

## 2. Prophet Muhammad is the 'coming Ahmad'

I shall now take the three doctrines which M. Mahmud is promulgating and which are opposed to the teachings of the Promised Messiah. I take first the question whether Ahmad was not a name of the Holy Prophet Muhammad and whether the prophecy of Jesus relating to the appearance of a messenger named Ahmad was not fulfilled by the advent of the Holy Prophet. I give it precedence over the other questions, both because the idea that the prophecy of the advent of the messenger named Ahmad was fulfilled by the appearance of the Promised Messiah seems to have been the nucleus about which the doctrine of his prophethood was formed, this being the first question brought into prominence by M. Mahmud after the dissension of 1914, and because it illustrates how it was after the death of the Promised Messiah that these doctrines grew up.

To make this point clear, I would refer the reader to M. Mahmud's own admission made in *Anwār-i-Khilāfat* on p. 21 in the following words:

“When I heard this in the beginning from the *first khalīfa*, I did not at first accept it and many discussions were held about it. But when I pondered over it, Almighty God expanded my breast concerning it and He granted me conclusive arguments and shining proofs and I accepted the idea.”

This shows clearly that he had not heard anything about this doctrine in the life-time of the Promised Messiah, but that it was after his death and in the time of the first *khalīfa* that he changed

his old views for the new ones. I may add here that the allegation concerning the first *khalīfa* is absolutely wrong. It was not the first *khalīfa*, but Zahīr-ud-Din, the author of *Nabī Ullāh kā Zahūr*, from whom he had taken up these ideas, and the first *khalīfa* had even gone so far as to pronounce an order of excommunication against Zahīr-ud-Din on account of *his beliefs*. The admission clearly shows that the basis of the novel doctrines was laid after the death of the Promised Messiah, and this is a point of utmost importance in this discussion.

### **Was Ahmad not a name of the holy founder of Islam?**

Soon after being recognised the head of the Qadian section of the Ahmadiyya community, M. Mahmud, following the earlier example of Zahīr-ud-Din, began to preach through his lessons on the Quran, notes of which were published in his newspaper *Al-Fazl*, that Ahmad was not a name of the holy Founder of Islam and that therefore the prophecy of the advent of Ahmad referred to in the Holy Quran 61:6 was not fulfilled in his person, and that both the name and the prophecy belonged to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement. Stray notes relating to this subject continued to appear in the newspapers, but as the subject was fully discussed by M. Mahmud in his address to his section of the community in the annual gathering held at Qadian in December 1915, I would give quotations from that address, which was later on published in *Anwār-i-Khilāfat* after revision by him as acknowledged in a footnote on p. 18 of the volume. As some of his disciples are under the wrong impression that M. Mahmud does not deny Ahmad being a name of the Holy Prophet, I shall first have to quote some passages from the book bearing on this subject. The question is introduced on p. 18 of the book in the following words:

“Although I intended to speak on other subjects, but on account of the present dissension in the movement I think it necessary to speak a few words on two questions regarding which difference of opinion is held and these I take first.

“The first question is whether Ahmad was a name of the Promised Messiah or that of the Holy Prophet, and whether the verse of the chapter entitled *The Ranks* (61) in which good news has been given of a messenger named Ahmad relates to the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, or to the Promised Messiah.

“My belief is that this verse relates to the Promised Messiah and that he alone is Ahmad, but as against this it is alleged that Ahmad was the name of the Holy Prophet, and that to call anyone else Ahmad is derogatory to him. But the more I think the greater does my conviction grow and I hold the belief that the word *Ahmad* occurring in the Holy Quran relates only to the Promised Messiah.”

Again on p. 17 we find:

“And this does not mean that the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, was not Ahmad. He was Ahmad and certainly so but ‘Ahmad’ was his attribute not his name.... But notwithstanding this it is not lawful to say that Ahmad was a name of the Holy Prophet.”

Then follow arguments. Summed up briefly they are as follows: That the Holy Quran does not speak of the Holy Prophet being ‘Ahmad’, that there is no report showing that Ahmad was his name, that the name Muhammad, and not Ahmad, occurs in the *Kalimah* and in the *azān*, that the companions never addressed him by that name, and so on. How did then the name Ahmad come to be applied to the Holy Prophet as his proper name? This question is not answered in *Anwār-i-Khilāfat* but an answer to it is met with in an earlier writing by M. Mahmud called *Al-Qaul-ul-Fasl* and the reader will find the explanation very interesting:

“Therefore you should make further investigation about these references so that you may know how unreliable and untrustworthy are these reports which were fabricated

simply to avoid the objection of the Christians (who said) that you (i.e., the Muslims) say that the prophecy of Ahmad is contained in the Gospel but the name of your Prophet was not Ahmad.” (p. 30)

It is a pity that it never occurred to the writer of these lines that no Christian in the world ever said that Ahmad was not a name of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and both names Muhammad and Ahmad have been recognised by friend and foe. But M. Mahmud is very severe upon those who recognise Ahmad to be a name of the Prophet, so much so that he plainly states that such men do not deserve to be called believers. Here is what he writes on p. 24 of *Anwār-i-Khilāfat*:

“People had an excuse so long as the truth had not come, but now that facts have shown that by ‘Ahmad’ is meant a servant of the Holy Prophet, persisting (in the false belief) is not the way of the believers.”

And again on the same page, he says:

“Does not one who considers this prophecy to have been fulfilled in the person of the Holy Prophet charge the Quran with making a false statement that while the name Muhammad is written in the Gospel, the Quran mentions the name Ahmad. Let such a one consider on what dangerous ground does this act of his make him stand, and to fulfil his own whim he calls the Holy Quran as well as the Holy Prophet a liar.”

These statements show that in M. Mahmud’s opinion no one can remain a Muslim who entertains the belief that Ahmad was a name of the holy founder of Islam or that the prophecy referred to in 61:6 was fulfilled by his advent. A difference with him on this point amounts to calling the Holy Quran and the Holy Prophet a liar, and therefore those of his disciples who still believe that Ahmad was a name of the Holy Prophet and that the prophecy relating to the appearance of Ahmad was fulfilled in his person are, according to the verdict of their new master, guilty of giving the lie to the Holy Quran and the Holy Prophet.

## **Ahmad was Holy Prophet's name**

Was Ahmad not a name of the Holy Prophet? No one in the world, neither a friend nor a foe, ever uttered such words. Hirschfeld indeed has in his *New Researches* recently denied that the Holy Prophet bore originally either the name Muhammad or Ahmad, and thinks both forms to have been adopted later but he does not do this on the basis of any historical testimony but simply to establish a new theory. I cannot say whether M. Mahmud took up the idea from Hirschfeld, but there is no doubt that his theory like that of Hirschfeld has not the least historical testimony in its support. It is not sufficient at this late date simply to say that the Holy Prophet did not originally bear this or that name, for if a simple statement is sufficient to discredit all historical testimony, one might as well say that the Holy Prophet never existed at all. And if it is madness to make the latter statement, the denial that the Holy Prophet bore the name Muhammad or Ahmad cannot be characterized otherwise.

### **The Quran on *Ahmad* as Holy Prophet's name.**

The name Ahmad occurs in the Holy Quran itself and the Holy Book makes it plain that the messenger who bore the name Ahmad had made his appearance at the time of the revelation of this verse. Here are the words:

“And when Jesus son of Mary said: O Children of Israel, surely I am the apostle of Allah to you, verifying that which is before me of the Torah and giving the good news of an Apostle who will come after me, his name being Ahmad; but when he came to them with clear arguments, they said: This is clear enchantment.” (61:6.)

How strange that even such clear words are perverted! The prophesied apostle is here clearly stated to have already made his appearance — “but when he *came* to them” (*jā'a hum*) — when this verse was revealed, but according to this new theory, he had to come thirteen hundred years after the revelation of this verse! And what is the argument? The preterite is occasionally used in the Arabic language to denote the future when great certainty of

the befalling of an event is to be indicated, but there must always be circumstances entitling us to take a word in other than its original sense. There may be exceptions to rules but the exception is not the rule. The preterite may be used to denote the future but that does not mean that we can always take the past tense for the future. There must always be some circumstances entitling us to take a word in a tropical sense, otherwise words would lose their significance. For instance, the Holy Quran speaks of a Prophet like Moses having been sent, and uses the past tense:

“Surely We have sent to you an Apostle ... as We sent an apostle to Pharaoh”, (73:15)

the word *arsal-nā* used in the original being in the past tense. Would it be a sane interpretation to say that the words meant that a prophet like Moses shall be sent, because the preterite may in exceptional cases indicate the future. And thus interpreting the Holy Quran, one might as well say that Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, had not yet appeared, nor had the Holy Quran been revealed. In fact, adopting this rule of interpretation, anything might mean anything.

Thus the Holy Prophet's name Ahmad clearly occurs in the Holy Quran. The burden of proving that Ahmad was not a name of the Holy Prophet but simply an attribute, lies on him who asserts it. The name does occur in the Holy Quran and the word of God does speak of him as having already appeared, and he who denies it must show on the basis of the Holy Quran or any reliable Hadith report that Ahmad *was not* a name of the Holy Prophet. To shelve this insuperable difficulty by the simple assertion, for which not the shred of an argument exists, that by *he came* is meant *he shall come* is not in the least honourable. What must be shown is this that the Holy Quran or some reliable report denies that Ahmad was a name of the Holy Prophet, but to say nothing of these two unimpeachable sources, no one in the world, neither friend nor foe, has ever denied that Ahmad was a name of the Holy Prophet.

**Hadith reports on *Ahmad* as name of Holy Prophet.**

Next we come to reports of the highest authority, and fortunately here we have the clearest testimony that the Holy Prophet himself gave ‘Ahmad’ as one of his names. The report in which this saying of the Prophet is mentioned is accepted by both *Bukhari* and *Muslim*, and it runs thus:

“I heard the Holy Prophet say, Mine are five names: I am Muhammad and I am Ahmad and I am *Al-Māhi* (the obliterator) by whom God will obliterate unbelief, and I am *Al-Hāshir* (the gatherer) at whose feet the people shall be gathered and I am *Al-‘Āqib* (the last comer) and *Al-‘Āqib* is he after whom is no prophet.”<sup>7</sup>

The first narrator is Jubair, a companion of the Holy Prophet. The report does not stand alone but there are many others speaking of the name Ahmad. As for the report quoted above, it is alleged that as the last three names are simply attributive titles, so is also ‘Ahmad’, but this argument would deprive the Holy Prophet even of the name Muhammad. The distinction in fact is clear. The last three names are all preceded by the definite article *al* (the), but not so ‘Muhammad’ and ‘Ahmad’, and an explanation is given for every one of the last three names, but no explanation is given for ‘Muhammad’ and ‘Ahmad’, showing that these two are treated further as proper names of the Holy Prophet. Notwithstanding this, if anyone should say that *Al-Māhi* or *Al-Hāshir* or *Al-‘Āqib* was a name of the Prophet, no Muslim would deny it. Any person may have a name other than that given to him by his parents. For instance, the prophecy relating to the birth of Jesus is announced to Mary in the following words:

“O Mary, surely Allah gives you good news with a word from Him, of one whose name is the Messiah, Jesus son of Mary.” (3:44)

Now, as everybody knows, the parents gave the child only the name Jesus, yet it would be foolish to deny that the Messiah or Christ was a name of the founder of Christianity. Just as when

Jesus is spoken of, and everybody understands that the founder of Christianity is meant, so when *the Christ* or *the Messiah* is spoken of, although it is preceded by the definite article *the* (*al* in *al-Masīh*), yet there is not the least doubt in the mind of a hearer that the person spoken of is the founder of Christianity. In the same manner, *al-Māhi*, *al-Hāshir* and *al-‘Āqib* are the names of the Holy Prophet, but ‘Muhammad’ and ‘Ahmad’ enjoy further the honour of being proper names because they are not preceded by *al*. I need not lengthen the discussion by citing other reports giving the name Ahmad.

### **Arabic lexicons on Ahmad as name of Holy Prophet.**

I would now turn to lexicons. In the first place is the *Tāj-ul-‘Arūs* which, discussing the words *Muhammad* and *Ahmad* under the root *hamd*, says:

“And they are the most excellent of the names of the Holy Prophet, and no one is known to have been named Ahmad before the Holy Prophet, excepting what is related of Khizr, on whom be peace, that his name was this.”

The *Lisān-ul-‘Arab*, another voluminous lexicon, writes:

“And *Muhammad* and *Ahmad* are of the names of our Master, the *Mustafā*, the Apostle of God, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him.”

The *Mufradāt* of the famous Imam Raghīb has the following:

“And as to the word of God, ‘And giving the good news of an Apostle, who will come after me, his name being Ahmad,’ *Ahmad* points to the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, by his name and his deeds, (the significance being) that he shall be found to be one praised in his morals and in all matters relating to him; and the word *Ahmad* has been particularly chosen in what Jesus, on whom be peace, gave the good news of, to make it plain that he (i.e., Ahmad) shall be a greater Praiser than he and those before him.”



It will be seen that all the lexicons agree that Muhammad and Ahmad are both the names of the Holy Prophet. That is sufficient testimony as to Ahmad being a name of the Holy Prophet, for a dictionary must always be our greatest authority on the right application of a word, and when the best dictionaries of the language agree that Ahmad was a proper name of the Holy Prophet, and mention Ahmad along with Muhammad, thus giving the two names a distinction above all other names, no sensible person would think of starting a theory which is condemned by the simplest form of evidence.

### ***Sīras on Ahmad as name of Holy Prophet.***

Let us, however, turn to other authorities. We will take the *sīras*, i.e., lives of the Holy Prophet. Ibn-i-Hisham is the earliest authority on this point, and he mentions the name Ahmad several times. For instance, he cites a number of verses speaking of the Banī Nazīr in which the name Ahmad occurs three times.\* A little further on he quotes a number of verses speaking of the battle of the Ditch and the name Ahmad occurs here too, the name Muhammad not occurring so often. I quote the last mentioned verse here:

“So that, by God, we may help Ahmad until

“We are the sincere servants of truth.”

I need not here refer to other authorities all of which agree in stating that Ahmad was a name of the Holy Prophet.

### **Commentaries of Hadith on name *Ahmad*.**

All authorities on Hadith reports also agree that Ahmad was a name of the Holy Prophet. Similarly all those who have commented on the great collections of reports accept Ahmad to be a name of the Prophet. As an example of the first, I have already quoted *Bukhari*; as an example of the second I may quote the *Fath-ul-Bāri*, the most well-known commentary of Bukhari which also quotes another famous Imam. Commenting on

---

\*These are not the verses of Abu Talib regarding whose authenticity doubts have been entertained. — *Author's Note.*

*Bukhari* which, under the heading “What has been reported as to the names of the Holy Prophet”, mentions the saying relating to the five names already quoted and then quotes the verses of the Quran which contain the names Muhammad and Ahmad, the author of the *Fath-ul-Bāri* says:

“As if he (i.e., Imam Bukhari) points to the fact that these two names (i.e., *Muhammad* and *Ahmad*) are the most famous of his names, and the more famous of these two is *Muhammad*. And it is related that he was named Ahmad because it is a proper name based on an attribute.... ‘Ayaz says that the Apostle of God, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, was Ahmad before he was Muhammad as it happened externally, for his name Ahmad occurs in the previous sacred books.”

#### **M. Mahmud’s assertion about commentaries of the Quran.**

The most wonderful thing about this whole discussion is that in advancing the new theory M. Mahmud has made statements for which not the least ground exists. I have already referred to one such statement in which M. Mahmud has made the absolutely false allegation that reports speaking of the Prophet being named Ahmad were fabricated by the Muslims to avoid the objections of the Christians who said that the prophecy relating to the advent of Ahmad, as given in the Gospels, could not be applied to the Prophet of Islam because Ahmad was not his name. It is to be regretted that without quoting the objection of a single Christian he has been so daring in laying the charge of fabrication against the Muslims. That Ahmad was not a name of the Prophet is an idea which never entered into the heart of anyone in the world before the present controversy began. Another baseless allegation is the following statement occurring on p. 30 of his *Al-Qaul-ul-Fasl*:

“If you consult their books, the best commentaries are devoid of this subject. They have written either that this was a prophecy of the attribute of Ahmadiyyat... or they

have written that the fact is this that on the heavens his name was Ahmad.”

To show the baselessness of this allegation I am compelled to refer to some of the well-known commentaries, all agreeing in the one point that ‘Ahmad’ is an *‘alam* or a proper name of the Holy Prophet. I take first the *Rūh-ul-Ma‘ānī* which, commenting upon 61:6 where the name Ahmad occurs, says:

“And this grand name is *a proper name* of our Prophet Muhammad, and this is borne out by the verse of Hassan: God blesses the blessed Ahmad and so do those who are around His throne of Majesty and the pure ones.”

Another famous commentator, Abu Hayyān, says:

“It is related that the disciples (of Jesus) said, ‘O Messenger of God, will there be a people (*ummat*) after us?’ He said, ‘Yes, the followers of Ahmad, on whom be peace and blessings of God, (they shall be) philosophers, learned men, virtuous, God-fearing’ ... and Ahmad is a *proper name* derived from the aorist...”

I will quote one more commentary, the *Fath-ul-Bayān*, which, commenting upon the words *his name being Ahmad* occurring in 61:6, says:

“This is our Prophet, peace and the blessings of God be upon him, and this is *a proper name* derived from an attribute.”

Thus it will be seen that all the best commentators are agreed that Ahmad was a proper name of our Holy Prophet.

It is clear from this that the Holy Quran, the sayings of the Holy Prophet, verses compiled by the companions of the Holy Prophet, the historians, the collections of reports, the commentators, the great imams, the learned and the laymen, nay friends as well as foes, are all agreed that ‘Ahmad’ was a proper name of the Holy Prophet in the same manner as ‘Muhammad’.

### **Modern writers on *Ahmad* as name of Holy Prophet.**

During the thirteen hundred years that have elapsed since the birth of Islam, there has not been a single person in the whole world who should have denied that Ahmad was a name of the Holy Prophet, and as the question is really of a historical nature, it is not open to anyone to start a theory quite opposed to historical evidence of the strongest nature. Coming to our own days, I may cite two great writers, the one a friend and the other a foe, who both state that Ahmad was a name of the Holy Prophet. Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan writes in his *Essays on the Life of Muhammad*:

“Abdul Muttalib gave the name of *Muhammad* to the child, while Amena gave that of *Ahmad*, in obedience to the command of an angel who had appeared to her in a dream, thus accomplishing the prophecies both of the Old and the New Testament.”

Sir William Muir, speaking of the name *Muhammad*, says:

“Another form is *Ahmad*, which, having been erroneously employed as a translation of the Paraclete in some Arabic versions of the New Testament, became a favourite term with Muslims, especially in addressing Jews and Christians, for it was (they said) the title under which the Prophet had been in their books predicted.”

### **Promised Messiah's writings on *Ahmad* as name of Holy Prophet.**

I have already stated that M. Mahmud has confessed in his *Anwār-i-Khilāfat* that he changed his belief in relation to the prophecy of Ahmad after the death of the Promised Messiah, and that confession is in fact a sufficient testimony that the Promised Messiah was not guilty of the outrage to reason and history which M. Mahmud is offering in propounding his new theory. But strangely enough, notwithstanding the plain confession, it is alleged that the views now advanced by M. Mahmud were the views of his holy father. It is an absolutely false charge against

that great sage of the age. Not once did it escape his pen, in the thousands of pages that he has written, that Ahmad was not a name of the Holy Prophet. On the other hand, his writings are full of references to the two names of the Holy Prophet, *Muhammad* and *Ahmad*. I would content myself with quotations from two books. In *Najm-ul-Hudā*, printed in three languages, he writes:

“And may peace and the blessings of God be upon His *Ummi* Apostle whose name is Muhammad and Ahmad. These two names of his are such that when the names were presented to Adam, these two were presented before all others, for in the creation of this world these two names are the ultimate object, and in the knowledge of God they are the most excellent and the foremost. And it is on account of these two names that the Holy Prophet stands first among the prophets of the world.” (p. 2)

In *I'jāz-ul-Masīh* he devotes about twenty-five pages to the discussion of the two names, Muhammad and Ahmad, of the Holy Prophet, and repeatedly speaks of these two names being given to him by God Himself. I will quote a few passages:

“And he named our Prophet Muhammad and Ahmad as He named Himself the Beneficent and the Merciful (*Ar-Rahman* and *Ar-Rahim*).” (p. 99)

“So God named him Muhammad and Ahmad and did not give these two names to Jesus, nor to Moses.” (p. 105)

“So God named him Muhammad, hinting to the quality of belovedness in him, and named him Ahmad, pointing to the quality of love in him.” (p. 105)

“And there is no doubt that our Prophet was named Muhammad when God intended that He should make him beloved in His sight and the sight of the righteous; and in the same manner He named him Ahmad when the Holy One intended that He should make him a lover of His own person and lover of the faithful Muslims.” (p. 106)

“And for this reason was he made Muhammad and Ahmad by the Lord of the worlds.” (p. 114)

“So on account of this, God named him Muhammad and Ahmad ... so he is the best of those who are praised and the best of those who praised.” (p. 116)

I do not think such overwhelming testimony would leave any doubt in the mind of any sane person as to the fact that the Promised Messiah looked upon ‘Muhammad’ and ‘Ahmad’ as two names of the Holy Prophet, and while he speaks of them conjointly times without number, he never once makes the distinction that while Muhammad was a name, Ahmad was not a name but simply an attribute. The theory started by M. Mahmud thus stands condemned on every ground. Moreover it should be noted that the Promised Messiah speaks of the two names, Muhammad and Ahmad, as being given to him by God Himself. And it appears from certain reports that both the names Muhammad and Ahmad were made known in a vision, and thus it was God Who gave these two names to the Holy Prophet. When, therefore, the Promised Messiah says that God named the Holy Prophet ‘Muhammad’ and ‘Ahmad’, he refers to the vision. Both names may have been revealed in a single vision to the mother or in different visions. There is a number of reports which show that the angel had appeared to the Holy Prophet’s mother telling her to name the child Ahmad, and there is also one which shows that the child was to be named Muhammad. It was on account of this that the child received both the names Muhammad and Ahmad, the first, as Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan suggests, from the grandfather and the second from the mother.

### **Closing comments.**

I would now bring this subject to a close as I think more than sufficient evidence has been produced on this point. I may add, however, that the two names are derived from the same root *hamd*, and according to some they are only two different forms expressing the same significance, *the most praised*. But the more correct view is that *Ahmad* means *one who praises most* and

*Muhammad* means *one who is praised most*, and each is necessarily a counterpart of the other, because the greatest praiser of God would necessarily be himself most praised in the world. And it is a fact that no one in the world has praised God like the holy Founder of Islam, and anyone who opens any page of the Quran at random will bear testimony to this, and therefore it was necessary that he should have received the name Ahmad even before he received the name Muhammad, because he became the most praised only after being the greatest praiser. And the name Muhammad therefore became the more famous, because it was through that name that his glory was to shine out in the world in full brilliance.

As to the argument that if Ahmad had been a name of the Prophet, the *Kalimah* (the Islamic formula of faith) would have contained that name, or that at least it would have been lawful to read *Ahmad is the Apostle of Allah* instead of *Muhammad is the Apostle of Allah*, it is queer logic. It is a sign of the wonderful unity of Islam that the whole of the Muslim world is agreed in all principles of importance. Look to the Quran for instance. What a wonderful unity prevails in the whole Islamic world with respect to it. There were no doubt certain readings allowed by Divine revelation, but no written copy of the Quran substitutes any of these readings for the original words. The *Kalimah* is the one pillar of the Islamic faith and to allow any variations in it would be to destroy the unity of the faith. We know that the Holy Prophet was a Prophet (*nabī*) as well as an Apostle (*rasūl*), but the *Kalimah* adopts *Muhammad-ur Rasūl-Ullāh*, i.e., Muhammad is the apostle of Allah, and not *Muhammad-un Nabī-Ullāh*, i.e., Muhammad is the prophet of God. And because the word *nabī* does not occur in the *Kalimah* nor is it lawful for us to make such a change, are we entitled to draw the conclusion that Muhammad was only an apostle and not a prophet? If that conclusion is not right, what logic is there in drawing a similar conclusion from the absence of the word *Ahmad*. In fact, these words are taken from the Holy Quran and they are marked by the Prophet's stamp and no one has any right to change them. We can neither substitute *Ahmad* for *Muhammad*, nor *prophet* for

*apostle*. And indeed if such liberty had been allowed, M. Mahmud would have found in it a very strong argument of the legality of substituting a new *Kalimah* of the Promised Messiah! I have already stated that there is one clear reason why the name *Muhammad* has been adopted in the *Kalimah*, because that is the name which is expressive of the great and transcendent glory of the Holy Prophet, and Divine wisdom had ordained that the Prophet's glory shall be ever sung in the world as he had sung the glory of God.

## **Prophecy of Jesus fulfilled by Holy Prophet**

Based upon the denial of the name Ahmad for the Holy Prophet is the theory that the prophecy of Jesus Christ referred to in 61:6 was not fulfilled by the appearance of the Holy Prophet. The evidence produced above, therefore, really destroys the very foundation of that theory and no further discussion is needed on this point. The prophecy spoke of the advent of a messenger whose name shall be Ahmad, and as the Holy Prophet bore the name Ahmad, therefore the prophecy was clearly fulfilled. But even if we suppose for the sake of argument that Ahmad was not a name of the Holy Prophet and that it only expressed an attribute, the prophecy was still fulfilled by his appearance. M. Mahmud gives three reasons why the prophecy is not applicable to the Holy Prophet if it is not proved that Ahmad was a proper name of his:

“Therefore the apostle named Ahmad, whose advent is foretold in this verse, cannot be the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him. Yet if all the signs which pertain to the apostle named Ahmad had come to pass in his time, then no doubt we could say that what is meant by the name Ahmad in this verse was an apostle possessing the attribute of *Ahmadiyyat* or being Ahmad, for when all the signs were fulfilled in him, what reason was there to apply it to another. But this is not the case as I shall prove later on.



“Another case would have been this, that in the prophecy relating to Ahmad there had been any word on account of which we could not have applied it to anyone else...

“Thirdly, notwithstanding that the Holy Prophet’s name was not Ahmad, there could have been a reason in applying this prophecy to him if he had himself said that he was the ‘Ahmad’ spoken of in this verse. But Hadith reports do not show this... There is no mention in any report that the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, applied this verse to himself.”

Therefore if any of these three propositions is disproved, the case falls to the ground even without proving that Ahmad was a proper name of the Holy Prophet. Before dealing with these propositions, however, I would refer the reader to another point which settles the question. The statement in the Holy Quran is to the following effect:

“And giving the good news of an apostle who will come after me, his name being Ahmad, but when he came to them with clear arguments, they said, this is clear enchantment.”

Now the words translated *his name being Ahmad* are *ismu-hū Ahmad*, and the word *ism* which has been translated as meaning a *name* conveys that significance primarily, but is applied sometimes to a word denoting an attribute. It is this circumstance that enables the originator of the new theory to escape scrutiny, for where it suits his purpose, he takes the word *ism* as meaning a *name*, and when such a significance is opposed to his interest, he rejects it and asserts the meaning to be an attribute. But if it simply rests on our choice to give what significance we like to a word, why should we not take the word *ism* as meaning an attribute in the prophecy quoted above, and the prophecy of Jesus would therefore run thus:

“And giving good news of an apostle who will come after me, his attribute being *Ahmad*.”

M. Mahmud at least can have no reason to question the correctness of this significance, and thus the whole of his discussion relating to the *name* Ahmad proves abortive. And the statement that *ism* in the prophecy means an attribute and not a name finds support from the fact that prophecies do not generally contain names, and the particular prophecies of Jesus Christ to which reference may be possibly suggested in these words do not contain any name at all. As M. Mahmud admits that the attribute of being Ahmad (i.e., a praiser of the Divine Being) was manifested in the highest degree in the Holy Prophet, it is clear beyond all doubt that a prophecy speaking of an apostle possessing the attribute of being Ahmad was fulfilled in the advent of the holy Founder of Islam.

### **Holy Prophet did claim to fulfil Jesus' prophecy.**

The most powerful argument of M. Mahmud against the application of the prophecy to the Holy Prophet is that we do not meet with any report in which it should have been stated that the Holy Prophet had said that he was the Apostle spoken of in such and such a verse. But this is a clear fallacy. Such a statement would have been needed if the words of the Holy Quran had left any doubt on the point. But the words are clear which show that the Apostle whose advent was prophesied had already made his appearance when the verse was revealed, for the prophecy is immediately followed by the statement: "But when he came to them with clear arguments, they said: this is clear enchantment". The verse says clearly that the prophesied Apostle had already made his appearance, and we do not stand in need of further assurance from the lips of the Holy Prophet that he was the prophesied apostle of that verse. And even if such clear statements of the Quran cannot be accepted unless there is a saying of the Holy Prophet that such and such a prophecy was applicable to him, we shall have to give up the idea of the fulfilment of a single prophecy of the previous books in the person of the Holy Prophet.

I will make this clear by an example. The Holy Quran refers to the prophecy of Deut. 18:15–18 in the following words:

“Surely We have sent to you an Apostle ... as We sent an Apostle to Pharaoh.” (73:15)

The likeness of the Holy Prophet to Moses is clearly hinted at here; but do we find any report, authentic or unauthentic, reliable or unreliable, in the whole collection of reports according to which the Holy Prophet claimed to be the prophet spoken of in this verse of the Quran. And if we may be at liberty to misconstrue the Quran as M. Mahmud has done, we might as well say that as the preterite sometimes denotes the future, the words *innā arsalnā*, translated as meaning *we have sent*, mean *we shall send*, and that therefore the like of Moses had not yet appeared but that he shall appear in the future. Such examples could be multiplied to any extent but I refrain from this useless task.

It is clear from the above that when the Holy Quran itself makes a point clear beyond the shadow of a doubt, no saying of the Prophet is needed. The Quran says plainly that the prophesied Apostle had come and been called an enchanter, so what need is there for the Prophet to say that he is the Apostle whose advent is foretold in such and such a chapter of the Holy Quran? But fortunately we have on this point the clearest proof demanded by the originators of this theory. I have already quoted a saying of the Holy Prophet, part of which runs thus: “I am Muhammad and I am Ahmad”. Now the Quran quotes a prophecy speaking of the advent of Ahmad and a highly authentic report quotes the Holy Prophet as saying “I am Ahmad.” He must be an extraordinarily dull-brained man who cannot understand from this that he was the prophesied Ahmad. Ahmad shall come, says the prophecy; “I am Ahmad” says the Holy Prophet. Is it still doubtful that he applied the prophecy to himself? It is for this clear reason that the great *Bukhari* not only mentions that report speaking of Ahmad being a name of the Holy Prophet when commenting upon the verse containing the prophecy,<sup>8</sup> but when he mentions the same report through a different channel in another chapter entitled *The Names of the Holy Prophet*, he quotes the verse containing the prophecy relating to Ahmad’s appearance as a

preliminary to the saying “I am Muhammad and I am Ahmad”, thus pointing very significantly to the connection between the verse of the Quran (61:6) and the saying of the Holy Prophet. Thus there is in this case a clear statement from the lips of the Holy Prophet himself that he was the ‘Ahmad’ spoken of in 61:6.

Another report not only confirms the conclusion already arrived at, but settles the point still more conclusively. According to this, the Holy Prophet said:

“I am the prayer of my father Abraham, and the good news given by Jesus, and the vision of my mother.”

It is not difficult to see what is meant by these words. In the first place he calls himself the *prayer* of Abraham. This evidently refers to the prayer spoken of in the Holy Quran which runs thus:

“Our Lord! raise up in them an Apostle from among them who should recite to them Thy communications and teach them the Book and the wisdom, and purify them.” (2:129)

There is a prayer of Abraham in the Holy Quran for a prophet to be raised among the Arabs, and the Holy Prophet simply says that he is the prayer of Abraham and the conclusion is evident that the reference is to the words of 2:129 quoted above. Again he calls himself “the good news given by Jesus”, and it is equally easy to see the reference. Jesus had given “the good news of an Apostle who will come after me, his name being Ahmad” and evidently when the Holy Prophet said that he was *the good news given by Jesus* he referred to these very words. While all the prophets are spoken of as having foretold the advent of the Holy Prophet, Jesus alone is spoken of as giving *the good news* of his advent. The reason is not far to seek. Jesus was the last of the national prophets (i.e., prophets raised for the regeneration of a single nation), and therefore while those who went before him could only be said to have foretold of the advent of the great world-prophet, Jesus gave the *good news* that the time of his advent had now come, and the world was about to see the approach of the golden era of the universal brotherhood of man and the blotting out of all national and tribal distinctions. Others

could only point to his coming in the far future but Jesus could well give the good news that he for whom the world had waited so long was now coming. Hence also it is that Jesus uses the words *min ba'dī*, i.e., after me, because no other prophet had to make appearance after him except the one of whose advent he gave the good news. This is therefore the most conclusive evidence that the Holy Prophet even directly applied the prophecy to himself.

### **Prophecy referred to in the Quran is that of “Paraclete”.**

Another important point in this connection is whether the signs of the advent of the promised messenger are met with in the Holy Prophet. It should be borne in mind that these signs are not given in the Holy Quran which merely refers to the original prophecy of Jesus. The whole discussion therefore turns upon the one point: To which prophecy is reference contained in the words of the Quran? The Muslims have been unanimous in claiming that the reference in 61:6 is to the prophecy of the Paraclete contained in the 14th and 16th chapter of John, and no one has ever questioned the truth of this. The Christians have always contested the claims of the Quran by holding that by the *Paraclete* was not meant *Ahmad* but the Holy Ghost which came upon the disciples of Jesus on the day of Pentecost.

Let us then see if the Muslim claim is true. Referring to the name Ahmad, Sir William Muir says: “Another form is *Ahmad*, which, having been erroneously employed as a translation of the Paraclete in some Arabic versions of the New Testament, became a favourite term with Muslims”. Who made this Arabic version which rendered the Paraclete as *Ahmad*? Certainly it was not a Muslim but a Christian. That it was done erroneously is the excuse of Sir William Muir, and every zealous Christian would offer the same excuse. But that excuse cannot in any way benefit the Christians. Here we have the admission of an opponent of Islam that Paraclete was rendered as *Ahmad* in Arabic by some Christian translators of the New Testament, and this admission should set at rest the controversy between the Muslims and the Christians. The Paraclete is therefore no other than Ahmad, and

it is to this that a reference is found in a saying of the Holy Prophet in which is contained the statement that “my name in the Gospel is *Ahmad*”.

The point on which a decision had to be arrived at was this, whether the prophecy referred to in the Holy Quran in 61:6 is the same as that met with in John where the Paraclete is spoken of? I think that that point is sufficiently established. We would now consider if the Holy Quran has, in referring to the prophecy of Jesus, mentioned any peculiarity of that prophecy. It would be seen that four words have been chosen which speak of the four characteristics of the prophecy. In the first place, it is not stated to be a mere prophecy but it is characterized as *good news*; secondly, it is a prophecy relating to the appearance of a *rasūl* or Apostle; thirdly, that Apostle must come *after* Jesus; and fourthly, his name or his distinguishing characteristic would be that he is *Ahmad* or the greatest praiser of the Divine Being in the world.

We shall now take these four characteristics. How would Jesus’ prophecy be a good news? In the prophecy of his second advent he only speaks of the coming of great disasters, terrible earthquakes, world-wide wars, pestilences and famines. Now these are clear *warnings*, *not good news*, and therefore the prophecy of the second advent could not be called good news. But in the case of the Paraclete there are many clear statements showing that his advent shall indeed be a good news for the world. In the first place Jesus must depart but the Paraclete must “abide with you for ever.” That is indeed a good news. The reference in abiding for ever is clearly to the permanence of his law. Again, Jesus is unable to teach all things but the Paraclete “shall teach you all things,” that is, he shall give the world a perfect guidance. That too is good news. Similarly the other characteristics of the Paraclete all show that his coming shall be a source of great good news for the world. Hence the statement about his advent as good news for the world singles him out to be the Paraclete, while the words can have no reference to the prophecy of the second advent which is all a warning.

The second characteristic is that he shall be a *rasūl* or an Apostle. M. Mahmud says that if the prophecy had contained any such word as should have been inapplicable to any but the Holy Prophet, the prophecy would have been regarded as fulfilled by the advent of the Founder of Islam. I say the use of the word *rasūl* (apostle) in the prophecy fulfils this requirement, for the Holy Prophet being the last of the apostles according to the plain teachings of the Holy Quran, the word could not have been applicable to anyone coming after him. Moreover a *rasūl* or apostle is he who brings some great Divine message to the world. Now the prophecy of the second advent of Jesus is not attended with any statement as to the message he shall bring, but the prophecy of the Paraclete speaks plainly of the comer as teaching all those things which even Jesus could not teach, thus plainly showing that he was to deliver some great message to the world which should bring all the previous messages to perfection. Hence the mention of the word *rasūl* in the prophecy in the Quran clearly points to the fact that it contains a reference to the prophecy of the Paraclete and not to that of the second advent of Jesus.

The third characteristic is that Jesus is made to say that the promised Apostle shall come “after me,” and it is clear that the whole history of the human race is silent as to the appearance of any apostle after Jesus Christ except the Holy Prophet Muhammad. Why should have Jesus Christ used the words *after me* at all. If he had simply said that an apostle would come, as the prophecy of Moses said that a prophet like him would be raised, his meaning would still have been clear, for a prophecy does refer to some future event, and nobody would have supposed that the promised prophet should come before him. Why did he then say that an apostle would come after him? The conclusion is evident that he was referring to the prophet who should come next after him. The prophecy of Moses only said that a prophet would be raised, not that a prophet would be raised after him, and hence a number of prophets appeared after Moses who did not fulfil the prophecy. But Jesus prophesied that the promised Apostle would appear *after him*, and hence it was

necessary that the Apostle who appeared in the world next after him should be the promised Apostle. And the origin of these words is also met with in the prophecy of the Paraclete for it is there said that Jesus must go away in order that the promised one should come, and the Quran thus here again makes it plain that it is referring to the prophecy of the Paraclete.

The fourth characteristic is that he is called in the prophecy *Ahmad* or the greatest Praiser of the Divine Being. The prophecy of the Paraclete is again clearly referred to in this word, for it is in that prophecy that the Promised one is spoken of as doing the work which no prophet before him had done. Every prophet of God was a praiser of the Divine Being in that he led people into the ways of truth and thus established the praise of the Divine Being, but *Ahmad* meaning *the Greatest Praiser* clearly indicated that he would make truth perfect and lead people into the ways of goodness into which no prophet before him had ever been able to lead. And when Jesus describes the Paraclete, he attributes to him the same work for he says that “he shall teach you all things”, which is explained in the Bible commentary in the following words: “He shall teach you all things, i.e., all saving truth which it is necessary for you and your successors to know. Those who confine the Christian religion to the words of Christ recorded in the Gospels, are here reprov’d” (Dummelow, p. 800).

Again the Paraclete is spoken of thus in John 16:13:

“Howbeit, when he, the spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth ... and he will show you things to come.”

The words *all truth* are here again explained as meaning *all that is necessary to the salvation of souls*. Both these descriptions of the Paraclete clearly point him out as the greatest advocate of Divine Unity on earth, and they signify exactly what the word *Ahmad* signifies. These descriptions are, moreover, applicable to only the Holy Prophet Muhammad who proclaimed that he brought a perfect religion for humanity, while no other man has ever advanced that mighty claim.