

Notes

compiled by the Editor

Note 1 (page 4)

Sahīh Bukhārī, Book 60: *Kitāb al-anbiyā* (Prophets), ch. 50.

Note 2 (page 8)

First we quote a few of the Promised Messiah's announcements denying the allegation that he claimed to be a prophet:

“I have heard that some leading Ulama of this city [Delhi] are giving publicity to the allegation against me that I lay claim to prophethood. ... these allegations are an entire fabrication, I do not make a claim to prophethood. ... After our leader and master, Muhammad *mustafa*, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, the last of the messengers, I consider anyone who claims prophethood and apostleship to be a liar and *kāfir*.” (Statement issued 2 October 1891. *Majmū'a Ishtihārāt*, vol. 1, pp. 230–231)

“Those people have fabricated a lie against me who say that I claim to be a prophet.” (*Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā*, p. 8)

“By way of a fabrication, they slander me by alleging that I have made a claim to prophethood and that I deny miracles and the angels. It should be remembered that all this is a fabrication. Our belief is that our leader and master, Muhammad *mustafa*, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, is the *Khātam-ul-anbiyā*, and we believe in the angels, miracles, and all the doctrines of the *Ahl-i Sunna*.” (*Kitāb-ul-Barriyya*, p. 182, footnote)

“I make no claim to prophethood. This is your mistake, or you have some motive in mind.” (*Jang Muqaddas*, p. 67)

“Another stupidity is that, in order to provoke the ignorant people, they say that I have claimed prophethood. This is a complete fabrication on their part.” (*Haqīqat-ul-Wahy*, p. 390)

Some quotations where he has denied claiming to be a prophet while affirming his claim to be a *muhaddas*, are given below:

“*Question:* In the booklet *Fath-i Islām* a claim to prophethood has been made (by Hazrat Mirza). *Answer:* There is no claim of prophethood; on the contrary, the claim is of being a *muhaddas*, which has been put forward by the command of God.” (*Izāla Auhām*, p. 421)

“I have not claimed prophethood, nor have I said to them that I am a prophet ... I did not say anything to the people except what I wrote in my books, namely, that I am a *muhaddas* and God speaks to me as He speaks to the *muhaddases*.” (*Hamāmat al-Bushrā*, p. 79)

“I am not a prophet but a *muhaddas* from God, and a recipient of Divine revelation.” (*Ā’īnah Kamālāt Islām*, p. 383)

“Because our master and apostle the Holy Prophet Muhammad is the *Khātam al-anbiyā*, and no prophet can come after him, therefore in this (Islamic) Shariah prophets have been replaced by *muhaddases*.” (*Shahādat al-Qur’ān*, p. 27)

Note 3 (page 8)

As is clear from these words, it is a *muhaddas*, a non-prophet, who is being described as possessing “imperfect prophethood”. This does not denote prophethood. As to why the term “imperfect prophethood” was used to refer to a *muhaddas*, see the explanation on page 65.

Note 4 (page 12)

The term “partial prophethood”, which is synonymous with “imperfect prophethood”, is based on the Saying of the Holy Prophet Muhammad in Bukhari, given elsewhere in this book, that “the vision of a true believer is one-forty-sixth part of prophethood” (see page 63). Therefore a *mujaddid* or *muhaddas* who is not a prophet, but is spoken to by God, is referred to as possessing *partial* or a *part of* prophethood.

Note 5 (page 12)

As an example, Mufti Muhammad Sadiq, who became a prominent Qadiani missionary after the Split, published the following report of his meeting in 1910 with the famous Muslim historian and writer Maulana Shibli, in the Ahmadiyya newspaper *Badr*:

“Shibli asked if we believe Mirza sahib to be a prophet. I replied that our belief in this respect was the same as that of other Muslims, viz., that the Holy Prophet Muhammad is the *Khātam-un-nabiyyin*. After him, no other prophet can come, neither new nor old. However, the phenomenon of Divine revelation still continues, but even that is through the agency of the Holy Prophet. By receiving spiritual benefit from him, there have been men among the Muslims who had the privilege of Divine revelation, and in future too there shall be such. As Hazrat Mirza sahib was also privileged with Divine revelation, and in his revelations God gave him many news of the future as prophecies, which were fulfilled, for this reason Mirza sahib was one who made prophecies. Such a one is called *nabī* in the Arabic language.” (*Badr*, 27 October 1910).

Note 6 (page 14)

Maulana Muhammad Ali also compiled a more comprehensive Urdu book on this issue under the title *Radd Takfīr Ahl-i Qibla*, i.e., “Refutation of Calling Muslims as Kāfir,” first published in 1916 and expanded in 1920. Several editions of this book have appeared since then, and an English translation of this work is under preparation.

Note 7 (page 24)

Sahīh Bukhārī, Book 61 (*Kitāb al-Manāqib*), ch. 17.

Sahīh Muslim, *Kitāb al-Fazā'il*, ch. ‘Names of the Holy Prophet’.

Note 8 (page 36)

Sahīh Bukhārī, Book 65: *Kitāb al-Tafsīr*, Commentary on the chapter *As-Saff*.

Note 9 (page 48)

Rūhānī Khazā'in, No. 2, *Malfūzāt*, vol. 4, pp. 197–198.

Note 10 (page 55)

Sahih Bukhari, Book 64: *Kitāb al-Maghāzī* (Expeditions), ch. 80.

Note 11 (page 55)

Tirmizī, Abwāb al-Fitan.

Note 12 (page 56)

Sahih Bukhari, Book 61: *Kitāb al-Manāqib*, ch. 18.

Note 13 (page 56)

Tirmizī, Abwāb al-Manāqib, under Umar.

Note 14 (page 57)

Sahih Muslim, Kitāb al-Masājid wa mawādi' as-salāt. The words found in this report are: *Khutima biy an-nabiyyun*, meaning “Prophets have come to an end with me.”

Note 15 (page 62)

Sahih Bukhari, Book 62: *Kitāb Fazā'il al-ashāb*, ch. 6.

Note 16 (page 63)

Sahih Bukhari, Book 92: *Kitāb al-Ta'bīr*, ch. 5.

Note 17 (page 63)

Sahih Bukhari, Book 92: *Kitāb al-Ta'bīr*, ch. 4.

Note 18 (page 64)

The word *rasūl* is used in the Holy Quran (12:50) to refer to an ordinary messenger sent by a king to Joseph. In a hadith report in *Sahih Bukhari* a man sent with a message by the Holy Prophet has been called a *rasūl* (book 10: *Kitāb al-Azān*, ch. 51), and in another report such a man has been called *rasūl* of the *rasūl* of Allah (book 64: *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*, ch. 81).

Note 19 (page 64)

The application of the word *prophet* in classical Islamic literature to those who are really saints is acknowledged by modern Muslim Ulama. Allama Khalid Mahmud, a present-day opponent of the Ahmadiyya Movement, has quoted verses of poetry by the renowned Persian saint Jalal-ud-Din Rumi, and given the following explanation:

“In this respect, the Maulana (Rumi) refers to every spiritual guide who follows the *Sunna* as metaphorically a prophet (as in): ‘*O disciple, he (your spiritual guide) is the nabī of his time, for he shows the light of the Prophet.*’” (Book ‘*Aqīqat al-Umma fī ma’nī Khatam an-nubuwwat*, p. 112)

Note 20 (page 70)

Elsewhere the Promised Messiah has clearly explained that one who is *fanā fir-rasūl* and the *burūz* of a prophet is a saint (*muhaddas*) and non-prophet. Such a one is not a prophet. For instance, he writes:

“The whole Muslim *Umma* is agreed that a non-prophet takes the place of a prophet as a *burūz*. This is the meaning of the hadith: The learned ones of my *Umma* are like the prophets of Israel.” (*Ayyām-us-Sulh*, p. 163)

“... one who in other words is known as a *muhaddas* ... due to his complete following of the Holy Prophet and being *fanā fir-rasūl*, is included in the being of the Last of the Messengers, as the fraction is included in the whole.” (*Izāla Auhām*, p. 575)

Note 21 (page 71)

Majmū’a Ishtihārāt, vol. 1, pp. 312–314. The declaration is dated 3rd February 1892, issued at Lahore, and it brought to an end a debate with a Maulvi Abdul Hakim which had been going on for a few days.

Note 22 (page 73)

The following are some examples from *Izāla Auhām*, in addition to the extracts given by the author in the main body of the book:

“Our Holy Prophet’s being the *Khātam-un-nabiyyin* is a bar to the coming of any other prophet.” (p. 575)

“The Holy Quran does not permit the coming of any apostle (*rasūl*) after the *Khātam-un-nabiyyin*, whether he would be a new apostle or a former one.” (p. 761)

At one place, having quoted the *Khātam-un-nabiyyin* verse in Arabic, he translates it into Urdu and then explains it, as follows:

“Muhammad is not the father of any man from among you, but he is the Apostle of God and *the one to end the prophets*. This

verse, too, clearly argues that after our Holy Prophet no apostle (*rasūl*) shall come into the world.” (p. 614)

He has here translated the term *Khātam-un-Nabiyyin* into Urdu as “the one to end the prophets”.

Note 23 (page 73)

The actual words are as follows:

“God the Most High would never tolerate such disgrace and humiliation for this *Umma*, nor such an insult and affront to His chosen Prophet, the *Khātam-ul-anbiya*, that by sending a messenger with whom it is essential that angel Gabriel must come, He should **oust the religion of Islam**, while He has promised not to send any messenger after the Holy Prophet Muhammad. The students of Hadith have certainly made a serious error in presuming, by seeing the word ‘Jesus’ or ‘son of Mary’, that that very same son of Mary who was a messenger of Allah shall descend from heaven. It did not occur to them that his coming would be tantamount to **the demise of Islam from the world.**” (*Izāla Auhām*, p. 586)

Note 24 (page 73)

For instance, he wrote in different books:

“It does not befit God that He should send a prophet after the *Khātam-un-nabiyyin*, or that He should re-start the system of prophethood after having terminated it.” (*Ā’īnah Kamālāt Islām*, p. 377)

“We have no need of a prophet after Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him.” (*Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā*, p. 49)

“This very thing has been disclosed to me that the doors of real prophethood are fully closed after the *Khātam-un-Nabiyyin*, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him. No new prophet can now come, according to the real meaning, nor can a past prophet.” (*Sirāj Munīr*, p. 3)

“The actual fact, to which I testify with the highest testimony, is that our Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, is the *Khātam-ul-anbiyā*, and after him no prophet is

to come, neither an old one nor a new one.” (*Anjām Ātham*, p. 27, footnote)

“How could it be permitted that, despite our Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, being the *Khātam-ul-anbiyā*, some other prophet should appear sometime and the revelation of prophethood commence.” (*Ayyām-us-Sulh*, p. 47)

Note 25 (page 73)

Some quotations from the books of the Promised Messiah in this respect are given below:

“*Muhammad is not the father of any man from among you, but he is the Messenger of God and the Khatam-un-nabiyyin.*’ Do you not know that the Merciful God has declared our Holy Prophet unconditionally to be the *Khatam-ul-anbiya*, and in explanation of this verse our Prophet has said: *‘There is no prophet after me’.*” (*Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā*, p. 20)

“The Holy Prophet had repeatedly said that no prophet would come after him, and the hadith *‘There is no prophet after me’* was so well-known that no one had any doubt about its authenticity. And the Holy Quran, every word of which is absolute, in its verse *‘he is the Messenger of God and the Khatam-un-nabiyyin’* confirmed that prophethood has, in fact, ended with our Holy Prophet.” (*Kitāb-ul-Barriyya*, p. 184, footnote.)

“The return of Jesus is not mentioned anywhere in the Holy Quran, but the ending of prophethood is mentioned perfectly clearly. To make a distinction between the coming of an old prophet [i.e., Jesus] and a new prophet is mischievous. Neither the Hadith nor the Quran make such a distinction, and the negation contained in the Hadith report *‘There is no prophet after me’* is general. What audacity, boldness and insolence it is to depart from the clear meaning of the Quran, in pursuit of one’s feeble conjectures, and believe in the coming of a prophet after the *Khātam-ul-anbiyā!*” (*Ayyām-us-Sulh*, p. 146)

“By saying *‘There is no prophet after me’*, the Holy Prophet closed the door absolutely to any new prophet or a returning prophet.” (*Ayyām-us-Sulh*, p. 152)

Note 26 (page 76)

The term *zillī nubuwwat* had been devised by Sufi saints and writers to refer to sainthood (*wilāyat*) which continues among Muslims after the ending of prophethood. The Promised Messiah has also explained this term in this sense several times in his writings, as for example:

“Sainthood is the perfect *zill* of prophethood.” (*Hujjat-ullāh*, p. 24)

“The prophet is the real thing, and a saint is the *zill*.” (*Karāmat-us-Sādiqīn*, p. 85)

“I firmly believe that our Holy Prophet Muhammad is the *Khātam-ul-anbiyā*, and after him no prophet shall come for this *Umma*, neither new nor old. ... Of course, *muhaddases* will come who will be spoken to by God, and possess some attributes of full prophethood by way of *zill*, and in some ways be coloured with the colour of prophethood. I am one of these.” (*Nishān Āsmānī*, p. 28)

These extracts show that “a prophet by way of *zill*” is a *walī* or *muhaddas* and not a prophet. The last extract clearly affirms, firstly, that no prophet can come after the Holy Prophet, secondly that it is a *muhaddas* who is a *zill* (or reflection) of prophets, and thirdly that the Promised Messiah is a *muhaddas*.

Note 27 (page 77)

The Promised Messiah has given the following explanation of why in Hadith reports the word *nabī* has occurred only about the coming Messiah, and not about Muslim saints generally:

“As the Holy Prophet Muhammad was the *Khātam-ul-anbiyā* and no prophet was to come after him, therefore if all the successors of the Holy Prophet had been called by the term *nabī* then the doctrine of the finality of prophethood would have been thrown into doubt. And if no person at all had been called by the word *nabī* the objection would have remained that there was no likeness [between the Israelite prophets and Muslim saints] because the successors of Moses were prophets. So Divine wisdom ordained that first many successors be sent for the sake of the finality of prophethood, and they be not called by the name *nabī* nor given such a rank, so that this be an evidence of the finality of prophethood. Then the last successor, that is, the

Promised Messiah, be called by the name *nabī* so that the two series [of successors to Moses and successors to the Holy Prophet] be proved to be similar.” (*Tazkirat-ush-Shahādatain*, p. 43)

Here the Promised Messiah affirms in clear words that no prophet can come after the Holy Prophet, and that this doctrine would have been undermined if the word *nabī* had been generally used about Muslim saints in Hadith reports (even though it would be metaphorical). This was why only one individual, i.e., the coming Messiah, was chosen to receive this title, and that too for a certain necessity. And he arose at a time when the doctrine of finality had become so firmly established, over the centuries, that it would be clear that the word *nabī* was only being used about him in a non-real, metaphorical sense.

Note 28 (page 78)

See *Tirmizī*, *abwāb al-ḥitan*. While the hadith report in *Sahīh Muslim* contains the words “the prophet of God, Jesus, and his companions” four times, the report in *Tirmizī* which has almost the same text has merely the words “Jesus son of Mary and his companions” in two of these places and “Jesus and his companions” in the other two.

The Promised Messiah has given the following explanation of this hadith of *Sahīh Muslim*:

“In *Sahīh Muslim* there is a hadith report that the Messiah shall come as a prophet of God. Now if, in a metaphorical sense, by ‘Messiah’ or ‘son of Mary’ is meant a Muslim figure who holds the rank of *muhaddas*, then no problem arises.” (*Izāla Auhām*, p. 586)

“The title ‘prophet of God’ for the coming Messiah, which is to be found in *Sahīh Muslim* etc. from the blessed tongue of the Holy Prophet, is in the same metaphorical sense as it is used in the books of the Sufis as an accepted, common expression for [a recipient of] Divine inspiration. Otherwise, how can there be a prophet after the *Khātam-ul-anbiyā*.” (*Anjām Ātham*, p. 28)

“Calling the coming Messiah as ‘prophet’, which occurs in Hadith, is not meant in the true sense.” (*Sirāj Munīr*, p. 3)

Note 29 (page 81)

The following Hadith reports may be given:

“No man accuses another man of being a sinner or of being a *kāfir* but it reflects back on him if the other is not as he called him.” (*Sahih Bukhārī*, Book 78: *Kitāb al-ādāb*, ch. 44.)

“If a Muslim calls another as *kāfir*, then if he is a *kāfir* let it be so; otherwise, he [the caller] is himself a *kāfir*.” (*Abū Dawūd*, Book of *Sunna*, Vol. iii, p. 484 of edition published by Quran Mahal Publishers, Karachi.)

Note 30 (page 82)

The reference is to Maulvi Abdul Haqq Ghaznavi. The Promised Messiah writes:

“Let it be clear to the readers that Mr. Abdul Haqq had asked for a *mubāhila*. But I cannot understand how a *mubāhila* could be permissible regarding those matters of difference which do not make either party into a *kāfir* or an unjust one. It is clear from the Holy Quran that in a *mubāhila* each party must believe that the party opposite is a liar, i.e., is deliberately deviating from the truth, and is not merely mistaken, so that each side is able to say: ‘May the curse of Allah be upon the liars!’ Now if Mr. Abdul Haqq considers me to be a liar due to his wrong judgment, I do not call him a liar but believe him to be in error, and it is not allowable to curse a Muslim who is merely in error.” (*Izāla Auhām*, p. 637)

A few days before his death, the Promised Messiah referred to this incident during his conversation with Mr. Fazl-i Husain as follows:

“A man asked me to hold a *mubāhila* with him. I said that *mubāhila* was not permissible between two Muslims. He wrote in reply: We consider you to be totally a *kāfir*.” (The reference is as in the Note below.)

Note 31 (page 83)

See *Rūhānī Khazā'in*, No. 2, *Malfūzāt*, vol. 10, pp. 376–377. The exchange took place on 15 May 1908, eleven days before the death of the Promised Messiah.

Note 32 (page 87)

Writing after the death of Khwaja Ghulam Farid, the Promised Messiah paid him the following tribute:

“To sum up, God had granted Khwaja Ghulam Farid an inner light by which he could distinguish between a truthful one and a liar at one glance. May God envelope him in mercy, and grant him a place near Him — *Ameen*.” (*Haqīqat-ul-Wahy*, pp. 208–209)

The concluding words of prayer above can only be used in respect of one whom you regard as a fellow-Muslim.

Note 33 (page 87)

In his *Anwār-i-Khilāfat*, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad writes:

“Now another question remains, that is, as non-Ahmadis are deniers of the Promised Messiah, this is why funeral prayers for them must not be offered, but if a young child of a non-Ahmadi dies, why should not his funeral prayers be offered? He did not call the Promised Messiah as *kāfir*. I ask those who raise this question, that if this argument is correct, then why are not funeral prayers offered for the children of Hindus and Christians, and how many people say their funeral prayers? The fact is that, according to the *Sharī`ah*, the religion of the child is the same as the religion of the parents. So a non-Ahmadi's child is also a non-Ahmadi, and his funeral prayers must not be said. ...

“This leaves the question that if a man who believes Hazrat Mirza sahib to be true but has not yet taken the *bai`at*, or is still thinking about Ahmadiyyat, and he dies in this condition, it is possible that God may not punish him. But the decisions of the *Sharī`ah* are based on what is outwardly visible. So we must do the same thing about him, and not offer funeral prayers for him.” (*Anwār-i-Khilāfat*, pp. 91–93)

This clearly shows that M. Mahmud Ahmad regarded non-Ahmadi Muslims as being outside Islam, like Hindus or Christians.

Note 34 (page 87)

Fatāwā Ahmadiyya, dated 18th April 1902. See *Rūhānī Khazā'in* No. 2, *Malfūzāt*, Vol. 3, p. 276.

Note 35 (page 87)

Letter to Mian Ghulam Qadir of Jeonjal (district Gujrat), dated 12 May 1907. A facsimile of this letter is reproduced in Maulana Muhammad Ali's book *Radd Takfīr Ahl-i Qibla*.

Note 36 (page 88)

Nearly forty years later, in 1953, at the Munir Court of Enquiry (set up by the government of the Punjab in Pakistan to enquire into the causes of the anti-Ahmadiyya agitation which had taken place), Mirza Mahmud Ahmad admitted the existence of the letter. The Report of the Court of Enquiry records:

“The position finally adopted by the Ahmadis [i.e., the party of M. Mahmud Ahmad] before us on the question of funeral prayers is that an opinion of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has now been discovered which permits the Ahmadis to join the funeral prayers of other Muslims who are not *mukazzibs* and *mukaffirs* of Mirza Sahib.” (p. 199)

Mark the words: *has now been discovered!* Maulana Muhammad Ali had been referring M. Mahmud Ahmad to this letter since the year of the Split, some forty years earlier, and pressing him to give his considered conclusion about what it implies.

Note 37 (page 91)

Rūhānī Khazā'in, No. 2, *Malfūzāt*, vol. 10, pp. 377–378.

Note 38 (page 91)

Printed in *Badr*, 24–31 December 1908, p. 5.

Note 39 (page 92)

A facsimile of this letter is reproduced in Maulana Muhammad Ali's book *Radd Takfīr Ahl-i Qibla*.