

Promised Messiah's belief that Holy Prophet was the coming *Ahmad*.

Thus a consideration of the four characteristics which are met with in the prophecy as quoted in the Holy Quran clearly shows not only that the prophecy referred to here is that regarding the advent of the Paraclete, but also that the prophecy was fulfilled in the person of the Holy Prophet of Arabia. How has M. Mahmud then dared to deny the fulfilment of the prophecy in the Holy Prophet of Arabia in the face of such facts? I have already quoted his words, admitting that he had heard something from the late Maulvi Nur-ud-Din which made him change his former belief. I know that Maulvi Nur-ud-Din never held the view that the prophecy relating to the advent of Ahmad was not fulfilled by the appearance of the Holy Prophet or that Ahmad was not his name, but it is useless to enter into discussion as to his views on the point.

Strangely enough, while admitting on the one hand that he changed his views after the death of the Promised Messiah, he at the same time assures us that he “found it written thus in the books of the Promised Messiah” (*Anwār-i-Khilāfat*, p. 21). How strange that during the life of the Promised Messiah he entertained a belief quite opposed to his writings! Was he indeed ignorant of what was written in those books at that time? If not, why did he retain a belief opposed to that of the Promised Messiah? And if he was indeed ignorant even of the writings of the Promised Messiah, his views on questions relating to the Promised Messiah must be accepted with the greatest hesitation, indeed they can have no value at all. But this is in fact a false assurance. It is *not* thus written in the books of the Promised Messiah who sincerely believed, and gave expression to his belief, that Ahmad was a name of the Holy Prophet and that the prophecy referred to in 61:6 was fulfilled by his advent. M. Mahmud really misinterprets the words of the Promised Messiah, and intentionally follows the error into which the opponents of the Promised Messiah fell. The passage which was misunderstood by the opponents occurs in *Izāla Auhām*, the first writing in

which he explained his position in Islam as being that of a *muhaddas* and plainly denied that he was an Apostle. That passage runs thus:

“And that the comer is called *Ahmad* points to his being a like, for *Muhammad* is a *jalālī* name (i.e., one expressing glory) and *Ahmad* is a *jamālī* name (i.e., one expressing beauty), and *Ahmad* and *Jesus* are one on account of their *jamālī* significance. It is to this that there is a reference in ‘And giving good news of an Apostle who will come after me, his name being Ahmad.’ But our Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, was not only *Ahmad* but also *Muhammad*, i.e., the possessor of both *jalāl* and *jamāl* (i.e., glory and beauty). But in the last days, in accordance with prophecy, the one who was only *Ahmad*, who possesses also the attribute of Messiahship, has been sent.” (p. 673)

It is evident that in this passage the Promised Messiah speaks of the Holy Prophet as being *Ahmad* as well as *Muhammad* and therefore he does not deny his being *Ahmad*. All that he says is that prophecy points to the coming of one who shall have only the (*jamālī*) attribute of being *Ahmad*. By *prophecy* here is not meant the prophecy contained in 61:6 but the prophecy of the advent of a Messiah in the last ages, for it is these prophecies that the Promised Messiah discusses before the passage quoted above. He refers to the verse of *istikhlāf* — i.e., 24:55 which promises the raising of successors to the Holy Prophet like the successors that were raised among the Israelites — and draws from it the conclusion that it was necessary that just as the last successor of Moses was one who came not with the sword but with peaceful doctrines, not to establish kingdom but to establish religious truth, it was necessary that at about a similar distance of time a successor should be raised to the Holy Prophet who should receive the same name as was given to the successor of Moses, and employ the same means as were employed by the successor of Moses. Then he adds:

“Therefore when the Holy Quran has plainly stated that the chain of successorship in Islam shall, in its rise and decline and with regard to its *jalālī* and *jamālī* attributes, totally correspond with and be similar and like to the Israelite chain of successorship, and it has also stated that the *Um̄mi* Arab Prophet is the like of Moses, it has thus been stated in a conclusive and certain manner that, in Islam, as the head of the Divine khalīfas (i.e., the *mujaddids*) is the like of Moses and he is the commander-in-chief of the Islamic Movement and the King and the first sitter on the throne of glory and the source of all blessings and the great progenitor of his spiritual offspring, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, so the last of this Movement on account of the perfect resemblance which he bears, is that Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, who out of this people has been given the attributes of the Messiah by the command of the Lord. And the proclamation, ‘We have made you the Messiah son of Mary’ (a revelation of the Promised Messiah), has made him actually the same.” (*Izāla Auhām*, p. 672, 673)

All that the Promised Messiah said was therefore this, that prophecies promised the advent of one in the last ages who should be, like Jesus, only the possessor of *jamāl* and that therefore it was for this reason that the promised one was called *Ahmad* (that being the name by which he was addressed in one of the Divine revelations received by him) because *Ahmad* signified one who possessed *jamāl*, and that there was a hint to this in the verse which gave the good news of the advent of *Ahmad*, for though the Holy Prophet was *Ahmad*, he was also *Muhammad*. Speaking of himself he simply says that there is a hint (an *ishārah*) in the verse to his advent, not that it speaks plainly of his advent.

That this was the significance of the words in *Izāla Auhām* is made clear by his later writings. *Ā’īnah Kamālat-i-Islām* is his next publication and in that book he writes:

“While the evidence of the Messiah is thus written in the Holy Quran that ‘I give the news of an Apostle who will come after me, that is to say, after I am dead, and his name will be *Ahmad*.’ Therefore if the Messiah has not yet passed away from this physical life, it necessarily follows that our Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, has not yet made his appearance, for the text proclaims in open words that when the Messiah shall pass away from this physical life, then shall the Holy Prophet make his appearance in this world.” (p. 42)

Here, then, it is plainly stated that the prophecy referred to in 61:6 was fulfilled by the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad and since this writing is later than *Izāla Auhām*, the words of that book must be interpreted in such a manner that they should not be opposed to the plain writing of a later date. The words were, however, misinterpreted by his opponents and he was charged with denying the fulfilment of the prophecy in the person of the Holy Prophet. Answers to this false charge were written by his followers, but I would refer to one from his own pen in a writing published some ten years afterwards. Referring to 61:6, the verse under discussion, he writes:

“And the significance of this verse is that when the promised Mahdi whose name on heaven is metaphorically *Ahmad* shall make his appearance, then the Holy Prophet, who is the actual holder of this name, shall bring about his *jamālī* manifestation in the person of him who is Ahmad only tropically. This is what I had written in my book *Izāla Auhām* before this, viz., that I partake in the name Ahmad with the Holy Prophet, and on this the ignorant Maulvis, as is their habit, raised a clamour.” (*Tuhfa Golarwiya*, p. 96)

Here the meaning of the words is explained by the writer himself, and it is plainly admitted that the actual holder of the name Ahmad is the Holy Prophet and that the Promised Messiah partakes in the fulfilment of the prophecy only by way of *majāz* or *zill*. The question was again taken up in *I'jāz-ul-Masīh* which

was published in February 1901, and in which the whole question is discussed in such words that not the least doubt would be left in an unprejudiced mind. After speaking of the two names of the Holy Prophet, Muhammad and Ahmad, the words having been quoted already, the Promised Messiah says:

“And one of these two names belongs especially to one period and the other to the other period ... God intended that He should make the Muslim nation to inherit these two names by way of *zill* (reflection) so that they may be as recurring blessings for this people ... so He made the companions and those who followed them a manifestation of the name *Muhammad* in conditions of glory and beneficence and gave them triumph and helped them with successive favours. And He made the Promised Messiah a manifestation of the name *Ahmad* and He raised him in conditions of beauty and mercy ... for the name Jesus and the name *Ahmad* have a unity in nature and a correspondence in disposition and from their very nature indicate beauty and the giving up of fighting, and as for the name *Muhammad* it is a name of supremeness and glory, and both these are as *zill* (reflection) of the (Divine names) Beneficent and Merciful.” (pp. 106–108)

The same subject is continued further on p. 111:

“So while the companions inherited the name *Muhammad* from Allah, the Great Giver, and they manifested the glory of God and they killed the tyrants like cattle, even thus did the Promised Messiah inherit the name *Ahmad* which is the manifestation of mercy and beauty, and God chose this name for him and for those who follow him and become, as it were, his off-spring. So the Promised Messiah along with his followers is a manifestation from God for the attribute of mercy and *Ahmadiyyat*.”

Now these two quotations along with those given from the same book under the first heading make the position of the Promised Messiah clear as daylight. The Holy Prophet had two

names, Muhammad and Ahmad, the first expressing glory and the second, beauty, the first requiring open triumph of Islam and the Muslims, and the second requiring its triumph by signs and arguments. We are further told that these two names found their manifestation in two different periods, the name Muhammad being manifested through the companions of the Holy Prophet, and the name Ahmad being manifested through the Promised Messiah and his followers. The companions are for this reason called the *zill* (reflection) of the name Muhammad, and the Promised Messiah *and* his followers are called the *zill* (reflection) of the name Ahmad. The companions did not actually become *Muhammad* by being the manifestation and *zill* of the name *Muhammad*; nor does the Promised Messiah along with his followers actually become *Ahmad* by being manifestation and *zill* of the name Ahmad. The whole thing is put in a nutshell here and the significance is clear as daylight and only a perverted mind could read in these words a denial of the name Ahmad and of fulfilment of the prophecy relating to the advent of Ahmad in the person of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. The Promised Messiah is absolutely clear of the charge. His later writings do not contain any reference to the prophecy of 61:6 but in his speeches, reported in the newspapers, the subject is put with a lucidity, the clearness of which would be palpable to the very blind. Mufti Muhammad Sadiq, who now follows his *khalīfa* in denying the fulfilment of the prophecy in the person of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, is responsible for reporting the following speech in *Al-Hakam* dated 31st January 1901:

“The Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, had only two names, *Muhammad* and *Ahmad*. The great name of the Holy Prophet is *Muhammad* as the great name of God is *Allah*... the name *Ahmad* of the Holy Prophet is that which Christ has mentioned (when he says) he will come after me, his name being *Ahmad*. The words *after me* show that he must come after Christ without interruption, i.e., there shall be no other prophet between him and Christ... Moses spoke of the name *Muhammad* of the Holy Prophet for he

himself was a *jalālī* prophet and Jesus spoke of his name *Ahmad* as he himself was a *jamālī* prophet. As our movement is also *jamālī*, therefore the name *Ahmadī* has been given to it.” (p. 11)

The Promised Messiah has also made it plain that *Ahmad* was the same as the Paraclete. It was really to give expression to his views that an article was written in the *Review of Religions* in 1902 in which it was shown that *Farqleet* (or Paraclete) meant one who distinguished between truth and falsehood. An objection to this was brought to the notice of the Promised Messiah, it being alleged that *Ahmad* was not the same as the Paraclete. The following answer is noted in the *Badr* newspaper dated 21st November 1902:

“It is not necessary for us that we should show that very word in the previous books as they exist at present.... It is possible that there was some other word which meant *Ahmad*. In the *Lisān-ul-'Arab* it is written that *Farqleet* is composed of *fāriq*, meaning *one who separates* and *leet* meaning the *devil ...* and *Ahmad* means one who praises most. Who is then greater than he who removes every kind of devilishness by means of the doctrine of unity? To become *farqleet* (Paraclete) it is necessary to be *Ahmad*. *Ahmad* is he who does away with the devil's part in this world and establishes the majesty and glory of the Divine Being. The significance of Paraclete in other words is *Ahmad*.”⁹

In the face of such clear pronouncements it would be barefaced calumny to say that the Promised Messiah denied the Holy Prophet's name being *Ahmad* or that he denied the fulfilment of the prophecy of 61:6 in the person of the Holy Prophet. And thus the doctrine as forcibly propounded by M. Mahmud and fathered on the Promised Messiah, that *Ahmad* was not a name of the Holy Prophet and that the prophecy referred to in 61:6 was not fulfilled by his advent, is condemned by the writings of the Promised Messiah as well as the Holy Quran, the sayings of the Holy Prophet and the consensus of opinion of the whole Muslim

nation from the companions of the Holy Prophet down to our own time, and I appeal to the good sense and moral courage of the Ahmadiyya community to denounce these false doctrines with one voice before they take root like the false doctrines attributed to the first Messiah.