

**TRUE FACTS ABOUT THE
AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT**

By

Maulana Hafiz Sher Muhammad

TRUE FACTS ABOUT THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT

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

Published By

*Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat Islam
pocket 'L', Janata Flats No. 25 A
ground Floor, Dilshad Garden
Delhi - 110 095*

Printed At :

BHARAT OFFSET 2035 Qasimjan Street,
Ballimaran, Delhi - 110 006, Phone : 3284486

By

Maulana Hafiz Sher Muhammad

OUR BELIEFS

Ash'hadu-an la ilaha ill-allahu wahdahu la sharika lahu wa ash'hadu-anna Muhammad-an 'abduhu wa rasuluhu

1. We believe Allah to be the Possessor of all the perfect attributes, free from all defects and imperfections, Unique in His Person, unrivalled in His Attributes and Works, and One without a partner.
2. We hold it is essential to believe in angels, all the Divine Books, and all the prophets and messengers of God.
3. We believe that the Holy Prophet Muhammad is ~~the~~ *Khatam al-Nabiyyin*. With his advent religion has been perfected, so he is the Last Prophet after whom no prophet shall appear, either a new one or a former one.
4. We believe in the life after death, and in all matters relating to the grave, the day of judgement, and paradise and hell, that are proven from the Qur'an and Hadith.
5. From the depth of our hearts, we hold the Righteous Caliphs, the Holy Companions (*ashab*), the Purified Wives, and members of the Holy Household (*ahl bait*), as beloved, worthy of respect, and honourable in the sight of God.
6. We hold the Imams Abu Hanifah, Shafi'i, Malik, and Ahmad bin Hanbal to be the leaders of jurisprudence (*fiqh*); and saints such as Shaikh 'Abdul Qadir Jilani, Khawaja Naqshband; and Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi to be the leaders of *Tusawwaf* (the spiritual sciences). We believe all such elders of the religion to be worthy of esteem.
7. In accordance with the Holy Prophet's sayings about mujaddids and muhaddaths, we believe in the truth of the mujaddids of all the centuries, and in accordance with the same tradition, believe in Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian as the Mujaddid of the fourteenth century of Hijrah, and *not as a prophet*.
8. We consider each such person to be a Muslim who professes to believe in Kalima *la ilaha ill-allah, Muhammad-ur rasul Allah* ("there is no god but Allah, and Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah) and calls himself a Muslim.
9. All the members of the Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Isha'at Islam believe in practising according to God's Book the Holy Qur'an

and the Sunnah of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and if no specific direction is found there, they give precedence to the Hanafi school of jurisprudence.

The Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Isha'at Islam has not only been proclaiming these beliefs but, for sixty-five years, it has been engaged in the propagation of Islam and service to its cause. The whole world and in particular the Muslim religious scholars of the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent have borne witness to this fact.

SWORN DECLARATION OF HAZRAT MIRZA GHULAM AHMAD OF QADIAN :

"I make it clear to the public that I swear by Almighty Allah that I am not a *kafir*. My belief is *La ilaha ill-allah Muhammad-ur rasul Allah*, and regarding the Holy Prophet I believe that "he is the messenger of Allah and *Khatam al-Nabiyyin*" (the Qur'an 33:40). I swear to this statement as many times as the Holy Qur'an, and as many times as there are excellences of the Holy Prophet in God's eyes. No belief of mine is opposed to the directions of God or of the Holy Prophet, and he who thinks otherwise is mistaken. Whoever still considers me a *kafir*, and does not refrain from declaring me as such, should remember with certainty that God will question him after his death."

"In all matters my beliefs are the same as those of the other followers of *ahl sunnah*. In this house of God, I admit most clearly that I believe in the finality of prophethood of the *Khatam al-anbiya*, the Holy Prophet. Whoever denies the finality of prophethood, I consider him to be a (*Kafir*) disbeliever and outside the pale of Islam."

SWORN DECLARATION OF HAZRAT MAULANA HUMAHHAD ALI, FIRST HEAD OF THE LAHORE AHMADIYYA COMMUNITY :

"I, Muhammad Ali, head of the Lahore Ahmadiyyah Community, do swear by Almighty God that my belief is that Hazrat Mirza Sahib was a Mujaddid and the Messiah, but not a prophet, and that a person cannot become a *kafir* and excluded from the pale of Islam by denying him as such; this was also the belief of Hazrat Mirza Sahib himself. "O God, if I have lied in swearing by Thy name, send upon me such exemplary punishment as could not come from human means, and by which the world would see how terrible and frightening is God's punishment for those who deceive His creatures by swearing falsely in His name."

SWORN DECLARATION OF MAULANA SADR-UD-DIN, HEAD OF THE LAHORE AHMADIYYAH COMMUNITY :

"Knowing God to be present and to be our witness, we state on oath that from the beginning we have believed and we still believe, that no prophet, either a new one or a former one can appear after our Holy Prophet Muhammad."

A Comparative Study

BELIEFS OF THE TWO SECTIONS OF THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT

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

Lahore Section**Qadian Section**

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

WE BELIEVE

- (1) After our Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) Allah has completely barred the appearance of a prophet, old or new.
- (2) After the Holy Prophet Muhammad, Gabriel can never descend and bring Prophetic Revelation (*Wahy Nubuwwah*) to any person.
- (3) If Gabriel were to descend with one word of Prophetic Revelation (*Wahy Nubuwwah*) on any person, it would contradict the two complementary verses : Holy Qur'an.

“This day have I perfected your Religion for you” (5:3);

“He is the Messenger of Allah and the Last (Seal) of the prophets”. (33:40)

- (4) The Holy Prophet also said : “I am Muhammad and I am Ahmad and I am *al-'Aqib* (the one who comes last) after whom there can be no prophet.” (Al-Bukhari : Kitab al-Manaqib).
- (5) In the light of the above Islamic fundamentals, the Holy Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad never claimed to be a *Nabi*, but claimed to be the God-Ordained Mujaddid (The Promised Messiah) of the 14th Islamic Century, having been expressly raised to re-establish the predominance of Islam in the world.
- (6) He named his followers ‘Ahmadi’ after the Holy Prophet’s *Jamali* (beautiful) name ‘Ahmad’.
- (7) He proclaimed that no verse of the Holy Qur'an has been abrogated nor shall ever be abrogated.
- (8) All the Companions of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and the Imams are venerable.
- (9) It is spiritually conducive to our Faith to accept the revivalist Islamic missions of all *Mujaddids* (Renovators.)
- (10) Any one who declares his faith in the *Kalimah* (Muslim formula of faith – La ilaha illallahu Muhammadur Rasulullah) is a Muslim.

FOREWORD

“TRUE FACTS ABOUT THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT” is the English translation of the Urdu book written by that renowned scholar and missionary of Islam, Hafiz Maulana Sher Muhammad Sahib, in reply to Salahuddin Popoola Tayo’s anti-Ahmadiyya “Facts about the Ahmadiyya Movement” published in Trinidad in 1979. S.P. Tayo, who originates from Ghana, West Africa, used to be an Ahmadi. Although he now denies having ever had any connection with the Ahmadiyya Movement, in his articles “Ahmadiyyat in the Light of the Holy Prophet Muhammad”, and “Questions by M. Amin Answered”, he clearly stated that the advent of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib represented the second coming of Jesus (peace be upon him), and appearance of Imam Mahdi.

Indeed, it was at the invitation of the Trinidad Muslim League,, an organisation which used to be associated to the International H.Q. of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat Islam at Lahore, that Mr Tayo went to Trinidad. At first, he continued to work with the Ahmadiyya Association in that part of the world. In August 1971, to quote one incident, he made a special trip to Guyana to take part in the Fourth Ahmadiyya Convention. However, after the rise of the anti-Ahmadi Movement, in particular after the decision of the National Assembly of Pakistan, in 1974, to declare Ahmadis as kafirs and outside the pale of Islam, Mr Tayo suddenly became a bitter opponent of Ahmadiyyat.

S.P. Tayo claims that his change of attitude came about because it was only at this time that he understood the “true” teachings of the Promised Messiah by directly reading his books, while previously his knowledge of Ahmadiyyat had come from the books of Hazrat Maulana Muhammad Ali. Although, in his booklet, Mr Tayo has abused The Promised Messiah, Hazrat Maulana Muhammad Ali, and the Ahmadiyya Movement, we have no intention of competing with his literary abilities in this respect. He claims that sincere and serious investigation led him to forsake his first views; so we request him to read these few pages with the same sincerity and desire for truth. We would also request him to research the questions we have raised, and publish his reply to them so that the world can also see whether the Holy Qur’an, Hadith, and writings of the sages and elders of the Islamic religion support his views or those of the Promised Messiah, Hazrat Maulana Muhammad Ali, and members of this organisation.

We must record our thanks to Hafiz Maulana Sher Muhammad Sahib for allowing us the honour of translating his scholarly work into English. We pray to Allah that He grant our non-Ahmadi brothers and sisters wisdom so that they may recognise The Promised Messiah.

Zahid Aziz
Shahid Aziz
Secretary,
Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat-I-Islam
(U.K.) 21.6.82.

TRUE FACTS ABOUT THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT

— *By Maulana Hafiz Sher Muhammad*

We have received an 18-page pamphlet, 'Facts about the Ahmadiyya Movement', published in 1978 from the Jinnah Memorial Mosque, Trinidad (West Indies), and written by Haji Salahuddin P. Tayo, a Muslim missionary working for various bodies including the Muslim World League of Makka. The author explains that previously he had held favourable views regarding Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam, but that these were based on what he had read about the Founder in the Lahore — Ahmadiyya literature produced by the *Hazrat* Maulana Muhammad Ali. Subsequently, claims Mr Tayo, he went through some of the Founder's own Arabic books, and saw some of his Urdu ones in translation, and found that Hazrat Mirza Sahib had claimed to be a prophet and had held un-Islamic views.

In his pamphlet, Mr Tayo has listed our articles of belief, as given in the 'We Believe' column of our magazine *The Light*, and has in each case tried to show from Hazrat Mirza Sahib's writings that he did not hold those beliefs. But looking at the quotations from Hazrat Mirza Sahib's works given by Mr Tayo, it is clear that he has not studied the Founder's original writings, and has taken these quotations from the abusive and prejudiced anti-Ahmadiyya literature produced by the inveterate opponents of the Movement. He also quotes from publications of the Rabwah Movement to support his case. These references do *not* necessarily show what Hazrat Mirza Sahib himself believed, and we shall disregard them altogether.

I. FIRST BELIEF : NO PROPHET AFTER HOLY PROPHET

Mr Tayo quotes the first article from our 'We Believe' column of *The Light* :

"After the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) Allah has barred the appearance of any prophet, old or new."

He then gives extracts from Hazrat Mirza Sahib's writings to try to show that the Founder himself claimed to be a prophet, and that therefore our belief is opposed to his. But we tell Mr Tayo that the very words of our belief above are taken from Hazrat Mirza Sahib's own writings. He wrote :

- (1) "By saying *la nabiyya ba'di*, the Holy Prophet Muhammad closed the door to any new or past prophet" (*Ayyam as-Sulh*, p. 156).
- (2) "Our Holy Prophet Muhammad is the *Khatam al-anbiya*. No prophet, either old or new, shall arise after him" (*Anjam Atham*, footnote, p. 27).
- (3) "Our Holy Prophet is the *Khatam al-anbiya*, and after him no prophet, either new or old, shall arise for this (Muslim) Ummah" (*Nishan-i Asmani*, p. 30).

From the above quotations it should be abundantly clear to Mr Tayo that even the wording of our belief is almost what our Founder had written. We also inform Mr Tayo that, of all Muslim *'ulama* in history, it is only the great figure of Hazrat Mirza Sahib who pointed out that the hadith *la nabiyya ba'di* ("no prophet after me"), from its grammatical construction, means that *all* prophets (old or new) are barred after the Holy Prophet. The majority of the *'ulama*, however, have held that an old prophet — Jesus — is still to come! WE CHALLENGE MR TAYO TO QUOTE ANY MUSLIM SCHOLAR BEFORE HAZRAT MIRZA SAHIB WHO INTERPRETED THIS HADITH AS MEANING THAT *OLD* PROPHETS AS WELL AS NEW ONES ARE NOW BARRED FROM COMING.

Mr Tayo has given extracts from Hazrat Mirza Sahib's books where the Founder has used the words *nabi* and *rasul* for himself. These quotations do not *show* that Hazrat Mirza Sahib claimed to be a prophet because Islamic religious literature, both ancient and modern, allows the application of the terms *nabi* and *rasul* (which technically mean "prophet" and "messenger") to non-prophets as well. This is a broad, literal use of these terms, as distinct from their technical, specialised meaning in the Shari'ah.

Use of *rasul*, *mursal*, for non-prophets in Qur'an and Hadith

- (1) "And the king said : 'Bring him to me'. So when the *rasul* came to him, he said : 'Go back to thy *rabb* (lord)'" (The Holy Qur'an, 12:50).

Here, the king's envoy is called a *rasul* (messenger) while he is certainly not a prophet. The king himself is called *rabb*. Both these words are used here in a literal sense, not the sense assigned to them by the Shari'ah.

- (2) "And I am going to send them a present, and see what answer the *mursals* bring back" (The Qur'an, 27:35).

The word *mursal*, also used for prophets and messengers of God, is here applied to ordinary envoys.

- (3) In *Sahih al-Bukhari* we read : "Then the *rasul* of the *rasul* of Allah came to me" (*Kitab al-Maghazi*, ch. 81). The "*rasul* of Allah" is the Holy Prophet, while his envoy is called his *rasul*.
- (4) The *Sunah* of Abu *Da'ud* records : "The Holy Prophet said : Praise be to Allah Who granted the *rasul* of His *rasul* that which pleases him" (Part 27, ch. 71). Again the Holy Prophet's envoy is called his *rasul*, or messenger.

Use of nabi, rasul, for non-prophets in Classical Islamic literature

- (1) The famous eighteenth century Indian Muslim Reformer, Shah Wali-ullah of Dehli, wrote :
"Remember that the Hadith which mentions the large number of prophets includes *muhaddaths* in its count" (*Al-Khair al-Kathir*; see p. 97 of the English translation). The hadith referred to by the Shah is the one which gives the number of prophets (*nabis*) as 124,000. According to the Shah, the word *nabi* in this hadith also includes *muhaddaths*, i.e., *Non-prophets* who are spoken to by God.
- (2) The early nineteenth century Indian Muslim leader, Shah Ismael Shaheed, writes : "A *muhaddath* too is called a *rasul*" (*Abqaat*).
- (3) *The renowned sixteenth-seventeenth century Indian Muslim reformer popularly known as Mujaddid Alif Sani* (mujaddid of the Second Millennium) states:
"What can these people gain from the *Shaikhain* (i.e., *Hazrat Abu Bakr and Umar*), while these two elders, on account of their eminence and dignity, are classed with the prophets, and possess the virtues of the prophets" (*Maktubat*, First *Daftar*, part 4, letter no. 251, p. 64).
- (4) Sayyid Abdul Qadir Jilani, famous Iraqi saint (d. 1166 C.E.), wrote :
"I was with the light of Muhammad in the exalted place, In Allah's undisclosed knowledge was my prophethood".
- (5) The famous and popular Baba Farid Shakar Ganj (d. 1265 C.E.) is reported to have said :
"I am Ali; I am a *wali* (saint or holy man); I am a *nabi*" (Daily *Nawa-i Waqt*, Lahore, Pakistan, 4 July 1964).

- (6) Jalal-ud-Din Rumi, world-renowned author of *Masnawi* (d. 1273 C.E.), wrote :
 "O disciple! he (the spiritual leader) is the prophet (*nabi*) of his time, for he is clearly the light of the Prophet" (*Miftah al-'Ulum*, vol 13, p. 152).
- (7) The Maulana Sanaa-Ullah Panipat wrote:
 "*Rasul* has a broad significance, applying both to men and angels ... Some scholars say that, as a general metaphor, the word *rasul* is also applied to the *auliya* (plural of *wali*, meaning *saint*)" (*Tafsir-i Mazhari*, Surah Mulk to Nas, p. 140).
- (8) Khwaja Habib-Ullah 'Attar said :
 "Consider me as the *rasul* of Allah" (*Masnawi Bahr al-'Irfan*, by Mirza Akmal Baig, vol, i., p. 179).

Views of modern Muslim scholars

- (1) Maulana Mufti Kifayatullah, one-time President of the *Jamiat-i Ulama* of India, wrote:
 "Muhaddath is he who receives the word of God through special ilham. He is a *nabi* (prophet) of a lower order according to some scholars, and a *wali* (saint) of a high rank according to others" (*Majalis al-Abrar*, footnote, p. 109).
- (2) Allama Khalid Mahmud, M.A., writes :
 "The Maulana (Jalal-ud-Din Rumi) refers to every Sunna-following spiritual leader metaphorically as *nabi*" (*Aqidat al-Ummah fi ma'ni Khatm Nubuwwat*, p. 112).
- (3) Regarding a poetic verse by Jalal-ud-Din Rumi, the Maulana Sajjad Ahmad writes :
 "Usually the word *nabi* is used in a specialised sense but Maulana Rumi applies *nabi* to reformers of a high order, as in : 'In the way of goodness think of serving humanity, so that thou may attain *nubuwwah* (prophethood) while yet remaining in this Ummah" (*Muqaddama Masnawi Rumi*, p. 23).
- (4) In the biography of Dr Sir Muhammad Iqbal, by Maulvi Muhammad Tahir Faruqi, the author has used for Iqbal the terms *mujaddid* (Divine Reformer), *muslih* (Reformer), and *paighambar* (Urdu word for *rasul*). He explains the use of these words thus :
 "Wherever I have used the word *mujaddid* or *paighambar* for the 'Allama (Iqbal), it has not been in the sense in which the Shari'ah uses it, but in a literal sense" (*Sirat Iqbal*, p. 210).

- (5) Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi writes :
“The *nubuwwah* (prophethood) or *risalah* (messengership) that brings with itself a new shari‘ah has been terminated. But *wilayah* (sainthood) has not ended, and some of its aspects are termed by some as ‘general *nubuwwah*’, i.e., news about matters unseen”
“*Al-Tanbiyya al-Tarbi fi tanzaliyya Ibn Arabi*, p. 101).
- (6) Maulana Abdur-Rashid, Head Teacher *Ahl-i Hadith*, Lahore, writes:
“From these writings the Sufis’ meaning is clear; they refer to all prophets as *tashri-i nabi* (prophets bringing a new law), and refer to the *auliya* of this *Ummah* as *ghair-tashri’i nabi* (prophets without a new law)” (*Khatm Nubuwwat aur Nuzul-i’Isa*, p. 74).
- (7) Maulana Mufti Muhammad Shafi *Deobandi* writes:
“The Shaikh (Muhiyud-Din ibn Arabi) has described *wilayah* as *nubuwwah* (prophethood) without a new law” (*Khatm Nubuwwah*, part III, p. 31).
- (8) Maulana Muhammad Haneef Nadavi states :
“The Sufis believe in the continuity of the *wilayah* (Sainthood) and then call one of its aspects as *nubuwwah*. That is to say, one meaning they give to *nubuwwah* is that it is a type of *wilayah*, not of *rasalah*. So when they say that the graces of *nubuwwah* still continue, they mean that *wilayah* still continues It should be made clear that the Sufis have their own interpretation of *nubuwwah* that includes the *auliya*” (*Mirzaiyyat Nai Zaveon Se*, p. 72).

Question for Mr Tayo

In the light of all the extracts given above, what do you, Mr Tayo, think about all the Muslim elders and scholars who have used the words *nabi* and *rasul* for non-prophets? Should they be declared *kafirs* as has been done with the Hazrat Mirza Sahib? What is more, some renowned saints have even asked their disciples, on occasions, to recite the *kalima* and *Darood* in their names. For example :

- (i) Abu Bakr Shibli (God’s mercy be upon him), the great Iraqi saint (d. 846 C.E.) told a disciple to recite : “There is no god but Allah, and Shibli is His *rasul*” (*Tazkira Ghausiyya*, p. 315).
- (ii) Khwaja Mu’in-ud-Din Chishti, the great Indian Muslim saint (d. 1236 C.E.) told a disciple to recite : “There is no god but Allah, and Chishti is His *rasul*” (*Fawa'id as-Salikeen*, p. 18).

- (iii) Shaikh Sadiq Gangohi told a disciple to recite : "There is no god but Allah, and Sadiq is His *rasul*". (Al-Takashshaf fi mahmat al-Tasawwuf, p. 584).
- (iv) Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi of India told a disciple that he had acted in accordance with the Sunna when he had, in a dream, recited the *kalima* : *La ilaha ill-llahu, Ashraf Ali rasul Allah* and Darood when he awoke : *Allahumma salli 'alaa sayyidi-na wa nabiiyyi-na wa maula-na Ashraf Ali*. (Al-Imdad, Mahe Safar 1336 A.H.).

Well, Mr Tayo! Do you consider these popular, venerated saints to be claimants to prophethood and outside the pale of Islam?! We also point out to you that when Jawahar Lal Nehru, the late Indian Prime Minister, visited an Arab country he was greeted with the words :

Marhāba! Rasul as-Salam meaning, *Welcome! Rasul of peace* (Daily Kohistan, Pakistan, 27/9/56).

What do you, Mr Tayo, think of Arab Muslims styling a Hindu as a *rasul*?

Hazrat Mirza Sahib's use of nabi, and rasul for himself

We have proved above that to apply to non-prophets the terms *rasul*, *mursal*, *nabi*, etc., is perfectly allowable according to the Qur'an, the Hadith, the writings of Muslim saints and scholars, and Arab expression itself. Hazrat Mirza Sahib's use of the words *nabi* and *rasul* for himself should be viewed in this light. In fact, the Founder himself has extensively clarified this point in his writings :

- (1) "The term *rasul* is general, and includes *rasul*, *nabi* and *muhaddath*" (*Ainah kamalat-i-Islam*, p. 322).
- (2) "By *rasul* are meant all those who are sent by God, whether they be *nabi*, or *rasul*, or *muhaddath*, or *mujaddid*" (*Ayyam as-Sulh*, p. 171).
- (3) "By *rasul* is meant the one appointed and sent, who has been raised to aid Islam" (*Siraj Munir*, p. 40).
- (4) "It should be remembered that, in the Divine expression, the word *rusul* is used for the singular, and is also used for non-prophets (*ghair rusul*)" (*Shahadat al-Qur'an*, p. 20).
- (5) "By *rasul* is meant those who are sent : whether such a one is a *rasul* or a *nabi* or a *muhaddath*" (*ibid.*, p. 23).

In the above extracts, Hazrat Mirza Sahib explains to his opponents that they should not misunderstand his use of the word *rasul*,

as Islamic Shari'ah uses this term to denote a *mujaddid* or *muhaddath* as well as a *prophet*. The word *nabi* is also used in a literal fashion to the same effect, as the Founder explained :

- (1) "One who gives news of matters unseen, having received it from God, is called *nabi* in Arabic. In Islamic terminology it (*nabi*) has a different meaning. At this place, just the literal use is intended" (*Arba'in* no 2, p. 20).
- (2) "All these terms (*nabi* etc.) have not been used in a real sense but simply in a literal sense" (*Majmu'ah Ishtiharat*, vol. I, p. 313).
- (3) "God well knows that my intention in using this word *nabi* was not to mean actual prophethood but to denote only a *muhaddath*" (*Majmu'ah Ishtiharat*).
- (4) "It should be remembered that, according to the lexicon, *nabi* means 'one who gives news of matters unseen, having received it from God'... It is in this sense that in *Sahih Muslim* the Promised Messiah has been called a *nabi*".
- (5) "Here, the revelation of God has used the words *rasul* and *nabi* regarding myself: that this person is *rasul* and *nabi*. The significance here is metaphorical and allegorical" (Appendix to *Tuh-fah Golarwiyya*, footnote, p. 24).
- (6) "As our Holy Prophet Muhammad is *Khatam al-anbiya*, and after him no prophet can come, so in the Shari'ah the *muhaddath* takes the place of the *nabi*" (*Shahadat al-Quran*, p. 24).
- (7) "Occasionally God's revelation uses such words (*nabi*, *rasul*, *mursal*) in a metaphorical and allegorical fashion regarding some of his *auliya*; and these are not meant in a real sense" (*Anjam Atham*, footnote, p. 28).
- (8) "*Nubuwwah* means 'to prophesy', i.e., it is not in the ken of just any person to make prophecies" (*Roohani Khaza'in*, vol. I, p. 140).
- (9) "*Risalah*, in Arabic lexicology, means 'to be sent'; and *nubuwwah* is to give out hidden truth and knowledge, having learnt it from God. By bearing the limit of this significance in mind, it is not reprehensible to believe (in Hazrat Mirza Sahib's *risalah* and *nubuwwah*) in accordance with this meaning" (Letter of 17 August 1899 published in *Al-Hakam*, vol III, no 29).
- (10) "According to their metaphorical significance, God can speak of any *mulham* (recipient of revelation) by using the terms *nabi* and *mursal* The Arabs, to this day, call a messenger sent by some person a *rasul*. So why should it be prohibited for God to use the

word *mursal* metaphorically? do you not remember the Quranic word *fa qalu inna ilaikum mursulun* ('they said, We are messengers to you')" (*Siraj Munir*, p. 3)

- (11) "It should be remembered that this humble one has never, at any time, made a claim to *nubuwwah* or *risalah* in the real sense. To use a term in its non-real sense, and to bring it into conversation according to its wide, literal meaning, does not constitute heresy. But I do not like even this, for there is the possibility of ordinary Muslims being confused" (*Anjam Atham*, footnote p. 27).
- (12) "My claim is not of *nubuwwah* but of being a *muhaddath*" (*Izalah Auham*, p. 421).
- (13) "I have not claimed *nubuwwah* but only *wilayah* and *mujaddidiyyah*" (*Majmu'a Ishtiharat*, vol, II, p. 296).

Is there even one iota of difference between Hazrat Mirza Sahib's exposition of the words *nabi*, *rasul* and *mursal*, and that which other Muslim religious scholars and elders have written! Had Mr Tayo read Hazrat Mirza Sahib's books he would not have found therein anything at all contrary to Islamic Shari'ah, or different from what had been written by the classical Muslim scholars.

Use of 'Like-unto Prophet' and 'Prophet' in Hadith

We also tell Mr Tayo that the basis of the above-noted views of Muslim saints of yore rests in the Holy Prophet's Sayings. There are two kinds of terms applied in Hadith to the great Reformers, Scholars, and Saints prophesied to appear amongst the Muslims. Firstly, titles such as 'like of Prophets' (*Ka-anbiya*); and secondly, the epithet where the prefix *Ka* (*like unto*) is omitted, and the title used is *nabi-Allah* ('prophet of God).

The first type of title is used in the following prophecies :

- (i) "The Learned ones of my community are like the prophets (*ka-anbiya*) of the Israelites."
- (ii) "The *Shaikh* is to his people as the prophet (*Kan-nabiyyi*) is to his community."
- (iii) "The Learned ones of this (Muslim) Community are like the prophets (*Ka-anbiya*) of all the previous nations."
- (iv) "There is not a prophet but a like of him (*nazir*) can be found in my Community; so, Abu Bakr is the like of Abraham, Umar is the like of Moses, Uthman is the like of Aaron, and Ali is like unto me."

The Holy Prophet thus stated that, though there would not be any prophets after him, there would appear 'Ulama', Shaikhs, and *Muhaddaths* who, while not being prophets, would be the 'likes' of the Israelite prophets.

Secondly however, in the prophecy relating to the latter-day advent of a Messiah, the title applied to him is *nabi-Allah* (prophet of God), rather than *Ka-annabiyy* (like a prophet).

Apparent Contradiction with Finality of Prophethood

This use of the term *nabi-Allah* is rather problematic. On the one hand, the Qur'an declares the Holy Prophet to be the Last Prophet (*khatam an-nabiyyin*); and there exist more than fifty hadith in which occur the words *la nabiyya ba'di* ('there is to be no prophet after me') — these words absolutely rule out the possibility of the appearance of any prophet *new or old*. Had this saying run : *la nabiyy-an ba'di*, it may have implied that a *past*, though not a *new*, prophet could come. But the actual wording — *la nabiyya ba'di* — means, as Hazrat Mirza Sahib has explained, that *all* prophets are barred.

On the other hand, however, the Messiah to come in the latter days is referred to as *nabi-Allah* (prophet of God) four times in a hadith in *Sahih Muslim*.

It is, therefore, the duty of all Muslim scholars — including Mr Tayo — to resolve this apparent contradiction : how can a *nabi-Allah* appear after the Holy Prophet Muhammad!

Hazrat Mirza Sahib's resolving of this contradiction

We hope that Mr Tayo will resolve the contradiction of a *nabi* appearing after the Holy Prophet, and will also clarify the various perplexing and contradictory hadith relating to the advent of the Messiah, the Mahdi, Dajjal, and Gog and Magog.

Hazrat Mirza Sahib has solved this riddle by giving a metaphorical interpretation to the terms used in the *Sahih Muslim* hadith narrated by Nawas bin Saman where the words *nabi-Allah* are the cause of the contradiction. He claimed to be the Promised Messiah, and so he had to interpret the various terms occurring in this hadith which prophesies the coming of the Messiah. As for *nabi-Allah*, Hazrat Mirza Sahib explained it as having been used in a metaphorical sense :

- (i) There is a hadith in *Sahih Muslim* that the Messiah is to appear as a *nabi* of Allah ... Now if by *Messiah* or *son of Mary* is metaphorically meant someone from the (Muslim) Ummah who

holds the rank of *muhaddathiyya*, no difficulty need arise" (*Izalah Auham*, p. 586).

- (ii) "The Holy Prophet's use of the title *nabi* of Allah for the Messiah-to-come that is found in *Sahih Muslim*, has the very same metaphorical meaning as that in which it is used in Sufi literature as a recognised and common term for *being spoken to by God*. Otherwise, how can there be a *nabi* after the *Khatam al-anbiya*" (*Anjam Atham*, p. 28).
- (iii) "In various hadith, the Promised Messiah's being called *nabi* is not meant in the real sense. This is the knowledge God has given me; whoever wishes to, let him understand this" (*Siraj Munir*, p.3).
- (iv) "In Hadith the Promised Messiah has been described by the word *nabi* its meaning in Islamic nomenclature is different — here only the literal sense is intended" (*Arba'in* no. 2, p. 20, margin).
- (v) "Our malicious opponents do not believe the Finality of Prophethood to be absolute, for according to them there is still room for the coming of a prophet, the Israelite Messiah. So, if after the Holy Prophet, an actual *nabi* appears and *wahy nubuwwah* re-commences, how and in what manner does the Finality of Prophethood remain" (*Siraj Munir*, p. 2).

Thus, out of respect and regard for the Finality of the Holy Prophet Muhammad's Prophethood, and using the accepted principle that a hadith apparently contradictory to the Qur'an and other hadith should be either interpreted to fit in, or rejected. Hazrat Mirza Sahib has interpreted the *Sahih Muslim* hadith to make it accord with the Holy Qur'an and the basic doctrine of Finality of Prophethood.

It is such a great personage that Mr Tayo is accusing of denying *Khatm-al-Nubuwwah*, and of claiming to be a prophet.

Summary — use of words *nabi*, *rasul*, for Hazrat Mirza Sahib

There are two grounds on which Hazrat Mirza Sahib applied to himself the words *nabi* and *rasul*. Firstly, like many previous Muslim saints, Hazrat Mirza Sahib attained the rank known as *fana fir-Rasul*.

And as with the other such saints, he too became eligible to use as titles *nabi* and *rasul*, without at all infringing the Finality of the Holy Prophet's Prophethood. He writes :

"I received this title in the position of *fana fir-Rasul*. Hence the significance of *Khatam an-nabiyyin* is not affected" (*Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*).

We have earlier given instances of previous, recognised saints using for themselves the terms *nabi* and *rasul*. Such use of these words is *not in a technical but in a broad or literal sense*.

The second ground for applying the word *nabi* to Hazrat Mirza Sahib is that, as explained above, a prophetic hadith in the *Sahih Muslim* refers to the coming Messiah as *nabi-Allah*. While Hazrat Mirza Sahib claimed to be that Promised Messiah, he also explained that the title *nabi* in this hadith was meant only in a metaphorical or figurative sense, since no *real prophet* can appear now.

Having noted the occurrence of the terms *nabi* and *rasul* in Hazrat Mirza Sahib's writings, Mr Tayo IS UTTERLY MISTAKEN IN ALLEGING THAT THEIR APPLICATION TO HAZRAT MIRZA SAHIB MEANS THAT HE CLAIMED TO BE A PROPHET, WHILE HE CLEARLY DECLARED :

“Those people slander me who assert that I have claimed prophethood?” (*Hamamat al-Bushra*, p.8).

Signs of God

We now turn to the next argument Mr Tayo adduces to prove that Hazrat Mirza Sahib claimed prophethood. He quotes him as follows :

“God has sent signs for confirmation of my apostleship which if distributed over a thousand prophets would testify to their apostleship. But satans among men do not testify to this (Ain-ul-Marifa, p. 317 by Ghulam Ahmad)”.

Mr Tayo gets the title of the book wrong: it should be *Chashma-i-Ma'rifa*. Much more serious, however, is the fact that his English version grossly distorts Hazrat Mirza Sahib's original Urdu words. The correct rendering is :

“To prove that *I am from Him*, God almighty showed so many signs that if these were distributed even among one thousand prophets, their prophethood would be proved. But, since this is the Last Age, and the Satan with all his followers has mounted the Final assault. In order to defeat the Satan, God has shown thousands of signs all together in one place”.

Hazrat Mirza Sahib has certainly *not* written here that these “signs” were sent to prove that he was prophet, but that these were sent “to prove that *I am from Him*”. When a Divine-appointee, be he a prophet (*nabi*) or a saint (*wali*), refers to the heavenly signs sent in his support, he does so to prove his claim :If the claim is of prophethood he advances the signs to prove that he is a prophet; but if his claim is that

of *wilayah* or *mujaddidiyya*, he adduces the signs to prove just that claim of being a *wali* or *mujaddid*, and *nothing more*. The number or magnitude of the Divine signs does not decide the office of the claimant: a sign granted to a prophet is to prove his prophethood, *but the very same (or even a greater) sign granted to a mujaddid is to prove his mujaddidiyya*.

We give below some extracts from Hazrat Mirza Sahib's writings on this topic:

- (i) "Heavenly Sign is the thing that has proved great prophethoods, messengerships, and scriptures as being the Word of God. Why cannot such (signs) prove one to be the like-of-Messiah (*Mathil Masih*)" (*Shahadat al-Qur'an*, p. 72).
- (ii) "Signs are undoubtedly shown by Messengers, Prophets, and the *auliya* (saints)" (*Ainah Kamalat Islam*, p. 171).
- (iii) "The second means of finding God is by His ever-fresh Signs displayed through the Prophets and the *auliya*" (*Chashma-i Ma'rifa*, p. 171).
- (iv) "The evidence furnished by Divine Signs is never weak — whether these are shown by a prophet or a *muhaddath*" (*Ayyam as-Sulh*, p. 75).
- (v) "The signs that come from God, whether displayed by a prophet or a saint (*wali*), are of the same rank because the Sender is the same. It is ignorant and foolish to think that when God sends some heavenly support through a prophet it is of great power and grandeur, but of a lesser magnitude when He sends it through a saint. In fact, some Signs of support for Islam, such as the destruction of the *ashab al-fil*, are shown then there exists neither a prophet nor a saint. It is recognised that a miracle of saint (*karamah*) is really the miracle (*mu'jizah*) of his master-prophet. Thus when *karamah* is *mu'jizah* too, it is not for the honest to differentiate between miracles (of the prophets and of saints)" (*Ayyam as-Sulh*, p. 74).

From the above quotations, we see clearly that it is to prove his claim of being a *wali* and the Promised Messiah that Hazrat Mirza Sahib referred to the Divine Signs granted to him, and also that such reference to Signs has no connection whatever with any claim to prophethood.

Granting of Signs to Hazrat Mirza Sahib — the reason

The reason why God granted so numerous signs to Hazrat Mirza Sahib is also explained by him in the original extract from *Chashmah Ma'rifa*, p. 317 :

“But, since this is the Last Age, and the Satan with all his followers has mounted the final assault, in order to defeat Satan, God has shown thousands of signs all together in one place”.

Elsewhere he writes :

“God granted me thousands of signs only so that the enemy may know that the religion of Islam is True. I desire not any honour for myself but for that for which I have been sent”(*Haqiqat al-Wahy*, p. 176).

Mr Tayo cannot deny that the assault of the Satan against Islam was by far stronger in the fourteenth century Hijrah than at any other time since the Holy Prophet's days. Hazrat Mirza Sahib, who came as the Messiah to lead Islam to victory, was therefore granted a great abundance of Divine signs to combat and defeat these attacks. It should also be remembered that, as the Holy Prophet's Prophethood extends right up to the Day of Judgement, the Divine signs granted to the *auliya* (saints) in various ages in support of Islam *are really the miracles of the Holy Prophet Muhammad himself*. Hazrat Mirza Sahib was granted all these Signs from God to prove to the great number of sceptics and deniers that the God of Islam really exists, and that its Prophet is a Living Prophet, and its Scripture a Living Book.

Status of Hazrat Mirza Sahib

Under his review of the first of our ten articles of faith, Mr Tayo's final argument in his attempt to show that Hazrat Mirza Sahib claimed to be a prophet, is to quote a poetic verse by the Founder which runs :

“He (God) gave me in perfection to that which He had given to every prophet”.

Before objecting to this verse, and erroneously concluding therefrom that Hazrat Mirza Sahib claimed prophethood, Mr Tayo should study those hadith that describe that high status of the Messiah-to-come; indeed, he may examine even the hadith that tell us of the exalted rank of the ordinary *auliya* and holy men of the Muslim Umma :

- (1) '*Ulama'u ummati ka-anbiya'i bani isra'il* : “The Ulama of my Umma are like the Prophets of the Israelities”.

- (2) *Al-'ulama'u warathatu-l-anbiya* : "The ulama are the heirs of the prophets".
- (3) *Ash-shaikhu fi qaumi-hi ka-an-nabiyyi fi ummati-hi* : "The Shaikh is to his people as the prophet is to his followers".
- (4) *Rijal-un yukallimuna min ghairi an yakunu anbiya* : "Men spoken to by God from among non-prophets".
- (5) "There are some servants of Allah who are neither prophets nor *shahids*, yet the prophets and the *shahids* envy their rank and Divine nearness".

The above extracts show the high status of the *auliya* (saints) as described by the Holy Prophet Muhammad. These great *auliya* have also themselves written about their exalted rank, and if Mr Tayo had read some of their writings he would have not raised any objection to Hazrat Mirza Sahib's writings. To take some instances :

- (1) Sayyid Abdul Qadir Jilani wrote :
"I am well beyond your comprehension. Do not think of me as being like any other person nor any other person as being like me."
(*Sharah Fatuhul Ghaib* (Persian) p. 22).
- (2) Hazrat Ahmad Jaan wrote :
"The thing that the prophets could not fully obtain, that thing I obtained easily, without effort".
- (3) Abu Yazid Bustami said:
Subhani ma a'zam shani : "Glory be to me, how great is my dignity" (*Tadhkirat al-auliya*).

There are other similar sayings of hundreds of holy men of Islam describing the status granted to them by God. However, the high status of the Messiah-to-come and Mahdi is one that was not granted to any holy man in the thirteen centuries of Islam, for there was to be only one promised personage. Regarding him, the Holy Prophet said:

- (1) "When you (O Muslims) see him you should swear allegiance to him though you have to trek over ice, for he is the *Khalifah* of Allah, the Mahdi" (*Kanz al-'Ummal*, vol. vi, p. 186).
- (2) "It is binding on every Muslim to aid him".
- (3) "On that day, if thou seest the *Khalifah* of Allah in the earth, thou shouldst take hold of him even if thy body perish and thy possessions be taken away".
- (4) "Whoever among you encounters Jesus (i.e., the coming Messiah), he should convey my greetings to him" (*Hakim*).

- (5) "How can that ummah perish, in the first of which am I, and after me twelve *khalifahs*, and at the end of which is the Messiah, son of Mary".
- (6) "Allah will send the Messiah, son of Mary, Allah will send revelation to him and the Prophet of God and his companions will be obstructed" (*Mishkat*).
- (7) "Whoever recognises not the Imam of the age, he indeed dies a death in ignorance (*Jahiliyya*)".

The above are the hadith of the Holy Prophet Muhammad that not only describe the status of the Messiah-Mahdi but also urge Muslims to support and aid him. He is, in fact, made the saviour of the Muslim ummah, and grave warnings are issued against those who refuse to acknowledge him.

The great religious divines of the Muslim Ummah have also written much about him :

- (1) Shaikh Muhiyud-Din Ibn Arabi (d. 1240 C.E.), one of the greatest saints of Islam, wrote :
"The Mahdi to come in the latter days will obey the Holy Prophet Muhammad in matters of the Shari'ah. However, in matters of spiritual knowledge all prophets and *auliya* will be subordinate to him because the inner nature (*batin*) of the Mahdi shall be the *batin* of the Holy Prophet Muhammad"
(*Sharh Fusus al-Hakam* by Abdur Razaq).
- (2) Imam Ibn Sirin:
"There will be a *khalifah* in this Ummah who will be superior to Abu Bakr and Umar. Someone asked: superior to both of them? He (Ibn Sirin) replied: Indeed, he shall be superior to even some of the prophets" (*Hujaj al-Kiramah*, p. 386).
- (3) Shaikh Ahmad, Mujaddid Alf Sani, of Sirhind, India (d. 1624):
 - (i) "The *auliya* are of various grades. Some have the capacity for just the first grade, others for the second, still others for third, and yet others for the fourth There are few who reach the fifth grade. However, there is a grade even beyond the fifth, which has not been attained since the time of the Holy Prophet's Companions..... This perfection shall, God willing, be manifested in the Latter days through the Promised Mahdi"
(*Mabd wa Mu'ad*, p. 7).

- (ii) "Allah is neither in this world nor out of it; He is neither a part of this world nor separate from it This secret has been disclosed only to the very select... This great wealth has been bestowed upon very few persons after the age of the Holy Prophet's Companions This quality will be manifested in the Latter days in the Promised Mahdi" (ibid., p. 9).

Would that Mr Tayo had read these sayings of the Holy Prophet and of the religious elders of Islam, He would not then have opposed Hazrat Mirza Sahib through ignorance. Mr Tayo, the fountainhead and source of the spiritual knowledge of the Prophets *and* of the *auliya* is one and the same — Allah. The difference between the revelation received by the prophets and that received by the *auliya* is that to the former Allah sends *wahy nubuwwah*, while to the latter He sends *wahy wilayah*.

Hazrat Mirza Sahib's verses

Let us now look at the poetic verses which Mr Tayo finds objectionable, in the light of the points made above :

"The balm for the heart is the word of God,
 Without this cup of God how can you be fulfilled.
 The cup that He granted to every prophet,
 He gave me too in its fullness.
 I am surely the heir of the Holy Prophet,
 I am coloured with this beautiful friend's colour.
 But I am really a mirror from the Lord,
 to show the world the face of the moon of Madina".

The meaning of these verses is very clear: the Divine knowledge that God had granted to the prophets, was granted to Hazrat Mirza Sahib through his perfect following of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. Hazrat Mirza Sahib has explained this point elsewhere as well:

- (1) "Those persons who follow the Holy Qur'an; believe truly in the Prophet of God; love him; and hold him to be purer, superior, and greater in perfection and rank than any other prophet or created thing of the past or future; such persons drink, in abundance and with enjoyment, the same draught that was granted to Moses and Jesus. They are granted the light and the blessings bestowed upon the Israelite prophets. Glory be to Allah. How high is the rank of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the *Khatam al-anbiya*, and how august in his light, that his humblest lowest, and most ordinary

devotees can reach the grades mentioned above" (*Barahin Ahmadiyya*, footnote 11, p. 215).

- (2) "This holy (Islamic) teaching can make thousands (of Muslims) the like of Jesus, and has done so for hundreds of thousands" (*Four Questions Answered*, p. 22).
- (3) "I believe (that I receive) not *why nubuwwah*, but *wahy wilayah* which the *auliya* receive through the prophethood of Muhammad due to their perfect following of him. If anyone accuses me of (saying) anything beyond this, he departs from honesty and fear of God" (*Majmu'ah Ishtiharat*, vol. ii, p. 297).

In short, there have been in this Ummah countless holy men who, through their spiritual knowledge and sure revelation from God, delivered thousands of people from the depths of evil and immorality, and made them into pious and saintly men. The Holy Prophet Muhammad himself has described the spiritual leader of people (*shaikh*) as *ka-an-nabi* (like unto prophet), the religious scholars of the Ummah as *ka-anbiya bani isra'il* (like the Israelite prophets) and as *warathatul-anbiya* (heirs of the prophets), and the coming Messiah metaphorically as *nabi-Allah* (prophet of God). Why therefore, cannot Hazrat Mirza Sahib, who fulfilled the Holy Prophet's prophecy about the Messiah-Mahdi to come, attain to perfect Divine communion, and Divine revelation and sure and certain as that granted to prophets?

Had Mr Tayo been aware of the facts given above, he would not have raised any objections to Hazrat Mirza Sahib's writings, nor would he have concluded that the Maulana Muhammad Ali and the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement hold beliefs different from those of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib.

II & III : SECOND AND THIRD BELIEFS : JIBREEL CANNOT BRING WAHY NUBUWWAH AFTER HOLY PROPHET MUHAMMAD

Mr Tayo moves on to quote beliefs no. 2 and 3 from the 'We Believe' column of *The Light*, which run :

2. After the Holy Prophet, Jibreel can never descend and bring wahy nubuwwah (revelation peculiar to prophets) to any person.
3. If Jibreel were to descend with one word of *wahy nubuwwah*, it would contradict the two complementary verses : "This day have I perfected for you your religion"; and, "He is the Messenger of Allah and the Last of the prophets'."

He then gives three extracts from Hazrat Mirza Sahib's writings to the effect that God's word was revealed to him, and that he believed in his own revelation as he believed in Divine scriptures such as the Torah and the Qur'an. These extracts, claims Mr Tayo, show that Hazrat Mirza Sahib's own belief was opposed to our beliefs no. 2 and 3 from *The Light* as given above.

We tell Mr Tayo that, as in the case of the 'First Belief' discussed earlier, even the very wording of our beliefs is based upon Hazrat Mirza Sahib's own writings, as we show below from his books:

- (1) "It is obvious that even if we assume that Jibreel can now descend with just one sentence, and remain silent thereafter, this would still contradict the *khatm al-nubuwwah*, for when the seal of finality is breached and *wahy risalah* again starts to descend, it is the same whether the amount is little or much. Every sensible person can understand that if God is true to His promise and the promise given in the *Khatam an-nabiyyin* verse and explained clearly in Hadith that *Jibreel, after the death of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, has been barred forever from bringing wahy nubuw-wah..* " (*Izalah Auham*, p.577).
- (2) "The Holy Qur'an does not allow, after the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*, the coming of any *rasul*, be he new or old. This is because a *rasul* learns religion from Jibreel, and the door of the descent of Jibreel with *wahy risalah* is closed. And it is self-contradictory to suggest that a *rasul* can appear but without *wahy risalah*" (*ibid.*, p. 761)
- (3) "it is in the definition of *rasul* that he learns religion from Jibreel, and it has just been proved that *wahy risalah* is now cut off till the Day of Judgement" (*ibid.*, p. 614).

The above extracts should convince Mr Tayo that he is entirely wrong in asserting that Hazrat Mirza Sahib had expressed some view opposed to our beliefs no. 2 and 3. He too believed that Jibreel cannot descend with *wahy nubuw-wah* after the passing away of the Holy Prophet. Mr Tayo should, therefore, amend his erroneous ideas.

Revelation to a Saint (wali) is also certain.

Turning to the extracts from Hazrat Mirza's writings that Mr Tayo has given, there is no statement at all there which even remotely suggests that Hazrat Mirza Sahib believed his revelation to the *wahy nubuw-wah* (revelation peculiar to prophets) brought by Jibreel. What he has written is that he is as certain of his revelation being from God as he is certain that the Torah or the Qur'an were revealed by God. The question arises, therefore, whether a saint (*wali*), who is the recipient of

wahy wilayah (revelation granted to one who is a *wali*), can have perfect certainty regarding his revelation, that it really is from God.

One need only look in the Qur'an to see that God's word to a non-prophet is just as clear and certain as His word to prophets. Had this not been so, Moses' mother could not, on the basis of what God had revealed to her, cast her infant son into a river (the Quran, 20:38, 39; 28:7, 8). Nor could the disciples of Jesus have believed in him on the basis of the revelation they received (5 :111).

Hazrat Mirza Sahib also claimed to receive this type of revelation, as he writes :

"The Divine word that is revealed to me is certain and definite. Just as a person who sees the sun cannot doubt that it is indeed the sun, similarly I have no doubt at all regarding the word that God reveals to me Among the Israelites the revelations used to be so certain that, on their basis, Moses' mother cast her innocent baby into the river, and did not doubt the truth of the revelation; and *Khidr* killed a child on the same basis. Does this (Muslim) Umma not reach the standard attained by the women of the Israelites" (*Tajalliyat Ilahiyya*, p. 26).

When Hazrat Mirza Sahib writes that he believes his revelation to be from God just as he believes the Qur'an and other Divine books to be from God, how can Mr Tayo conclude therefrom that he is claiming to receive *wahy nubuwwah*? The Founder has declared:

- (1) "I believe that *wahy risalah* began with Adam and concluded with Holy Prophet Muhammad" (*Majmu'ah Ishtiharat*, vol. ii, p. 230).
- (2) "I too curse any claimant to prophethood ... I believe that the *auliya* receive, not *wahy nubuwwah*, but *wahy wilayah* through the Prophethood of Muhammad and due to their close following of him" (*ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 297).
- (3) "O you who call yourselves sons of Muslims, do not oppose the Qur'an by asserting that *wahy nubuwwah* can start again after the *Khatam al-nabiyyin*" (*Asmani Faisalah*, p. 16).

A Challenge

There are scores of other similar references where Hazrat Mirza Sahib has clarified that *wahy nubuwwah* ceased after the Holy Prophet; and that his own revelation is *wahy wilayah*. We challenge Mr Tayo to produce even a couple of extracts from Hazrat Mirza

Sahib's books where he should claim that his revelation is not *wahy wilayah* but *wahy nubuwwah*. He can never meet this challenge !

As to Hazrat Mirza Sahib having written that his revelations were so abundant as to constitute no less than twenty volumes, this statement is in no way objectionable. Let alone twenty, even forty volumes of revelation of the *wahy wilayah* type could be revealed to a Muslim saint. What cannot be revealed in any measure at all this *wahy nubuwwah*.

IV. FOURTH BELIEF : HOLY PROPHET IS LAST PROPHET

Here Mr Tayo quotes our fourth article of belief (that the Holy Prophet said he was the Last Prophet), and as usual tries to show that Hazrat Mirza Sahib believed the opposite. Let us, therefore, quote the Founder on this matter :

- (1) "(God is He) Who created Adam, sent Messengers, revealed scriptures, and *last of all* sent the Holy Prophet Muhammad who is the *Khatam al-anbiya* and *Khair ur-Rusul*" (*Haqiqat al-Wahy*, p. 141).
- (2) "(God sent) our Holy Prophet *after all the prophets* to unite all nations under his banner" (ibid., Supplement, p. 44).
- (3) "According to the Holy Qur'an, no prophet can come after the Holy Prophet Muhammad" (*Ayyam as-Sulh*, p. 163).
- (4) "Islam teaches that after our Holy Prophet no prophet shall come" (*Kashf al-Ghita*, p. 46).
- (5) "The Holy Prophet repeated again and again that after him no prophet shall come" (*Ayyam as-Sulh*, p. 152).
- (6) "I firmly believe that our Holy Prophet is the *Khatam al-anbiya*, and after him there shall not arise any prophet for this Ummah" (*Nishan Asmani*, p. 30).
- (7) "In this mosque I make a clear declaration before Muslims that I believe in the Holy Prophet Muhammad's finality of prophethood, and whosoever denies this finality I consider him as faithless and outside the pale of Islam" (Speech in Dehli, Oct. 1981).

In short, in each one of his books Hazrat Mirza Sahib has expressed his belief that the Holy Prophet Muhammad is the *Khatam al-nabiyyin*, the Last Prophet after whom no prophet shall ever arise. Mr Tayo simply demonstrates his ignorance of the works of Hazrat Mirza Sahib by asserting repeatedly that there is a contradiction between Maulana Muhammad Ali's beliefs and those of Hazrat Mirza Sahib.

Can Quranic passages be revealed to auliya

Mr Tayo next alleges that Hazrat Mirza Sahib had claimed that some of the Quranic passages mentioning the Holy Prophet Muhammad referred not to the Prophet but to him. HAZRAT MIRZA SAHIB NEVER WROTE REGARDING ANY SUCH QURANIC VERSE THAT IT DID NOT APPLY TO THE HOLY PROPHET MUHAMMAD.

As to certain Quranic verses having occurred in the Founder's revelations from God, we have to ascertain whether passages of the Qur'an can be revealed as *wahy wilayah* to *auliya*, and whether any Muslim holy men before Hazrat Mirza Sahib claimed to have received such passages as revelation. Had God granted Mr Tayo to read the works of the great *auliya*, he would not have raised any objection to Hazrat Mirza Sahib's writings on this topic.

(1) The great Shaikh Muhiyud-Din Ibn Arabi wrote :

“And similarly the revelation (*nuzul*) of the Qur'an to the hearts of the *auliya* has not been barred even though that Book is preserved securely with them. But, because of their taste (*dhaug*) for Quranic revelation, it is revealed to them. This is reserved only for certain of the *auliya*” (*Futuh at Makkhiyya*, Part II, p. 258).

According to the same book (Part III, p. 367), the Shaikh received as revelation the following verse of the Qur'an : *Qul "amanna bi-illahi wa ma unzila ilaina wa nahnu la-hu muslimun"* (2:136).

(2) The famous Sayyid Abdul Qadir Jilani :

“Many times the Quranic words *wa-stana 'tu-ka li-nafsi* (I have created thee especially for Myself) were revealed to him (i.e., Abdul Qadir)” (*Sharh Futuh al-Ghaib*, Persian, p. 33).

“Thy status in the sight of God shall be elevated, and thou shalt be addressed in the words *inna-ka al-yauma ladai-na makin-un amin* (i.e., Surah Yusuf, verse 54)” (*ibid.*, p. 171).

(3) Regarding Shaikh Ahmad, the Mujaddid Alif Sani (d. 1624), it is written: “Before the birth of his younger son, Shah Muhammad Yahya, the Mujaddid Alif Sani received a revelation *inna nubashshiru-ka bi-ghulam-in ismuhu Yahya* (i.e., Surah Maryam, verse 7). Thus was he given the name Yahya” (*Maqamat Imam Rab-bani*, p. 136).

(4) The *Ilm al-Kitab* (pp. 61-64) records the following about Khwaja Meer Dard of Dehlvi:

He received in revelation many Quranic verses some of which are addressed by God to the Holy Prophet Muhammad. For instance:

(i) “Warn thy near relatives” (The Qur'an, 26:214).

- (ii) "Say: Allah is sufficient for me"
- (iii) "Follow the right path, as thou art commanded" (42:15).
- (iv) "Grieve thou not for them, nor be distressed because of what they plan" (27:70).
- (v) "Did He not find thee groping, and guided thee" (93:7).

After these verses it is added : "These are the Quranic verses with which my Lord aided me, but the deniers believe not".

- (5) The biography of Maulvi Abdullah Ghaznavi records :
"The late Maulvi sahib received a very large number of Divine revelations given below :

 - (i) *Sallu 'alai-hi wa sallimu taslima* (The Quran, 33:56).
 - (ii) *Wa la-saufa yu'ti-ka rabbu-ka fa-tarda* (ibid., 93 :5).
 - (iii) *A lam nashrah la-ka sadra-ka* (ibid., 94:1).
 - (iv) *A laisa Allah bi-kaf-in 'abdu-hu*

Mr Tayo should note how well-known the first four verses above are as Quranic verses where the Holy Prophet Muhammad is addressed or referred to.

- (6) In his reply to Maulvi Ghulam Ali Qasoori, Maulvi Abdul Jabbar Ghaznavi writes :
"If someone receives a Divine revelation (*ilham*) which is some verse of the Qur'an addressed particularly to the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the recipient of this revelation would take it as referring to himself, and would interpret it in accordance with his own circumstances and draw a lesson from it.... So if someone has revealed to him verses addressed to the Holy Prophet, for instance: "Have We not expanded for thee thy breast"; "thy Lord will soon give thee so that thou wilt be pleased"; "Allah will suffice thee against them"; "be patient and resolute as the messengers were"; "hold thyself with those who call upon their Lord morning and evening"; "pray to thy Lord and sacrifice"; "obey not him whose heart We have made heedless of Our remembrance, and he follows his low desire"; "He found thee groping and guided thee"; the meaning would be that that person would be granted these things according to his capacity" (*Asbat al-ilham*, p.142).

What do you, Mr Tayo think of the *auliya* mentioned above who claimed to have received Quranic verses, including some addressed specifically to the Holy Prophet, in their own revelations? Are they kafirs too? Hazrat Mirza Sahib too said : "If claiming to receive Quranic verses in one's revelation makes one a kafir, you should first issue this

verdict against Sayyid Abdul Qadir Jilani who also made this claim". We hope that it has now been settled to Mr Tayo's satisfaction that, not only Quranic verses in general, but also those verses addressing or referring to the Holy Prophet Muhammad, can be revealed (as *wahy wilayah*) by God to the *auliya* of this Ummah.

Quranic verses referring to Hazrat Mirza Sahib

Mr Tayo also condemns Hazrat Mirza Sahib for claiming that a certain Quranic verse refers to him. However, we tell him that it is not only Hazrat Mirza Sahib who has thus written, but the majority of the classical commentators of the Qur'an have also agreed that this particular verse refers to the Promised Messiah and Mahdi in whose time Islam shall predominate in the whole world:

- (1) Tafsir Ibn Jarir, vol. xv, p. 72:
"The verse *'He it is Who sent His Messenger with guidance and the Religion of Truth that He may make it prevail over all religions'*, relates to the time of the coming to the Messiah."
- (2) Tafsir Ibn Jarir, vol. xxv, p. 54:
"Abu Hurairah reported regarding the verse *'that He may make it prevail over all religions'*, that it applied to the time of Jesus' coming".
 - (v) Anta minni wa ana min-ka fa-la takhaf wa la tahzan
 - (vi) *In huwa illa 'abd-un an-am-na ali-hi*
(Biography of Maulvi Abdullah Ghaznavi by Maulvi Abdul Jabbar Ghaznavi, pp. 10, 11).
- (3) Khilasah al-Tafsir, vol., iv, 245:
"*That He may make it prevail*, means predominate, by argument or by force. This predominance began with the victory at Badr, and reached its middle part during the early Khilafah. God willing, it shall reach its perfection and completion at the hands of the Imam Mahdi".
- (4) Tafsir Jami al-Bayan, p.29:
"This Predominance shall come during the time of Jesus".
- (5) Tafsir Qadiri:
"That God may make this Religion prevail over all others at the time of Jesus' descent".
- (6) The Shi'ah commentary *Bahar al-Anwar* (vol xiii, p. 12) notes:
"This verse was revealed about the Mahdi, and he is the Imam through whom God shall grant this predominance".

It is this proved that Ahli-Sunnah and the Shi'ah are agreed that the predominance of Islam spoken of in the verse shall come about in the age of the Promised Messiah and Mahdi. And Hazrat Mirza Sahib has written the same in *I'jaz-i Ahmadi* and *Nuzul-i Masih* referred to by Mr Tayo. Obviously, in his capacity as the Promised Messiah and Mahdi, the Founder would say that this verse "*refers to me*". In fact, Mr Tayo must himself admit that, were the Messiah or the Mahdi, he is still awaiting actually to come, that personage would also say to people that this verse "*refers to me*". Would Mr Tayo then object? However, we give him the good news that the Messiah and Mahdi he is expecting has already appeared, and he is Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib.

Jesus' prophecy about coming Ahmad

Mr Tayo also gives some extracts from the Rabwah Movement literature asserting that Jesus' prophecy of the coming Ahmad, as referred to in the Holy Qur'an (61:6), applies not to the Holy Prophet Muhammad but to Hazrat Mirza Sahib. Since these extracts are *not* taken from the Founder's own writings, he cannot be held responsible for them. His own belief, held throughout his life, was that the true and actual fulfiller of this prophecy was the Holy Prophet Muhammad, Hazrat Mirza Sahib wrote:

- (1) "You have heard that our Holy Prophet has two names. (i) Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), which is the name referred to in the Torah because it presents a Law of outward glory. This is clear from the verse "Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah, those with him are firm against disbelievers and compassionate among themselves'. (ii) The second name is Ahmad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), which is the name referred to in the Gospels because they contain a Divine teaching of inward beauty. This is clear from the verse: 'And I (Jesus) give you glad tidings of a Messenger to come after me, his name being Ahmad'. Our Holy Prophet combined both outward glory and inward beauty: his life in Makka reflected the aspect of inward beauty, while that at Madina displayed outward glory" (*Arba'in*, no. 4, P. 13).
- (2) "Jesus' testimony is recorded in the Qur'an thus: I give you good news of a Messenger who shall come after me, i.e., after my death, and his name shall be Ahmad. So, if the Messiah has not yet left this physical world, it implied that our Holy Prophet has not yet come into the world; for it is explicitly stated here that, only after

the Messiah has left the world, will the Holy Prophet come into it” (*Aniah Kamalat Islam*, p.42).

- (3) “Beyond comprehension is the glory of Ahmad.
Whose servant, see, is the Messiah of the Age.”
“I swear by you, my beloved Ahmad,
for your sake did I bear all this (opposition)”.

In these two poetic verses Hazrat Mirza Sahib has referred to the Holy Prophet Muhammad as *Ahmad*. The words “whose servant” allude to Hazrat Mirza Sahib’s own name *Ghulam Ahmad* (which means the *servant of Ahmad*).

There are many other similar references showing that Hazrat Mirza Sahib held the Holy Prophet Muhammad to be the person whose advent was prophesied by Jesus as that of *Ahmad*, referred to in the Holy Qur’an, (61:6).

V. FIFTH BELIEF : DID HAZRAT MIRZA SAHIB CHANGE HIS CLAIM?

Mr Tayo quotes our fifth article of belief:

“The Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement never claimed to be *nabi*.

He exhorted his people to refrain from using the word *nabi* for him. He further directed them to regard the word *nabi* in his writings as deleted”.

Since Mr Tayo is unable to disprove the truth of the above statements, he advances the theory that “this item is reflected in the books of Ghulam Ahmad, when he had not received his so-called revelation which made him a prophet”. Mr Tayo then lists these early books, and includes among them the “Complement to *Haqiqat al-Wahy*”. Yet throughout his pamphlet he gives quotations from this very *Haqiqat al-Wahy* to try to show that Hazrat Mirza Sahib *had* claimed to be a prophet!! On pp. 5 and 6 he reproduces four references from this book to try to prove that the Founder claimed to be a prophet, yet on page 7 he classifies the same book as one having been written before this claim was allegedly made. Can he resolve this puzzle for us?

The fact is that the world *nabi* as referring to Hazrat Mirza Sahib had occurred in his revelations from the earliest days, many of these being published by him in his famous *Barahin Ahmadiyya* during 1880-1884. All his other books, including those listed by Mr Tayo as early ones, were written long afterwards and they all explain that words such as *nabi* and *rasul* in this context bore a literal, and non-

technical meaning, not the technical sense assigned to them by Islamic Shari'ah. To fully remove any misunderstanding. Hazrat Mirza Sahib gave in writing that any such occurrence of *nabi* or *rasul* in his books may be regarded as deleted and replaced by *muhaddath* (a non-prophet spoken to by God).

Mr Tayo's assertion that the Founder only made such statements before "he received his so-called revelation which made him a prophet", is not only wrong but also palpably absurd: for how could Hazrat Mirza Sahib direct that the word *nabi* in his books should be regarded as deleted if that word had not yet occurred therein. Incidentally, there was no revelation which "made him a prophet": we have assumed that Mr Tayo is referring to the occurrence of the words *nabi* and *rasul* in the Founder's revelations and writings.

Maulana Muhammad Ali and use of nabi for Founder

Mr Tayo next quotes from two early articles of the late *Hazrat Maulana Muhammad Ali* to try to show that at that time the Maulana believed Hazrat Mirza Sahib to be a prophet. If Mr Tayo had seen these quotations in their proper context he would have realised that the Maulana was applying the words *nabi* and *rasul* in the same broad sense as that in which the Founder himself had used them. We have shown earlier that many of the great religious elders of Islam have also used these titles in the same manner. Does Mr Tayo condemn those personages?

VI. SIXTH BELIEF " AHMADIS NAMED AFTER HOLY PROPHET NOT AFTER HAZRAT MIRZA SAHIB

Here Mr Tayo accuses us of lying when we declare that Hazrat Mirza Sahib "named his followers *Ahmadi* after the Holy Prophet's beautiful name *Ahmad*." He asserts that *Ahmadis* are named after Hazrat Mirza Sahib's last name *Ahmad*. He further alleges that this title has been used since 1889 when the Ahmadiyya Community was formed, and that we are "often telling lies" that this name was first coined in 1900/1901 to have the Community counted separately in the census of 1901.

Mr Tayo's assertions, allegations, and accusations here are simply against facts. The Community was indeed formed in 1889, but the name *Ahmadiyya* was selected in 1900/1901, the reason and explanation being given at that time by Hazrat Mirza Sahib himself:

- (1) "Since it has been arranged in this census that each sect that is distinguished from other sects by its beliefs should be entered

separately, and the name that a sect selects for itself shall be the one used for it in official documents... the name that is suitable for this Movement, and which we select for our Community, is *Muslims of the Ahmadiyya Section*... We ask the government to use this name in its documents for our Section... This sect has been named *Muslims of Ahmadiyya Sect* because our Holy Prophet had two names: *Muhammad* and *Ahmad* (peace and blessings of God be upon him). The name *Muhammad* signified outward glory, and contained the prophecy that the Holy Prophet would punish with the sword those enemies who attacked Islam with the sword. The name *Ahmad*, however, represented inward beauty, implying that the Holy Prophet would spread peace and reconciliation throughout the world. God divided the manifestation of these two names such that *Ahmad* was symbolised during the Holy Prophet's life at Makka, and *Muhammad* at Madina. There was, however, a prophecy that in the Latter Days the name *Ahmad* would again be manifested... For this reason it is fitting to name this sect the *Ahmadiyya Sect*" (*Ishtihar Wajib al-izhar for my Jama'at and for the Government's attention*, 4 November 1900).

- (2) "The Holy Prophet's name *Ahmad* is the one mentioned by Jesus in the prophecy:

'a prophet to come after me whose name shall be Ahmad'. The words after *me* show that the Holy Prophet was to appear directly after Jesus, there being no prophet between the two... Moses called the Holy Prophet as *Muhammad*, for he himself symbolised glory. Jesus called the Holy Prophet as *Ahmad* because he himself represented beauty (*jamal*). Since our Movement too symbolises *jamal*, it is named *Ahmadi*" (Newspaper *Al-Hakam*, 31 January 1901).

These extracts make the position so clear that every person can see the totally hollow and unsound nature of Mr Tayo's objection. We challenge him to show even a single sentence written by Hazrat Mirza Sahib to the effect that he had named his Community *Ahmadiyya*, not after the Holy Prophet's *jamali* name *Ahmad*, but after his own name *Ghulam Ahmad*. Mr Tayo will certainly never be able to show any such writing, but we, for our part, shall not resort to using offensive words against him, even though he has twice called us "liars" without the slightest justification.

VII. SEVENTH BELIEF : NO VERSE OF THE QUR'AN EVER TO BE ABROGATED

Our Seventh article of belief is given by Mr Tayo thus: "He (Hazrat Mirza Sahib) proclaimed that no verse of the Holy Qur'an has been abrogated, nor shall ever be abrogated".

Mr Tayo's first objection here is that "although Ghulam Ahmad never abrogated the verses of the Holy Qur'an he could construe or twist the Quranic verses to serve his purpose of posing himself to be a prophet of Islam". The fact is, however, that whereas previous commentators of the Qur'an believed many verses to be abrogated, Hazrat Mirza Sahib declared that no verse was abrogated, and for interpreting the Qur'an he laid down such sound principles that they cannot be bettered. He wrote:

- (1) "It should be remembered that, according to us, the correct and reliable interpretation of any Quranic verse is that which is corroborated by other passages of the Qur'an, for the various verses explain one another. If an interpretation does not have such corroboration from other places in the Qur'an that raises it to the level of full certainty, there should be some sound hadith in favour of the meaning. In short, we do not believe it permissible to interpret a Quranic verse simply according to one's opinion". (*Arya Dharm*, p.86).
- (2) "It should be realised that the first standard of sound interpretation (of a verse of the Qur'an) is Quranic evidence itself... If we interpret a Quranic verse we should test whether that interpretation is supported by the Qur'an itself... The second standard is an explanation (of that verse) traceable to the Holy Prophet Muhammad ... The third standard is an interpretation traceable to the Companions... The fourth standard is for oneself to reflect upon the Qur'an with a pure heart... The fifth standard is Arabic lexicology... The sixth standard is analogical reasoning by comparison with the physical world to draw conclusions about the spiritual world... and the seventh standard is the revelation of the *wali* and the visions of the *muhaddath*" (*Barkat al-Du'a*, p. 17).

Hazrat Mirza Sahib always followed the above rules when interpreting a verse of the Qur'an. Of some verses he has indeed written that they refer to him. But that is because many previous commentators had said of these verses that they apply to the Messiah or the Mahdi. Since Hazrat Mirza Sahib claimed to be that Promised Messiah

and Mahdi, he also claimed that these particular verses referred to him. Mr Tayo and other critics fail to comprehend this point.

As to Mr Tayo's accusation that Hazrat Mirza Sahib "posed himself to be a prophet of Islam," we have repeatedly proved earlier that he did not claim to be a prophet, but believed that no prophet, either *new or old* could arise after the Holy Prophet Muhammad. He wrote:

- (1) "After the Finality of Prophethood, in Islam there cannot arise another prophet" (*Raz-i-Haqiqat*, p. 16).
- (2) "In Islam no prophet can arise after the Holy Prophet Muhammad" (*ibid.* p. 16)
- (3) "It is a belief in Islam that, after our Holy Prophet Muhammad, never shall a prophet arise" (*Kashf al-Ghita*, p. 46).
- (4) "God would certainly never disgrace this Umma, nor detract from the dignity of His beloved Prophet, the *Khatam al-anbiya*, by sending now a *rasul*, with whose advent it is necessary that Jibreel should also come. This would overthrow Islam, whereas He has promised that after the Holy Prophet no *rasul* would be sent" (*Izalah Auham*, p. 586).

Quranic verses and Hazrat Mirza Sahib

Mr Tayo next accuses Hazrat Mirza Sahib of applying to himself two verses of the Holy Qur'an that refer to the Holy Prophet Muhammad, viz., 48:29 and 61:6. As to the latter verse which contains Jesus' prophecy of the coming *Ahmad*, it has been explained under "The Fourth Belief" above the Hazrat Mirza Sahib considered the Holy Prophet to be the true and actual fulfiller of this prophecy.

Taking the first verse, i.e., "Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah, and those with him..." (48:29), Hazrat Mirza Sahib never wrote anywhere that this verse refers not to the Holy Prophet but to him (i.e., to the Founder) only. To elucidate, we quote below from a review of Hazrat Mirza Sahib's famous *Barahin Ahmadiyya*, written by the Ahl-i Hadith leader Maulvi Muhammad Hussain Batalvi:

"The author of *Barahin Ahmadiyya* has not at all claimed that these Quranic verses refer to him, nor that where God has addressed the Holy Prophet or Jesus or Abraham or Adam, in the Qur'an or earlier scriptures, it refers to him... He (Hazrat Mirza Sahib) fully believes and clearly admits that, in the Qur'an or earlier scriptures, the verses in which are addressed these prophets refer to the prophets addressed therein... By claiming that these verses have been revealed

to him, he means that he had been spoken to by God in the same words as were used to address various prophets in the Qur'an or earlier scriptures. When applied to him, the verses bear a significance different from their original one, this significance being a derivative of the original meaning" (*Isha 'at al-Sunna*, vol. vii, no. 7, pp. 218, 219).

The above reviewer also wrote:

"Since the person addressed is different (from the original prophet), the verses revealed to him should also be regarded as different (from the original revelation). The words that God revealed to the Holy Prophet are contained in a Book read by Muslims known as the Qur'an. If the same words occur in the revelation of a non-prophet or in some earlier scripture, they are not called the Qur'an" (ibid. vol vi, no. 6).

Hazrat Mirza Sahib himself has written upon this topic the following:

- (1) "If even a Quranic verse is revealed to some person, I believe that his revelation will not encompass so much as did, and still does, the Holy Prophet's revelation" (*Malfuzat*, vol ii, p. 57).
- (2) "It should be remembered that God's law in the case of every perfect *mulham* (recipient of revelation) has always been that hidden treasures of the Qur'an are disclosed to him. Occasionally, to a *mulham's* heart may be revealed a Quranic verse bearing a significance different from the original. In a letter, Maulvi Abdullah Ghaznavi writes that it was once revealed to him, *Qul-na ya naru kuni bard-an wa salam-an*, (We said, O fire, be coolness and peace', the Quran, 21:69) but he could not understand its meaning. It was then revealed: *Qul-na ya sabru kuni bard-an wa salam-an*, and he realised that *nar* meant *sabr* (patience)... Similarly, he has included among his revelations many Quranic verses, and has taken them as having a meaning different from the original" (*Izalah Auham*, pp. 318 to 332).

There is, thus, nothing objectionable in Hazrat Mirza Sahib's claim to have received as revelation (in the form of *wahy wilayah*) Quranic verses in general or those addressed specifically to the Holy Prophet.

Quranic verses and followers of Hazrat Mirza Sahib

Mr Tayo's next allegation is that Hazrat Mirza Sahib's followers have asserted that the Quranic verse 4:69 classifies the Founder as a prophet, while verse 2:4 contains a prophecy about him. The first-men-

tioned verse runs: "And whoever obeys Allah and the messenger, they are with those upon whom Allah has bestowed favours from among the prophets (*nabi*) and the truthful (*sadiq*) and the faithful (*shahid*) and the righteous (*salih*)..." Now Hazrat Mirza Sahib comments on this verse as follows:

"It is a necessary condition for *wilayah* that matters unseen be disclosed in such great abundance that they exceed what is given to everyone else in the world... There are four accomplishments granted to the great *auliya* as signs and miracles... and the four things which are four signs or miracles granted to the *wali azam*, *qutb al-Qutub*, and *sayyid al-auliya* (i.e., holy men of very high rank) are these: the accomplishment of *nabi*, the accomplishment of *sadiq*, the accomplishment of *shahid*, and the accomplishment of *salih*... In short, these are the four attainments to seek which is the duty of all the faithful" (*Tiryaq al-qulub*, p. 120).

Hazrat Mirza Sahib has here taken verse 4:69 of the Qur'an as referring to the qualities possessed by *the great auliya*, not as making anyone into a *nabi*. This verse, says the Founder, tells us of the four kinds of perfection that mark out a man as high-ranking *wali*, and this is clearly the position, Hazrat Mirza Sahib claims for himself.

As to the verse 2:4, about which Mr Tayo alleges that we interpret *al-akhirah* in it, as meaning *the revelation that was to come to Hazrat Mirza Sahib*, we tell him that this is a very grave accusation. Never at any time in his life did the Founder take *al-akhirah* in 2:4 as meaning anything other than its traditional, universally accepted significance of the *Day of Judgment*:

- (1) *Quoting verse 2:4, Hazrat Mirza Sahib explained:*
 "The *muttaqi* are those who believe in the earlier scriptures and in the Book revealed to the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and also repose faith in the *akhirah*" (Report Annual Jalsa 1897).
- (2) "The salvation seeker is he who believes in what was revealed to the *Khatam an-nabiyyin*, the Prophet of the Last Day, and in the Divine Books revealed to previous prophets. 'And those who are sure of *al-akhirah*' (2:4), and the salvation seeker is he who believes in the hour to come, i.e, *Qiyamah*, and the final reward and punishment" (*Al-Hakam*, 10—17 October 1904).

***Alai-hi as-Salam* with Hazrat Mirza Sahib's name**

Mr Tayo's last point under the seventh belief is the assertion that because we, the Lahore Ahmadis, add the prayer '*alai-hi as-salam*'

(peace be upon him) after the Founder's name, this means that, like the Rabwah Movement, we too believe him to be a prophet. It is true that we consider it quite permissible to add the prayer 'alai-hi as-salam after not only Hazrat Mirza Sahib's name, but also the name of any mujaddid, *wali*, or true believer. However, Mr Tayo is entirely wrong in supposing that our use of this prayer after the Founder's name implies that we consider him to be a prophet, and he is also at error in believing that *peace be upon him* can be uttered only after a prophet's name.

For his benefit we give below references from the Qur'an, the Hadith, and the writings of great religious elders, to show just when can one invoke *salat* (blessings) and *salam* (peace) on some person:

Referring to true believers the Qur'an states:

- (1) "Those are they on whom are blessings (*salat*) and mercy from their Lord" (2:157).
- (2) "Peace (*salam*) to him who follows the guidance" (20:47).
- (3) "Praise be to Allah, and peace (*salam*) on His servants whom he has chosen" (27:59). The "servants" here, according to Hazrat Ibn Abbas, are the Holy Prophet's Companions.
- (4) "He it is Who sends blessings (*salat*) on you (O Muslims), and so do the angles" (33:43).
- (5) A chapter in the *Bukhari* is headed: "Can *salat* be invoked upon anyone other than the Holy Prophet Muhammad?"
 "It is related by Ibn Abi Aufa that whenever anyone brought a charitable donation to the Holy Prophet, he would invoke *Darood* on that person. The narrator added that when his father brought such a donation, the Holy Prophet prayed for him and said: *Allahumma salli 'ala aale Abi Aufa* (i.e., O Allah send blessings upon the progeny of Abu Aufa)" (*Bukhari, Kitab al-Da'wat*).
- (6) The commentators of Hadith, in exposition of the hadith given above, have extensively discussed the issue of whether *salat and salam* can be invoked upon persons other than the prophets. In *Fath al-Bari*, the well-known commentary of *Sahih Bukhari*, it is recorded:
 "There are three opinions upon this matter. One of these is that it is certainly permissible (to invoke *salat and salam* on anyone other than prophets), and Imam Bukhari's action shows that he too held this view" (vol. xi, p. 146).

- (7) Many Muslim scholars of modern times also hold the same view:
- (i) A disciple of Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi wrote to him that, in a state of wakefulness, he uttered the *Darrod* as: *Allahumma salli 'ala sayyidi-na wa nabiiyi-na wa maulana Ashraf Ali* ("O Allah, bless our leader, prophet, and patron, Ashraf Ali"). The Maulana replied: "In this incident it was intended to satisfy you that the one to whom you turn is a follower of the Sunna" (*Al-Imdad*, Safar 1336 A.H., p., 35).
 - (ii) Of Maulana Ahmad Raza Khan Bareilvi it is recorded: Point no. 2—"The *Darood*, instead of being recited in the Holy Prophet's name, should be recited in the name of 'his eminence' (i.e., the Maulana), as his disciples are forever presenting in his honour: *Allahumma salli wa sallam wa barak 'ala 'abd al-Mustafa Maulana Ahmad Raza*" (*Al-Junah li-ahl al-Sunna*, p. 127), as referred to in *Deoband se Bareli tak*, p. 123.
- (8) A Pakistani organ of the **Jama'at-i Islami** wrote about the Iranian leader Ayatullah Khumaini in the words: Darood bar Khumaini but shikan i.e., *Darood* (invocation of *salat and salam*) be upon Khumaini, the shatterer of idols (*Asia*, Lahore, Pakistan, 21 January 1979). Does this mean that in Mr Tayo's view members of the *Jama'at-i Islami* believe Khumaini to be a *nabi*!
- (9) While invoking *Darood* upon the Holy Prophet, a Muslim also invokes the same upon the Prophet's Companions, his wives, and members of his household, by adding the words: *wa 'ala aali-hi, as habi-hi, wa azwaji-hi ajma'in*. Are all these other persons believed to be prophets?
- (10) In prayer every Muslim recites: *As-salamu 'alai-na wa 'ala 'ibadi-llahi as salihin* ("peace be upon us and upon the righteous servants of God"). Are all the people mentioned here prophets?
- (11) In Sunni and Shi'ah literature the names of Jibreel, Imam Husain and others, are followed by the words *'alai-hi as-salam*. Are they prophets?
- (12) A Muslim greets a fellow Muslim thus: *As-salamu 'alai-kum* ("peace be upon you"). Does this make every Muslim a prophet?

It is therefore proved that *salat and salam* may legitimately be invoked upon persons who are not prophets, and such a prayer about them does not imply that they are believed to be prophets. Had Mr Tayo known these facts he would not have made his emotional and unsound remarks.

VIII. EIGHTH BELIEF : RESPECT FOR COMPANIONS OF HOLY PROPHET

Our belief no. 8 is: "All the Companions of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and the Imams are venerable". Quoting this, Mr Tayo goes on to try to show that Hazrat Mirza Sahib himself had been disrespectful to Imams Hasan and Husain, and to the Holy Prophet's Companions.

We tell Mr Tayo that Hazrat Mirza Sahib was a great admirer, lover, and devotee of the Imams and the Companions. He wrote:

- (1) "Husain, may God be pleased with him, was a pure and purified soul. He was undoubtedly one of those venerable people who are purified by God Himself, and into whose hearts He implants His love. There is no doubt that he is of the foremost in Paradise. To bear a grudge against him deprives one of true faith. A person who insults, or mentions with contempt, the Imam Husain or any other of the purified elders of Islam loses his faith" (*Fatawa Ahmadiyya*, p. 233).
- (2) "My heart and soul are devoted to the beauty of Muhammad, my motral dust paves the streets walked by the *a'al* (descendants) of Muhammad".
- (3) "What I have written in my poem about Imam Husain, may God be pleased with him,... is not the work of man. Evil is the person who, for himself, opens his tongue against the righteous and the perfect. I believe that no person who uses offensive words against a righteous man like Husain can pass even one night but is overtaken by God's warning: 'Whoever opposes a *wali* of Mine, I declare war on him' " (*Ijaz Ahmadi*, p. 38).
- (4) "I love Ali, may God be pleased with him, and both his sons, and I am enemy of anyone who is an enemy to them" (*Sirr al-Khilafah*, p. 34).

In view of the statements quoted above it is a great travesty of justice to allege that Hazrat Mirza Sahib has made derogatory remarks regarding Imam Husain. As to the poetic verses Mr Tayo notes to support his charge, the Founder wrote these, not against Imam Husain, but to refute the Shi 'ahs' exaggerated and extreme claims about him. Some of these claims are: On the Day of Judgement, Imam Hussain will intercede (*shifa'ah*) for every prophet, even for the Holy Prophet Muhammad; everyone should seek Imam Hussain's help in times of difficulty to obtain deliverance; and, the Imam Hussain is superior to all the prophets. Does Mr Tayo approve of these beliefs?

Had he actually read the book (*I'jaz Ahmadi*) from which he quotes the poetic verses, he would know that these were written only in refutation of extreme shi'ah beliefs as propounded by leaders like Sayyid Ali Ha'iry.

Hazrat Mirza Sahib's technique adopted here is exactly that used down the ages by the great *Ahl-i Sunna* leaders. If Mr Tayo wishes, we can reproduce extracts from their books to satisfy him fully.

Hazrat Abu Bakr and other Companions

Mr Tayo next accusingly quotes the following from one of the Founder's writings.

"I am the Mahdi regarding whom Ibn Sirin was asked whether he was of the same status as Abu Bakr, and he replied: Let alone Abu, Bakr, he (the Mahdi) is superior even to some prophets".

We fail to see why Mr Tayo is so infuriated with Hazrat Mirza Sahib. It was Imam Ibn Sirin who gave the reply that the Mahdi-to-come would be superior, not only to Hazrat Abu Bakr and Umar, but even to some prophets (*Hujaj al-Kirama* by Nawab Siddiq Hasan Khan). If Mr Tayo objects to this view, he should castigate Imam Ibn Sirin, not Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib.

Mr Tayo gives two other short quotations, taken out of their context, from the Founder's writings to allege that he had used offensive words regarding the Holy Prophet's Companions. Therefore, we first give below the Founder's views about these holy persons:

- (1) "I am proud to be a eulogist and devotee of these persons. Till the Day of Judgement none can attain the virtues granted to them. Only if the Holy Prophet would again come into the world, would anyone get the opportunity the *Shaikhain* had to serve him" (Malfuzat, vol i, p. 366).
- (2) "The Companions were that pure community, of whose praise the Qur'an is full" (ibid., p. 43).
- (3) "None of the Companions ever told a lie" (ibid., vol ii, p 334.)
- (4) "Look at the example of the Companions. In fact, in the example shown by the Companions is the likeness of all the prophets" (ibid., vol v, p. 42).
- (5) "When we look at the Companions we find that not one of them so much as ever told a lie... The Holy Prophet's teaching, guidance, and efficacious exhortations turned the Companions into heavenly beings possessing sublime attributes" (ibid., vol iii, p. 85).

- (6) "By living close to the Holy Prophet, and through the blessings of contact with him, the Companions became imbued with his colouring" (ibid., vol v, p. 28).
- (7) "The Companions' lives were such that the life of none of the prophets can present the same example" (ibid., vol v, p. 398).
- (8) In an Arabic poem, Hazrat Mirza Sahib writes:
 "The Companions are like the sun; with their light they illumined the whole world. They possessed great qualities; we do not discriminate among them. They were like the staff (*a'sa*) of him who is the best of the prophets. They obeyed the Holy Prophet, and became dust in the way of their beloved. O Lord! have mercy on us through the Companions of our Prophet".
- (9) In another Arabic verse he writes:
 "His Companions loved him madly, and made the dust of his footsteps as collyrium for their eyes".
- (10) And further: "God knows that if I can and if I live, I shall spread among the opponents eulogies of the Companions."

We are certain that, after reading the above passages, Mr Tayo shall never again allege that Hazrat Mirza Sahib did not respect the holy Companions.

The Founder's comments

We now turn to the short quotations from Hazrat Mirza Sahib that Mr Tayo has given to assert that he had been disrespectful towards the Companions. It is to be hoped that Mr Tayo has read basic Islamic literature relating to Hadith, principles of Hadith, *asma'u al-rijal*, and principles of Fiqh. In that literature he would have found criticism of the narrators of Hadith. Had it been unlawful to make this criticism, the various categories of Hadith that there are would not have existed. If the authors of works in Hadith and *asma'u al-rijal* are allowed to investigate each narrator of Hadith, why is it objectionable for some other person, while discussing a narrator or a Hadith, to quote their conclusions? Let us see what even an elementary book on the principles of Fiqh has to say:

"There are two kinds of narrators. The first are those who are renowned and well-known for their knowledge and sound judgement; for example, the four Caliphs, Abdullah bin Mas'ud, etc... So if a narration of any of the above-listed elders is proved to be from the Holy Prophet, it is better to follow that than to use analogical reasoning (*qiyas*)... The second kind of narrators are those who, although being

reputed for a good memory and honesty, cannot be relied upon in matters of judgment and religious verdicts; for example, Abu Hurairah and Anas bin Malik" (*Asul ash-shashi*).

So, according to the Hanafis, in any issue related to *ijtihad* or *fatwa* the opinion of Hazrat Abu Hurairah cannot be relied upon. It is this very thing that Hazrat Mirza Sahib wrote, i.e., in matters of judgement Hazrat Abu Hurairah did not possess the highest degree of intelligence.

If Mr Tayo were fair-minded he would read the two quotations, which he finds objectionable, in the context of Hazrat Mirza Sahib's numerous writings praising the Companions, and in the light of the principles of the study of Hadith and its narrators. Further, if Mr Tayo had read what the Shi'ahs and persons like Mr Ghulam Ahmad Pervaiz write about the Companions, he would have come to his senses and discovered the sort of things many in the Muslim world say of the Companions, while the Sunnis not only tolerate it all but raise not even a small voice in protest.

Comparison with prophets

Mr Tayo further alleges, under belief no. 8, that Hazrat Mirza Sahib described himself as superior to the prophets of God. He first refers to *Haqiqat al-Wahy* (appendix, p. 137) where the Founder wrote that he had been granted so many Divine signs that if the same had been revealed in Noah's time his opponents would have been saved from destruction. We fail to see why Mr Tayo imagines that in this passage Hazrat Mirza Sahib has claimed superiority to the prophet Noah. The wording clearly means that Noah's opponents were less obdurate and stubborn than the Founder's opponents, so that while the latter were denying his signs the former would have accepted similar signs from Noah. There is no claim here to superiority over Noah, nor any attempt to denigrate him.

Finally, Mr Tayo gives a quotation from *Malfuzat Ahmadiyya* (vol vi, p. 142) which if translated correctly, reads:

"The attainments found variously in previous prophets were to be found all together in the Holy Prophet Muhammad, in even greater measure these attainments have, from the Holy Prophet, been granted to me in an imagery (*zilli*) manner. So I was called Adam, Abraham, Moses, Noah, David, Joseph, Solomon, John and Jesus."

In Mr Tayo's version the second sentence above is given as just: "Then all these perfections were transferred to me", which is a gross

misrepresentation of the original since it omits the crucial mention of receiving these perfections *by way of zill from the Holy Prophet*.

This statement was made by Hazrat Mirza Sahib in his capacity as the Mujaddid of *Tariqah* (spiritual side of Islam), and in his status of *fana fir-rasul* (self-effacement in the Holy Prophet Muhammad). The Sufis believe that when a believer reaches this station, God addresses him by such names.

- (1) In praise of the perfect believer, the late Sir Muhammad Iqbal wrote:
 "He is *Masih* (Jesus), he is *Kalim* (Moses), he is *Khalil* (Abraham). He is Muhammad, he is *Kitab* (Qur'an), he is Jibreel."
- (2) Shah Niyaz Ahmad of Delhi said:
 "Sometimes I am Idris, sometimes Shish, sometimes Noah, sometimes Jonah, sometimes Joseph, sometimes Jacob, and sometimes Hud. Sometimes I am Salih, sometimes Abraham, sometimes Isaac, sometimes John, sometimes Moses, sometimes Jesus, and sometimes David." "I am Ahmad Hashmi and Jesus son of Mary."
- (3) The world-renowned Khwaja Mu'in-ud-Din Chishti:
 "Every moment Jibreel reveals to Mu'in, I don't say it, but truly I am the second Jesus."
- (4) Writing in praise of Sayyid Ahmad Barelvi (Mujaddid of the 13th century hijrah, d. 1831), his great disciple Shah Ismael Shaheed says:
 "One day Sayyid Ahmad came with his *ashab* (companions), say though that it was as if, with his Companions, came the *Khatam al-Mursalin*".
- (5) Referring to the Maulvi Muhammad Qasim Nanotvi and Rasheed Ahmad Gangohi, Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hasan wrote:
 "Messiah of the age and Joseph of Canaan, are those two, I say that Moses and Amran, are those two".
- (6) Sayyid Farid-ud-din, known popularly as Sipah Salar, wrote:
 "The treasure of God's mercy opened up, and the mantle of the Prophet was put upon the spiritual leader, O people! the Mustafa has appeared again, so believe."
- (7) "Hazrat Shams Tabriz said:
 "I am that spirit which was breathed into Mary, I am that spirit which was Jesus' soul. Shibi and Mansur make obeisance to me, That is, I am in between these and those".
- (8) Regarding Abu Yazid Bastami it is recorded:
 "He was asked, what is the 'arsh? He replied: It is I. Then, what is

the *kursi*? He replied: It is I. What is the *Luh* and the *Qalam*? It is I, he replied. It was said, God has servants the like of Abraham and Moses and Jesus. He said: All are I" (*Tadhkirat-ul-Auliya*, see pp. 122, 123 of the English translation *Muslim Saints and Mystics*, by A.J. Arberry).

- (9) Sayyid Abdul Qadir Jilani said:
"I was annihilated (*fanna*) in the Holy Prophet Muhammad. At that time I was not so-and-so (i.e., Abdul Qadir), but certainly I was Muhammad" (*Saif-ur-Rabbani*, p.100).
- (10) Khwaja Muhammad Nasir Muhammadi wrote:
"The Muslim Umma has had in it perfect *auliya*. In the inward and spiritual sense, the nature of some was that of Adam, of some Noah, of some Abraham, of some David, of some Jacob, of some Jesus, and of some Muhammad" (*Nala 'Andalib*, vol i, p. 243).

What do you, Mr Tayo, now consider the above-mentioned Muslim divines to be? Are they also kafirs, or is it that you do not find their writings objectionable, yet condemn similar words when used by Hazrat Mirza Sahib!

IX. NINTH BELIEF : BELIEF IN MUJADDIDS

Quoting our belief no. 9, that Muslims must accept the missions of all Mujaddids, Mr Tayo adds that Hazrat Mirza Sahib calimed to be a prophet, which is more than Mujaddid; and so our belief is opposed to the Founder's, he alleges.

We inform Mr Tayo that Hazrat Mirza Sahib's statements regarding his calim are so plain that there is not the least doubt or ambiguity about what it is. Given below are some of these statements which show clearly that the Founder claimed, not *nubuwwa* (prophethood), but *mujaddidiyya*.

- (1) "The author has been informed (by God) that he is the Mujaddid of the age" (*Majmu'ah Ishtiharat*, vol i, p. 24).
- (2) "This humble servant is Mujaddid both for the *Shcri 'ah* and the *Tariqah*" (*Al-Hakam*, 24 June 1900).
- (3) "A perusal of *Barahin-i Ahmadiyya* shows that this humble servant, at the age of forty, was appointed for the *tajdid* (work of mujaddid) of the Religion; about eleven years have since passed" (*Nishan-i Adsmeni*, p. 4).
- (4) When the Ulama are asked as to who other than this humble servant claimed to be Mujaddid of the fourteenth century..." (*Ainah Kamalat Islam*, p. 340).

- (5) "God honoured this humble servant with His communications, and declared him to be the Mujaddid of this fourteenth century" (*Majmu'ah Ishtiharat*)
- (6) "When I reached forty years of ages, God disclosed to me by revelation that I was the Mujaddid of this century" (*Tiryaq al-Qulub*, p. 68).
- (7) "Then, when the thirteenth century was coming to an end and the fourteenth century was about to begin, God informed me by revelation that I was the Mujaddid of this century" (*Kitab al-Bariyya*, p. 183).
- (8) "When I proclaim that God has sent me as the Mujaddid of this century, they deny it" (*Malfuzat*, vol ix, p. 157).

Can there be any clearer proof that Hazrat Mirza Sahib claimed to be a Mujaddid. If Mr Tayo is still labouring under the misunderstanding that the Founder claimed to be more than a Mujaddid, we refer him to the following passage by Hazrat Mirza Sahib:

"It should be remembered that the claim of being the Promised Messiah is not greater than the claim of being a *mulham* (recipient of revelation) and a Mujaddid of God. It is obvious that the person who holds the status of being spoken to by God, can be named by Him with any name such as the like-of-Messiah or the like-of-Moses. The real excellence is not in being the like-of-Messiah, but in being a *mulham and kalim* of God. If a person attains this virtue, and is then made a Divine-appointee (*mamur min Allah*) to serve the Religion, God can confer upon him any name made suitable by his time" (*Aninah Kamalat Islam*, p. 340).

Hazrat Mirza Sahib has here clarified the point that his claim of being the Promised Messiah is not greater than his claim to be a Mujaddid from God. Mr Tayo is, therefore, utterly mistaken in imagining that the Founder laid claim to something above a Mujaddid. As to his assertion that Hazrat Mirza Sahib calimed to be a prophet, this has been thoroughly refuted in the foregoing pages. The Founder clearly stated:

"There is no claim of *nubuwwa* (prophethood), only of *wilayah* (sainthood) and *mujaddidiyya*" (*Majmu'a Ishtiharat*, vol ii, p. 298).

It is thus proved that Hazrat Mirza Sahib calimed only to be a *wali* and a *mujaddid*, and so there is no contradiction between his claims and our beliefs.

X. TENTH BELIEF : ALL KALIMA-RECITERS ARE MUSLIMS

Following the same method of attack as with the nine beliefs dealt with above, Mr Tayo quotes our tenth and last belief ("He is a Muslim who recites the Kalima") and then attempts to prove that Hazrat Mirza Sahib's own view was contradictory to it. Here Mr Tayo alleges that the Founder considered all kalima-reciters who did not believe in him to be non-Muslims and kafirs.

On the contrary, Hazrat Mirza Sahib, in a court case against his arch opponent Maulvi Muhammad Husain Batalvi, stated on oath:

"From the beginning it has been my belief that no person, by rejecting my claim, becomes a kafir" (*Tiryaq al-Qulub*, p. 130).

In fact, in very many other places too he has refused and opposed the practice of *takfir al-muslimin* (declaring Muslims as kafirs) which was, and is, commonly employed by various Muslim sects against one another:

- (1) "O maulvis! will you not face death one day, that you are so bold and cunning in declaring a whole world (of Muslims) as kafirs. God says that if someone even uses the greeting *as-salamu 'alaikum* for you, you should not consider him a kafir for he is a Muslim" (*Itmam Hujjah*, p. 23).
- (2) "Today it is being attempted to reduce the number of Muslims by as much as possible... By the orders and verdicts of the maulvis, Muslims are expelled from the religion of Islam. Even if there are to be found in them a thousand signs of Islam, all these are ignored, and some nonsensical and trivial excuse is found to declare them to such disbelievers as surpass even the Hindus and Christians (in disbelief)... O Muslims... there are few enough Muslims already, do not reduce this small number still further" (*Izalah Auham*, p.p. 594-597).
- (3) "It is a matter of amazement that a person who is a kalima-reciter, an *ahl-i Qiblah*, a believer in One God, a believer and true lover of God and His Messenger, and a believer in the Qur'an, should on account of some secondary difference be declared a disbeliever on par with, nay even beyond, Jews and Christians" (*Ainah Kamalat Islam*, p. 259).
- (4) Look at this falsehood they accuse us of having declared 200 million Muslims and kalima-reciters as kafirs, whereas we did not take the initiative for *takfir* (declaring Muslims as kafirs). Their own religious leaders issued verdicts of *kufir* (disbelief) against us

and raised a commotion throughout Punjab and India that we are kafirs. These proclamations made the ignorant people so disenchanted with us that they considered it to be a sin even to talk to us politely. Can any Maulvi or any other opponent prove that we had declared them kafir first? If there is any paper, notice, or booklet issued by us, prior to these people's verdicts of *kufr* (against us), in which we had declared our Muslim opponents to be kafirs, then they should bring it forward. Otherwise, they should realise how dishonest it is that, while they are the ones who call us kafirs, yet they accuse us of having declared all Muslims as kafirs. How heart-tormenting such dishonesty, falsehood, and slander is, every sensible person can realise" (*Haqiqat al-Wahy*, p. 120).

- (5) "In his booklet *Al-masih al-Dajjal* and elsewhere, Dr Abdul Hakim Khan accuses me of having written in some book that whoever does not believe in me, though he may live in a country where my message has not reached, is a kafir and shall go to hell. This is an absolute fabrication on the part of the said doctor. In no book or notice have I written any such thing. He should produce any book of mine containing such a statement" (*ibid.*, 178).
- (6) "A man once challenged me to a prayer-duel (*mubahila*). I said that a *mubahila* was not permissible between two Muslims. He wrote in reply that he believed me to be a through-and-through kafir... Never do I call kafir any person who does not call me a kafir" (*Malfuzat*, vol x, p. 237).
- (7) A Persian poem by Hazrat Mirza Sahib contains the following verses:
- "To dub someone a kafir by one's tongue is easy,
But the difficulty comes when God will question you.
Brother, why do you call kafir those who recite the kalima,
If you fear God uproot your own *kufr* (disbelief),
It is not achievement to declare your own people kafir,
If you are a man try to convert a Jew to Islam.
When the Day of Judgement's morning breeze uncovers the truth,
It shall be clear who is a kafir and who is a believer"
- (*Ainah Kamalat Islam*, p. 23).

The clear and explicit writings of Hazrat Mirza Sahib given above should inform Mr Tayo that there is no contradiction between our belief and that of the Founder. What Maulana Muhammad Ali wrote was, in fact, taken from the Founder's writings. There is, however, a distinction between those Muslims who merely deny Hazrat Mirza Sahib's

claims, and those who have pronounced him to be a kafir. Hazrat Mirza Sahib has expressed his views regarding both of these groups. As for the first group he declares:

“From the beginning I have believed that by denying my claim no person becomes a kafir” (*Tiryaq al-Qulub*, p. 130).

In a footnote at this point he enunciates the following principle :

“To deny a *mulham* or *muhaddath*, other than those who bring a shari‘ah, does not constitute *kufr*.”

It is now up to Mr Tayo and his associates to prove that Hazrat Mirza Sahib ever expressed an opposite view to the above.

As regards those who pronounce the Founder to be a kafir, he wrote:

- (1) “It is a point of shari‘ah that he who calls a believer kafir, himself becomes a kafir ultimately” (*Haqiqat al-Wahy*, p. 163).
- (2) “It is an agreed point that he who calls a believer kafir, himself becomes a kafir. How can we reject this point? You people should tell us what option we have under these circumstances. We did not issue a verdict (of *kufr*) against them first” (*Ruhani Khaza’in*, no. 2, vol. x, p. 77).
- (3) “I still do not call the *ahl-i Qibla* as kafir” (*Haqiqat al-Wahy*, p. 165, footnote).

These extracts show that Hazrat Mirza Sahib did not call kafir those Muslims who merely denied his claims. As to those who dubbed him a kafir, he directed them to the Holy Prophet Muhammad’s Saying: “Whoever labels his Muslim brother as kafir, then *kufr* applies to one of these two”. So a Muslim condemning his fellow-Muslim as kafir is, according to the Holy Prophet, himself deservant of the same epithet.

We ask Mr Tayo whether the above Saying of the Holy Prophet is authentic or not. And if the Messiah whose advent he is awaiting is, at the same time of his coming, declared a kafir by the then Muslim religious leaders, would these *ulama* be true believers?

Which Imam to pray behind?

Mr Tayo next alleges that Hazrat Mirza Sahib forbade his followers to say their prayers behind an Imam who denies his claim and his “prophethood” we have already explained that was not his claim.

Before dealing with Tayo’s specific point we ask him to reply to the following :

- (1) According to Islamic shari'ah, who is the person behind whom it is not permissible to say one's prayers?
- (2) In Hadith and works of Fiqh, are there any conditions required of a person who is to act as Imam, or not?
- (3) Do, or do not, various Muslim sects throughout the world have their own separate mosques?
- (4) Does any sect appoint in its mosques Imams belonging to sects opposed to it? For instance, are Shi'ahs made Imams in Sunni mosques, or Sunnis made Imams in Shi'ah mosques? Do the Ahl-i Hadith appoint in their mosques Imams belonging to the Ahl-i Qur'an, and vice versa? Are Barelvis made Imams in Deobandi mosques, and vice versa?

We hope that Mr Tayo will answer these questions, and show us some mosque in which the Imam and the congregation belong to rival sects!

Let us now elucidate on this topic the views of Hazrat Mirza Sahib :

- (1) "As the maulvis of this country have, due to prejudice, generally declared us to be kafirs, and have issued such verdicts, and the rest of the people are their followers; so if there are any people who, to absolve themselves from this, publish a notice to the effect that they are not the followers of these maulvis, it would be permissible (for us) to pray with them" (*Ruhani Khaza'in*, no. 2, vol x, p. 167).
- (2) "So long as these people do not publish a notice saying that they consider members of the Ahmadiyya Movement to be Muslims, and that they believe the kafir-declarers to be kafirs, — (if they do so) I would today instruct my Jama'at to pray with them. We follow the Truth, and you cannot force us to depart from the Islamic shari'ah. When it is unanimously agreed that he who calls a Muslim as kafir is himself a kafir... how can we believe these people to be true Muslims while their hearts do not respect the word of the Holy Prophet. It is every Muslim's duty to believe according to the Prophet's word" (*ibid.*, p. 378, 15 May 1908).
- (3) If it is not correct to say that by calling someone kafir, one becomes a kafir himself, then show me a verdict of the maulvis to this effect and I will accept it. Otherwise, if one does become a kafir, then you should issue a notice naming two hundred maulvis regarding their *kuf*r. After that it would be disallowed for me to doubt your faith in Islam" (*Haqiqat al-Wahy*, p. 165).

From the above verdicts of Hazrat Mirza Sahib it certainly does not follow that he has forbidden his disciples to pray behind anyone who denies his so-called 'prophethood'. In fact, the Founder regards every kalima-reciter as a Muslim. His dispute is with those who do not respect the kalima by declaring its reciters to be kafirs. Far from pronouncing the deniers of his claims to be kafir, he challenges his opponents to bring forth any writing of his wherein he should have taken the initiative in calling them kafirs. None of them could ever answer this challenge.

The Founder's stand

The separate question that arises is: if someone declares Hazrat Mirza Sahib to be a kafir and beyond the pale of Islam, is it permissible for Ahmadis to pray behind him? Now, such pronouncements of *kufr* against kalima-reciters not only bring the kalima into dishonour, but in fact, cause it to be annulled as the distinctive mark of Islam. In order, therefore, to preserve the dignity of the kalima, Hazrat Mirza Sahib invoked the edict of the Holy Prophet (he who calls a Muslim kafir, becomes a kafir himself) to demand that whoever wanted to maintain religious fraternity with the Ahmadis should openly dissociate himself from the maulvis who call them kafirs, and should declare them to be Muslims. Is this demand of the Founder not permissible in Islamic shari'ah?

Treatment of and verdicts against Ahmadis

Hazrat Mirza Sahib and his Jama'at were not only pronounced to be kafirs, but they were also boycotted, expelled from mosques, and prohibited from using Muslim cemeteries. Had Mr Tayo read the pronouncements of the leading maulvis against Hazrat Mirza Sahib and his followers, he would never have raised his totally erroneous objections against us. Below we produce some of these verdicts:

- (1) The ruling of Maulvi Nazir Hussain of Delhi, published in 1890, ran: "Muslims must steer clear of these liars and deceivers (i.e., Ahmadis), and, must not pray behind them nor join in funeral prayers for any of them" (Journal *Isha'at al-Sunna*, no. 5, vol xiii, 1890).
- (2) Maulvi Faqirullah wrote :
"He (i.e. Hazrat Mirza) is himself misguided and he misleads others. He is a liar and spreads mischief in the world. There is no room for discussion in that he is covert renegade and a kafir. May

God destroy him" (Fatwa, 1892, published in *Isha'at al-Sunna*, vol xiii, no. 6, p. 87).

(3) Maulvi Abdul Haque Ghazanavi announced :

"Mirza is a kafir, a covert renegade, misguided, heretic, *dajjal*, caster of evil doubts... Undoubtedly Mirza is a kafir, a renegade, a *zindiq*, misguided and misguider, heretic...." (ibid., no. 7, p. 104).

(4) Commenting on Hazrat Mirza Sahib's conciliatory leaflet to the maulvis, *Al-Sulh al-khair*, issued on 5 March 1901, Maulvi Abdul Wahid Janpuri spurned this noble gesture thus:

"Let it not be concealed that the reason for this conciliatory note is that after the Mirzaee (i.e., Ahmadi) group in Amritsar were subjected to disgrace, expelled from Friday and congregational prayers, humiliatingly thrown out of the mosque in which they used to pray, and barred from the park where they held their Friday prayers, they then asked Mirza Qadiani for permission to build a new mosque. Mirza told them that they should wait while he tried to make peace with the people, for in that case there would be no need to build a mosque. They (i.e., the Ahmadis) had to bear many humiliations. Their social relations with Muslims were stopped, their wives were taken away from them owing to their having become Mirzaees, their dead had to be thrown into pits without burial dressing or funeral rites, etc., etc. It was then that the Qadiani liar issued this conciliatory note" (*Ishtihar Mukhadat Musailimah Qadiani*, p. 2)

It is clear from the above extract how the maulvis scoffed at the Divine injunction to accept the extended hand of peace, and how they were proud of having subjected the Ahmadis to every possible abuse. Ahmadis bore these tribulations in the way of Allah, and complained of their treatment only to Him. Despite such cruel treatment, as long as the maulvis did not reach the position of exceeding all bounds in their verdicts of *kufir* and inflicting injustices of all kinds against Ahmadis, Hazrat Mirza Sahib and his followers continued to regard them as Muslims. A hundred years on, Mr Tayo belies historical facts and has the audacity to write :

"It is surprising to see that the Lahori's are still shamelessly arguing that the Mirza was forced to refrain his followers from praying behind non-Ahmadi Imams praying only when the Ahmadis were often driven out of the Muslim mosques".

These accusations made by Mr Tayo are completely falsified by the extract given above wherein a maulvi prides himself on maltreat-

ment of Ahmadis and sneers at Hazrat Mirza Sahib's gesture of peace. As to Mr Tayo's language, we shall follow in the footsteps of the Holy Prophet Muhammad by praying for him, as Hazrat Mirza Sahib commanded us:

"In reply to abuse say prayers for them; return injury with goodness; In response to haughtiness show humility.

No Contradiction

We hope that Mr Tayo is now fully satisfied and realise that his former views regarding Ahmadiyyat were the ones based on truth, and that his revised beliefs which he has adopted from the misleading and scurrilous anti-Ahmadiyya literature are absolutely wrong. There is not the slightest difference or contradiction between our views as published in his books by Maulana Muhammad Ali, and the beliefs expressed by the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib. We have conclusively established this fact above, and have shown that Mr Tayo's criticism is based on ignorance.

XI. CAUSES OF THE SPLIT

Having completed his conspicuously unsuccessful attempt to make Hazrat Mirza Sahib's views appear contradictory and opposite to our ten articles of belief, Mr Tayo proceeds to attack the late Maulana Muhammad Ali's motives in separating from Qadian and forming the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam of Lahore. In support of his wild allegations he cites extracts from, on the one hand, the anti-Ahmadiyya book *Qadiyaniyyat*, and on the other the Rabwah Movement newspaper *Al-Fadl*. It is simply absurd to base a case against a person or Jama'at purely on the writings of its avowed opponents. For instance, in order to study Sunni beliefs if one refers only to the Shi'ah literature on this subject, one can hardly form a true opinion. Or, would Mr Tayo recommend the study of Christian polemics against Islam as a suitable means of evaluating his religion! Introducing a reference against the late Maulana Muhammad Ali from *al-Fadl*, Mr Tayo writes :

"Even the Qadiyani organ admitted that...."

These words are absolutely incredible since it is quite obvious that the "Qadiyani organ" would be hostile to the late Maulana. It is rather like saying , "Even the Christian organ admitted that Islam was not true religion"! Can a Rabwah Movement organ, or a book such as *Qadiyaniyyat*, be expected to be favourable or even fair to the late Maulana? If Mr Tayo were seeking to determine the truth he should also have consulted the books wherein the Maulana has replied to the

charges against him which Mr Tayo is avidly reproducing from his two sources.

Reasons for the Split

The man whom Mr Tayo accuses of having personal motives in breaking away from Qadian and forming the Lahore Ahmadiyya Jama'at, viz., Maulana Muhammad Ali, is widely known to the world for his piety, integrity, and sincerity. He never cared for worldly achievement or honour, and regarded the service of Islam as the greatest wealth to be earned. These well-established facts by themselves belie Mr Tayo's slander that the Maulana split with Hazrat Mirza Sahib's relatives after the Founder's death because he could not share in their wealth, or that he made a bid for *khilafat*. We note here that, so strong is Mr Tayo's bias against our Jama'at, that he constantly describes the author of *Qadiyaniyyat* as "learned" merely because this book contains the above-mentioned slander against the Maulana.

As to the actual reasons for the Split, and why the late Maulana and his comrades left Qadian six years after Hazrat Mirza Sahib's death and established a separate Jama'at in Lahore, we refer Mr Tayo to the article written at the very same time by the late Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the world-famous Indian Muslim scholar. This dignitary, who was a learned, neutral observer, noted :

"For a long time there had been two parties in this (Ahmadiyya) Jama'at over the issue of *takfir*. One group believed that non-Ahmadi Muslims are Muslims even though they may not acknowledge Mirza Sahib's claims. The other group, however, stated clearly that those people who do not believe in Mirza Sahib are definitely kafirs — *inna li-llahi wa inna alai-hi raji'un*. The latter group is headed by Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmood Ahmad, and they have now declared him to be their *khalifah*, but the first group does not accept this. The writing published in this connection by Maulana Muhammad Ali, and the wonderful courage with which he has stayed in Qadian to express his belief, is truly an event which shall ever be regarded as a memorable event of this year" (*Al-Hilal*, 25 March 1914).

Here we have an independent commentator's clear statement, written and published in the very month the Split took place, that the controversy which divided the Ahmadiyya Community related to the issue of whether non-Ahmadi Muslims should be considered as kafirs, with Maulana Muhammad Ali and his comrades taking the stand that

non-Ahmadis were Muslims, while Mirza Mahmud Ahmad believed that they were kafirs.

It Mr Tayo is still not satisfied that the issue of *takfir* of non-Ahmadis was the cause of the Split, we quote below Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's own statement of his differences of belief with Maulana Muhammad Ali:

“Maulvi Muhammad Ali has written a history of our differences, in which he has tried to prove that, after the Promised Messiah's death, due to certain events I, that is, this author, changed my beliefs. According to the Maulvi Sahib, this change of belief relates to three matters: firstly, that I have spread the idea that the Promised Messiah is an actual *nabi*; secondly, that he is the one who fulfills the prophecy of 'Ahmad' contained in the Qur'an, (61:6), thirdly, that all Muslims who have not entered into the *bai'at* of the Promised Messiah, though they may not even have heard of his name, are kafirs and excluded from the circle of Islam. I acknowledge that these are my beliefs” (*Ainah Sadaqat*, p. 35).

Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud himself states :

“Besides it may also be noted that on the eve of the meeting at which God was pleased to decide the question of successor to the Khilafat, Maulvi Muhammad Ali came to pay me a call. There were present on the occasion Maulvi Muhammad Ahsan, Dr. Khalifa Rashiduddin, and Nawab Muhammad Ali Khan, Jagirdar of Malerkotla. Maulvi Muhammad Ali at that time laid stress upon this very question. He pointed out that it was difficult to proceed with the election of a Khalifa, because there was such serious disparity of beliefs prevailing in the Community. One party regarded the Promised Messiah as a *Nabi* and his deniers as *Kafirs* while the other party refused to subscribe to any such doctrine.” (The Truth about the Split, page 178)

Maulana Muhammad Ali's stand

It was the beliefs of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad as acknowledged by him in the extract given above that caused the Split in the Jama'at. Immediately upon the death of Maulana Nur-ud-Din, the head of the Ahmadiyya Movement from 1908 to 1914, when Mirza Mahmud Ahmad was made Khalifa by his supporters, Maulana Muhammad Ali issued the following declaration :

"In matters of faith and religion one should not act hastily. However, our Movement cannot unite upon the stand of calling other Muslims as kafirs. Never did Hazrat Mirza Sahib call his deniers kafirs for not believing in his claim" (17 March 1914).

Two days later, in the newspaper *Paigham Sulh* he stated :

"I am impelled by an urge in my heart to accept all tribulations to express this view. Declaring the *ahl-i-Qiblah* to be kafirs is the crime for which Hazrat Mirza Sahib laid the grave guilt upon his opponent *maulvis*. Alas! the thing of which others were accused is being committed by us today. My heart trembles at the idea of declaring as kafirs those who recite, 'there is no God but Allah, and Muhammad is His Messenger'. ...If all kalima-reciters are kafirs unless they believe in the Promised Messiah, then our efforts to propagate Islam are futile, for it is purposeless to make a Hindu or Christian recite the kalima.... I am prepared to suffer whatever consequences I have to. I pray to God that he grant me to adhere to the path of truth and give me patience in difficulties" (19 March 1914).

It should now have become abundantly clear to Mr Tayo that the Split in the Ahmadiyya Jama'at in 1914 took place mainly over the issue of *takfir* of Muslims. Gradually there developed differences between the Lahore and the Qadian Jama'ats over other issues as well.

The late Hazrat Maulana Muhammad Ali bore all sorts of privations and tribulations just for the sake of defending the honour of the kalima and of the Muslims, yet Mr Tayo keeps on repeating grave accusations against him. How appropriate here is Hazrat Mirza Sahib's poetic verse:

"My friend, my soul is consumed in grieving over your faith,
yet strangely, you think I am a kafir"

Migration to Lahore

It became impossible for Maulana Muhammad Ali to continue living in Qadian while differing in these matters with Mirza Mahmud Ahmad who was now the master of that place. To avoid continual bickering, friction, and strife, the Maulana decided to move to Lahore in order to continue Hazrat Mirza Sahib's mission of the defence and the propagation of Islam. After his move to Lahore, the Maulana made great efforts to resolve these issues with Mirza Mahmud Ahmad in order to prevent disunity in the Jama'at. But when no agreement could

be reached, the Maulana decided to carry on the Promised Messiah's mission from Lahore. It was for the sake of this mission that he had originally sacrificed his worldly career, and left his near and dear ones, to go and settle in Qadian with Hazrat Mirza Sahib. And it was for the sake of continuing this very mission, and fulfilling his pledge to 'prefer religion to worldly advantage', that he now started afresh at Lahore. God granted him tremendous success, and the literature produced by him spread to all corners of the earth. The Lahore Ahmadiyya Jama'at too spread to various countries around the world, and in number runs to hundreds of thousands.

Maulana Muhammad Ali's triumph over issue of takfir

Besides the propagation of Islam, the Maulana also carried on a jihad against the doctrine of *takfir* of Muslims as referred to above. The Lahore Ahmadiyya Jama'at published articles, pamphlets, and books on this issue, and even participated in public debates on the matter. At last in 1953 came the time when a prophecy made by the Maulana in 1930 was fulfilled, and God Himself showed which of the two parties was right. In a Pakistan court of enquiry headed by Justice Munir, the following recorded exchange took place between the court and Mirza Mahmud Ahmad :

“Question : Do you include Mirza Ghulam Ahmad among those Divine-appointees in whom one must believe if one is to be called a Muslim?

Answer by Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad : I have already answered this question. A person who does not believe in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad cannot be declared to be excluded from Islam.

“Question : You have stated in your testimony that a person who, with honesty of heart, does not believe in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, still remains a Muslim. Have you always held this view?

Answer by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad : Yes.

“Question : As the use of the word *kufir* (regarding non-Ahmadis) is likely to cause misunderstanding and bitterness, would it not be better to give up its use altogether, or exercise great caution in using it?

Answer by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad : Since 1922 we have been trying to desist from its use". (Proceedings of the Court of Enquiry into the Punjab disturbances of 1953).

Thus the result of Maulana Muhammad Ali's struggle against the doctrine of *takfir* of non-Ahmadi Muslims was that ultimately Mirza Mahmud Ahmad had to retract all his statements in which he had declared non-Ahmadi Muslims to be kafirs. His court testimony quoted above conclusively proved the truth of Maulana Muhammad Ali's stand on the issue. No one can deny the evidence of actual events that at last Mirza Mahmud Ahmad had to admit the truth of the Maulana's beliefs and to seek shelter therein. Would that the Rabwah Jama'at take a lesson from this, and adopt the belief that all kalima-reciters are Muslims!

XII. A VICIOUS ALLEGATION AGAINST MAULANA MUHAMMAD ALI

Mr Tayo further blackens the pages of his booklet by introducing a vicious allegation against the Maulana Muhammad Ali made by the Qadian/Rabwah Jama'at, which he found reproduced in the anti-Ahmadiyya book *Qadianiyyat*. This charge was fully refuted by the Maulana himself nearly sixty years ago in his *Haqiqat-i Ikhtilaf*. It is alleged by a Nawab Muhammad Ali Khan and some other Qadianis that the Maulana and the late Khwaja Kamal-ud-din wanted Hazrat Mirza Sahib to give account of the Movement's finances, and that the Founder believed that they were suspicious of what he did with the money. In reply to this accusation Maulana Muhammad Ali wrote :

- (1) "The reply to the charge that we had said to the Nawab (Muhammad Ali Khan) that the time had come to demand an account from Hazrat Mirza Sahib, is that *this is a greater slander*" (*Haqiqat-i Ikhtilaf*, p. 57).
- (2) "This is simply false. We never said such a thing to the Nawab" (*ibid.*, footnote, p. 13).
- (3) "I never wrote such a letter. If the allegation is true, publish a facsimile of the letter" (*ibid.*).
- (4) "The second accusation levelled against us in this letter by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad is that the Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din had said to me: 'Hazrat (Mirza) Sahib himself lives in luxury and ease, but teaches us to donate even by curtailing our personal expenditure'. The reply to this accusation is : *this is a great slander*. The Khwaja never said such a thing to me" (*ibid.*, p. 57).

- (5) "The whole statement, which was written to incite Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din against, us, is a naked lie from start to finish. By saying this, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad has attacked not only us, but also the Promised Messiah himself" (ibid., p. 16).
- (6) "No such thought ever entered our minds, not did any such words ever leave our lips. This is a naked lie concocted by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad in order to disgrace us in the eyes of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din. How could any person saying and thinking such things about the Promised Messiah maintain any connection with his Jama'at! And, had the Promised Messiah believed this about us, what was it that prevented him from expelling us from the Jama'at? What hold or influence did we exercise on him that, whereas in his heart he would think that we accused him of misappropriation, yet in practice he handed us the management of his business! So much so that when he left Qadian a month before his death, he gave me the charge of the charity-kitchen. Thus Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's statement is proved false from every angle" (ibid., p. 53).
- (7) "When someone objected to the gardener being given bread from the charity-kitchen, Hazrat Mirza Sahib warned that person, and everyone knows about it. Yet we were allegedly accusing Hazrat Mirza Sahib of misappropriation (God forbid) and he did not mention it to anyone except whispering a word in Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's ear! The fabricators of this story disapprove it themselves by their mutual contradictions: one says it happened in Qadian, the other places it in Lahore; one alleges it happened 12 hours before the Founder's death, the other says it took place months earlier. Apart from this, internal evidence conclusively belies it. I have written earlier that this charge against us is false. We never said what is attributed to us, nor did Hazrat Mirza Sahib utter the words ascribed to him".
- (8) "Can a man appointed for a task by God ever say such a thing (as that attributed to Hazrat Mirza Sahib), and can a follower's criticism make him think of renouncing his claim (of being from God)!... We have always been adducing it as an argument in favour of the Promised Messiah's truth the fact that he was above any worldly involvement. When his death drew near he did not, as was the practice of the established spiritual leaders, bequeath the Movement's finances to his son or to any other individual, but placed them under the charge of an Anjuman (council)... Had we imagined even for a single instant that the Promised Messiah

used to misappropriate the money (we seek refuge in Allah from so saying), we could not have stayed at his side for a moment longer. What is the sense in accepting such a person as the Promised Messiah.... There is no limit to Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's contradictory statements... I swear by Allah that these three allegations are absolutely false" (ibid., pp. 15-17).

So, the vicious charges against Maulana Muhammad Ali that Mr Tayo has reproduced from the books, magazines, and newspapers of the opponents, have been refuted and denied on oath by the late Maulana. He swore by God that all these allegations were totally false.

XIII. ISSUE OF KHILAFAT AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LAHORE AND QADIAN/RABWAH JAMA'ATS

We inform Mr Tayo that, as regards the question of *khilafat* (successorship to Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib), the Maulana Muhammad Ali disagreed with Mirza Mahmud Ahmad *on points of basic principles*, and was not concerned with the question of the personalities involved. Given below are the three points regarding *khilafat* upon which the Lahore Jama'at differs with the Rabwah Jama'at.

- (1) The Rabwah Jama'at holds that only *nubuwwa* (prophethood) can have after it a *khilafat* (successorship). As a *khilafat* was established in the Ahmadiyya Jama'at after Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, he must, they argue, have been a prophet, and his *khilafat* is successorship to a prophet which is the type of *khilafat* referred to in the Qur'an, Surah *al-Nur*, verse 55.

As opposed to this, we in the Lahore Jama'at believe that, not only prophets, but also Mujaddids and other spiritual leaders have *khalifas* for successors. For instance, there have been *khalifas* to Mu'in-ud-Din Chishti and Sayyid Abdul Qadir Jilani. Such *khalifas* are not of the class referred to in Surah *al-Nur*, verse 55. Hazrat Mirza Sahib was a Mujaddid and a *sheikh* (spiritual master). So the institutions of *bai'at* (pledge taking) and of *khilafat* after him in the Ahmadiyya Movement are of the same type as those which prevail amongst the Sufi orders. And the *khilafat* established after Hazrat Mirza Sahib is not a *khilafat* of Surah *al-Nur* verse 55, but a *khilafat* to a *sheikh*.

- (2) The Rabwah Jama'at holds that a person not entering into the *bai'at* of a *khalifa*, even though that person may have taken the *bai'at* at the hand of the Promised Messiah himself, is a transgressor (*fasiq*).

The Lahore Jama'at, on the other hand, believes that a person not

entering into the *bai'at* of a *khalifa* or successor to the Promised Messiah (such a *khalifa* or successor being a person who is chosen by the Jama'at, or by forty members of it, for the purpose of initiating new members into the Community), does not thereby become a *fasiq*. After the Promised Messiah's death, a number of Ahmadis did not re-take their *bai'at* at the hand of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din, but he did not call them "*fasiq*", rather referring to them as his spiritual colleagues.

- (3) The Qadian Jama'at holds that their *khalifa* wields authority over the Promised Messiah's successor Anjuman. He has the power to interfere in the Anjuman's decisions as well as to quash them. The Lahore Jama'at's beliefs and practice in this regard is that no *khalifa* has the power to interfere in, or quash, the Anjuman's decisions, and that a *khalifa* is as much bound by these decisions as any other member of the Jama'at.

Matter of principle

To summarize the late Maulana Muhammad Ali and the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam Lahore have no objection to the mere use of the title *khalifa* for a successor, since other mujaddids and spiritual leaders (*sheikhs*) have also been succeeded by persons bearing the title *khalifa*. In his book-let Mr Tayo has distorted this issue of principle and presented it as a "bid for khilafatship" by Maulana Muhammad Ali. This accusation is sheer slander. The late Maulana differed with Mirza Mahmud Ahmad on points of principle, and he refuted his beliefs by establishing conclusively that :

- (i) Hazrat Mirza Sahib had *NOT* claimed to be a prophet;
- (ii) By denying Hazrat Mirza Sahib's claims a Muslim does *NOT* become a kafir;
- (iii) The *khilafa* after Hazrat Mirza Sahib is *NOT* of the type spoken of in the Qur'an, Surah *al-Nur*, verse 55;
- (iv) By not re-taking his *bai'at* on the hands of a *khalifa* a person does *NOT* become a *fasiq* (transgressor).

On these questions there were debates between the Lahore and Qadian Jama'ats. Books, booklets and pamphlets were written which can be obtained from the Lahore Ahmadiyya Anjuman. For almost forty years Maulana Muhammad Ali, besides being engaged in the defence and propagation of Islam, also conducted a struggle against the erroneous Qadiani views. At last in 1953, in the Enquiry Court of Justice Munir, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad contradicted all his former

beliefs on the issue of *takfir* of Muslims, and thus proved the truth of Maulana Muhammad Ali's stand. No one can deny this testimony of actual events, yet Mr Tayo ignores all this and writes page after page in contradiction to facts. We repeat that his allegations and accusations against the late Maulana, which he seems merely to have copied from hostile sources, are sheer and absolute fabrications, and were fully answered by the Maulana a long time ago.

XIV. HAZRAT MIRZA SAHIB AND MAULVI SANA-ULLAH OF AMRITSAR

Mr Tayo next raises a spurious question relating to Maulvi Sana-Ullah of Amritsar, a contemporary opponent of the Founder. He alleges that Hazrat Mirza Sahib had issued a declaration wherein he had prayed to God to give judgement between him and the Maulvi Sana-Ullah by causing the liar to die of some mortal disease like plague or cholera during the life-time of the truthful one; and as the Maulvi outlived Hazrat Mirza Sahib by many years it proves, asserts Mr Tayo, that the Founder was false in his claims.

Mr Tayo further asserts that "Muhammad Ali was one of the principal eye-witnesses" to all this, and therefore must have known that Hazrat Mirza Sahib's claims were untrue. We inform Mr Tayo that, in fact, Maulana Muhammad Ali wrote a book entitled "*Ayat-ullah: Maulvi Sana-Ullah runs away from the Promised Messiah's mubahila challenge*". Had he heard of, or read this book, he would never have made his ridiculous remark citing the Maulana as a witness to the so-called defeat of Hazrat Mirza Sahib by Maulvi Sana-Ullah!

Sana-Ullah's reply to the Founder

In Tayo's booklet we find extracts given only from Hazrat Mirza Sahib's Notice "The Final Decision re: Maulvi Sana-Ullah", which is in fact a challenge to the Maulvi to participate in a *mubahila* (or prayer-duel) where each party would invoke Divine curses on whichever of the two be the liar. A *mubahila* requires the participation of both parties in order for it to be a valid means of showing the general public by its result as to who is the liar. So we must ask Mr Tayo what answer did the Maulvi give to this challenge? Given below are some extracts from his reply to Hazrat Mirza Sahib's announcement:

- (1) "My consent was not obtained for this prayer, and it was published without my agreement".

- (2) "This statement (of the Founder) was not published as being a revelation from God; it is said not to be based on any Divine communication but is merely a prayer".
- (3) "My confrontation is with you. If I were to die, what would it prove to people at large?"
- (4) "You have been very clever in spotting that these days the plague is severe, particularly in the Punjab, and especially in the capital of the Punjab, Lahore, which is very close to Amritsar. Even burying the dead is a problem. Under these circumstances every person is in fear of the plague, and if one is alive today, there is no guarantee that one shall be so tomorrow."
- (5) "This prayer of yours can, under no circumstances, be accepted as leading to a clear decision".
- (6) "You did a trick by first praying for my death by plague or cholera, but said in the end that I could be overtaken by some great calamity equal to death".
- (7) "In your last article, published in *Ahl-i-Hadith* of April 19, you state in sentence no. 14 that God's messengers are merciful and they wish constantly that no person be struck by destruction and calamity. So why are you now praying for my death".
- (8) "To summarize..... this statement of yours is not acceptable to me nor could any sensible person accept it" (*Ahl-i Hadith*, 26 April 1907).

From the above extracts every fair-minded and God-fearing person can see that Maulvi Sana-Ullah considered Hazrat Mirza Sahib's Notice (which Mr Tayo has quoted from) to be an invitation to a *mubahila*, and *NOT* a one-sided prayer by the Founder for the death of the liar within the life-time of the truthful one. Had this Notice not been an invitation to *mubahila*, the question of Maulvi Sana-Ullah's agreement (see extracts nos. 1 and 8 above) to it could not arise. The above extracts also show that the Maulvi was absolutely terrified of what may befall him in case he accepted the challenge to enter into a *mubahila*. In many other places too, Maulvi Sana-Ullah has referred to this Notice as the "Notice of *mubahila*".

- (1) "Krishan Qadiani (an abusive epithet for Hazrat Mirza Sahib) issued, on 15 April 1907, the Notice of *mubahila* against me" (*Muraqqa' Qadiani*, June 1908, p. 18).
- (2) "The Mirza issued a lengthy Notice of *mubahila* against me" (*ibid.*, December, p. 18).

- (3) "O Zealous members of the Mirza'i Jama'at! What time are you waiting for! The time-limit set by your leader for the *mubahila* has passed" (ibid., June 1980).

Sana-Ullah's own criterion and fate

It is clear, therefore, that Maulvi Sana-Ullah understood Hazrat Mirza Sahib's Notice as a challenge to him to enter into a *mubahila*. THE MAULVI OPENLY DECLINED THIS CHALLENGE, and refused to accept the criterion of the liar dying within the life-time of the truthful one, as the means of determining which of them was supported by God. Hence the fact that Hazrat Mirza Sahib died before Sana-Ullah does NOT go against the Founder, for his adversary plainly and openly refused to enter into the proposed *mubahila* and proclaimed that the liar need not die first.

In fact, rejecting the criterion that the liar would die first, the sub-editor of *Ahl-i Hadith* added to Sana-Ullah's above article the following footnote :

"Your (i.e., Hazrat Mirza Sahib's) claim absolutely contradicts the Qur'an. The Qur'an says that evil-doers are granted respite by God. Look at: "As to him who is in error, the Beneficent will prolong his length of days" (19:75); "We grant them respite only that they may add to their sins" (3:177); "and He leaves them alone in their inordinacy, blindly wandering on" (2:15); etc. These verses belie your deception. And also: "Nay, We gave provision to these and their fathers, until life was prolonged to them" (21:44). These words clearly meant that God causes the liars, the deceitful ones, the mischief-makers, and the disobedient, to live long that in this respite they may add to their evil deeds. How can you coin the principle that such people are not granted to live long" (*Ahl-i Hadith*, 26 April 1907).

Commenting on this Sana-Ullah himself wrote :

"I believe this to be correct; (ibid., 31 July 1908).

He also wrote :

"Despite being the true Prophet, the Holy Prophet Mohammed passed away before Musailima the Liar. And Musailima, despite being the liar, died after the truthful one" (*Muraqqa' Qadiani*, August 1907).

SO, MAULVI SANA-ULLAH REJECTED THE CRITERION THAT THE ONE WHO DIES FIRST IS THE LIAR, AND ADDUCED

HIS OWN CRITERION THAT THE LIAR CONTINUES TO LIVE WHILE THE TRUTHFUL ONE DIES BEFORE HIM.

As, in Mr Tayo's own words, "Sana-Ullah lived many years after him (the Founder)", it can easily be judged who satisfied Sana-Ullah's own criterion for the liar!

XV. HAZRAT MIRZA SAHIB'S DEATH

Mr Tayo raises objections relating to the time and manner of the death of the Founder, He writes :

"Ghulam Ahmad had predicted his death about six months earlier. This means that he had seen the wrong course before the death came upon him".

Here we say again what has been so often repeated above, that if only Mr Tayo had read Hazrat Mirza Sahib's books he would not have made this nonsensical remark. Long before he was appointed Mujaddid by God, the Founder had received, in 1865, a Divine revelation relating to the length of his life span. He writes :

"Since God knew that the opponents would wish for my death so that they could claim that I was a liar as I had died early, He had addressed me before hand and said: 'Your age shall be eighty years or a few years less or more, and you shall see a distant generation'" (*Tadhkira*, p. 6).

This is the word of God, the knower of the unknown. Can Mr Tayo or any other person predict with certainty the age he is going to attain, or foretell that he will see his grandchildren?

Time of Founder's death

When the time of his death approached, God informed him of this by revelation, as He does with His beloved servants. The Founder thereupon wrote a booklet *Al-wasiyya*, two and a half years before his death, in which he noted the revelation:

"The time of your death is nigh, and the appointed term of your life is about to be completed".

As the time of his death came nearer and nearer, God continued to reveal this fact to him, till six days before his death it was revealed:

"The time to go has come. Death is near".

Just as forty years previously God had told him that his opponents would not be able to harm him in the slightest, He now disclosed to Hazrat Mirza Sahib that the appointed time promised in 1865 had now drawn near, so that no opponent could raise the objection that the

earlier prophecy had not been fulfilled. It is note-worthy that, even at a time when the Founder was publishing revelation upon revelation prophesying that he was about to die, none of the opponents could pluck up enough courage to engage with him in a *mubahila*. Maulvi Sana-Ullah too had been reading these revelations in *Al-Wasiyya* (December 1905/January 1906) and the Ahmadiyya newspapers, yet when Hazrat Mirza Sahib issued the April 1907 Notice, discussed above, challenging him to a *mubahila*, Sana-Ullah became quite terrified and replied: "I do not agree to this statement of yours, nor could any sensible person agree to it". Since the Maulvi evaded this challenge, and refused to agree to the holding of a *mubahila*, it matters not that Hazrat Mirza Sahib died before him, and one cannot raise any objection against the date of his death. Only if Maulvi Sana-Ullah had agreed to holding the *mubahila*, could one infer that Hazrat Mirza Sahib's date of death disproved his claims.

How did the Founder die?

Mr Tayo alleges that the Founder died of cholera, and charges that his being "stricken" with this disease was the result of God's punishment which Hazrat Mirza Sahib had invited upon himself in case he was false in his claims.

We tell Mr Tayo that the assertion that the Founder died of cholera is totally false. Since Tayo's booklet purports to give an account of Hazrat Mirza Sahib's condition in his last hours, we record below the actual events as witnessed by numerous people :

Due to the great pressure of intellectual work on him, Hazrat Mirza Sahib used to grow quite weak on occasions. This ailment is known medically as neurosthenia. He would suffer from this whenever he had to exert himself hard in writing a book or preparing a lecture. Before coming to Lahore where he spent the last month of his life, he had done a considerable amount of exhausting work such as writing the voluminous *Chashma Ma'rifa* published on 15 May 1908. He was now over seventy years of age, and at Lahore he became busier than ever. From morning to night there was a constant stream of visitors putting to him all kinds of questions which he answered. At the same time, he began writing his message of peace between Hindus and Muslims, the *Paigham Sulh*. Thus, the Founder was either busy delivering addresses and speeches, or, while at home, absorbed in his writing work.

Due to the mental strain of all this work, he fell ill on two or three occasions but not seriously. However, on the evening of 25th May

(1908), after his return from a walk, following a whole day's work on *Paigham Sulh*, Hazrat Mirza Sahib fell ill again. Dr. Sayyid Muhammad Husain Shah was informed, and he had some medicine prepared and sent, but it had no effect. At about 11 p.m. Hazrat Mirza Sahib had a bowel motion which left him very weak. Dr. Sayyid Muhammad Shah and Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din were sent for. They administered some fortifying tonics, and the Founder was then left alone to rest. At about 2 or 3 a.m. he had a strong bowel motion which made his pulse very faint. This time Dr. Sayyid Muhammad Husain Shah, Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din and Dr. Mirza Yaqub Baig were all called. On their arrival, Hazrat Mirza Sahib called them over to himself and said, "it is a severe attack of diarrhoea, please suggest some medicine". He then added: "the real medicine can only come from heaven. So say some prayers as well as preparing medicine".

Treatment was begun, but since the condition was critical people stayed around him. When the Call for the morning prayer was sounded, Hazrat Mirza Sahib performed the prayer despite great weakness. Treatment continued, and a famous British doctor Dr. Sutherland of the Lahore Medical College was called. There is, however, no cure for death, and at 10.15 a.m. on Tuesday, 26 May 1908, with the words "O my beloved Allah", "O my beloved Allah", upon his lips, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib returned to his Maker — *inna li-llahi wa inna ilai-hi raji'un*.

Cause of death

Mr Tayo should note that, at the time of the Founder's death, there was gathered around him some leading doctors and physicians of the Punjab. They, along with the foreign doctor Dr. Sutherland, unanimously declared the cause of death to be *diarrhoea*, not *cholera*. The information sent for publication to the newspapers, bearing the signature of Dr. Sayyid Muhammad Husain Shah, also gave *diarrhoea* as the cause of death. The same is to be found in all Lahore Ahmadiyya Jama'at literature on the subject.

Now Mr Tayo ignores the diagnosis of the expert doctors present on the spot, and relies instead on some tales told by persons having no medical knowledge whatever. Mr Tayo should also consider the following facts: the doctors and physicians treating Hazrat Mirza Sahib were gathered around him devotedly; people were keen to preserve the clothes in which he died in their own houses, and these garments are now in the custody of Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din's family; masses flocked to the house where he died; some would embrace him lovingly, others

would touch him for blessing; and the reverence with which the washing of his body was carried out can only be described by those present there. Is this, we ask Tayo, how people behave over someone who dies of cholera! Do people cluster around the dead body of a person who had died of cholera, or do they stay as far away as possible? Are the clothes of the deceased kept as blessed mementoes, or are they consigned to fire? Does the place of death become a shrine, or do people run away from it?

The people clustering around Hazrat Mirza Sahib's body were not the ignorant masses but Punjab's leading doctors, physicians, religious scholars, business men, and lawyers. In case of death by cholera it is observed that even the deceased's relatives are loath to approach the body. Public health departments are stirred into action, committees of doctors being appointed to advise on combating the disease. Yet the Founder's so-called "cholera" was so novel that great and eminent men considered it to be a source of blessing to touch and embrace him, and to preserve his clothes in their own houses. The house where he died attracted masses of visitors. The Public health department took no action. Is this consistent with Hazrat Mirza Sahib having died of cholera?

The coffin was taken to Lahore Railway station where a crowd of mourners had gathered. There, a certificate was shown to Railway officials to confirm that the Founder had not died of an infectious disease such as cholera, for in a case of that kind it was not permitted to take the body from one place to another. It was only on production of the certificate showing that he had died of diarrhoea that Hazrat Mirza Sahib's body was allowed to be taken by rail to Qadian. There, thousands of people vied with one another to get a close look at the face and to embrace it. After the funeral prayers Hazrat Mirza Sahib was buried with the greatest honour and respect.

We ask Mr Tayo again, is this what happens when a person dies of cholera? Only out of sheer prejudice and malice do Mr Tayo and his source, the author of *Qadianiyyat*, ignore the testimony of eminent doctors, scholars, lawyers, and business men, and reply instead on the heresy of persons totally ignorant of medicine.

CONCLUSION

Mr Tayo concludes his booklet by describing Hazrat Mirza Sahib as an "imposter" and a "liar". The fact is however, that the truth of the Founder's claim is so clear and well-established that, just as the existence of the sun cannot be denied even by a blind man, the arguments

and proofs supporting Hazrat Mirza Sahib's claims of being a Mujadid, the Promised Messiah, and the Mahdi, are so conclusive as not to leave the smallest room for doubt. If Mr Tayo had read any substantial amount of our Jama'at's literature he would not have levelled at us the utterly erroneous charge that we "accept half of the writings or claims of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib and reject the other half". We accept all the writings of Hazrat Mirza Sahib, from start to finish, and we affirm that he did not claim to be a prophet, nor did he ever alter his claims, nor did he declare the deniers of his claims to be kafirs. In the whole world, it is only the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam Lahore which believes that any person reciting the kalima and calling himself a Muslim is indeed a Muslim, and that the Holy Prophet Muhammad is the *khatam al-nabiyyin* and the Last Prophet after whom there shall not arise any prophet, be he a new one or a former one.

Mr Tayo's advice to the young missionary, with whom he is engaged in debate, to read all the books of Hazrat Mirza Sahib, reminds us of a story. An ignorant man cornered a non-Muslim and threatened him thus: "become a Muslim or I will kill you". Terrified, the non-Muslim replied, "I am prepared to become a Muslim". The ignorant Muslim said, "recite the kalima"; "what is the kalima", asked the non-Muslim. "Oh, I do not know what it is myself", replied the puzzled Muslim scratching his head! This is exactly Mr Tayo's position, that himself being totally ignorant to Hazrat Mirza Sahib's books, he advises others to read them thoroughly!

We also believe that if Mr Tayo had read the works of the Promised Messiah, he would have found him to be a true follower, lover and devotee of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and a great servant of Islam. He would then have held his inspiring writings and sublime discourses in the greatest regard and esteem. Upon discovering the complete truth about Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib and his mission for Islam, Mr Tayo would have joyously sung along with us the song:

"In this world, Ahmadiyyat shall succeed and prosper
The enemies of Muhammad shall face exemplary requital."

SOME QUESTIONS ADDRESSED TO ISLAMIC RELIGIOUS LEADERS, SCHOLARS AND THEOLOGICAL EXPERTS

The Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam (Lahore) Fiji recently produced a leaflet written in urdu directed some questions at the present-day Islamic religious leaders and theological experts in connection with the beliefs of the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement and the

declaration of Ahmadis in Pakistan as non-Muslims. This leaflet has been translated into English by the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam of the U.K.

That follows :

Section 1

1. What is the positive definition of a *Muslim*?
2. *From the time of the Holy Prophet Muhammad till the present day, what declaration have non-Muslims had to make to become Muslims?*
3. *Does a political legislature have the authority to declare that the religion of a person, or a community, is other than what that person, or community, claims? For instance, if someone claims to be a Christian or a Hindu or a Muslim, would it be legal and correct for some Assembly or Parliament to decide that he is not a Christian or a Hindu or a Muslim but of some religion determined by that body?*
4. *Is every decision of a Muslim government right and correct in terms of the Islamic law (Shari'ah)? And is it necessary for a Muslim to believe in all such decisions?*
5. *If every decision of a Muslim government is correct and according to Shari'ah, then does this mean that the decisions against Imam Hussain (Alaihissalaam), Imam Abu Hanifah (Rehmat Allah Alaih), Imam Ahmad Hambal (Rehmat Allah Alaih) etc., by the Muslim governments of their times were correct? And, do you believe in these decisions being correct even now?*
6. *If the Parliament of a Muslim country has the right referred to in Question 3 above, then would a non-Muslim government also have the right to declare that its Muslim subjects were, in fact not Muslim but Hindus or Christians? If not, why not?*

Section 2

7. What, according to the Holy Qur'an, is the definition of a prophet (*nabi*)?
8. In the Holy Qur'an, are the words *rasul* and *mursal* (messenger of God) used in their technical sense wherever they occur, or are there any places where they have been used in their lexicological, or metaphorical, sense? What have the servants of Islam written about them?

9. In the Holy Qur'an, the Hadith, and the books of the elders of Islam, are the words *rasul*, *mursal* (messenger of God), *nabi* (prophet), and *Ka-anbiya'* (like unto prophets) ever used for non-prophets, or not?
10. Does the term *muhaddath* (one spoken to by God, though not a prophet) occur in Hadith? And, if so, what is its definition therein?
11. What is the difference between a *nabi* (prophet) and a *muhaddath*? Have, or have not, Muslim religious scholars included the *muhaddaths* amongst the *rasul* (messengers of God)?
12. Is there, or is there not, evidence in the Holy Qur'an, the Hadith, and the books of the elders of Islam, that God speaks to non-prophets?
13. Can verses of the Holy Qur'an be revealed to the *auliya'* (holy men of the Muslims), or not? What is the belief of the elders of Islam about this?
14. Has after the Holy Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), any *wali* (holy man of the Muslims) ever used the word *nabi* (prophet) metaphorically regarding himself or for his elders?
15. Have, or have not the Muslim Sufis (mystics) used, in their books, the following terms :
Ghair tashri'i nabi, ... non-law-bearing prophet; *Zilli nabi*, ... shadow of a prophet; *Buruzi nabi*, ... manifestation of a prophet; *Fana fir-rasul*, ... one lost in the Holy Prophet?
16. Do the Holy Qur'an and Hadith ever employ metaphor, or not? What is the belief of the Muslim elders?
17. If a person denies the prophethood of any one of the 1,24,000 prophets (being the total number that appeared, according to Hadith), would you consider him to be a Muslim?

Section 3

18. Which verse of the Holy Qur'an says that Jesus ascended to heaven with his earthly body?
19. As, according to you, Jesus has ascended to heaven with his material body, does he eat and drink there, or not? What does the Holy Qur'an say?
20. Jesus' prophecy that the Holy Prophet Muhammad would come *after him* is quoted in the Holy Qur'an (61:6). Is there any verse of the Holy Qur'an stating that Jesus would descend from heaven with his physical body *after* the Holy Prophet Muhammad?

21. If the verse of the Holy Qur'an *bal rafa'ahu Allahu ilaihi* ("Nay, God exalted him (Jesus) in His presence", (4:158) is taken by you to refer to Jesus' physical ascension to heaven, then what will these words mean after (as you believe) Jesus has descended from heaven? Will they mean Jesus is in heaven or on earth?
22. If, as you believe, Jesus descends to earth from heaven in the latter days, how old would he be then? What do the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith say about this?
23. Since his ascent to heaven, as you believe, has Jesus ever returned to earth with his physical body? What do the Holy Qur'an and Hadith say about this?
24. Jesus' own tongue was not Arabic. So when he descends how will he read the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith as these are in Arabic? Will he learn through Divine Revelation or from Muslim scholars? Please explain from the Holy Qur'an.
25. Will Jesus' be favoured with prophetic revelation (*wahy nabuw-wah*) after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, whereas in fact such revelation came to an end with the Holy Prophet?
26. According to the Holy Qur'an, Jesus was a messenger of God sent to the Israelites. If he descends amongst the Muslims in the latter days, after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, then he would be the Seal of the prophets (*Khatam al-nabiyyin*) and the last prophet because he would have come after all other prophets. By his coming, would not the Seal of finality of prophethood with the Holy Prophet break?
27. If, in spite of wording of the "Khatam al-nabiyyin" (Seal of the prophets), verse of the Holy Qur'an, a prophet like Jesus can still come amongst the Muslims then what words of the Arabic language would God have used if He had intended to convey the meaning that no prophet would appear after the Holy Prophet Muhammad?
28. If, in spite of the hadith "*la nabiyya ba'di*" ("There is no prophet after me"), Jesus can still appear after the Holy Prophet, then what words of the Arabic language would the Holy Prophet have used to say that "There is no prophet after me"?
29. In the hadith, narrated by Nawas bin Sam'an and recorded in the collection of Hadith of *Muslim*, about the second advent of the Messiah, the words *nabi Allah* (prophet of God) are applied to the Messiah four times. What is the interpretation of this term "nabi

Allah" in view of the *Khatam al-nabiyyin* verse of the Holy Qur'an, and the hadith *la nabiyya ba'di*?

30. The Holy Qur'an says that on the day of judgement every prophet will be a witness for his nation, and the Holy Prophet Muhammad will be a witness for the Muslim nation. Is not the advent of Jesus amongst the Muslim in the latter days contradicted by this verse?
31. If Jesus, at his second advent, will not be a prophet (*nabi*) but a follower (*ummati*) of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, then would this not be against the Quranic verse: "And We sent no messenger but that he should be obeyed by God's command" (4:64), i.e., a prophet is himself a leader, not a follower of another prophet?
32. The *istikhlaf* verse in the Holy Qur'an (24:55) contains God's promise that, after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, *khulafa'* (successors) will be raised amongst the Muslims to establish and strengthen Islam, these successors being the *likes* of the Israelite prophets. Now even if Jesus were to appear amongst the Muslims as a successor to the Holy Prophet, rather than as a prophet, this would, or would it not, contradict the above verse which refers to the *likes* of the Israelite prophets, not actual Israelite prophets?
33. If someone believes that Jesus, like other prophets, is dead, and that all hadith speaking of the descent, or second advent, of the Messiah were fabricated as a result of Magian and Persian religious thought, and that these hadith are contradictory to the true Quranic spirit, is such a person a Muslim or not?

Section 4

34. A large number of Muslim sages and scholars of the past have used the terms referred to in question 15 of Zill, Buruz, etc., in their writings. Were they correct in so doing, or did they try to mislead the Muslims by adopting aspects of Hindu religious thought, or did they aim to serve Islam by using these terms? Why did they use these terms, and what do you think of any other person who uses them? Some of these sages, holy men, and scholars are : Sayyid 'Abdul Qadir Jilani; Shaikh Akbar Muhiyuddin 'Arabi; Shaikh Ahmad of Sirhind, the Mujaddid Alf Thani; Shah Wali Allah Muhaddith Dehlvi; Shah 'Abdul 'Aziz; and Sayyid Muhammad Isma'il Shahid; etc., etc.
35. The traditionists and jurists of Islam (*muhaddithin and fuqaha*) and other Islamic scholars, have coined many terms in fields of Hadith and Jurisprudence. Are these terms un-Islamic because they were coined after the time of the Holy Prophet Muhammad?

And, if these terms are Islamic then why are terms coined by the Sufis un-Islamic?

36. There have been thousands of Muslim sages who, having reached the status of *fana fir-rasul* (utterly lost in the Holy Prophet), have called themselves Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, and Ahmad. Some have even called themselves *nabi* (prophet) and *rasul* (messenger of God), and many substituted their own name in the *kalimah tayyibah* (declaration of faith). For example,

a. Hazrat Sayyid Abdul Qadir Jilani said: "My prophethood was in the concealed knowledge of Allah. I was with the light of the Holy Prophet Muhammad in his lights."

b. Abu Bakar Shibli, while taking the *bai'at* from a disciple, told him to recite

لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ شَيْبَلِي رَسُولُ اللَّهِ

La i-laa-ha il-lallah Shibli Rasoolallah

i.e. "There is no god but Allah, Shibli is His Messenger."

c. Similarly, Khwaja Mu'in-ud-Din Chishti told a disciple to recite :

لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ چشتی رَسُولُ اللَّهِ

La i-laa-ha il-lallah Chishti Rasoolallah

i.e. "There is no god but Allah, *Chishti* is His Messenger".

d. Maulana Ashraf 'Ali Thanavi, in reply to a letter from a disciple of his, told him that he (the disciple) had been acting in accordance with the *Sunnah* when he had recited:

La i-laa-ha il-lallah Ashraf Ali Rasoolallah Allahumma Swalli ala Sayyidina wa Nabiyyina wa Maulana Ashraf Ali

i.e.: "There is no god but Allah, Ashraf 'Ali is His Messenger. O Allah! exalt the master, prophet, and Maulana, Ashraf 'Ali."

e. The famous Persian mystic, Maulana Jalal-ud-Din Rum has written : "for he (the spiritual leader) is the prophet of the age, O disciple, because he clearly manifests the light of prophethood".

f. Hazrat Farid-ud-Din Mas'ud-ul-Ma'ruf of Pak Patan said:

"I am 'Ali, I am a *wali*, I am a prophet".

مَنْ عَلِيٌّ مَنْ وَالِيٌّ مَنْ نَبِيٌّ

g. The famous Indian Muslim leader of the early nineteenth century, Sayyid Muhammad Isma'il Shahid writes: "The *muhaddaths* also are called *rasul* (messengers of God)."

Section 5

37. Every person belonging to the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement believes unconditionally, that the Holy Prophet Muhammad is the *Khatam al-Nabiyyin* and the last of the prophets; and that the Imam of the age, the *Mujaddid* (Reformer) of the fourteenth century of Islam, and the Promised Messiah, viz., *Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib* of Qadian did not claim to be a prophet. *Hazrat Mirza Sahib* declared time and again that "I consider any claimant to prophethood after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the last of the messengers, to be a liar and a disbeliever", and "I, too, curse the claimant to prophethood".

Every Ahmadi affirms in words, and believes in his heart, the *kalimah tayibah*, i.e., "There is no god but Allah, and Muhammad is His Messenger"; believes the Holy Qur'an to be the final authority for his material and spiritual guidance; considers compulsory the established institutions of *Salat* (prayer), *Saum* (fasting), *Zakat* (regular charity), and *Hajj* (pilgrimage to Makkah); believes himself to be a devotee and follower of the Holy Prophet Muhammad; and, he is proud to be called a Muslim.

As *Hazrat Mirza Sahib* was a Reformer for both the formal and the spiritual aspects of Islam (*Shari'ah* and *Tariqah*), he has also used, in his writings, the terms coined by the Sufis which have always been current among them. A person using these terms is *not* a prophet but a righteous, holy man (*wali*). Prophethood has terminated with the Holy Prophet Muhammad but sainthood (*walayah*) continues.

The Lahore Ahmadiyyah Movement has throughout subscribed to, and publicised, the beliefs given above. If, despite adhering to these beliefs, the members of the Lahore Ahmadiyah Movement are non-Muslims, then pray tell us what characteristic or distinctive mark of being a Muslim is there that you possess which the Ahmadis do not? Further, if you have devised some declaration other than the *kalimah tayyibah* for converting a person to Islam, then tell us what it is, so that it may be used to make Ahmadis Muslims.

If the Muslim religious leaders, scholars, and theologians, who declare their fellow-Muslims as disbelievers, had been honest, God-fearing, and true well-wishers of Islam and the Muslims, they would have declared it a sin to dub any Muslim as a *kafir*, instead of themselves calling Muslims as *kafirs*. Thus the Muslim nation would have been consolidated, the curse of sectarianism lifted for ever, the disruptive issues raised by the religious scholars ended, and there would have been in the world *one kalimah* and *one Islam* and *one Muslim nation*.

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 Imams (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 as various branches of a tree. There might be several differences on minor points but all of them agree on the Qur'an and the Prophet Muhammad.
4. Obedience to the law of Shari'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'an.
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 co-operation with the Imam 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 Muhammad, the devotion to the cause of Islam and goodwill for mankind in general and for the community of Muhammad in particular should be given priority over everything else in one's life.