodwill for mankind in general and for the community of Muḥammad in particular should be given priority over everything else in one's life.
THE PLEDGE

أَشَهَّدُ أَنَّ لا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ وَحِيدَةٌ لَا شَرِيكَ لَهُ

وَأَشَهَّدُ أَنَّ مُحَمَّدًا عَبْدُهُ وَرُسُولُهُ

Ash-hadu al-lā ilāha illallāhu, wahdahu lā sharika lahu
wa ash-hadu anna Muḥammadan ‘abdulahu wa Rasūluh.

"I bear witness that there is no object of adoration besides Allah, Who is One and has no associate and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His servant and His Messenger."

This day, I join the Movement of the Mujaddid, the Promised Messiah and the Mahdi, Ḥadrat Mirzā Ghulām Āḥmad, at the hand of—

and sincerely repent of all the sins that I have so far committed. I sincerely pledge that so far as my wit and power go, I will eschew all evil and

WILL HOLD RELIGION ABOVE THE WORLD.

To the best of my capacity, I will fulfil the obligations of prayer, of fast, of charity, and of the pilgrimage to Mecca. To the best of my means, I will exert myself in the propagation of Islam and the extension of the Movement, as the Aḥmadiyyah Anjuman Isha‘at Islām Lahore may direct.

أَسْتَغْفِرْلَاهُ رَبِّي بِنَفْسِي ذَنِبِي وَأَتْبِعْ الْإِلْهَيْنِ اِلَّيْهِ رَبِّي إِلَيْهِ َتَحْلِمُ نَفْسِي

Astaghr firullah Rabbi min kulli zambin wa atūbu ilaihi, Rabbi inni zalamu nafsi wa‘tarafu bi-zambi fagh firīlī zunūbi fa-innahū lā yagh firuz-zunūba illā anta.

"I ask forgiveness of Allāh for all my sins and to Him I turn. I have been cruel to myself, O Lord, and I confess my sins. So be merciful to forgive my sins; for no one forgives sins except Thyself."
Name Mr. Mrs. Miss  
(block letters) ......................................................

Date and place of birth ..............................................

Nationality ..............................................................

Profession ...............................................................

Present address (block letters) ......................................

.................................................................

.................................................................

.................................................................

Permanent address (block letters) .................................

.................................................................

.................................................................

.................................................................

Date ................ Signature .................................


[The form is to be sent to the Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Ishâ'at Islam, Ahmadiyyah Buildings, Brandreth Road, Lahore-7, (Pakistan) or to the nearest representative of the Anjuman].