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This book is dedicated to the 86 Ahmadi Muslims who were martyred on May 28, 2010, in two mosques of Lahore, Pakistan, as well as all the other martyrs of Islām Ahmadiyya, starting from Hazrat Maulvi ‘Abdur Rahmān Shahīd and Hazrat Sāhibzāda Syed ‘Abdul Latīf Shahīd, to the martyrs of today.
And proclaim: ‘Truth has come and falsehood has vanished away. Verily, falsehood is bound to vanish.’

—Sūrah Banī Isrā‘īl, 17:82
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Publishers’ Note

The name of Muhammad sa, the Holy Prophet of Islām, has been followed by the symbol sa, which is an abbreviation for the salutation (ﷺ) Sallallāhu ‘Alaihi Wasallam (may peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him). The names of other prophets and messengers are followed by the symbol as, an abbreviation for ( صلى الله عليه وسلم / صلى الله عليه وسلم) ‘Alaihissalām/‘Alaihimussalām (on whom be peace). The actual salutations have not generally been set out in full, but they should nevertheless, be understood as being repeated in full in each case. The symbol ra is used with the name of the Companions of the Holy Prophet sa and those of the Promised Messiah as. It stands for ( رضي الله عنهم / رضي الله عليها / رضي الله عنهم) Radī Allāhu’anhū/‘anḥā/‘ānhūm (May Allāh be pleased with him/with her/with them). rh stands for (رحمه الله تعالى) Rahimahullāhu Ta‘ālā (May Allāh’s blessing be on him).

In transliterating Arabic words we have adopted the following method (which is partially taken from the method used by the Royal Asiatic Society):

١ at the beginning of a word, pronounced as a, i, u preceded by a very slight aspiration, like h in the English word 'honor'.

ّ th, pronounced like th in the English word 'thing'.

خ kh, pronounced like the Scotch ch in 'loch'.

iii
dh, pronounced like the English th in 'that'.

‘, a strong guttural, the pronunciation of which must be learnt by the ear.

gh, a sound approached very nearly in the r 'grasseye' in French, and in the German r. It requires the muscles of the throat to be in the 'gargling' position while pronouncing it.

q, a deep guttural k sound.

‘, a sort of catch in the voice.

Short vowels are represented by:

\( a \) for \( \text{ـ} \) (like \( u \) in 'bud');
\( i \) for \( \text{i} \) (like \( i \) in 'bid');
\( u \) for \( \text{ـ} \) (like \( oo \) in 'wood');

Long vowels are represented by:

\( \ddot{a} \) for \( \text{ـ} \) (like \( a \) in 'father');
\( \ddot{i} \) for \( \text{i} \) (like \( ee \) in 'deep');
\( \ddot{u} \) for \( \text{ـ} \) (like \( oo \) in 'root');
Preface

Since the advent of the Promised Messiah\textsuperscript{as}, a struggle has been going on between truth and falsehood and light and darkness. However, as it is the way of Allāh, truth and light always prevail. The enemies of Islām Ahmadiyya surface with different kinds of attacks including physical assaults and emotional harassment, as well as forceful attacks by the pen. One such cowardly attempt has been made by Farhan Khan in his book entitled, “With Love to the Ahmadis of the World”. As the title suggests, he very cleverly disguised himself to be a well-wisher of the members of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at. However, after reading only a few pages of his book, one is forced to think:

That is, one who has a friend like you does not need any enemy!

The main objective of the establishment of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at is, by the Grace of Allāh, the propagation of the true teachings of Islām. As a result, it has always been the practice of the Community to respond to provocative texts and books with dignity and honor.

It gives me great pleasure to state that our young missionaries, Maulāna Farhan Iqbal and Maulāna Imtiaz Ahmed Sra, have presented a very thorough and
comprehensive response to the allegations raised by Farhan Khan, and in doing so, they have sufficiently addressed the subject of the finality of the prophethood of the Holy Prophet Muhammad ﷺ for any researcher of this subject. All those who have doubts and questions about the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at’s beliefs related to this subject are invited to read this book and have their questions answered. All the arguments are presented from authentic and authoritative sources of the Holy Qur’ān, sayings of the Holy Prophet Muhammad ﷺ, writings of Hazrat [i.e., His Holiness] Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad as, the Promised Messiah and Imam Mahdī, and saints of repute who followed the true teachings of Islam. As a matter of fact, a genuine need was felt to have such a book in the English language written in contemporary style addressing the same old baseless and worn out allegations and accusations against the beliefs of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at.

May Allāh reward Maulāna Farhan Iqbal and Maulāna Imtiaz Ahmed Sra abundantly for such a praiseworthy effort and make this book a means for opening the hearts of the people to the acceptance of the true message of Islam Ahmadiyyat! Āmīn!

Sheikh Abdul Wadood
National Secretary Ishā’at, Canada
August 10, 2013
Foreword

Intellectual differences are found in every religion of the world. Some are based on truth, while others on falsehood, but they remain intellectual differences whether or not someone’s belief is based on it. However, the subject of the finality of the prophethood of the Holy Prophet\(\text{sa}\) regarding which non-Ahmadi Muslims disagree with the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at has left the form of intellectual discussion and assumed the shape of mischief and falsehood. This is because a malicious allegation is made against the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at that it considers Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiānī\(\text{as}\) a Prophet in the sense that goes against the message of the following statements:

[There is no Prophet after me] لَا نَبِيٌّ بَعْدِي
[I am the last of the Prophets] اِنَّي أَخْرِجْ اَلْنَّبِيَّاءِ

In other words, it is alleged that a new community and a new religion have been established by the abrogation of the prophethood of Hazrat Muhammad Mustafā Khātamul Anbiyā\(\text{sa}\). In this way, regarding this issue, false and baseless allegations have been levelled against the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at and fictitious beliefs have been attributed to it. This is despite the fact that those who spread this mischief and attribute falsehood to the community hold the belief of the coming of a Prophet after the Holy Prophet\(\text{sa}\) themselves. Their elders have written exactly what the community believes! It is a proven fact – attested by the Islāmic books that have been published in the
last 14 centuries – that the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamāʿat holds the same belief about the finality of the prophethood of the Holy Prophetṣa that the ‘Ulemā, Āʾimmah, and Awliyāʾullah held, because it is, was and will remain the true belief!

It is true that the Holy Prophetṣa has said, “لا نَبِيَّ بَعْدِي” (there is no Prophet after me), and “إنِي آخرُ الأنبياء” (I am the last of the Prophets), however, at the same time, he has informed us of the coming of a Prophet, who is also the Mahdī and the Messiah, in very clear words and with much clarification, and has ordered us to take his baiʿat. The various Āʾimmah of Islām have brought congruence to the understanding of both these kinds of statements of the Holy Prophetṣa by making true and enlightening discussions on them. No true Muslim has had the courage to disagree with them! This is the reason why the ummah has always held the belief that a Prophet is to come after the Holy Prophetṣa. His coming does not affect the truth of “لا نَبِيَّ بَعْدِي”, or “إنِي آخرُ الأنبياء”. You will be able to read the divine and enlightening reasoning of these elders in this book.

Not a single one of the claims and spiritual statuses declared by the founder of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamāʿat, Hazrat Mirza Ghulām Ahmadṣ, for himself, goes against the reasoning and explanations of the former Āʾimmah. If his writings are placed next to the writings of the former elders, they would appear like a reflection of each other in terms of meaning and essence.

Despite these truths, the opponents of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamāʿat constantly lie by attributing false beliefs to the community. A similar attempt was made by a boy named Farhan Khan (from USA), who attempted to step ahead of his predecessors in lying, deceit, etc. Under my guidance, Maulāna Farhan Iqbal and Maulāna Imtiaz Ahmed Sra have made a strong effort to do research, collect quotations, and write an
appropriate response to his allegations. Hence, with the help of Allah, the Exalted, and His grace and blessings, this is now a useful book in the English language addressing the issues of the finality of the prophethood of the Holy Prophet(saw) and the coming of an ummati (or subordinate) Prophet in Islam, with detailed material and true reasoning, Al-hamdu lillah!

It is our prayer that Allah, the Exalted, may make this book beneficial for the people and a source of guidance for many, and may He grant a great reward to these two aforementioned warriors and others who assisted in any way. O Allah! Please accept this book!

Wassalam,
The humble one,
Hadi Ali Chaudhary
Jamia Ahmadiyya Canada
27th May, 2011
By the grace of Allāh the Almighty, this book has been written for the purpose of spreading the truth of Islām Ahmadiyya. It is a direct response to the arguments presented by Farhan Khan in his book entitled “With Love to the Ahmadiīs of the World” (version of March 20, 2010). His work cleverly attempts to deceive his readers into believing that the Ahmadiyya Muslim arguments are weak and insufficient. This book will prove the exact opposite and place Khan on the receiving end of his own accusations. We will show the true face of the Ahmadiyya Muslim arguments and will dispel all false notions be they from Farhan Khan or anyone else, Inshā’ Allāh!

Let not any enemy of Islām Ahmadiyya take cowardly cover behind Farhan Khan for this book is equally addressed to all such blasphemers who, having declared us as non-Muslims, have estranged themselves from the teachings of Islām and the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa. Wherever we have made a personal challenge to Farhan Khan, we challenge them all –
each and every one. We call Allāh to Witness between us two, and Judge our differences.

We believe the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa is the last law-bearing prophet as well as the greatest and the best prophet of Allāh. He predicted in very clear words the coming of a prophet in the Latter Days, who would serve his cause. That prophet has already come in the person of Hazrat [i.e., His Holiness] Mirzā Ghulām Ahmadas of Qādiān, India and he established the International Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamāʿat. He did not abrogate a single law of the Holy Qur’ān nor did he add anything new to it, and he came exactly according to the criteria set forth in the Holy Qur’ān. He only carried out the work of the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa and spread his message, while demonstrating extraordinary love and service to him.

The death of Hazrat Īsāas [Arabic: Jesusas] is central to the beliefs of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamāʿat but in the introduction to his book, Farhan Khan writes, “From the perspective of the Muslims, this seems like a relatively trivial issue.”

We do not know when Farhan Khan self-crowned himself as the spokesman for all “Muslim” denominations nor how he accurately assessed their opinion, but his statement is a direct affront to the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa. Khan’s statement was made in complete disregard to the Holy Prophet’s numerous statements and the verdict of the Holy Qur’ān, both of which clearly prove Hazrat Īsā’s death and prophesy the coming of the Messiahas in the Latter Days. In other words, the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa himself emphasized the importance of this subject by discussing it repeatedly. Who, then, is Farhan Khan to say otherwise? The fact of the matter is that the above-quoted statement of Farhan Khan is either an excuse to avoid admitting the obvious death of
'Īsā bin Mariam as, or an attempt to discredit clear-cut messages of the Holy Prophet Muhammad sa. There is no alternative to explain Farhan Khan’s shallow statement, but either way it exposes his immature intellect and deprived scholarship. Over the last 120 years, Islâm Ahmadiyya has successfully refuted the erroneous belief in the supernatural 2,000 plus year old life of 'Īsā bin Mariam as. Nevertheless, Farhan Khan joins the long list of our defeated opponents – his only strategy being an attempt to “trivialize” it. How disappointing!

Farhan Khan goes on to state that the Ahmadī Muslims have “invented three alternate explanations for what Khātam Al-Nabiyyīn means: last law-bearing Prophet, chief (best) of the Prophets, or that future prophets will come bearing the seal of the Prophet Muhammad sa. This may pose as a source of confusion to the reader because their position may seem inconsistent.”

This is a blatant misrepresentation of Islâm Ahmadiyya. Nothing has been invented as these are not new explanations. Previous scholars of the Muslim ummah [Arabic: community] have made similar statements as will be shown in this book, Inshā’ Allāh! If non-Ahmadī Muslims have failed to understand the very scholars they revere, it is no fault of ours. Those who cannot swim should stay away from the deep end of the pool, as those with shallow intellect should stay away from the deep verses of the Holy Qur’an, lest they drown in ignorance.

Secondly, our position is not “inconsistent” because these three explanations are not contradictory. All three meanings equally apply to the status and greatness of the Holy Prophet Muhammad sa. This illustrates the multi-dimensional beauty and depth of the Arabic language which allows the same phrase to have several cumulative meanings.
Farhan Khan also argues that his position that the Holy Prophet \( \text{sa} \) is the last chronological prophet is simple and straightforward while the Ahmadiyya Muslim position is complicated. This argument represents an *appeal-to-emotion* fallacy, which attempts to obscure the logical argument with a superficial appeal. This tactic is typically applied when there is an inexplicable contradiction. For example, while Farhan Khan believes the Holy Prophet Muhammad \( \text{sa} \) is the last prophet in the sense of time and place, he conveniently forgets that he himself believes in the coming of a prophet *after* the Holy Prophet Muhammad \( \text{sa} \): ‘Īsā bin Mariam \( \text{as} \). Strangely, Khan believes that ‘Īsā\( \text{as} \) is somehow precluded from being “the last” because he came earlier as well.

To illustrate the matter in another way: If John enters a room and leaves, then Fred enters the room and leaves, then John re-enters the room and leaves; who was the *last* person in the room?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>John enters the room &amp; leaves</th>
<th>Fred enters the room &amp; leaves</th>
<th>John re-enters the room &amp; leaves</th>
<th>Who was the <strong>last</strong> person in the room?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pm</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4pm</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obviously, John was the last person in the room. However, Khan’s reasoning would like us to believe that Fred is the last person in the room, while simultaneously believing that John is the last person in the room. The two conditions are mutually exclusive and present a contradiction.
Many non-Ahmadi Muslims have been plagued by this very contradiction over the last fourteen hundred years claiming that both, Muhammadṣa and ‘Īsāas, are the last prophet. Non-Ahmadi Muslims try to avert this contradiction by saying that ‘Īsāas will not be a new prophet when he re-appears in the Latter Days, for he was granted prophethood before the coming of the Holy Prophetṣa. However, their point is irrelevant. The issue is not whether a prophet is new or old, but which prophet is last in time. Unfortunately, their inability to satisfactorily answer such simple questions results in the frustration with which they legally ban Ahmadi literature and persecute Ahmadi Muslims in pathetic witch hunt fashion. This currently takes place in Pakistan, Indonesia, Afghanistan and Saudi Arabia, to name a few. This oppression itself is the greatest admission of their defeat!

Inshā’ Allāh, the reader will soon discover that the only remedy to this contradiction can be found in the enlightening Ahmadiyya Muslim beliefs. They harmonize both concepts, content the heart, and cut at the very root of falsehood. In fact, the light of the Promised Messiah, Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmadṣ of Qādiān, as manifested in his illuminating arguments, was destined to dispel the darkness of ignorance – and falsehood would have no choice but to disappear.
Meanings of *Khātam* in Dictionaries

In order to understand the meaning of *Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn* (lit. Seal of the Prophets), it is essential to understand the key operative words and the connotative meanings associated with them in the Arabic language.

Under the chapter entitled *Classical Lexicons and the Word خاتم* (*Khātam*), Farhan Khan criticizes the Ahmadiyya understanding of the word خاتم (*khātam*, lit. *seal*) and presents isolated quotations from various lexicons or dictionaries in support of his opinion that “...all of the lexicons understand خاتم to mean last or finish, and some even reference Sūrah Al-Ahzab verse 41 saying Muhammad عليه الصلاة و السلام is the last of the prophets”¹. We call into question the intellectual integrity of the quotations presented by Farhan Khan based on the fact that he did not go into a sufficient discussion of the word *khātam* in the context of any of his quotations. Any honest individual can go through those entries and come to the conclusion that they were presented with much bias, predisposed to the belief that Hazrat

---

¹ Farhan Khan, *With Love to the Ahmadīs of the world* (U.S.A, 2010), Page 58
Muhammad
 is the last prophet in absolute terms. The fact of the matter is that Farhan Khan does this to give the impression that the only possible meaning of *khātam* is *the last*.

This chapter will challenge this impression that Farhan Khan tries to give by quoting three universally acknowledged dictionaries: *Mufridāt Imām Rāghib*, *Līsān-ul-‘Arab*, and *Lane’s Lexicon*. We present below a complete quotation from *Mufridāt* which thoroughly discusses the meanings of the word *khātam*.

*Mufridāt Imām Rāghib*

الختَمُ والطبَعُ يقال على وجهين: مصَّدر ختمتُ وطَبعُتُ، وهو تأثير كنقشِ الخَتَمِ والطَّابِعِ. والثاني: الإثْر الحاصل عن النقش، ويتجَّوَّرُ بذلك تارة في الاستِثِيقَة من الشَّيء، والمنع منه اعتبارًا بما يحصل من المنعٍ بالختَم على الكتب والأبوابِ

"The words *al-Khatm* and *at-Tab‘* are used in two ways:

1. The infinitive meaning of ‘I sealed’ or ‘I stamped,’ and this refers to the impressing of something on something [تأثير] like the stamp [نقش] of a seal or a ring.

2. And, second: The obtained impression [الاثر] of the stamp. [In other words, the word *khatm* can also be used for the impression itself]

Sometimes, it figuratively means: stopping from something. And this meaning has been given based on the fact that when books or chapters are sealed
after writing, it means that their writing has ended and one has stopped writing. [In other words, the meaning of finishing something is figurative].

For example, ‘Allāh has set a seal on their hearts’ [Al-Baqarah / 7]... this is an indication towards a law of Allāh that when man exceeds in false belief or in committing sin, and does not pay any attention to the truth, then his behaviour creates such a condition that he starts considering sin a good thing. It is as if a seal has been placed on his heart [such that truth does not affect him and his heart does not pay attention to the truth].

‘and the Seal of the Prophets’ [Al-Ahzāb/40], because he is the Seal of prophethood, that is: He perfected it by his coming.”
Based on the above explanatory statements of Imām Rāghib, we can conclude that the words *khātam* or *khātim* have the following meanings:

**Primary Meanings (*Haqīqī*):**
1. Stamp or Ring
2. To create an effect or impression

**Secondary or Applied Meanings (*Majāzī*):**
1. The obtained or received impression
2. To close something
3. To bring something to an end
4. To perfect something.

It can now be concluded that there are several meanings of the words *khātam*/*khātim* and these respectively apply based on the context. The Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at has never denied the fact that one of the secondary or applied meanings of *khātam* is to close something or to bring something to an end. Our argument is that these meanings do not apply to the context in which the phrase *Khātam-un-Nābiyyīn* has been used in the Holy Qur’ān (33:41). Instead, *Khātam* translates to mean *Seal* in sense of praise. As this is a unique title conferred on the Holy Prophetṣa, its literal translation should rely on the most appropriate primary meanings, whereas secondary meanings should be utilized to understand the figurative connotations of the literal meaning.
Meanings of *Khātam* in Dictionaries

**Lisān-ul-‘Arab**

"All these words – *khatam*, *khātimu*, *khātam*, *khātamu*, *khītamu*– are used to refer to jewellery. It is such [as if to indicate] that an impression [or stamp] was created with it the first time ever. Hence, it came into the grammatical form of *Tābi‘*. In this meaning, it was used extensively."

This quotation from *Lisān-ul-‘Arab* (under the word *Khatama*) further supports the meanings already provided by *Mufridāt* and tells us that the essential and first meaning of *khātam* or *khātim* is the impression of a stamp. That is the primary and fundamental meaning, whereas all other meanings are derived, used in a figurative sense when the context demands it.

The fact remains that the words *Khātam-an-Nabīyyīn* have been applied to the Holy Prophet *sa* in 33:41 as praise. The context shows that Allāh, the Exalted, is praising the Holy Prophet *sa* in that verse which prevents us from applying the meaning of ‘last,’ as being the ‘last’ of anything is not a praiseworthy trait. Hence, we apply the first or fundamental meaning of *Khātam*, that is, seal.
Similarly, *Lane’s Lexicon* reiterates the same meanings discussed above as shown on the next two pages. The only objection, in this context, is that the compiler, Edward William Lane (1801 to 1876 CE), was a British orientalist and lexicographer who, lacking both background and aspiration in theology and Qur’ānic exegesis, applied the wrong meaning of the word *khātam* to verse 41 of Sūrah Al-Ahzāb. This was an error of judgment on his part and it is not surprising, given his European and un-Islāmic background.

There is no wonder why, in all instances, Farhan Khan only quoted this dictionary writer’s opinion regarding *Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn*, while ignoring the actual meanings of the word *khātam*. This exposes Khan’s shameful intellectual dishonesty for the purpose of promoting his personal bias.

Farhan Khan repeatedly criticizes Mr. Malik Ghulām Farīd for stating that one of the meanings of *khātam* is *the best and most perfect*. It is surprising that someone could criticize this meaning of *khātam* since this *idiomatic* application of the word *khātam* in the sense of praise is so commonly expressed in Arabic that it appears unnecessary to give such examples in this book. Ahmadiyya Muslim literature provides numerous examples of this kind of usage of the word *khātam* in the sense of praise. In any case, in order to prove that Mr. Malik Ghulām Farīd gave all the meanings that have already been discussed

---

2 Mr. Malik Ghulām Farīd was a companion of the Promised Messiah and wrote the Dictionary of the Holy Qur’ān available at: 

3 If you would like to see such examples, please refer to *Mahzarnama – The Memorandum*, Pages 103-108, available at: 
[http://www.alislam.org/library/books/mahzarnama/Mahzarnama.pdf](http://www.alislam.org/library/books/mahzarnama/Mahzarnama.pdf)
in this chapter, an image of the complete entry under the word خَتَمَ (khatama) in his *Dictionary of the Holy Qur’ān* has been attached, after an image of the complete entry from *Lane’s Lexicon.*
God make his end to be good]. (S. Mgh.)

The covering over the seven seeds: (Aa, Mgh.)

They turned the earth over the seven seeds, and then watered it: (Yer. Eikh., T.)

The watered the seed-produce, or seed-field, the first (Jk, Mgh.)

[see above.]

The bees filled with honey the place in which they deposited it: (Jk, Mgh.)

The bees collected some nectar, thicker than the wax of the comb, and mingled with it the nectar of their [see above.]

[see above.]

He sealed it, stamped it, etc., etc.: (Mgh.)

[see above.]

The signet-ring upon his other (another's) finger.

(sect. to different copies of the S.)

[sigil or signet-ring]. (Mgh.)

He put on his turban: (Mgh.)

He put on his turban in the manner of a [q.v.]

The signet, signifying the act or mode, of doing so is: (Mgh.)

He concealed his affairs, etc.: (Mgh.)

[Also A sealed piece of clay (or wax) like the sense of the S. and the sense of so: in the raising of El-Ashsh,

[Also A load of red-ochre-coloured wine, the Jemander (wine) came, and brought it out, with a sealed piece of clay upon it.]

[Also similarly used as meaning: A copy of the Kur'dan, and so on.]

[see above.]

[see above.]

[see above.]

[see above.]

[see above.]

[see above.]
generally a signet; i.e., a certain ornament (M, K) for the finger, (K) app., as the first, used for sealing, or stamping, thereof; so that the word is of the same class as ṣamūʿ; afterwards, in consequence of frequency of usage, applied to one not used for that purpose: (Ibūd, TA;) or a ring having a ṣamūʿ of a substance different therefrom (not in ḳāʾ; i.e., having a stone, or gem, set in it): if without a name, it is called ṣamūʿ (Mgh;) or ṣamūʿ signifies the qāyūf (i.e., the person sealing, or stamping): (JK, Az, Mgh;) the thing that is put upon the piece of clay or wax, for the purpose of sealing, or stamping: (Az, Mgh, K;) the pl. of ṣamūʿ (and its like) is ṣammūʿ (K) and (properly ṣammūʿ), (S, in which the former pl., though more common, is not mentioned, and K;) Sb says that those who use the latter pl. make it to be pl. of a sing. of the measure ʿamāṣ, though it be not in their language, which shows that ṣamūʿ signifies singular, and not plural. (TA.) ṣamūʿ also signifies a seal, or stamp, and a mark: so in a tr. in that, it is said: ṣamūʿ, (TA.) ṣamūʿ also signifies a seal, or stamp, and a mark: (TA.) ṣamūʿ, the seal of the prophet, in the Kūr [xxiii. 40; accord. to one reading, reading, with dammānī to the ʾinfipl. or ʾinfipl., i.e. Mehamma); (S) also called and ṣammūʿ. (TA.) And the last portion of anything that is broken (ṣāḥ; see), in the Kūr [xxxii. 60; means] the last that will receive thereof will be the colour of that which is removed: (S, K;) or, accord. to ḫāṣṣāʾ, its result shall be the state of ṣamūʿ: Fr says, ṣamūʿ and ṣamūʿ, and ṣamūʿ and ṣamūʿ are nearly the same in meaning; whereas the rending of ṣamūʿ, ṣamūʿ, and the explanation is this: that when any one thereof, he will find the last part thereof to have the sound of ṣamūʿ. (TA.) [See also ṣamūʿ and ṣamūʿ.] Also, (ʾAr, K, Ḥ, and K; or, accord. to Ḥ, TA;) ṣamūʿ signifies the places of separation (ṣāḥ, [q. v.]) of the joints (ḥuṣūs) of horses. (ʾAṣr, K.) ṣamūʿ (Mgh, Ḥ, and K;) which is more commonly known than ṣamūʿ (Mgh, but see what follows,) and ṣamūʿ and ṣamūʿ (K, Ḥ, and K; and TA but omitted in the Ḥ, H, M, and K; and Ṣ, ʿAbd, al-Ṭāʾī, TA) and ṣamūʿ (Ṭāʾī, Ṣ, al-Ṭāʾī, TA) and ṣamūʿ (Ṭāʾī, Ṣ, al-Ṭāʾī, TA) and ṣamūʿ (Ṭāʾī, Ṣ, al-Ṭāʾī, TA) and ṣamūʿ (Ṭāʾī, Ṣ, al-Ṭāʾī, TA) and ṣamūʿ (Ṭāʾī, Ṣ, al-Ṭāʾī, TA) signify the same: (JK, S, Ḫ, K, TA;) (A signet; ...
assuaged. Every time it (the fire of Hell) abates We shall increase for them the flame (17:98).

**خَطَّمَ** [aor. خَطَّمْ and خَطِّم noun خَطَّم] : He acted or behaved towards him with perfidy, treachery or unfaithfulness or with deceit, guile or circumvention. **خَطَّمَ بالعَدِيدُ** : He was unfaithful etc., to the covenant. **خَطَّمَ فَنَسَى** : His stomach became heavy; or became agitated by a tendency to vomit; became in a disordered state. **خَطَّمَ** : One who acts or behaves with perfidy or treachery or with the foulest perfidy; one who acts or behaves with deceit, guile or circumvention or in a corrupt manner and does so much or frequently or habitually. **إِلَّا كُلُّ خَطَّمٌ كَفُورٌ** : None but every perfidious and ungrateful person (31:33).

**خَتِّمَ** [aor. خَتِّمْ and خَتَّم inf. noun خَتِّم] : He sealed, stamped, impressed or imprinted the thing or he put the seal on it. **خَتَّمَ** : He reached the end of the thing. **خَتِّمَ** and **خَتِّمَ** signify the impressing of a thing with the engraving of signet and stamp. The former sometimes means the securing oneself from a thing and protecting oneself from it; in consideration of protection by means of sealing upon writings; sometimes it means the producing of an impression or effect upon a thing from another thing; in consideration of the impress produced by the signet, sometimes it is used as relating to the reaching the end of a thing. Or the primary signification of **خَتَّمَ** is the act of covering over a thing. The word also signifies the protecting of what is in a writing by means of a seal. **خَتَّمَ عَلَيْكَ بَأْنَةً** : He sealed his door against thee i.e. he turned away from thee or avoided thee. **خَتَّمَ لِكَ بَأْنَةً** : He sealed for thee his door i.e. he preferred thee to others. **خَتَّمَ عَلَى قَلْبِهِ** : He (God) sealed his heart i.e. he made his heart or mind to be such as it understood not. **خَتَّمَ اللَّهُ عَلَى قَلْبِهِمْ وَعَلَى سَمَعِهِمْ** : Allah has set a seal on their hearts and their ears (2:8). **خَتَّمَ (Khatam)** and **خَتَّمَ (Khatim)** and **خَتَّمَ (Khatmun)** are almost synonymous. **خَتَّمَ (Khatam)** means a signet-ring; a seal or stamp and a mark; the end or lost part or portion and result and issue of a thing. **إِنَّمَا الأَعْمَالُ بِخَوَاطِبِهِمْ** :
Actions are judged by their results. خاتم also means the best and most perfect; embellishment or ornament; the hollow of the back of the neck; وَلْكِنْ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَخَاتَمُ النَّبِيْنَ: But he is the Messenger of Allah and the seal of the Prophets (33:41). خَادَعَ (inf. noun and a subs.): The first watering of a sown-field; the clay with which one seals or stamps upon a thing; the hymen; as being the seal of virginity; شَيْطَانُ الْبَيْكَ بَحَتَاهَا: She was conducted as a bride to thee with her seal of virginity; the furthest part of a valley; the last of a company of men as also خَاتَمَ: the last portion of anything that is drunk; admixture; result; the end or last draught. : The sealing of it will be with musk; its result shall be the taste of musk; the last draught shall be in perfume like musk etc. (83:27). مَخْتَوُهُ: Sealed or stamped. رَحِيقٌ مَخْتَوُهُ: Sealed beverage (83:26).

[ar. inf. noun] خَادَعَ: He furrowed or he made a furrow or trench in the ground. The tears made marks upon his cheeks. خَادَعَ: He or it marked or made a mark or an impression upon a thing; he cut a thing. خَادَعَ: The cheek; the plank of the ; a side of a track of high ground; an assembly; a company of men; a rank or class or a race or generation of men. مَخْتَوُهُ ... أَخْمَلَدْ: A generation of men passed away; a road. خَادَعَ: syn. خَادَعَ خُذَّوُهُ: A blow or beating that furrows the skin. وَإِنَّا نَصَعُرُ خَادَعَ: And turn not thy cheek away for the people (31:19). قُلْ: Cursed be the fellows of the Trench (85:5).

[ar. inf. noun] خَادَعَ: He hid or concealed it; he deceived, deluded, beguiled and outwitted him; he desired to harm in a way unknown to the latter; he pretended to him the contrary of what he concealed; or he made him to relinquish the object that he had in view by pretending to him some-thing the contrary of what he concealed. خَادَعَ فِي خَبَرِهِ: It entered its hole in order that it might not be caught.
Questions for Farhan Khan:

1. Why did he hide the complete dictionary entries about the word *khātam*?
2. Why did he criticize Mr. Malik Ghulām Farīd’s **idiomatic** translation of “the best” for the word *khātam* when it is consistent with dozens of universally accepted examples found in Arabic literature⁴?

⁴ Further discussion of this issue follows in the next chapter
Structure of the word *Khātam*

In the chapter entitled *Structure of the word Khātam*, Farhan Khan presents an absurd Arabic lesson that does little more than expose his poor knowledge of Arabic grammar. He foolishly questions the very possibility that *khātam* means *seal of authentication*.

Although Khan has proven his skills in selectively quoting from dictionaries—which are secondary source material for the works cited therein—we highly recommend he study the original works to teach himself an Arabic lesson long overdue. These works will help Khan understand the usage of a word intended by the author in a particular context.

It has already been shown in the previous chapter that the dictionaries categorically state that the primary meaning of the word *khātam* is *seal* or *the impression made by its use*. Khan’s questioning of this possibility advertises his ignorance. Placing several partially excerpted dictionary quotations to fill up several pages does not reveal much understanding of what those dictionaries actually state. After all, what is a seal? A seal is something that authenticates or verifies something! Should
Khan find himself in disagreement, we present two examples below which show that the word \textit{khātam} was used to mean \textit{ring} and \textit{the seal of authentication} by the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} himself at the time of the revelation of the Holy Qur’ān.

\textit{Khātam} used to mean \textit{ring}:

\begin{quote}
 صحيح بخارى، باب خواتيم ال۸۳۷۸
 حدّثني محمد بن بشرٍ حذَّنَا غنَّرُ حذَّنَا شعَبة عن قِتادة
 عن النَّضر بن أنس عن بشر بن لهيكة عن أبي هريرة رضي الله عنه عن النبي ﷺ
 صلى الله عليه وسلم أنَّهُ نَبَى عن خاتم ال۸۳۸۶
 الذَّهَبِ وقال عمرُ أَخْبَرَنَا شَعَبةٌ عَن قِتادة سَمِع النَّضر سَمِع
 خاتَم مثَلَّه.

“Hazrat Abū Hurairah\textsuperscript{ra} narrated: The Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} forbade the wearing of a gold ring (\textit{khātam}).”\textsuperscript{5}
\end{quote}

\textit{Khātam} used to mean \textit{a seal of authentication}:

\begin{quote}
 صحيح بخارى، باب اتخاذ الخطام ليُختتم به الشيء أو ليكتب به إلى
 أهل الكتاب وغيرهم
 حدّثنا أَدَم بن أبي يائس حذَّنَا شعَبة عن قِتادة عن أَنس بن مالك رضي الله عنه قال لما أَرَاد النَّبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أن
 يكتب إلى الرومقيل لَهُ إنهم لن يقرأوا كتابك إذا لم يكن مخْتومًا.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{5} Sahih Bukhari, Chapter: Gold Rings
Hazrat Anas bin Malikṣa narrated: When the Prophetṣa intended to write to the Byzantines, it was said to him, ‘Those people will not read your letter unless it is stamped.’ So the Prophetṣa took a silver ring (khātam) and got Muhammad, the Messenger of Allāh engraved on it... as if I am now looking at its glitter in his hand.”

These are only two examples, among many, that are sufficient to shatter Farhan Khan’s opinion that khātam does not mean seal of authentication and can only mean last. When the meaning of “seal” is applied to the phrase Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn, it means Seal of the prophets. This implies that the Holy Prophetṣa is the seal of authentication for all of the prophetsṣṣ, past and future. This is the simple, logical understanding of the position of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at.

The other objection that Farhan Khan raises against this meaning is:

“...if the letters م ت خ meant seal of attestation as they [Ahmādī Muslims] understand it, then to produce the meaning of best, or most attested, the word should have been as follows:

احْتَمَّ – best, highest of quality

6 Sahīh Bukhārī, Chapter: Taking a ring for stamping certain things or (for stamping) letters written to the people of the Scripture (Jews and Christians) and other people
If the root-letters meant *attestation* or *authentication*, to make it mean *most attested, most authenticated, of highest quality or best*, [akhtamu] should have been used...”

The above quotation exposes Farhan Khan’s pitiable knowledge of Arabic grammar and its linguistic structure. We are replying to this argument only for the benefit of those unfamiliar with the basics of Arabic; otherwise, anyone with rudimentary knowledge would be aware that this is not how the meaning *Best of the prophets* is derived from the phrase *Khātam-un-Nabīyyūn*.

We Ahmadī Muslims translate *Khātam-un-Nabīyyūn* as *Seal of the prophets* based on the primary and fundamental meaning of the word *khātam*, as stated in the dictionaries. We also understand the phrase to mean *Best of the Prophets*, based upon the derived connotation and idiomatic usage of the word *khātam*. When the word *khātam* comes as *مَضَافَ افَلَّه* (Mudāf or Possessed) of a group of people (*مَضَافِ الْإِلَه* – Mudāf Ilaih), then the idiomatic meaning of the phrase is *best of the group*. This idiomatic application of the word *khātam* is actually derived from, and a logical result of, the primary meaning “seal”. The one who is the “Seal of the prophets” is, quite obviously, also the best among them.

The Arabic “lesson” that Farhan Khan has tried to give in his chapter, quite sadly, reveals how unqualified he is to give Arabic lessons! If the native Arabs customarily use the word *khātam* in a phrase to idiomatically convey the meaning of “the best,” then who is Farhan Khan – or anyone else for that matter – to contradict them? Who is he to question the idiomatic usage

---
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of a word in the Arabic language by its native speakers and scholars? There are no idioms in the world which rely exclusively on literal meanings to be understood. They are figurative by definition.

The following are some examples of idioms in the English language that Farhan Khan may not be able to understand because he would try to translate them literally according to the dictionary:

1. A piece of cake
2. Lend me your ear
3. On the same page
4. Actions speak louder than words
5. A picture paints a thousand words

More specific to this topic, the following English idioms express the same connotations as we attribute to *khātam*, along with examples of their usage:

1. **Be-all, end-all** (The ultimate expert: He thinks he’s the *be-all, end-all* of the Arabic language, but he doesn’t even know the basics of Arabic grammar.)
2. **Cream of the Crop** (The best: The Navy SEALs are the military’s *cream of the crop* and they are qualified by the highest training standards.)
3. **Call the Shots** (The decision maker: Although the president is officially in charge, the vice-president *calls the shots.*)
4. **Seal of Approval** (The authority: Nothing gets done around here without the director’s *seal of approval.*)
5. **Carry Weight** (The credible and respected: He has been working here for 20 years and he *carries a lot of weight* with management.)

Imagine how foolish someone trying to translate the above literally would appear! It is the context and the usage of the above phrases that determines their meanings, not the literal dictionary meanings of the individual words. For example, the idiom *cream of the crop* came to be known as *the best*, most likely because cream rises to the top of the milk. The same connotation applies to *la crème de la crème* which means *the best of the best*. Hence, the phrase *Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn* idiomatically means the *Best of the prophets* and if individual words of this phrase are taken out and checked in the dictionary, we would not be able to get this idiomatic translation.

The Arabic language is a very powerful, *mubīn*\(^8\), and beautiful language which allows multiple meanings to be applied to the same words. Judgement is required to sift through the different meanings of *khātam* (literal and figurative) in order to select the meaning(s) which demonstrate the exalted status and greatness of the Holy Prophet Muhammad\(^sa\). Any intelligent and rational person would accept the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding that the Holy Prophet Muhammad\(^sa\) is the seal of authentication *as well as* the best of the prophets. As a matter of fact, the meaning “Best of the prophets” *in every kind of quality and skill*, is the logical result and very essence of being titled the *Khātam (Seal) of the prophets*. The same is being stated in the following *hadīth* of the Holy Prophet Muhammad\(^sa\):

---

\(^8\) Arabic: Eloquent and clear
Hazrat Abu Hurairah ṭa reported that the Messenger ṭa of Allāh said: I have been given superiority over the other prophets in six respects: I have been given words which are concise but comprehensive in meaning; I have been helped by awe [in the hearts of my enemies]; spoils have been made lawful to me; the earth has been made for me clean and a place of worship; I have been sent to all mankind and [the truth of] the prophets is attested [khutima] by me.⁹

In this hadīth, the Holy Prophet Muhammad ṭa himself says that he has been given superiority over the other prophets by being the khātam of the prophets. If being the Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn does not mean that he is the best among the prophets then what superiority is he referring to in the above hadīth? Moreover, the Holy Prophet ṭa is the one who testified to the truth of the prophets as it is stated in the Qur’ān, “‘ رسولٌ مَّصِدِّقٌ أَلْوَامُكَ’”¹⁰. This

---

⁹ صحيح مسلم، كتاب المساجد ومواضع الصلاة [Sahih Muslim, Kitābul Masājid wa Mawādhi‘-is-Salāt]

¹⁰ A Messenger, fulfilling that which is with you. — Sūrah Āle Imrān, 3:82
With attestation to the truth of past prophets, together with a discussion of superiority mentioned in the above *hadīth*, can mean nothing other than his being the best or the most superior of all of the prophets.

**Questions for Farhan Khan:**

1. What credentials does he have to question the centuries-old idiomatic usage of a word in the Arabic language?
2. Why does the Holy Prophet sa consider being *Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn* a superiority over the other prophets if the word *khātam* cannot possibly mean “the best” (according to Farhan Khan)?
Alternative Qirā’āt of the Qur‘ān

Under the chapter entitled Alternative Qirā’āt of the Qur‘ān and Khātim, Farhan Khan argues that since nine of the ten preserved qirā’āt [recitation styles] of the Qur‘ān state khātim instead of khātam, the meaning of khātim should apply as the last one, meaning that the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa is being entitled the Last Prophet11. He also quotes Hazrat Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd Ahmadṣa who has emphasized the fact that the Qur‘ān states khātam, with the fatah [i.e., diacritical mark giving an “a” sound] on tā’, instead of kasra [diacritical mark giving an “i” sound], and that gives the meaning of seal.

First, it should be noted that the background to the qirā’āt that Farhan Khan provides is not entirely accurate. It is true that there were multiple dialects of Arabic at the time of the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa. As a result, the Holy Qur‘ān was revealed with different qirā’āt to facilitate its learning and memorization for Arabs of different tribes with different dialects. However, by the time of Hazrat ‘Uthmān bin ‘Affānra [d. 656 CE] the Third Khalīfah [Caliph or Successor], various tribes
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and nations mixed with the Arabs, and there was no more a need for the different dialects and recitation styles (qirāʿāt) of the Qurʿān. Hence, Hazrat ʿUthmān ῶra ordered that only the Quraishi dialect (or the Hijāzī dialect) should be preserved and Farhan Khan agrees to this when he writes, “The Qurʿān was originally compiled in a single copy for mass distribution by Zayd bin Thābit ῶra under the direction of [Hazrat] ʿUthmān bin ʿAffān ῶra in the year 24 A.H. All of the other alternat[ive] dialects were disregarded. The only dialect that [Hazrat] ʿUthmān ordered to be preserved was the dialect spoken by the Qurayshī Arabs”\textsuperscript{12}. This is true and a reason for this which Farhan Khan does not apparently understand is that the people had started understanding the Hijāzī dialect. The need for them to use the other dialects was now non-existent. The differences in the qirāʿāt existed due to a temporary need and when the times changed, Hazrat ʿUthmān ῶra abrogated the permission to use the different qirāʿāt and established only one qirāʿāh, that is, the qirāʿāh of the Quraishi dialect.

Second, it must be noted that the qirāʿāt other than the Hijāzī qirāʿah do not come directly from the Holy Prophet Muhammad ῶsa. While the chain of narrators of the different qirāʿāt do reach the companions of the Holy Prophet Muhammad ῶsa, there is no evidence of any of the qirāʿāt, other than the Hijāzī qirāʿah, to have been narrated directly from the Holy Prophet Muhammad ῶsa.

Third, whether the word is khātim or khātam, it does not affect the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding. The construction of the word khātam is called Ism Ālah in Arabic grammar and the construction of the word khātim is called Ism Fāʿil. As a result, while khātam means seal, khātim means the one who seals. Both of

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
these meanings are equally applicable to the Holy Prophet Muhammad$^{sa}$ and are only different ways of saying the same thing, that is, the Holy Prophet$^{sa}$ is the one who attests to the truth of past and future prophets. In other words, 33:41 would translate as follows (in the alternative qirā‘āt):

Ма къан мухаммад аб ахд мън ръхалкъм и лкън рсулъл алъх и хатимъл нбъйън
Muhammad is not the father of any of your men, but [he is] the Messenger of Allâh and the one who seals [or attests to the truth of] the prophets.

This means that the Holy Prophet Muhammad$^{sa}$ is the one who placed the seal of authentication on the previous prophets and attested to their truth. He did this by fulfilling their prophecies and confirming the integrity of their claims to prophethood. The Holy Prophet$^{sa}$ is also the khātim for future prophets, that is, he attests to the truth of all future prophets by having established a law or shari‘ah that no future prophet can break. Any future prophet who fails to comply with the law of the Qur‘ān would be guilty of breaking the Holy Prophet’s seal of authority, thereby admitting to falsehood.

This understanding also upholds the superiority of the Hijāzī qirā‘ah used by the Muslims worldwide. It is obvious that we cannot use the inferior qirā‘āt of the Qur‘ān to impose a biased translation on the Hijāzī qirā‘ah which clearly states that the Holy Prophet Muhammad$^{sa}$ is the Khātam (seal), with the fatah on the letter tā’, of the prophets.

Nevertheless, this argument should not be taken to mean that the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at rejects the fact that khātim can mean last. As explained in the chapter entitled Meanings of Khātam in Dictionaries, there are several meanings of this word and “last” is definitely one of those meanings. However, when
the verse is studied in its proper context of praise in rebuttal to insults, and in view of other verses of the Holy Qur’ān which promise the coming of prophets, the meaning of Last of the prophets simply cannot be applied to the phrase Khātim-an-Nabiyyīn, and the only possibility is to take the literal meaning of the one who attests to the truth of the prophets.

Fourth, an objection to the non-Ahmādī understanding is that the word khātim is Ism Fā‘il and if the meaning of last is to be taken, then the literal translation of khātim would be the one who ends or the one who finishes. This meaning cannot be applied to the phrase Khātim-an-Nabiyyīn because the Holy Prophetṣa is definitely not someone who has the authority to “finish” the prophets. This authority rests entirely with Allāh as He is the One who can finish the prophets, not the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa.

Fifth, it must be remembered that in Ibn Al-Anbārī, Kitāb Al-Masāḥif, there is a narration that ʿAbd-ur-Rahmān Aslamīra states:

I was appointed to teach Hazrat Imām Hassanra and Imām Hussainra the Holy Qur’ān. Then, once, Hazrat ʿAlī bin Abī Tālibra passed by me [and] I was teaching them to read Khātim-an-Nabiyyīn, with the kasra on tā’. Then, he [Hazrat ʿAlīra] said to me: “Teach them to recite wa Khātam-an-Nabiyyīn, with the fatah on tā’. May Allāh enable you to!”
This statement is the *fatwā* [i.e., Islāmic legal opinion] of Hazrat ʿAlīṣa on this discussion. What he meant to say is that the *qirāʿah* with the *fataḥ*, Khātam-an-Nabiyyīn, is superior to the *qirāʿāt* with the *kasra*, Khātim-an-Nabiyyīn. Farhan Khan insists that the phrase Khātam-an-Nabiyyīn should be judged based on the inferior *qirāʿāt* but the argument of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamāʿat is that the superior *qirāʿah* should be used to judge the meaning of this phrase. If Hazrat ʿAlīṣa agreed with Farhan Khan, he should have been happy that his sons were being taught the *qirāʿah* which conveys the correct meaning but the fact of the matter is that he discouraged that *qirāʿah* and ordered that *khātam* be recited with a *fataḥ*. Furthermore, it should be noted that in his chapter entitled Examples of Khātam used in other contexts, Farhan Khan says that we should stick to the definition of a word contemporary to the speaker, not contemporary to the interpreter13. However, when it comes to the *qirāʿāt*, he rejects the one employed by Hazrat ʿAlīṣa, who was one of the earliest companions of and contemporary to the Holy Prophet Muḥammadṣa, and wants to impose his preferred *qirāʿāt* centuries later!

Finally, Farhan Khan uses this discussion to point out instances where Hazrat Maulwī Nūr-ud-Dīnra, the first successor [Khalīfa] of the Promised Messiahas, and Hazrat Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd Ahmadra, the second successor of the Promised Messiahas, have apparently stated that Khātam-an-Nabiyyīn means *Last of the prophets*. These can obviously not help him the way he intends because the argument that these great scholars and Khulāfāʾ of Islām Ahmadiyya have made is that the Hijāzī style of recitation is superior to the others. They have not disregarded, negated or rejected the other recitation styles. They

13 Khan, *With Love*, Page 43
have merely made the same argument that has been made in this chapter that the superior qirā’ah states khātam and that word means seal and this meaning applies to the inferior qirā’āt as well. In other words, the qirā’āt containing the word khātim are subordinate to the qirā’ah containing the word khātam, which means seal. This is not something new that has been proposed by the authors. When discussing the narration of Ibn Al-Anbārī, Hazrat Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd Ahmadra states the following:
“This was the *fatwā* of Hazrat ‘Alīra that the *qirā’āt* of Khāṭīm-an-Nabiyyīn with the *kasra* under the *tā’* is subordinate to the *qirā’āt* with the *fatah* over the *tā’*. However, the scholars say that the *qirā’ah* of Khāṭam-an-Nabiyyīn with the *fatah* on *tā’* is subordinate to the *qirā’ah* with the *kasra* under the *tā’*. If khāṭam had meant that which the scholars say, then Hazrat ‘Alīra should have been happy that ‘Abd-ur-Rahmān Aslāmī is teaching his sons to recite with the *kasra* under the *tā’*. Instead, he gives instructions that his children should not be taught to recite with the *kasra* under the *tā’*. This proves that according to Hazrat ‘Alīra, the phrase Khāṭam-an-Nabiyyīn with the *fatah* on *tā’* was more secure. **In general, the *kasra* under the *tā’* is also permissible.** However, since there was a danger that Hazrat Hassanra or Hazrat Hussainra may take it to understand that there is no prophet after the Holy Prophet Muhammadsa even if he is a student of his, he told the teacher to teach his children to recite with the *fatah* on *tā’* and not with the *kasra* under the *tā’*. This also helps us understand that according to Hazrat ‘Alīra, Khāṭam-an-Nabiyyīn does not mean that which can [possibly] be understood with the *kasra* under the *tā’*, that is, “the one who ends the prophets.” Otherwise, he would not have stopped the teacher from teaching with the *kasra* under the *tā’*.14

14 Hazrat Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd Ahmadra, *Tafsīr Kabīr* (Qadian: Printwell Amritsar), Volume 10, Page 382
In conclusion, the Hijāzī qirā‘ah, which is the most superior qirā‘ah, as accepted by all the Muslims of the world, should be used to translate the words Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn and the subordinate qirā‘āt should not be used to force an interpretation on this phrase.

Questions for Farhan Khan:

If any qirā‘ah with the kasra under the tā’ is superior to the qirā‘ah with the fatah on tā’, then:

1. Why did Hazrat Uthmānra order the burning of the other qirā‘āt?
2. Why did Hazrat ‘Ālīra order the teacher to use the qirā‘ah with the fatah on tā’ instead of the qirā‘āt with the kasra under the tā’?
Relationship of Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn to Lā Nabiyya Baʿadī

In his chapter entitled Relationship of Khātam Al-Nabiyyīn to Lā Nabī Baʿadī, Farhan Khan presents the following argument:

The Prophet, being the best in speech, would not combine random, unrelated statements together. With this in mind, consider the following statement of Prophet Muhammadṣa:

واخرج ابن مarduویه عن ثوبان رضی الله عنه قال: قال رسول الله صلی الله عليه وسلم إنه سيكون في أمتى كذابون ثلاثون كلهم يزعم أنه النبي، وانا خاتم النبيين لا نبي بعدي.

Ibn Marduweyah reported, with his chain on the authority of Thawban رضی الله عنه that the Messenger of Allāh صلی الله عليه وسلم said: “Indeed, there will arise in my ummah thirty arch-liars, each of whom will claim to be a Prophet, and I am the seal of the Prophets, there will be no Prophet after me.

If seal of the prophets really means best of the Prophets, and no prophets after me really means no law-bearing prophets after me or no prophets in parallel to me, the
Ahmadi [Muslims] must explain why the Prophet would place two unrelated statements adjacent to another statement that speaks about false prophets who will come to his nation.... 15

Farhan Khan then goes on to boast that his understanding is “consistent” and “coherent” but this is merely wishful thinking which has not come true and will never come true no matter how hard he tries!

First, it must be noted that Farhan Khan clearly misrepresents Islām Ahmadiyya when he writes that Ahmādī Muslims believe that “seal of the prophets really means best of the prophets.” As explained earlier, this is not the stance of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at. “Seal of the prophets” means one who authenticates the truth of past and future prophets. In this sense, the words لَا نَبِيّيْا بَعْدَي نَبِيّيْا mean that there can be no prophet after the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa in opposition to him. When the Holy Prophetṣa says that he is the خَاتَمُ النَّبِيّيْيْن and no prophet can come after him, he means that he is the Seal of the prophets and no prophet can come after him without the seal of authentication of his prophethood. In other words, no prophet who breaks the seal of his prophethood can come in the future. Only one who follows him in letter and spirit can come as a prophet. To further elaborate his statement, the Holy Prophetṣa says that there will be 30 such liars who would break this seal and claim to be independent prophets.

Second, let us test Farhan Khan’s understanding and literal interpretation of his above quoted hadīth. Throughout his book, he argues that خَاتَمُ النَّابِيّيْيْن means “last prophet” but in the chapter under discussion, he presents the above hadīth

15 Khan, With Love, Page 70
which explicitly states only 30 liars would appear in the Muslim ummah. What are we to do once that number has been achieved? If Farhan Khan was right, the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} would never have placed a limit on the number of false claimants to prophethood that were to come after him. Instead of saying إنَّهُ سيكونُ في أمتيِ كذابونِ ثلاثونَ [Indeed, there will arise in my ummah thirty arch-liars], he would have said إنَّهُ سيكونُ في أمتيِ كذابونِ كثيرونَ [Indeed, there will arise in my ummah many liars]. In fact, this is a riddle that non-Ahmadīs cannot solve no matter how hard they try!!! While Farhan Khan insists that false prophets will keep on coming endlessly as the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} is the very last prophet, after whom no prophet can come, the hadith quoted by him states that there will only be 30 of them. After that, one must be careful in judging claimants to prophethood. From a literal perspective, this number has already been achieved. In the commentary of Sahīh Muslim, Al-Ikmāl Al-Akmāl, it is stated:

هذَا الحدِيثُ ظَهَرَ صَدِيقُهُ فَأَنَا لَوُعدُ مِنْ تَنْبَأَ مِنْ زَمْتِهِ صَلِّي الله عليه وسلم إلى الآن لبلغ هذا العدد ويعرف ذلك من طالع التاريخ

This hadith had demonstrated its truth, for, if all the false claimants to prophethood are counted from the time of the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} until today, then, this number has surely been achieved and whoever studies history would know this.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{16} As-Sharah Al-Ikmāl Al-Akmāl, Volume 7, Page 458
It must be noted that the writer of this book died in 828 Hijrī! Hence, those 30 who broke the seal and claimed independent prophethood came a long time ago!

Third, if Farhan Khan’s faulty understanding is correct, then no prophets can ever come after the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa. Hence, whoever claims to be a prophet has to be a dajjāl [i.e., liar or deceiver]. If this is correct, then the statements of the Holy Prophetṣa regarding the coming of a prophet in the future would be incorrect, and by stating this, Farhan Khan is essentially accusing the Holy Prophetṣa of contradicting himself. In quoting the Holy Prophetṣa, he states that there can be no prophet after him whatsoever, yet the Holy Prophetṣa himself has stated that a prophet will come and not only that, he repeatedly emphasized the importance of accepting the truth of that prophet! The following ahādīth by the Holy Prophetṣa clearly indicate he prophesied the coming of a prophet in the Latter Days:

نبي الله عيسى واصحابه

The prophet of Allāh, Jesus, and his companions¹⁷

ليس بيني وبينه يعني عيسى عليه السلام نبي وانه نازل-...-

There is no prophet between me and him i.e. ʿĪsāṣa and he shall descend (in the future)¹⁸

Farhan Khan’s understanding ignores these ahādīth which clearly speak of a prophet to come after the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa. He should clarify his position for us!

¹⁷ Sahih Muslim, Kitāb-ul-Fītn, Chapter: ذكر الديبال وصفته وما معه
¹⁸ Sunan Abū Dawūd, Kitāb Al-Malāhim, Bāb Khurūjud Dajjāl
On another note, since Farhan Khan is keen on finding weaknesses in the narrations of the *ahādīth* presented by Ahmadī Muslims, he should bear in mind that the above *hadīth* that he cites in his book *three times* and emphasizes in his *YouTube* videos has similarly been criticized as weak (*dhaʿīf*) by his own reputed scholars! It is quoted again as follows:

و اخرج ابن مردوযّه عن ثوبان رضي الله عنه قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إنه سيكون في أمتى كذابون ثلاثون كلهم يزعم أنه نبي، وانا خاتم النبيين لا نبي بعديٍ

Hazrat Thaubān ṭa narrates that the Holy Prophetṣa said: “Indeed, there will arise in my *umma* thirty arch-liars, each of whom will claim to be a prophet, and I am the *Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn* (Seal of prophets), there is no prophet after me (without my seal”).

All the varying narrations of the above *hadīth* are from weak narrators. For instance, in *Jāmiʿ Tirmidhī*, it is narrated by Abū Qalābah and Thaubān, both of whom are weak narrators. About Abū Qalābah, it is written, “ليس أبو قلابة من فقهاء التابعين وهو عند الناس محدود في البله” (Abū Qalābah was not a wise person. Instead, among the people, he was famous for ignorance)19. It is also stated, “أنا مدرس عمن لحقهم و عمن لم يلحقهم” (He used to narrate from those whom he met and from those whom he did not meet)20. About Thaubān, Azdī states, “يتكلمون فيه” (There is

---

19 *Tehzīb At-Tehzīb*, Volume 5, Page 226
20 *Mizānul Aʿitadāl*, Volume 2, Page 39
disagreement in the authenticity of this narrator)\textsuperscript{21}. In the same way, all the other narrations of this hadīth have weak narrators. \textit{This is the status of the hadīth that Farhan Khan likes to present over and over again!}

**Questions for Farhan Khan:**

1. Why did the Holy Prophet \(\text{sa}\) specify that there will only be 30 liars after him when, according to Farhan Khan, there can be no prophet of any kind \textit{whatsoever} after him?
2. Why does he believe in no prophets \textit{whatsoever} after the Holy Prophet Muhammad \(\text{sa}\) in light of the above statements about the coming of a latter day prophet?

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Mizānul A’itedal, Volume 1, Page 173}
Examples of Khātam used in other Contexts

Under the chapter entitled Examples of Khātam used in other contexts, Farhan Khan makes a straw man fallacy by stating that Ahmadi Muslims believe, “The title Khātam Al-Nabiyyīn can only mean best of the prophets...” This is completely false! As shown earlier, Ahmadi Muslims take the phrase Khātam-an-Nabiyyīn to mean “Seal of the prophets” and the meaning “Best of the prophets” is also applied idiomatically because it is the intended meaning behind the literal translation. Plenty of examples of similar usage of khātam are found in Arabic literature. For instance, Hazrat ‘Alīra was called Khātam-ul-Awliyā’ (Seal of the Awliyā’), Abū Tamām was called Khātam-us-Shuʿarā (Seal of the Poets), and so on. Obviously, the Arabs did not consider Hazrat ‘Alīra the last wali [i.e., saint] nor did they consider Abū Tamām the last poet. Nevertheless, Farhan Khan lays down three objections against the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding:

---

22 A fallacy based on misrepresentation of an opponent’s position
23 Khan, With Love, Page 42
1. The method of analysis of the words of the Qur’ān by Ahmadi Muslims is erroneous.
2. One must analyze how the Holy Prophet sa defined the word khātam, instead of going to external sources.
3. One must look at how Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad as used the word khātam in his writings.

These objections will now be discussed one by one.

Method of Analysis of Qur’ānic Words

While discussing the method of analysis of Qur’ānic words, Farhan Khan explains that the mufassirūn [i.e., writers of commentaries of the Qur’ān] would commonly refer to Arabic poetry and literature to understand the meaning of words. He then explains that this is only applicable to Arabic poetry and/or literature from the pre-Islāmic period or the period contemporary to the Qur’ān. To illustrate his point, he writes that the word “salāh” (صلاة) used to mean blessing or connection at the time of the Holy Prophet Muhammad sa but over time, it evolved to mean ritual prayer. In other words, in later periods, the Arabic language began to evolve and the usage of certain words, including khātam, began to change. Hence, the meanings of words from later periods cannot be applied to their usage in the Holy Qur’ān or ahādīth. In conclusion to his argument, Farhan Khan says, “...hypothetically, even if the meaning of Khātam did evolve to mean ‘best,’ the modern evolution of Arabic does not retroactively change the meaning of the Qur’ān.”

Although we must give credit to Farhan Khan for his creative ignorance, we are forced to expose his deceit. Our rebuttal to his long ramblings about the alleged evolution of the

24 Khan, With Love, Page 44
meaning of the word *khātam* from “final” to “best” is quite simple! The Holy Prophet Muhammad ﷺ himself used the word *khātam* to mean “best.” There was no evolution! Consider the following *ahādīth*:

أَنَّى عَنْدِ اللَّهِ مَكْتَوبُ خَاتَمِ النَّبِيِّينَ وَأَنَّ أَدْمَ لَمْ يَنْجِدَ فِي

Certainly, I have been with Allāh as *Khātam-an-Nabiyyīn* while Adam as was yet in the nascent stage.

In the above *hadīth*, the phrase *Khātam-an-Nabiyyīn* cannot possibly be translated as “Last of the prophets”. How could he be the last prophet when those before him had not even appeared? This demonstrates that the Holy Prophet Muhammad ﷺ himself used the phrase idiomatically to state that he is the *Best of the prophets*.

أَنَّى خَاتِمُ الْنَّبِيِّاءَ وَانْتِ يَا عَلَى خَاتِمِ الأَوْصَيَاءِ

I am the *Khātam-ul-Anbiyā’* and you, O ‘Alī, are the *Khātam-ul-Awsiyā’* [i.e., Seal of the advisors].

أَنَّى خَاتِمُ الْنَّبِيِّاءَ وَانْتِ يَا عَلَى خَاتِمِ الأَوْلِيَاءِ

I am the *Khātam-ul-Anbiyā’* and you, O ‘Alī, are the *Khātam-ul-Awliyā’* [i.e., Seal of the saints].

---


In the above two narrations, the principles of the Arabic language tell us that Hazrat ‘Alīra was the Khātam-ul-Awliyā in the same way as the Holy Prophetsa was the Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn. If sainthood continues after Hazrat ‘Alīra, prophethood continues after the Holy Prophetsa.

Hazrat Abu Hurairahra reported that the Messenger of Allāh said: I have been given superiority over the other prophets in six respects: I have been given words which are concise but comprehensive in meaning; I have been helped by awe (in the hearts of enemies); spoils have been made lawful to me; the earth has been made for me clean and a place of worship; I have been sent to all mankind and the truth of the prophets is attested (Khutima) by me.28

---

27 Maulvī Syed ‘Ammār ‘Alī, Tafsīr ‘Umdat-ul-Bayān, Volume 2, Page 284, Published: 1302 Hijrī, Publisher: Yusuf Dehlī
28 Sahīh Muslīm, Kitāb Al-Masājid wa Mawādhi‘ī Al-Salāt

[ صحيح مسلم. كتاب المساجد و مواضع الصلاة؟]
In the above hadīth, the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa declares that he is superior to the earlier prophets because he is their Khātam! No one can deny that the Holy Prophetṣa considered his Khatamiyyat (being the seal) as his Fadhilat [i.e., superiority]! This is factual proof that the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa also used the word Khātam to idiomatically mean “best” and this precedent is the reason why this word was continuously used over the centuries to mean “best.” There are countless examples of this usage in Arabic literature. Hence, the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding of the word Khātam is contemporary to the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa, not contemporary to Farhan Khan!

Furthermore, Farhan Khan says that the mufassirūn followed the Usūl-ut-Tafsīr [Principles of commentary of the Holy Qur’ān] by commonly referring to pure Arabic poetry and literature to understand the meanings of Qur’ānic words. Let us see how the mufassirūn themselves understood the word Khātam. Hazrat Imām Rāzī, one of the greatest mufassirūn in the history of Islām and a very well-acknowledged authority on Tafsīr-ul-Qur’ān [i.e., commentary of the Qur’ān], writes:

عند هذه الدرجة فازوا بالخلع الأربعة الوجود والحياة والقدرة والعقل فالعقل خاتم الكل وقد الخاتم يجب أن يكون أفضل الاتري ان رسولنا صلى الله عليه وسلم لما كان خاتم النبيين كان أفضل الأنبياء عليهم الصلاة وسلم ولما كان خاتم المخلوقات الجسمانية كان أفضلها كذالك العقل لما كان خاتم الخلع الفائضة من حضره ذي الجلال كان أفضل الخلع واكملها
At this stage, man is granted four garments, that is, existence, life, power, and ‘Aql [i.e., the ability to think]. And ‘Aql is the Khātam-ul-Kul [i.e., best among them all]. And it is necessary for Khātam to be the ‘Best’. Don’t you see that our Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) was the Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn in the sense of being the Afzal-ul-Anbiyā’ [Best of the Prophets] (upon whom be blessings and peace)? And man is the Khātam-ul-Makhluqat-ul-Jismāniyyah [i.e., Seal of the created beings with bodies] in the sense of being the best among them. In the same sense, ‘Aql is the Khātam of the Garments granted [to man] by Allāh – the Possessor of Majesty – in the sense of being the best of the garments and the most excellent.29

This quotation is from a very well acknowledged Tafsīr of the Holy Qur’ān and nobody can claim that the writer did not follow the Usūl-ut-Tafsīr or that he tried to use an ‘evolved” or “changed” meaning of the word khātam. In conclusion, it is now proven that the Ahmadiyya Muslim interpretation of the word khātam is completely in coherence with the Usūl-ut-Tafsīr!

One more thing that needs to be noted here is that Farhan Khan illustrates his faulty point with a ridiculous example! He quotes the following verse:

29 Imām Razi, Tafsīr Kabīr, Volume 4, Pages 22, 31, and 34 [تفسير كبير، جلد ۳، صفحة ۳۲]
Allāh and His angels send blessings on the Prophet. O ye who believe! You also should invoke blessings on him and salute him with the salutation of peace.\(^{30}\)

Then, he writes, “...the original meaning of salāh is blessing or connection. Over time, the word salāh evolved to mean ritual prayer. However, modern evolutions in the Arabic language do not retroactively change the meaning of the Qur‘ān. This verse says that Allāh and the angels bless the Prophet\(^{sa}\), and the Muslims are commanded to send their blessings upon the Prophet\(^{sa}\) as well.”\(^{31}\)

This theory of the evolution of the word salāh is entirely an innovation of Farhan Khan! To his embarrassment, he has solidified his position as one of the fabricating liars in the history of Islām. In his desperation to discredit Ahmadiyya Muslim beliefs, he has crossed the line in forging examples to prove his ridiculous points! The following ahādīth prove that the Holy Prophet Muhammad\(^{sa}\) himself used the word salāh in the meaning of “prayer”:

\[
\text{أَنَّ رَجُلًا قَالَ يَا رَسُولُ الْلَّهِ أَخْبِرْنِي بِعَمَلٍ يُدْخِلْنِي الْجَنَّةَ}
\]

\[
\text{فَقَالَ الْقُوْمُ مَا لَهُ مَا لَهُ فَقَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ}
\]

\[
\text{وَسَلَّمُ أَرْبَ مَا لَهُ فَقَالَ الْبَيْبُ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمُ تَعْبُدُ}
\]

\[
\text{اللَّهَ لَا تُشْرِكُ بِهِ شِيّئًا وَتُقِيمُ الصَّلَاةَ وَتُؤْتِي الرَّكَآةَ وَتَصِلُّ}
\]

\[
\text{الرَّجُمَ ذَرْهَا قَالَ كَانَ عَلَى رَجُلِهِ}
\]

A man said, “O Messenger of Allāh! Inform me of a deed which will make me enter Paradise.” The

---

\(^{30}\) Sūrah Al-Ahzāb, 33:57

\(^{31}\) Khan, With Love, Page 43
people said, “What is the matter with him? What is the matter with him?” The Messengerṣa of Allāh said, “He has something to ask [what he needs greatly].” Then, the Prophetṣa said [to him], “[In order to enter Paradise] you should worship Allāh, not associating anything with him, and you should offer prayers perfectly, and give obligatory charity [Zakāt], and keep good relations with your kith and kin.” He then said, “Leave it!” (The sub-narrator said, “It seems that the Prophet was riding his she camel”).32

It is narrated by ‘Abdullāh bin Abī Qatāda: My father said, “While we were praying [Nusallī] with the Prophetṣa he heard the noise of some people. After he had offered the prayer [Sallā] he said, “What is the matter with you?” They replied, “We were hurrying for the prayer [As-salāh].” He said, “Do not make haste for the prayer, and whenever you come for the prayer [As-salāh], you should come with calmness, and pray [Fasallū] whatever you get [with the people] and complete the rest which you have missed.”33

32 Sahih Bukhārī, Good Manners and Form, Book 8, Volume 73, Hadīth 12
33 Sahih Bukhārī, Call to Prayers (Adhān), Book 1, Volume 11, Hadīth 608
Examples of Khātam used in other contexts

This is the kind of example that Farhan Khan gave in his book! He is so blinded by his bias against Islām Ahmadiyya that he does not even bother to read what he is writing! There was never any evolution with the word salāh! Since the Arabic language is mubīn and multiple meanings can be applied to the same word, the word salāh has multiple meanings as well. In the verse, the meaning of “blessing” is applied based on the context of the verse, and in the hadīth, the meaning of “ritual prayer” is applied based on its particular context. The same principle applies to the usage of the word khātam. If the context shows that it has been used to mean “last,” then this meaning would apply and if the context shows that it has been used to mean “seal,” then this meaning applies.

Khātam-ul-Muhājirīn

Another narration that Farhan Khan quotes in his chapter is as follows:

اطمئن يا عم فانك خاتم المهاجرين في الهجرة كما أنا خاتم النبيين في النبوة

“Rest assured O Uncle! For you are the Khātam-ul-Muhājirīn (last of the migrants) in the migration as I am the Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn (last of the Prophets) in the prophethood.”

Quoting the above hadīth, Farhan Khan goes into a long discussion about the authenticity of the narrators of the hadīth.
Then, he writes that the words في الهجرة [in the migration] “seem to indicate that ‘Ibn Abbas was the last migration in the specific migration from Makkah to Medīnah.”35

First of all, Farhan Khan makes another embarrassing mistake, this time with the background of the hadith. This is not about Hazrat Ibn ‘Abbāsra. Instead, it is about Hazrat ‘Abbāsra, who was indeed the uncle of the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa! What happened was that Hazrat ‘Abbāsra was worried about the nature of his migration. He embarked upon his migration from Mecca to Medina at the time when the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa was returning to Mecca from Medina with thousands of Muslims. This was just before the Prophet’s victory of Mecca. When Hazrat ‘Abbāsra left Mecca for Medina, he met with the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa on the way and came back to Mecca with him. This caused him to get worried that his migration may not be considered an actual migration. Hence, the Holy Prophetṣa comforted him with the words, “طمئن يا عم” (Rest assured, O Uncle!). Then, he said, “For you are the Khātam-ul-Muhājirīn in the migration as I am Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn in the prophethood.”

Farhan Khan is correct in stating that this hadith is not about migration in general, but the specific migration from Mecca to Medina. In that sense, the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa comforted Hazrat ‘Abbāsra that his migration from Mecca to Medina would in fact be accepted but it would be the last of its nature. This also means that the Holy Prophetṣa could not possibly be comparing the specific migration to prophethood in general. If that is so, then this comparison would be faulty and no Muslim would accuse the Holy Prophetṣa of making faulty
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comparisons! The fact of the matter is that the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} compared the \textit{specific} migration from Mecca to Medina to his \textit{specific} prophethood which is \textit{law-bearing} prophethood. If this had not been the case, the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} would have said, “You are the \textit{Khātam-ul-Muhājirīn} as I am the \textit{Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn}”. Instead, he says, “You are the \textit{Khātam-ul-Muhājirīn in the migration} as I am the \textit{Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn in the prophethood}.” As a result, the words “in the prophethood” clearly show that he was referring to his \textit{specific} prophethood which has ended and no prophet with a law or a status comparable to the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} can come until the Day of Judgment. Only subordinate prophets can come, that is, subordinate to the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} and subservient to his \textit{shari’ah} (i.e., law).

\textbf{Usage of the word \textit{Khātam} by Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad\textsuperscript{as}}

Farhan Khan has presented three examples of the usage of the word \textit{khātam} by Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad\textsuperscript{as} with the intended meaning of “last,” according to him. In the chapter entitled \textit{Meanings of Khātam in Dictionaries}, we have already explained that the word \textit{khātam} does not have only one meaning that is \textit{always} applied. It has several meanings, both literal and derived. The principle is that the context and usage of a word helps determine the correct meaning of a word in a phrase or sentence. As a result, when Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad, the Promised Messiah and Imām Mahdī\textsuperscript{as}, uses the word \textit{khātam} to mean “last” in a certain context, there can be no objection against it! This principle does not only apply to the Arabic language. It is universal and fundamental to all languages. Consider the following examples of a phrase in the English language with different meanings in different contexts:
1. **All right**: expression of reluctant agreement.
   a. Can you come to the house with me?
   b. Oh, **all right**. I don't want to, but I will.

2. **All right**: fair; not particularly good.
   a. How’s your Arabic class?
   b. It’s **all right**, I guess, but I’m struggling with Arabic grammar.

3. **All right**: unharmed; in satisfactory condition.
   a. You don't look normal. Are you **all right**?
   b. Yes, but I have a backache.36

These examples illustrate that the same phrase can have different meanings in different contexts. Similarly, when the Promised Messiah as says that he was the *Khātam-ul-Walad* (last of the Children) for his parents and no child was born after him, the context clearly states that he is using the word *Khātam* in one of its derived meanings, that is, “last”. In the same way, when he says that Hazrat ‘Īsā bin Mariam as was the *Khātam-ul-Anbiyā’* among the Israelite Prophets, he means that he was the last of the Israelite prophets and he is stating it as a historical fact. However, he used the word *Khātam* in a different sense in the following quotation:

36 Idioms slightly modified from source: [www.schools.utah.gov](http://www.schools.utah.gov)
And I am not one who rejects the greatness of Hazrat ‘Īsāas. God has informed me that the Masīh of the Muhammadan dispensation is greater in status compared to the Masīh of the Mosaic dispensation. However, I have great respect for Masīhas Ibn Mariam because, in terms of spirituality, I am the Khātam-ul-Khulafā’ in Islām just as Masīh Ibn Mariam was the Khātam-ul-Khulafā’ for the Israelite dispensation. In the Mosaic dispensation, Ibn Mariam was the Promised Messiah and in the Muhammadan dispensation, I am the Promised Messiah. Hence, I respect him who has the same name as me and only a mischievous one and a liar would say to me that I do no respect Masīhas Ibn Mariam 38.

It is clear from the context of the above quotation that Hazrat Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad as is not using the word khâtam to speak of the finality of the Khilāfah of Hazrat ‘Īsāas in terms of time. He is actually speaking of Hazrat ‘Īsāas finality in terms of status because he compares him to himself and states that he is the Khātam-ul-Khulafā’ in Islām in terms of spirituality just as Masīh Ibn Mariamaas was the Khātam-ul-Khulafā’ for the Israelites. If he had intended to speak of his or Hazrat ‘Īsāas finality in terms of time, he would have said:

37 Kishtī-e-Nūh, Rūhānī Khazā’in, Volume 19, Page 18
In terms of time, I am the Khātam-ul-Khulafā’ in Islām just as Masīh Ibn Mariam was the Khātam-ul-Khulafā’ for the Israelite dispensation.

In terms of spirituality, I am the Khātam-ul-Khulafā’ in Islām just as Masīh Ibn Mariam was the Khātam-ul-Khulafā’ for the Israelite dispensation.

Hence, it is quite clear from the quotation itself that the Promised Messiah as is speaking of the status of Hazrat ‘Īsā as. Further proof of the fact that he was not using the word khātam to mean “last” in this specific context is that he himself predicted that there would be Khulafā’ after him. This is demonstrated when he writes, “يُسَافِرُ الْمُسِحُ الْمَوْعُودُ أَوْ خَلِيفَةٌ مِنْ خَلِيفَاتِهِ اِلَى أَرْضٍ دِمَشْق” (The Promised Messiah as or a Khalifa from his Khulafā’ would travel towards the land of Damascus). In a similar quotation, the Promised Messiah as calls himself the Khātam-ul-Awliyā’ and clarifies his use as well, “أَنَّهُ خَاتِمُ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ وَأَنَا خَاتِمُ الْأَوْلِيَاءِ لاَ وَلِيٌّ بَعْدُنِي الَّذِي هُوَ مَنْيُ وَعَلِيُّ عَهْدِ” (Certainly, he [the Holy Prophet Muhammad as] is the Khātam-ul-Anbiyā’ and I am
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the Khätam-ul-Awliyā’ [Seal of the Saints]. There is no wali after me except one who is from my followers and upon my covenant])⁴⁰. These quotations show that Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad as believed that there would be Awliyā’ and Khulafā’ after him and he could not have called himself the Last of the Khulafā’ or the Last of the Awliyā’. Moreover, this holds true from a historical point of view. Hazrat ‘Īsā as was indeed the last prophet for the Israelites or the Khätam-ul-Anbiyā’ for them but the system of Khilāfah continued after him. In this sense, Hazrat ‘Īsā as cannot possibly be called the Last of the Khulafā’. Instead, Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad as calls him the Best of the Khulafā’ for those who came after him. As a result, both Hazrat ‘Īsā as and Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad as share the title of Khätam ul-Khulafā’ as they are the best of the Khulafā’ among those Khulafā’ coming after them.

Questions for Farhan Khan:

1. If the word khätam did not idiomatically mean “best” at the time of the Holy Prophet Muhammad sa, why did he repeatedly use it in this sense in his statements?
2. What does he think about the fact that Hazrat Imām Razī translated Khätam-an-Nabiyyīn as “Best of the prophets” while knowing full well what the Usūl-ut-Tafsīr are?

⁴⁰ Khutba Ilhāmiyya, Page 35
Last Law-bearing Prophet\textsuperscript{sa}

\textit{Misrepresentation of İslām Ahmadiyya}

Under the chapter entitled \textit{Last of the Law-Bearing Prophets}, Farhan Khan gives the names of the books from where he took the arguments in favour of İslām Ahmadiyya and draws the conclusion: “When [Ahmadī Muslims] argue that khātam Al-nabiyīn means last law-bearing Prophet, they implicitly accept that \textit{khātam} can mean \textit{last} and \textit{Al-nabiyīn} means \textit{the prophets}.” \textsuperscript{41}

It is important to mention here that Farhan Khan is following the footsteps of those who have been mentioned in the Holy Qur’ān as \textit{mawāṣi‘u ṣalṭānātul ‘ākhirah} (\textit{those who pervert words from their proper places})\textsuperscript{42}. In his attempts to avoid a straw man fallacy, he does precisely that by falsely and dishonestly concocting a belief and attributing it to Ahmadiyya, the True

\textsuperscript{41} Khan, \textit{With Love}, Page 29
\textsuperscript{42} Sūrah An-Nisā’ 5:14
Islām. Before refuting his false accusations it is important to read from the original sources which Farhan Khan was supposed to be quoting from in the beginning of his chapter. One may ask: Why did he not include the original quotations in his book? After reading these quotations, the readers will not only have the answer to this question but also see his real face.

The first quotation is from the book Revelation, Rationality, Knowledge and Truth:

The Rationale of Finality

The finality of any Prophet can be observed with reference to his message as well as with reference to his status. It is possible for a Prophet to be final in his message and his status, yet it is also possible for another lesser Prophet to come after him without violating his finality. It is this aspect of prophethood that we are going to thoroughly examine now.

The belief in the finality of the Qur‘ānic law and in the finality of the Prophet sa to whom this law was revealed, is unanimously held by all Muslims. The Qur‘ān—a complete code of life—claims for itself a promise of eternal Divine protection from interpolation by human hands. If this claim is right, as the Muslims believe and demonstrate it to be, the bearer of such a book must be accepted as the last law-bearing Prophet. This is clearly understandable and is so endorsed by the entire world of Islām without exception. But from the non-Muslim vantage point, it is difficult to comprehend how any Book could fulfil the needs of all ages and defy the requirements for change during the times to come.
Add to this the Qur’ānic claim of universality and the problem will increase manifold. How can it be logically explained that any Divine Book could satisfactorily address the ethnic and parochial problems of all mankind alike? There are Europeans, Americans, Africans, Arabs, Russians, Israelis, and numerous people of Asian origin with different ethnic backgrounds and inherited cultures. Their political and social traditions also differ so widely that it is difficult to visualize how a single universal code of religious law could satisfy them with equal justice.

In answer to both these questions, the Qur’ān claims that all its teachings are founded on the human psyche which is common to mankind and unchangeable in relation to time. Any teaching which perfectly corresponds to the human psyche becomes unchangeable. It is this principle that the Qur’ān alludes to when it says:

 فلاَّ أَقَّمْ وَحَمَّلْ لِلَّذِينَ حَنَّفُوا فَطَّرَتُ اللَّهُ الْتَّيِنَ فَطَّرَ النَّاسَ عَلَّيًا ۗ لَا تَتَبَدَّلَ لِحَلَقِي اللَّهُ ذَلِكَ الَّذِينَ الْقَيْمَ وَلَكِنْ أَكْثَرُ النَّاسِ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ

So set thy face to the service of religion as one devoted to God. And follow the nature made by Allāh—the nature in which He has created mankind. There is no altering
the creation of God. That is the right religion. But most men know not.43

Indeed the nature created by God cannot be altered. Even the atheist must concede that human nature has remained universally unaltered since time immemorial. But a Book of Law corresponding to this unalterable nature can itself be changed all the same by the interference of humans. The Qur’ān takes care of this danger by declaring it is a well-protected book.

Verily, it is We Who have sent down this Exhortation, and most surely We are its Guardian.44

History has proved this claim to be right. Hence the Prophet45 who was bestowed this Book has to be accepted as the last law-bearer. Nothing in this claim is irrational, but when it is suggested that even non-law-bearing prophets cannot come, the jurisdiction of finality is overextended without any rational justification. No sooner have they made this claim of absolute finality than they venture to demolish it themselves. The cracks begin to appear the moment they hasten to exempt Jesus46 from this all-pervasive law of finality.

43 Sūrah Ar-Rūm 30:31
44 Sūrah Al-Hijr 15:10
When confronted with this dilemma, they dismiss it with a mere wave of their hand as though it were no dilemma at all.

The reappearance of Jesus as a Prophet after Prophet Muhammad, they argue, does not contradict his absolute finality on the following counts:

- Jesus would be brought back from a stock of prophets who had already been commissioned before the advent of Prophet Muhammad. Thus his finality will not be violated. It can only be violated if a Prophet is raised after his advent even if that Prophet brings no new law and is selected by God from within his own ummah (people).
- Jesus’ prophethood would be the one granted to him during his advent prior to Islām.
- Moreover because during his second advent he would be subordinated to the Holy Prophet, he would no longer be held as independent.

Hence by being an older Prophet and by becoming subordinated, he would not violate the seal of prophethood. As such, their concept of finality only means that new prophets cannot be commissioned while old prophets can be brought back; but this is sheer absurdity. What manner of an All-Wise God would He be who would pass the verdict of absolute finality in favour of anyone despite His knowledge that a Prophet would certainly be needed after him? The question of old or new is irrelevant. Central to the issue is the question of need.
The need for another Prophet after the advent of the last is an intrinsically contradictory belief. Faced with this dilemma the ‘Ulemā’ always twist the issue by arguing that the need for the advent of a Prophet may occur after the final Prophet had come and gone. Yet, the absoluteness of his finality would remain intact as long as the new need is fulfilled by an old Prophet. But anyone should be able to see through this transparent effort at cheating. The difference of old or new is just a childish attempt to confuse the issue. If Jesus\textsuperscript{as} of Nazareth reappears and submits to the supremacy of Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa}, he would still be a Prophet after him. To fulfil the new need by borrowing an old Prophet from a bygone people is far worse than fulfilling the same need by raising a new Prophet from within the people of Islām. If the former does not violate the Doctrine of Finality the latter most certainly cannot.\textsuperscript{45}

Based on this quotation, it is already clear that Farhan Khan made inappropriate and dishonest conclusions about the Ahmadiyya Muslim position. His second quotation is from the article entitled \textit{The concept of Revelation in Islām} and this is also quoted below:

\textbf{Do We Need a Further Law After the Holy Qur’ān}

The tenth question relating to the subject of revelation is: Is it necessary to have a new law revealed even after the Holy Qur’ān?

\textsuperscript{45} Hazrat Mirzā Tahir Ahmad\textsuperscript{rh}, \textit{Revelation Rationality Knowledge and Truth} (Islamabad: Islam International Publications Ltd., 1998), Pages 670-673
It must be remembered that the Holy Qur’ān, as we believe, is a book of complete and perfect laws which need not be abrogated. The question, therefore of a new law does not arise at all. No new law needs promulgation, nor is there a need for a new Prophet with a new law. This is a fact which is wholly based on the Holy Qur’ān - the word of God, and is also supported by the general consensus of the Muslim divines. Muslim scholars of the past have explained that the correct meaning of the expression Khātaman-Nabiyyen and Laa Nabi B’adi simply mean that no Prophet would ever come after the Holy Prophet (sa), who would revoke and abrogate the law of the Qur’ān - Islām.

So now, only non law-bearing revelation can come. The Qur’ān is the perfect and complete law of Islām and there would be no new law in the future. The Holy Qur’ān has repeatedly stated that saints and sages of Islām will definitely be honoured with non law-bearing revelation. God the Gracious has given the firm promise that the true followers of the Holy Qur’ān and the Holy Prophet (sa) shall be raised to the rank of those whom God loves: ‘And whoso obeys Allāh and this messenger shall be among those on whom Allāh has bestowed His blessings - the Prophets, the Truthful, the Martyrs and the Righteous. And an excellent company are they.’ (Chapter 4, Verse 70). And again, Allāh says in the Holy Qur’ān: ‘Behold! the friends of Allāh shall certainly have no fear, nor shall they grieve. Those who believed and were ever righteous, for them are glad tidings in the present life and also in the
hereafter, there is no changing the words of Allāh - that indeed is the supreme achievement.’ (Chapter 10, Verse 65). Again, the Holy Qur‘ān says: ‘As for those who say, “Our Lord is Allāh”, and then remain steadfast, the angels descend on them, reassuring them: “Fear not, nor grieve and rejoice in the glad tidings of the gardens which were promised. We are your friends in this life and the hereafter. Therein will you have all that you will ask for”.’ (Chapter 41, Verses 31-32).

These verses make it quite clear that the door of the non law-bearing revelation shall remain open for all true Muslims; and Muslim sages and Muslim saints shall continue to be exalted with this great blessing of God. Traditions of the Holy Prophet (sa) also tell us the same about revelation. (See Mishkat Al-Masabeh).

According to the Holy Qur‘ān, therefore, this holy tree is flourishing in the most splendid manner and is giving its sweet fruit to the true believers, and this great blessing of Allāh shall continue so long as this world is in existence.46

In both the references, the given meaning of Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn is an established precedent by renowned Muslim saints and scholars and it does not exclusively represent the Ahmadiyya Muslim interpretation. The Ahmadiyya Muslim stance and exposition on the phrase Khātam-an-Nabiyyīn has already been discussed at length in the previous chapters. In reality, the false

accusations of Farhan Khan fall on the saints of the Muslim ummah, not the Ahmadi Muslims. This also exposes his dishonesty and his shallow attempt to lead people astray with his false accusations against Ahmadiyya, the True Islam.

To prove this beyond a shadow of doubt, a few examples from the writings of great saints of the Muslim ummah are being presented here. Hazrat Muhy-ud-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabī, a great saint, expresses his belief in the following quotation:

The prophethood which came to an end with the advent of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be on him) was Tashrīʿī Nubuwat [i.e., a prophet with a new book and new law]. There is no room for such prophethood after the Holy Qur‘ān. This is the correct meaning of the hadith, which contains the Holy Prophet’s saying that there is to be no prophet after him. The hadith only conveys that after the Holy Prophet, there can be no prophet who will replace his shari‘ah with another one. Henceforth, whenever any prophet comes, he will be subordinate to him and his shari‘ah.47

Similarly, Sheikh Balī Āfandī wrote in Fusūs-ul-Hakam, “Khātam-ur-Rusul is one after whom no law-bearing prophet can come”.48 The famous saint, Hazrat Syed ‘Abd-ul-Karīm Gilānī wrote:

With the advent of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be on him), prophethood bearing a new law came to an end. The Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be on him) was called Khātam-

47 Futūhāt Makkiyyah, Volume 2, Chapter 73, Page 3
48 Fusūs Al-Hakam, Page 56
un-Nabīyīn because, with his advent, the law was completed and perfected.49

Hazrat Sheikh ‘Abd-ul-Qādir Al-Kurdistānī wrote, “The title Khātam-un-Nabīyīn conferred on the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be on him) means that after him a law-bearing prophet will not come.”50 Maulwī Abū Al-Hasnāt ‘Abd- ul-Hay of Farangimahal, Lucknow, a Brelwī scholar gives his exposition on the same topic that:

‘Ulemā Ahle Sunnat also subscribe to the view that following the advent of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be on him) no law-bearing prophet can come. The prophethood of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be on him) is wide in scope. Any prophet who would now come would be from the ummah and follow his sharī‘ah.51

It is now evident that our interpretation of Khātam-un-Nabīyīn was taught much earlier by these great saints and this fact is well known in the Muslim ummah that the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa is the last law-bearing prophet.

The Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at has only reiterated what these saints and scholars said. A criticism of this belief by Farhan Khan is indirectly a criticism of these well-known and well-recognized saints. In other words, he failed miserably to

49 Al-Insānul Kāmil, Volume 1, Chapter 36, Page 69 [edition I, 1316 A.H.]
50 Taqrīd Almaram, Volume 2, Page 233
51 Maulvi Abdul Haye, Majmū‘ah Fatā‘wā, Volume 1, Page 17
52 These are only a few examples of the opinions of the scholars and saints of Islām. Several other examples are given in the chapter entitled Opinion of the Sahābāṣa, Ā‘immah, and Mujaddidīnřh
discredit the beliefs of the Ahmādī Muslims and his criticism on this subject is a self-destructive waste as he has no solid ground to stand on. Farhan Khan would do well to learn the adage: *People who live in glass houses shouldn’t throw stones.*

Ahmadiyya, the true Islām, only adopted what the saints of the Muslim ummah said as it makes perfect sense. However, it does make one wonder how a person like Farhan Khan, who thinks that he is doing a great favour to Ahmādis, the true Muslims, by writing a book, has no knowledge of his own beliefs. His degree of intellect is akin to a person who boastfully cuts the very branch upon which he is sitting.

We kindly encourage him to get his facts straight and remind him that it is never too late to learn from one’s own mistakes! It is high time that he learn about his own faith before even thinking about telling others about Ahmadiyya, the Real Islām.

**Farhan Khan’s Arguments**

In order to refute the Ahmadiyya Muslim belief in the finality of law-bearing prophethood, Farhan Khan raises three points:

1. The Qur’ān does not explicitly state that it is the last book.
2. The argument for non-law-bearing prophethood based on Sūrah An-Nisā’4:70 is unacceptable.
3. The word ‘law-bearing’ has been incorrectly inserted to the phrase *Khātam-an-Nabiyyīn.*

About the first point, it must be noted that Farhan Khan himself forgot about this point altogether when, in the same
chapter, he presented the following verse of the Holy Qur’ān which categorically states that it is the last book:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(Al-iyām)  Allāhul Kallāth} & \text{ Lām dīn Allāh wājūmūth 'Ilm Allāh wa'rafi'īth} \text{ Lām}\ \\
\text{Wātamm Allāhul  Dīna Allām Dīna Allām anasst Allām al-dīna} & .
\end{align*}
\]

This day have I perfected your religion for you and completed My favour upon you and have chosen for you Islām as religion.\(^{53}\)

According to the above verse, since the religion of Islām has been perfected by God, it is the last religion and the Qur’ān is the last book or last law for the guidance of mankind. No new religion and no new law can come after it. The same argumentation applies to anything inseparably associated with the Qur’ān, that is, the prophet who not only brought that law, but perfectly exemplified its teachings, becomes the last law-bearing prophet.

Farhan Khan’s second point in relation to Sūrah An-Nisā’, 4:70, is discussed thoroughly in the chapter entitled, Continuation of prophethood according to the Holy Qur’ān. His third point is an absurd and senseless argument explained by him as follows:

The Ahmadi approach is to begin with the belief that Muhammad is only the last law-bearing Prophet and then re-interpret the text to their pre-conceived theology. Had Allāh meant last law-bearing Prophet instead of last Prophet, the Qur’ān would have clearly said khātam Al-Nabiyyīn Al-tashri‘i, meaning last law-

\(^{53}\) Sūrah Al-Mā’idah 5:4
bearing Prophet, rather than leaving humanity a Qur’anic puzzle to solve or suffer the consequences... the Qur’an is a book of guidance, not misguidance, and its language is clear and simple not baffling and complex.\textsuperscript{54}

Farhan Khan’s proud display of ignorance perplexes us – should we laugh or cry? His use of phrases such as “Ahmadi approach” and “pre-conceived theology” are tightening the noose of ignorance he has placed around his neck, as if he has eagerly set the stage for his own hanging. He has forced us to expose his ignorance by further illustrating examples where Muslim scholars held the “Ahmadi approach” long before the Ahmadiyya Jamā’at even came into existence! For instance, the founder of Madrassat-ul-‘Ullūm, Deoband (a Sunni sect), Hazrat Maulwī Muhammad Qāsim Nānautwī writes:

The general public may conceive that Khātam-un-Nabiyyin means that the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be on him) was the last of the prophets but people of knowledge and understanding know very well that being the first or last does not necessarily connote excellence. The words

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{55} ولَكَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ وَخَاتَمَ النَّبِيّنَ
\end{quote}

are designed to convey the Holy Prophet’s (peace and blessings of Allāh be on him) exalted and unequalled status and this alone is the correct

\textsuperscript{54} Khan, With Love, Pages 29-30

\textsuperscript{55} ...but he is the Messenger of Allāh and the Seal of the Prophets. –Sūrah Al-Ahzāb, 33:41
interpretation. *Khātamiyyat* is not in any way rejected or denied if a prophet appears after the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be on him). However, if *Khātamiyyat* is only taken to mean the last prophet, this would be a disparaging interpretation. Such an interpretation would not be acceptable to followers of Islām.56

Similarly, a Brelvī scholar, Maulwī Abu Al-Hasnat ‘Abd-ul-Haye of Farangimahal, Lucknow, writes:

‘*Ulemā Ahle Sunnah* [i.e., *Scholars of the People of the Sunnah*] also subscribe to the view that following the advent of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be on him) no law-bearing prophet can come. The prophethood of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be on him) is wide in scope. Any prophet who would now come would be from the *ummah* and follow his *shari’ah*.57

The Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at has adopted the truth told by the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa. This true belief was held by truthful people and scholars long before our community was founded. If Farhan Khan insists on an explanation on the reason why Allāh, the Exalted, chose the words He did in the Holy Qur’ān, then we refer him to the aforementioned Deoband and Brelvī explanations!

Moreover, let us suppose for a moment that Allāh, the Exalted, had indeed said, *Khātam-an-Nabiyyīn-Tashrī‘ī* or *The Seal of the Law Bearing prophets*. If that had been the case, then

56 *Tahzīr An-Nās*, Page 3
Christians and Jews could have argued that this title implied that the Holy Prophet sa was only the best among the law-bearing prophets like Moses as. Jews could have argued that Ezra as was superior to the Holy Prophet sa and Christians could have argued that Jesus as was superior to the Holy Prophet sa, for both of these prophets were non-law bearing and were revered as “sons of Allāh” by their respective communities (Qur’an 9:3). It could then be argued that the door to non-law-bearing independent prophethood could still be open in addition to non-law bearing prophets within Islām!

There are three kinds of prophethood:

1. **Law-bearing prophethood** – like the prophethood given to Hazrat Musā as and the Holy Prophet Muhammad sa, bearing laws
2. **Non-law-bearing independent prophethood** – prophethood gained directly from Allāh, the Exalted, and not by following the Holy Prophet sa
3. **Non-law-bearing dependant prophethood** – prophethood gained through the beneficence and perfect obedience of the Holy Prophet sa, also known as zillī prophethood.

As a result, if Allāh, the Exalted, had said *Khaṭam-an-Nabiyyīn-Tashrī‘ī*, the doors to the second and third types of prophethood would have remained open and Allāh, the Exalted, would have had to use other words or verses to declare that the doors to those kinds of prophethood are also closed.

In contrast, the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding is simple. The Holy Prophet sa is the *Khaṭam-un-Nabiyyīn* – the *Seal of the prophets* – and no new or old prophet can come who breaks his seal. Only one authenticated by the seal of the Muhammadan prophethood can now come. Therefore, we
Ahmadi Muslims do not dare to suggest weaknesses in Allāh’s book – the Holy Qur’ān – and see its perfection in its present form! Unfortunately, Farhan Khan has the “courage” to do otherwise, but that, once again, is on account of his own ignorance. There exists a fine line between courage and stupidity, and one’s knowledge or ignorance determines which side one stands upon.

**A Controversial Statement of Farhan Khan**

In order to strengthen one of his arguments against Islām Ahmadiyya, Farhan Khan writes something very controversial, that is, “...only prophets receive the revelation from Allāh...”\(^58\). Statements like these underscore the magnitude of Khan’s ignorance and illustrate the distance he is willing to go in order to discredit Ahmadiyya Muslim beliefs in his desperate attempt to bring Ahmadīs, the real Muslims, to his personal version and interpretation of Islām. This statement has been made in utter ignorance of many statements of the Holy Qur’ān! For the benefit of the reader, we are presenting a few verses that categorically state that people other than prophets can receive revelation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{إِنَّ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا رَبُّنَا اِنْفَسْكُمْ وَلَكُمْ فِي الْحَيَوَةِ الْأُخْرَى وَلَكُمْ فِيهَا مَا تَشْتَيِّى}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{اتَّدَعَونَ وَلَا تَخْفِوُنَّ وَلَا تَقْفَرُنَّ بِالجَنَّةَ الَّذِي كُنْتُمْ تُوعَدُونَ}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{يَخْشَوُنَّ أَوَّلَيْبَكُمْ فِي الْحَيَاةِ الدُّنْيَا وَفِي الْأُخْرَى وَلُكَمْ فِيهَا مَا تَشْتَيِّى}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{أُفْسَكُمْ وَلُكُمْ فِيهَا مَا تَدَعَّوْنَ}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{تَبَآَزِلُ الَّذِينَ غَفُّوْا بِرَحْمَةٍ}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{58}\) Khan, *With Love*, Page 29
As for those who say, ‘Our Lord is Allāh,’ and then remain steadfast, the angels descend on them, saying: ‘Fear ye not, nor grieve; and rejoice in the Garden that you were promised. We are your friends in this life and in the Hereafter. Therein you will have all that your souls will desire, and therein you will have all that you will ask for — An entertainment from the Most Forgiving, the Merciful.’ \(^{59}\)

It is clear from the above verse that even a person like Farhan Khan can easily understand its purpose, provided he reads the Holy Qur’ān with a clear mind. To put it in simple words, Allāh says that angels descend upon those who believe in Him and remain steadfast, and convey glad tidings of an everlasting jannah.

In another verse, Allāh, the Exalted, says that He revealed to the disciples of Hazrat ‘Īsā\(^{\text{as}}\):       

\[\text{وَ إِذْ أُولِحْتُ إِلَى الْحَوَارِيْنَ أَنُّ أَمْتُوْنَ يْنُ وَيْبَسْوُبُونَ قَالُوْاَ أَمْتَأَ} \]

\[\text{وَاشْهَدْ} \text{إِلى} \text{مُسْلِمُونْ} \]

And when I inspired the disciples of Jesus to believe in Me and in My Messenger, they said, ‘We believe and bear Thou witness that we have submitted.’ \(^{60}\)

Allāh also revealed to the mother of Hazrat Mūsā\(^{\text{as}}\):

\[\text{إِذْ أُولِحْتَ إِلَى} \text{أَمْيَكَ مَا يُؤْحَتَ} \]

\(^{59}\) Sūrah Hā Mim Sajdah 41:31-33

\(^{60}\) Sūrah Al-Mā‘idah 5:112
When We revealed to thy mother what was an important revelation, saying, 'Put him in the ark, and throw it into the river, then the river will cast it on to the bank, and one who is an enemy to Me and also an enemy to him will take him up.' And I wrapped thee with love from Me; and this I did that thou mightest be reared before My eye.

Moreover, Allâh, the Exalted, also reveals to the honey bee:

And thy Lord has inspired the bee, saying, ‘Make thou houses in the hills and in the trees and in the trellises which they build.'

Furthermore, Allâh, the Exalted, says that He revealed to heaven in Sûrah Hâ Mîm Sajdah 41:13, and to the earth in Sûrah Az-Zilzâl 99:6. It is now proven beyond a shadow of doubt that Allâh, the Exalted, not only reveals to His prophets but His chosen servants as well, be they men or women and He not only revealed in the past but He reveals today and shall continue to reveal in the future (Sûrah Hâ Mîm Sajdah 41:31-32). The Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamâ‘at strictly adheres to what the Holy Qur’ân is saying and we do not invent our own religion based

---

61 Sûrah Tâhâ, 20:39-40
62 Sûrah An-Nahl, 16:69
upon our personal whims. The Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamāʿat came to eradicate the misconceptions and false innovations which crept into the beliefs of Muslims over time. We believe in a Living God, Who continues to guide us through revelation.

Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad, the Promised Messiah as, has profoundly said:

Our God is that God Who is alive even now as He was alive before. He speaks even now as He used to speak before. And even now He hears as He heard before. It is a false notion that in these times He only hears but does not speak. On the contrary, He hears and also speaks. All His Attributes are eternal and everlasting. None of His Attributes is in abeyance, nor will it ever be.63

This is the real Islām, not what Farhan Khan is presenting. We must remind him that keeping a beard and reciting Arabic does not make one a scholar. One must read the Holy Qur’ān with knowledge and purify one’s self in order to gain accurate knowledge of the Holy Qur’ān. It is now evident that he has very little knowledge of the Holy Qur’ān and Islām in general. Otherwise, he would not have made such an obvious mistake.

Combined with Sūrah Al-Māʿidah

Under the section entitled Combined with Sūrah Al-Māʿidah, Farhan Khan presents an argument based on the “unique insight of individual Ahmadīs” and says that it is not

---

63 The Will, Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad as, (Islāmabad, Islām International Publications Ltd., 2005), Pages 12-13
the official argument of Ahmadi Muslims\textsuperscript{64}. His reasoning is that he wants to avoid the straw man fallacy but this is a very strange excuse! By choosing to present that argument, his motive is quite the opposite of what he is saying. The Ahmadiyya Muslim argument is presented by him in a form that can easily be refuted. Although the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at is not obliged to answer such ridiculous allegations that attempt to discredit its beliefs, we will respond regardless for the benefit of the reader.

After making a lengthy discussion, Farhan Khan summarizes the Ahmadi belief as follows:

\[ \text{[No more laws from 5:3]} + \text{[No more prophets from 33:41]} = \text{[No more law-bearing Prophets]} \]

This is a dishonest and pathetic attempt to discredit Ahmadiyya Muslim beliefs. At no time in its entire history has the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at accepted that 33:41 states that there are “No more prophets.” If Farhan Khan was being \textit{intellectually honest}, he should have chosen to point out which Ahmadi literature or which Ahmadi scholar has stated that there are “no more prophets” according to 33:41. Nevertheless, for the sake of argument, his rebuttal is quoted below:

\begin{quote}
...Suppose a grocery store owner was checking his inventory and realized he had overstocked on apples and sweets. Immediately, he put two requests to his local supplier: not to deliver any more apples or any more sweets.

Next, consider these two statements from the perspective of the supplier. He has been told (1) not
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{64} Khan, \textit{With Love}, 30
to deliver any apples and (2) not to deliver any more sweets. Both of these statements are of an absolute scope and do not allow for any exceptions. Suppose the supplier were to logically combine the two statements together. According to the faulty Ahmadī logic, he would yield the following result: 

\[ \text{[No more apples]} + \text{[No more sweets]} = \text{[No more sweet apples]} \]

Based on the above conclusion, the supplier could send the grocery store owner non-sweet apples without violating his instructions.

This analysis is clearly flawed. When two rules are combined, the resulting rule should satisfy the two producing rules individually. However, according to the erroneous rule produced above, the supplier could deliver non-sweet apples. Non-sweet apples are a subset of apples. Statement 1 said no apples, be they sweet or non-sweet. The combination of the two rules is not correct.

The accurate combination of the two rules is below:

\[ \text{[No more apples]} + \text{[No more sweets]} = X \]
\[ \text{[No more apples]} + \text{[No more sweets]} = \text{[No more apples]} + \text{[No more sweets]} \]
\[ \text{[No more apples]} + \text{[No more sweets]} = \text{[No more apples and no more sweets]} \]

(The final statement can be rewritten as [no more apples or sweets])
Then, Farhan Khan goes on to demonstrate the same faulty logic in what he alleges is the Ahmadiyya Muslim belief:

\[
\text{[No more laws] + [No more Prophets] = X}
\]
\[
\text{[No more laws] + [No more Prophets] = [No more laws] + [No more Prophets]}
\]
\[
\text{[No more laws] + [No more Prophets] = [No more] * ( [laws] + [Prophets] )}
\]
\[
\text{[No more laws] + [No more Prophets] = [No more laws and no more Prophets]}
\]

(The final statement can be rewritten as [no more laws or Prophets])

Once again, Farhan Khan proves how well he wastes time on a false premise. Had he taken the time to understand what he was criticizing before he criticized it, he could have saved himself a lot of time and embarrassment.

First, as stated earlier, we need to emphasize that the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at does not believe that 33:41 states that there can be “no more prophets.” If an Ahmādī Muslim made this argument, it is his or her personal opinion and the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at does not bear responsibility for the personal opinions of those who have a weak understanding of its beliefs. The correct logic of the Ahmadiyya Muslim beliefs is presented in the same style as above for the purpose of clarity:

This is a simple way to describe the Ahmadiyya Muslim belief and this understanding cannot be refuted. It is no wonder why Farhan Khan chose not to refute the above belief and sought help from the unique insight of individual Ahmādis!
When the Ahmadī Muslims say that the Holy Prophetṣa is the Seal, they mean that he is the authority that validates the truth of the prophets. The Qur’ān has clearly stated that despite the fact that there are no more laws, there can still be more prophets. The only way to harmonize these statements is to believe that no more law-bearing prophets can come from outside the ummah as that will break the Seal of prophethood. Only those authenticated by the Seal of the prophethood of Hazrat Muhammadṣa can come. This is elaborated by The Promised Messiahas in the following quotation:

Thus if someone were to ask how it is possible for another prophet to come after the Holy Prophetṣa who is Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn, the simple answer is that no prophet—new or old—can come in the manner in which you people seek the descent of Jesusas in the latter days, while you also believe that he will be a prophet and that he will continue to receive prophetic revelation for forty years, and will thus surpass the period of the Holy Prophet’sṣa prophethood. Such a belief is undoubtedly sinful. The verse:

\[\text{ولاَكِنُ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَحَامِمُ النَّبِيَّيْنَ}^{65}\]

and the hadīth:

\[\text{لَانَبِيَ بعَدَى}^{66}\]

---

65 But he is the Messenger of Allāh and the Seal of the Prophets.—Al-Ahzāb, 33:41 [Publishers]
categorically testify that this belief is totally false. I myself am strongly averse to such beliefs and I resolutely believe in the verse:

وَلَكِنْ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَحَاقَامَ الْبَيْتَينَ

This verse contains a prophecy of which our opponents do not have the least idea. In this prophecy God Almighty says that, after the Holy Prophet, the door of prophecies has been closed until the Day of Judgement, and that it is no longer possible for a Hindu, a Jew, a Christian or a nominal Muslim to assume the title of prophet; and that all the doors leading to prophethood have been closed except the door of sīrat-e-siddiqī, i.e., losing oneself in the Holy Prophet. Thus he who comes to God through this door is clad, by way of zill, in the same mantle of prophethood which is the mantle of the prophethood of Muhammad. As such, his being a prophet is not a matter for jealousy, for he does not derive this status from himself but from the fountain of the Holy Prophet; and, that too, not for his own glory but for

---

66 There is no Prophet after me. (Bukhārī, Kitābul Fazā’il, Bābu Fazā’ili ‘Alī bin Abī Tālib; Muslim, Kitābul Fadā’il, Bābu Min Fadā’ili ‘Alī bin Abī Tālib) [Publishers]

67 But he is the Messenger of Allāh and the Seal of the Prophets.—Al-Ahzāb, 33:41 [Publishers]

68 Complete devotion to the Holy Prophet, such as was shown by Hazrat Abū Bakr Siddīq. [Publishers]

69 Zill or Zilliyyat signifies such complete devotion to the Holy Prophet, and such self-effacement that a person begins to reflect the image of his Master. [Publishers]
the glory and majesty of the Holy Prophet}\textsuperscript{sa}. For this reason, in heaven he is named Muhammad}\textsuperscript{sa} and Ahmad}\textsuperscript{sa}. Thus the prophethood of Muhammad}\textsuperscript{sa}, in the final analysis, returns to Muhammad}\textsuperscript{sa}, albeit by way of \textit{burūz}\textsuperscript{70}, and to no one else. So, the verse:

\begin{quote}
ما كان محمدًا آبًا أحدٍ مِن رِّجالِكُمْ ولَكِن رَسُولُ اللهِ وَخَاتَمُ النَّبِيّينِ
\end{quote}

means that:

\begin{quote}
ليس مُحمَّدًا آبًا أحدٍ مِن رِجالِ الدُنيا وَلَكِنُ هُوَ أب لِرِجالِ الآخرة لَنَّهِ خَاتَمُ النَبيّينِ وَلَا سَبِيلَ إِلَى فُسُوقِ اللهِ مِنْ غَيْبِ تَوْسِطُهِ
\end{quote}

In short, my prophethood and Messengership is only by virtue of my being Muhammad}\textsuperscript{sa} and Ahmad}\textsuperscript{sa}, and not in my own right; and I have been given this name because of my complete devotion to the Holy Prophet}\textsuperscript{sa}. This does not in any way change the true

\textsuperscript{70} Burūz: Spiritual manifestation; or the person who is the spiritual manifestation of a Prophet\textsuperscript{as} or Saint. [Publishers]

\textsuperscript{71} Muhammad}\textsuperscript{sa} is not the father of any of your men, but \textit{he is} the Messenger of Allāh and the Seal of the Prophets\textsuperscript{as}.—Al-Ahzāb, 33:41 [Publishers]

\textsuperscript{72} Muhammad is not the father of any man of this world but he is the father of men of the hereafter because he is the \textit{Seal of the Prophets}\textsuperscript{as} and there is no way of receiving Divine grace except through his intermediary. [Publishers]
connotation of Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn, but the descent of Jesus as from heaven would certainly change it.\[73\]

Based on personal communication with Farhan Khan, we know that he has read the book quoted above several times. Although impossible, it would have been more appropriate for him to at least try to refute the argument and logic given in the above quotation instead of picking arguments derived from the insight of individual Ahmadīs and refuting those. His example is like a pigeon who closes his eyes in hopes that the cat disappears, when in reality the cat is right in front of him and is about to make a meal out of him! Closing his eyes to the flawless logic of the Ahmadiyya Muslim beliefs does not mean that it will go away!!

**Distinction between Law-Bearing and Non-Law-Bearing Prophets**

Under the section entitled No Firm Basis for the Distinction Between Law-Bearing vs. Non-Law-Bearing Prophet, Farhan Khan tries to refute the Ahmadiyya Muslim belief in a distinction between law-bearing and non-law-bearing prophets by presenting the following argument:

The crux of the refutation of this argument lays in an important distinction between the methods Allāh employs to communicate with his prophets. What is known from the Qurʾān is that Allāh sent inspiration (wahi) to all of the Prophets, but did not necessarily speak (kalama) to them all.

---

\[73\] A Misconception Removed, Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad as, (Islamabad, Islam International Publications Ltd., 2007), Pages 3-5
For example, in Sūrah Nisā’, verses 163 and 164, Allāh says:

163. Surely, We have sent revelation to thee, as We sent revelation to Noah and the prophets after him; and We sent revelation to Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob and his children and to Jesus and Job and Jonah and Aaron and Solomon, and We gave David a Book.

164. And We sent some Messengers whom We have already mentioned to thee and some Messengers whom We have not mentioned to thee - and to Moses Allāh spoke at great length

In verse 163, the Qur’ān says Allāh sent revelation (اوحَيْنَا) to the prophets. Then, in verse 164, the Qur’ān specifies that Allāh spoke to Mūsā (كَلمَ الله مُوسى). Notice the distinction between revelation and speech. This is because Mūsā as was one of the few prophets who spoke to Allāh directly, without the intermediary of an angel...

This is Farhan Khan’s perspective on this subject and it has been presented in a very awkward manner and creates more confusion than clarity. As a result, the proper logic of the Ahmadiyya Muslim belief will now be explained.

First, it must be noted that Allāh, the Exalted, ‘speaks’ with all His prophets. There’s no basis for a distinction between ‘speech’ (كلم) and revelation (وحى) in the sense that Farhan Khan has presented above. Consider the Arabic wording of the following verse:
And it is not for a man that Allāh should speak to him except by revelation or from behind a veil or by sending a messenger to reveal by His command what He pleases. Surely, He is High, Wise.\(^74\)

It is crystal clear from the above verse that Allāh, the Exalted, ‘speaks’ (يُّستحقُّمُهُ) with His prophets in three ways:

1. By direct revelation (وَحْيًا)
2. From behind a veil (من وَرَآيَّةٍ حِجابٍ)
3. By sending a messenger (رَسُولًا يُرسِلَ)

As a result, Farhan Khan’s distinction between speech for some prophets and revelation for others is rendered invalid by this verse. Revelation is simply one of the three forms of communication or speech between Allāh and man. Then, in his rebuttal, he attributes a false belief to the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamāʿat by writing, “[Ahmadi Muslims believe that] direct speech is not a valid medium of communication between Allāh and his prophets...” This is absolutely untrue and like many others, just another false allegation against the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamāʿat! Direct speech is indicated by the word وَحْيًا (Direct Revelation) in 42:52!

The fact of the matter is that no matter how hard Farhan Khan tries, there is no denying that some prophets were given laws while others were not. The following verse makes it very clear that Prophet Moses\(^\text{as}\) brought a law, that is, the Torah, and

\(^{74}\) Sūrah As-Shūrā, 42:52
the prophets that came after him used the same law to judge among the Jews:

Surely, We sent down the Torah wherein was guidance and light. **By it did the Prophets, who were obedient to Us, judge for the Jews**, as did the godly people and those learned in the Law; for they were required to preserve the Book of Allâh, and because they were guardians over it. Therefore fear not men but fear Me; and barter not My Signs for a paltry price. And whoso judges not by that which Allâh has sent down, these it is who are the disbelievers.75

This verse very clearly declares that the Torah was a book of Law for the Jews and it was used by the later prophets to judge among the Jews. This argument is further enforced by the fact that the Jews used the law of the Torah throughout their history to judge among themselves. Farhan Khan tries to break this argument by stating the following:

If this verse was taken in isolation, the Ahmadis would have a tenable position, but further analysis weakens their claims.

---

75 Sûrah Al-Mâ’îdah 5:45
According to the Ahmadis, ‘Esā bin Marīam  عليه السلام is a non-law-bearing Prophet. It is true that he came to confirm the Torah, but it is vital to consider Sūrah Āle ‘Imrān, verse 50, where ‘Esā bin Marīam عليه السلام says:

وَمُصَدِّقًا لِّما بَيْنَ يَدَّيْ مِنَ التَّوْرَةِ وَلَأُجَلَّ لَكُمْ بَعْضَ الَّذِيْ حُرِّمَ

‘And I come fulfilling that which is before me, namely, the Torah; and to allow you some of that which was forbidden unto you, and I come to you with a Sign from your Lord; so fear Allāh and obey me.’

...although Esā bin Marīam عليه السلام fulfills the Torah, per the mandate of Allāh, he also modified and altered the existing laws. Some of the scholars of Islām comment that this means he allowed certain foods that were previously impermissible and made work permissible on their Sabbath. Either way, he was authorized to modify law. This would effectively make him a “law-bearing” Prophet.76

It is sometimes amusing to see the great lengths that Farhan Khan is willing to go in order to discredit the beliefs of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at. This argument of Farhan Khan is refuted in the following section.

76 Khan, With Love, Page 35
Was Hazrat ‘Īsā as a Law-Bearing Prophet?

Before refuting the argument of Farhan Khan, it must be stated that it was quite surprising to read such a ridiculous argument presented by him. If not for the sake of the reader’s benefit, we would have ignored this pathetic argument altogether. Here is how this absurd argument is refuted in the five-volume commentary of the Holy Qur’ān published by the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at, under the verse under discussion [Sūrah Āle ‘Imrān, 3:51]:

Jesus came in fulfillment of the prophecies of the previous prophets contained in the Torah. But he brought no new Law, being a follower of Moses in this respect. He himself was conscious of this limitation of his authority. Says he: “Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled” (Matt. 5:17, 18). The expression, to allow you some of that which was forbidden to you, does not, therefore, refer to any change or modification in the Mosaic Law. The reference is only to those things which the Jews had themselves rendered unlawful for themselves. Elsewhere the Qur’ān says, so because of the transgression of the Jews, We forbade them pure things which had been allowed to them (4:161). Again, Truly I am come to you with wisdom and to make clear to you some of that about which you differ (43:64). These verses show that there were differences among the various sects of the Jews regarding the lawfulness or
otherwise of certain things and that by their iniquities and transgressions they had deprived themselves of certain divine blessings. Jesus thus came as a judge to decide in what matters the Jews had deviated from the right path and to tell them that the blessings of which they had been deprived would be restored to them, if they followed him.

Among Islāmic sources the following well-known Commentaries support our interpretation of the verse: “Jesus did not abrogate any portion of the Torah; he simply made lawful to the Jews those things about which they used to disagree among themselves through error” (Kathīr, under present verse). Again, “The words, that which was forbidden to you, refer to those things which the learned men after Moses had declared to be unlawful, giving the innovation the force of Law; Jesus restored the true commandments of the Torah, as they had been revealed by God” (Muhīt). Yet again, “Jesus followed the Law of Moses. He used to observe the Sabbath, and turn his face to the Temple and he used to say to the Jews, I do not teach you even a single word which is not in accord with the Law of Moses; I only remove from you the burden laid on you as a result of the innovations you made after Moses” (Fath). 77

In other words, it is ridiculous to assume that Jesus as had the authority to modify the law and this also shatters the argument of Farhan Khan who should pay more attention to the study of

77 The Holy Quran with English Translation and Commentary (Islāmabad, Islām International Publications Ltd., 1988), Volume 1, Page 404
the Qur’an. Therefore, the Holy Qur’an not only supports the belief in two kinds of prophethood, that is, law-bearing and non-law-bearing, but also promises the coming of prophets from the ummah of the Holy Prophet⁷⁸.

The same situation applies to the Messiah promised to the Muslims in the latter days. He would be a judge and decide for the Muslims whose differences would fragment them into various sects (Tirmidhī states 73 sects) just as the Jews were fragmented into 72 sects at the time of their Messiah. In all of his judgements, the Promised Messiah⁷⁹ would not deviate from the shari’ah of Islām and would remain completely subservient to it as Jesus⁷⁹ was to the Torah. On that note, Farhan Khan should explain his belief that when the Messiah will descend, he will “end war”⁷⁸ (يضع الحرب”) and, in another narration, it says that he shall “end Jizya”⁷⁹ (يضع الجزية”). Does this mean that the Promised Messiah for the Muslims will abrogate the law of the Holy Qur’an and remove all the verses about Jihad? Does this mean that he will change some of the ahādīth that speak about jizyah? Would he be given the right to modify the shari’ah? If the answer is no, then, how can Khan accuse Hazrat ‘Īsā bin Mariam⁸ as of “modifying” the law when he was only removing some of the innovations of the Jews? Similarly, before criticizing the perfectly sound and logical beliefs of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at, Farhan Khan needs to think about the fact that Allāh, the Exalted, states the following about Hazrat ‘Īsā bin Mariam⁸ as:

78 Sahih Bukhārī, the Book of Prophets, Chapter: “The Descent of ‘Īsā bin Mariam⁸ as” [صحيح بخاری، كتاب الانبياء، باب: نزول عیسی بن مريم].
79 Sunan Ibn Mājah, the book of Al-Fitn, Chapter: “The Fitnah of Ad-Dajjāl and the coming of ‘Īsā bin Mariam⁸ as and the coming of Ya’jūj and Ma’jūj [سنن ابن ماجه، كتاب الفتنة، باب: فتنة الدجال وخروج عيسى بن مريم وخروج ياجوج وماجوج].
This means that Hazrat ’Īsā bin Mariam(as) is a “Prophet for the Banī Isrā‘īl” and was meant to establish the law of the Torah among the Jews. Now, when he returns and attempts to join the ummah of the Holy Prophet Muhammad(sa), would he be given the authority to modify the law of the Holy Qur‘ān to make it aligned with the law of the Torah? Or would he be allowed to abrogate the verse above as it restricts his message to the Banī Isrā‘īl only? Farhan Khan should probably think about these numerous paradoxes that exist in his own concept of the return of Hazrat ’Īsā bin Mariam(as), whom he considers to be a “law-bearing Prophet,” before criticizing Islām Ahmadiyya.

Questions for Farhan Khan:

1. Why does he always present the Ahmadiyya Muslim side of the arguments in his own words instead of quoting from the official literature of the Jamā‘at?
2. If Hazrat ’Īsā(as) was a law-bearing prophet, why does Allāh say that he judged for the Jews according to the law of the Torah in 5:45?
3. When Hazrat ’Īsā(as) returns, according to Farhan Khan, what happens to 3:50?

80 Sūrah Āle ‘Imrān, 3:50
In the chapter entitled *Statements of the Prophet Muhammad* sa, Farhan Khan lists a number of *ahādīth* to support his pre-conceived belief that there can be no prophets whatsoever after the Holy Prophet Muhammad sa. While reading through the list of *ahādīth*, his desperation becomes quite apparent! It seems that he loses control of himself because of his inability to resolve a most clear paradox in his beliefs, that is, if there can be *no prophets whatsoever* after the Holy Prophet Muhammad sa, where is the room for the coming of ʿĪsā bin Mariam as as a prophet of Allāh? Throughout his book, Farhan Khan is unable to resolve this paradox!

Each of the *ahādīth* presented by Farhan Khan is listed below along with the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding, which is a cohesive and sound approach to understanding all the *ahādīth* of the Holy Prophet Muhammad sa.
Hadīth Number 1 – The Thirty Liars

Ibn Mardawī narrated that Thawbān, may Allāh be pleased with him, said, “The Messenger of Allāh, may Allāh bless him and give him peace, said that there will be in my nation thirty arch-liars, each of them claims that he is a prophet, and I am the Seal of the Prophets; there is no prophet after me.”

Although the above hadīth has been discussed thoroughly earlier, let us bring perspective to it by looking at what Hazrat Mirzā Tāhir Ahmadth, the 4th successor of the Promised Messiahas, has said about it:

Our opponents assert that there can be no more prophets. But, instead of relying on the Holy Qur’an to substantiate their claim, their assertion is based on interpretation of certain ahādīth by them and which according to them conclusively prove that there can be no prophet of any kind after the Holy Prophetṣa. The door to prophethood is now closed in the ummah. Whosoever makes a claim of prophethood would be an imposter or a dajjāl.

One such hadīth they put forth prominently and with their interpretation is as follows: “Thaubānṣa reports that the Messenger of Allāhsa said: ‘Thirty people will make false claims to prophethood in my ummah even though I am Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn and

81 Abū Dā’ūd, Kitāb-ul-Fitn wal-Malāhīm
there is no prophet after me.’’ (Abū Da‘ūd: Kitāb-ul-Fitn).

This hadīth according to them categorically debars the coming of a prophet of any kind after the Holy Prophet. For the sake of argument, if we accept their interpretation as correct and that the door to all kinds of prophethood is now closed, then I declare on behalf of Jamā‘at-e-Ahmadiyya Muslim that we are bound by it. No mother has given birth to a son who can change this meaning. On the other hand, if the Holy Prophet has opened a door for the continuation of prophethood in the ummah, no one has the authority to close that door. This is the source of our disagreement.

Having reviewed the above hadīth, I would draw your attention to the hadīth related to Messiah of the latter days. This is contained in the book Sahīh Muslim, Kitāb-ul-Fitn in the chapter about the dajjāl. This is a long hadīth and only relevant portions are mentioned here.

Narrating the accounts relating to the descent of the Messiah son of Mary, the Holy Prophet says: “...The Prophet of Allāh, Jesus, peace and blessings of Allāh be on him, will be besieged along with his companions, Allāh be pleased with them.” Then he says: “Then, the Prophet of Allāh, Jesus, peace and blessings of Allāh be on him, will turn to God with full attention along with his companions, Allāh be pleased with them...”

This hadīth is noted in Sahīh Muslim, one of the six most authentic compilations of ahādīth. It is to be noted that the Holy Prophet calls the Messiah who
is to come as the Prophet of God four times. In addition, the Holy Prophet ṣa calls the companions of the Messiah ‘Sahāba’ followed by the appellation radhi Allāho ‘unhum (Allāh be pleased with them).

Our opponents may say Jesus (peace be on him) was an old prophet. That is why he has been mentioned as prophet of Allāh. How would they explain the use of the word ‘Sahāba’ for the companions of the Messiah? According to them, ‘Sahāba’ is a term used exclusively for the companions of the Holy Prophet ṣa. It is very obvious that the Holy Prophet ṣa was referring to an event that was to take place in the future.

Irrespective of the fact whether we have thirty or thirty thousand dajjāls or impostors, the fact remains that the Holy Prophet ṣa has called the Messiah of the latter days a prophet of God! No one can change that!

An incident is recorded about the Czar of Russia. He asked his doorman not to let anyone in as he was busy in some important work and did not wish to be disturbed. Shortly after, a son of the Czar sought entry into the Czar’s room but was stopped by the doorman. The prince challenged his authority to do so. The doorman indicated it was the order of the Czar of Russia and he would not allow him to go in. The prince beat him and attempted to go in but the doorman again intervened. The doorman was beaten again but he would still not allow the prince to go in. The Czar himself was watching all of this. He came out and asked what happened and the prince told him what happened and how the doorman stopped him from entering at the order of the Czar. At this,
the Czar told the prince that he disobeyed his order and ordered the doorman to whip his son. The prince pleaded, saying, “Your majesty, the law of the land does not permit an ordinary man to whip an officer.” Hearing this, the Czar elevated the doorman to the post of a captain and ordered him to whip his son. The prince pleaded again, saying “Your majesty, the law of the land does not permit a junior officer to whip a senior officer.” At this, the Czar made the doorman a general and ordered the punishment to be carried out. The son further pleaded, saying “Your majesty, the law of the land forbids a person, who is not a prince, from beating a prince.” Thereupon, the Czar made the doorman a prince and ordered that the punishment be carried out. Thus, an ordinary soldier became a prince in a few moments and there was no one who could stop that.

Would not our opponents concede as much authority to the Holy Prophet\(^{sa}\) as was wielded by the Czar of Russia? The fact of the matter is that the Holy Prophet\(^{sa}\) possessed immeasurable honour and status both in heaven and on earth. He calls the Messiah of the latter days the Prophet of God four times consecutively in one hadīth. Now, who is there to deprive him of this status? Who can close this door that has been opened by him?\(^{82}\)

---

Hadīth Number 2 – Statement made to Hazrat ‘Alīra

The Messenger of Allāhsa went out for Tabūk, appointing Hazrat ‘Alīra as his deputy (in Medina). Hazrat ‘Alīra said, “Do you want to leave me with the children and women?” The Prophetsa said, “Will you not be pleased that you will be to me like Aaron was to Moses? But there will be no prophet after me”.83

About the above hadīth, Hazrat Mirzā Tāhir Ahmadth states:

There is another hadīth that our opponents frequently quote to support their position. The hadīth reads: “Saīd Bin Al-Musayyab reports on the authority of Āmir Bin Saʿad Bin Abī Waqqās who reports on the authority of his father (Allāh be pleased with them): The Holy Prophetsa said to Hazrat ‘Alīra: ‘You are to me what Aaron was to Moses, except there is no prophet after me’.” Another version of the hadīth of Sahīh Bukhārī reads: “...except that you are not a prophet.” Still another version quoted by Masnad Ahmad Bin Hanbal reads: “...But do not become a Prophet”. (1. Sahīh Bukhārī: Kitāb Al-Fadhā’il – Chapter Fadhā’il ‘Alī Bin Abī Tālib; 2. Sahīh Muslim: Kitāb Al-Fadhā’il; 3. Masnad Ahmad, 331/l).

83 Sahih Bukhārī, Volume 5, Book 59, Number 700
As the story goes, the Holy Prophet sa was leaving for an expedition and appointed Hazrat ‘Alī ra to act as Amīr in Medina during his absence. Hazrat ‘Alī ra was a great warrior and had accompanied the Holy Prophet sa in all prior expeditions. For him to be left behind was very painful. He felt he would be deprived of the privilege of Jihād and that people may think the Holy Prophet sa was displeased with him. So Hazrat ‘Alī ra submitted to the Holy Prophet sa, “O Prophet of Allāh! Am I going to be left behind as Amīr over women and children?” It was a subtle way of evoking the Holy Prophet’s sa love for him. Thereupon, the Holy Prophet sa answered: “O ‘Alī! Why do you express this grief? This event has given you the same position in relation to me, as Aaron held in relation to Moses in his absence. You are to me what Aaron was to Moses. The difference is that you are not a prophet.” This hadīth has been reported in different ways in Sahīh Bukhārī. The meaning is essentially the same.

Now, the present day ‘Ulemā’ would insist that in this hadīth the word ‘ba‘adī’ does not mean anything but the fact that there is no prophet after the Holy Prophet sa. It has no relevance to the temporary absence of the Holy Prophet sa from Medina.

Hazrat Shāh Waliullāh Mohaddes Dehlavī, universally acknowledged as the mujaddid (reformer) of the 12th century and very well known to Muslims of the sub-continent and who is held in high esteem by these people, writes in Qurrat-ul-Ainīn Fī Tafsīl Ash-Shaikhain, Page 602:
It must be clearly understood that the object of this *hadīth* is to highlight the appointment of Hazrat ‘Alīra to act in the place of or as an in charge of the region while the Holy Prophetṣa was to be absent from Medina during his expedition to Tabūk. It was also done to highlight Hazrat ‘Alī’sra resemblance to Hazrat Hārūnra when Hazrat Mūsāas had journeyed to the Mount. It is to be noted that the word بعدی [ba‘adī] here means غیری [ghairī: besides me]. It does not mean *after me in time*. As we say that in:


deeds bā‘adī

(Who, then, will guide him **other than** Allāh?84). بعدی [ba‘d-Allāh] means **other than** Allāh.

He further states:

Here the word بعدی [ba‘adī] is not in the context of بعدیت زمانی [after his time] because Hazrat Hārūnra did not outlive Hazrat Mūsāas. Hence, the implied conclusion was not for a period after the Holy Prophetṣa for Hazrat ‘Alīra. As a result, there was no reason to make the exception of a period after the Holy Prophetṣa for Hazrat ‘Alīra.

What a powerful argument! Using the Holy Qur‘ān, Hazrat Shāh Waliullāh has put forth irrefutable

---

84 Sūrah Al-Jāthiyah, 45:24
evidence of the use of ba‘adī in the meaning of beside me. Such arguments can only be put forth by righteous people who are enlightened with divine wisdom. They carry out a deep scrutiny and thorough investigation of the ahādīth with singular love and devotion. These devout lovers of the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} made genuine efforts to find out the real motives and meanings of his sayings. It was, in fact, the result of this devoted pursuit that Hazrat Shāh Waliullāh succeeded in adducing the arguments he put forth above.\textsuperscript{85}

In other words, in this particular hadīth, the word ba‘d has been used to point out a temporary absence. This is similar to the statement, “I am leaving for a few days. Please take care of my things after I’m gone.” Here, the word after does not mean after death. Instead, it means until I return or during my absence. In the same sense, the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} said that he is leaving for Tabūk and until he returns, there will be no prophet in Medina.

\textit{Hadīth Number 3 – There will be Khulafā’ right after me}

Hazrat Abū Hurairah\textsuperscript{ra} narrates that the Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} said, “The Israelites used to be ruled and guided by prophets. Whenever a prophet died, another would take over his place. \textbf{There will be no prophet after me}, but there will soon be Khulafā’ who will

\textsuperscript{85} \textit{The True Meaning of Khatme Nubuwwat}, Pages 24 – 25
increase in number”. The people asked, “O Allâh’s Apostle! What do you order us (to do)?” He said, “Obey the one who will be given the pledge of allegiance first. Fulfill their rights (i.e., the rights of the Khulafâ’), for Allâh will ask them about (any shortcoming) in ruling those Allâh has put under their guardianship.”

About this hadîth, it must be noted that it uses the words سیکون خلفاء (there will soon be Khulafâ’). This phrase clearly shows that this hadîth is about the period of time immediately after the Holy Prophet Muhammad. According to the rules of Arabic grammar, when the letter “س” is added to the word “یکون” it means “it will soon be” and this means that this hadîth is about the period of time right after the Holy Prophet Muhammad. What he intended to say is that there will be Khulafâ’ right after me but there will be no prophet right after me. This understanding is further supported by the following hadîth, which contains a prophecy that has been fulfilled and all Muslims can bear testimony to it:

تكون النبوة فيكم ما شاء الله ... ثم تكون خلافة على منهج النبوة ما شاء الله ... ثم تكون ملكا عاصفا فتكون

ما شاء الله ... ثم تكون خلافة على منهج النبوة

There shall remain in you prophethood as long as Allâh wills..... Then there will be Khilâfah upon the footsteps of prophethood as long as Allâh wills...
Then there will be kingdom and it shall remain as

---

86 Sahîh Bukhârî, Volume 4, Book 56, Number 661
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long as Allâh wills... Then there will be Khilâfah upon the footsteps of prophethood.\footnote{Mishkât, Kitâb-ur-Riqâq, Bâb-ul-Inzâr wat-Tehzîr}

This *hadîth* clearly shows that Khilâfah was to continue for only a limited period of time *immediately after* the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} and it was eventually going to be replaced by kingdom. This is exactly how it happened.

Hence, when the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} said that there will be no prophets after him, it was in the sense that there will be no prophets *immediately after* him. Furthermore, the above *hadîth* also proves the continuity of prophethood. The Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} declares that eventually a time will come when Khilâfah will be re-established but it will be upon the footsteps of prophethood. In other words, Khilâfah cannot be re-established without prophethood preceding it. As a result, this prophecy was fulfilled when Hazrat Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad\textsuperscript{as} was appointed by Allâh as the Promised Messiah\textsuperscript{as} and a prophet, and after him, a system of Khilâfah was established.

*Hadîth Number 4 – Twenty Seven Arch-Liars*

Ahmad narrated that Hudhaifah, may Allâh be pleased with him, said that the Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} said, “In my nation, [there are] twenty-seven arch-liars and deceivers, among them are four
women, and I am the **Seal of the Prophets; there is no prophet after me**”.\(^8^9\)

The response for the above *hadīth* is the same as the response given for a similar narration in the chapter entitled *Relationship of Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn to Lā Nabiyya Ba’adī*. However, just to shed new light on this issue, the following quotation of Hazrat Mirzā Tāhir Ahmad\(^r\)h is being presented here:

There is a *hadīth* that sheds more light on the word *ba’ad*. Hazrat Muhy-ud-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabī\(^r\)h, the world-renowned Muslim scholar and commentator (died 638 A.H.), in his book *Fūtūhāt Makkiyyah*, has elaborated on the following *hadīth*. The *hadīth* reads:

> عن جابر بن سمرة عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال، إذا هلك قيصر فلا قيصر بعده وإذا هلك كسرى فلا كسرى بعده (بخاري كتاب الإيمان و النذور - باب كيف كانت يمين النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم)

Hazrat Jābir Bin Sumrah\(^r\) reports: “The Holy Prophet\(^s\) said, ‘When this Caesar will die, there will be no Caesar after him and when this Khosro will die, there will be no Khosro after him’. [Sahīh Bukhārī, Book of Faith]. In this *hadīth*, the Holy Prophet\(^s\) in his unique wisdom has clearly explained the meaning of the words “فلا بعده” (And there is none

\(^8^9\) As quoted in Farhan Khan’s book.
after him) by saying “فلا قیصر بعده” (There would be no Caesar after him) and “فلا کسری بعده” (There would be no Khosro after him). He makes it clear that ‘لا’ used in this context does not signify the exclusion of an entire genus. Rather, it is used to emphasize that there would be no one who would attain their majesty and their magnificence.

Accordingly, we had Caesar succeeding a Caesar and a Khosro succeeding a Khosro for a thousand years after the Holy Prophet  but they never attained the glory and grandeur of the Caesar and Khosro of the time of the Holy Prophet . Hazrat Ibn  elaborates this hadith when he says:

فما ارتفعت النبوة بالكلیته و لهذا قلنا انما ارتفعت نبوة التشريع فهذا معنی لا نبئ بعده (------) فعلمنا ان قوله لا نبئ بعده لا تمترع خاصة لانه لا يكون بعده نبئ فهذا مثل قوله إذا هلك کسری فلا کسری بعده وإذا هلك قیصر فلا قیصر بعده (فتوحات مکیه جلد ٢ ـ باب ۳٢ سوال ۵۵ ـ صفحة ١٥ مصري)

Prophethood has not been totally abolished. That is why we had said that only prophethood bringing a new law (or sharī‘ah) has come to an end. This is the meaning of the words “لا نبئ بعده” (there is no prophet after him). Hence, we have learned that the saying of the Holy Prophet  that there is no prophet after him actually
means that there is no law-bearing prophet (after him), because there is no prophet after him. Hence, this is similar to his statement: “When the Caesar shall die, there is no Caesar after him, and when the Khosroe shall die, there shall be no Khosroe after him. (Fūtūhāt Makkiyyah, Volume 2, Chapter 73, Question 25, Page 85)  

Hadīth Number 5 – Al-ʿĀqib: After Whom there is no Prophet

 حدثنا سفيان بن عيينة عن الزهري سمع محمد بن جبير بن مطعم عن أبيه أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال أنا محمد وأنا أحمد وانا الماحي الذي يمحي بي الكفر وانا الحاضر الذي يحضر الناس على عقبى وانا العاقب والعاقب الذي ليس بعده نبي

Sufyān bin ‘Uyainah reported on the authority of Zuhrī, who heard it from Muhammad bin Jubair ibn Mut‘im, who reported on the authority of his father that he heard Allāh’s Messenger  saying, “I am Muhammad and I am Ahmad, and I am Al-Māhī (The Obliterator) by whom unbelief would be obliterated, and I am Al-Hāshir (The Gatherer) at whose feet mankind will be gathered, and I am Al-ʿĀqib (The Last to Come) after whom there will be no prophet.”

This narration is simply unacceptable! It has been narrated by Sufyān bin ‘Uyainah who narrated it from Zuhrī. About Sufyān bin ‘Uyainah, it is written:

90 The True Meaning of Khatme Nubuwat, Page 32
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He used to make false reports. Ahmad said, “He has made mistakes in about 20 narrations from Zuhrī.” Yahyā bin Sa‘īd said, “I bear witness that Sufyān bin ‘Uyainah became mentally challenged in 197 Hijri. So, whoever took a narration from him after that, it is useless.”

About Zuhrī, it is written, “كان يدّلّس في النادر” (He used to make false reports sometimes). Hence, in the same manner, it appears that the narrators gave their personal opinion of the word Al-‘Āqib when they said, “after whom there will be no prophet.”

Secondly, it is important to note that the Holy Prophet Muhammad ᵐsa was an Arab and his companions were also Arab. What was the need for him to translate the word Al-‘Āqib? The very fact that the word was explained in so many words shows that it was done by a narrator perhaps in discussion with a non-Arab. This is exactly what Hazrat Mullā ‘Alī Qārīrh has indicated but Farhan Khan didn’t bother to present the complete quotation in his own book! What marvellous dishonesty!!! Here is the actual statement:

---

92 Mizānul A‘etadāl, Volume 1, Page 398
93 Mizānul A‘etadāl, Volume 2, Page 146
الظاهرين هذا تفسير للصحابي أو من بعدها في شرح مسلم قال ابن الاعرابي العاقب الذي يخلف في الخير من كان قبله.

It is clear that this [i.e., the wording after whom there will be no prophet] is the commentary made by the companion or someone after him. Ibn Arabīrh said, “Al-‘Āqib is one who is the successor in goodness of one before him.”

Despite this, Farhan Khan wants us to accept his biased translation. He insists that Hazrat Mullā ‘Alī Qārīrh or Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabi are both wrong and their understanding of the word “Al-‘Āqib” is incorrect. The question is: Do we accept Farhan Khan’s biased translation or Hazrat Mullā ‘Alī Qārī’s honest and insightful understanding? The choice is up to the reader!

Hadīth Number 6 – Al-‘Āqib: After Whom there is No One

ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال ان لي اسماء أنا محمد وأنا أحمد وأنا المأتمي الذي يمحو الله بي الكفر وأنا الحاشر الذي يحشر الناس على قدمي وأنا العاقب الذي ليس بعده أحد وقد سماه الله روعا رحيمًا

Allāh’s Messengerṣa said: I have many names: I am Muhammad, I am Ahmad, I am Al-Māhī through whom Allāh obliterates unbelief, and I am Al-Hāshir (The Gatherer) at whose feet people will be gathered, and I am Al-‘Āqib, after whom there would

مرقاة شرح مشكاة، جلد 5، صفحة 30
Mirqāt Sharah Mishkāt, Volume 5, Page 376
be none, and Allāh has named him as compassionate and merciful.\textsuperscript{97}

The presentation of this hadīth by Farhan Khan confuses us greatly! What does he want us to believe? Which one of the following meanings of Al-‘Āqib does he want us to take?

1. There is no prophet after the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} [ليس بعده نبي]
2. There is no one after the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} [ليس بعده] 2

If it is number 1, that meaning has already been rejected by Hazrat Mullā ʿAlī Qārīth. If it is number 2, then there are three possibilities of what no one after him can mean:

1. There is no prophet after the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa};  
2. No human being was born after him; or  
3. No one of his status can be born after him

About number 1, the burden of proof is on Farhan Khan. There is no mention of prophethood in the hadīth. He has to tell us how he arrived at that meaning. Presenting the opinion of the writer of the commentary of Sahīh Muslim is not enough. He has to demonstrate from the words of the hadīth that this is what the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} intended to say.

Number 2 is unacceptable because human beings have been born for hundreds of years after the Holy Prophet

\textsuperscript{97} Sahīh Muslim, Chapter 30, Chapter 31, Book 30, Number 5811
Muhammadṣa and he cannot be called the “last man” in terms of time.

The only option left is number 3. That is the most logical understanding of this hadīth and each and every Ahmadī is willing to accept that the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa is the last man to be born of his status. No one can achieve his status after him.

Hadīth Numbers 7 & 8 – Al-Muqaffā

كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يسمي لنا نفسه أسماء فقال
أنا محمد وأحمد والمقفى والحاشرون نبى التوبة ونبي الرحمة

Allāh’s Messengerṣa mentioned many names of his and said: I am Muhammad, Ahmad, Al-Muqaffā, Al-Hāshir, the Prophet of Repentance, and the Prophet of Mercy.

Farhan Khan’s Translation: I heard the Messenger of Allāh, may Allāh bless him and give him peace, say, “I am Muhammad (The praised one), Ahmad (The praiseworthy), Al-Muqaffā (the last in succession), Al-Hāshir (the gatherer), Al-Khātim (The Last), and Al-‘Āqib (The last).

Neither of the above ahādīth states that the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa was the last prophet. The translation of the word Muqaffā as “the last in succession” by Farhan Khan is just what it is - only a translation! It is based upon the opinion of Farhan

98 Sahīh Muslim, Chapter 30, Chapter 31, Book 30, Number 5813
Khan and it is wrong. Allāma Ibn Al-Anbārī said, “معنی المتبع للنبيين” (Its meaning is, “one who is followed by the prophets”)⁹⁹. This meaning itself requires that prophets come after the Holy Prophet Muhammad⁷⁸ as his followers! Presenting these ahādīth in support of the cessation of prophethood is absolute ignorance of the Arabic language. Consider the following verse of the Holy Qur’ān:

وَ لَقَدْ أَتَيْنَا مُوسَى الكِتَابَ وَقَفَّيْنَا مِنْ بَعْدِهِ بَيْنَ الرِّسْلِينَ

And verily, We gave Moses the Book and caused after him Messengers to follow in his footsteps...¹⁰⁰

Here, the word Qaffainā [We caused (messengers after him) to follow in his footsteps] has been applied to Hazrat Mūsāas and it has the same root as the word muqaffā [the one who is followed (by the prophets)]. Hence, the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding of the word muqaffā is based on the Holy Qur’ān while Farhan Khan’s understanding of this word is based on his bias.

Secondly, Farhan Khan’s translation itself shows his dishonesty and bias. He translates Al-Muqaffā as “last,” Al-Khātim as “last” and Al-‘Āqib as “last.” In other words, he is trying to say that the Holy Prophet Muhammad⁷⁸ wanted to continuously repeat the word “last” and had no other meanings in mind. This is an insult against the fasih [eloquent] speech of the Holy Prophet Muhammad⁷⁸. He would never make such childish repetitions to say something so simple.

Farhan Khan’s desperation grows as he compromises his own integrity to grab anything within reach to invalidate the

⁹⁹ Al-Ikmāl Al-Akmāl, Sharah Muslim, Volume 2, Page 143
¹⁰⁰ Sūrah Al-Baqarah, 2:88
Ahmadiyya Muslim beliefs – even at the expense of the Holy Prophet’s honour!

Questions for Farhan Khan:

1. Why does he keep ignoring the fact that the Holy Prophet Muhammad(sa) prophesied the coming of a latter-day prophet?

2. If the word *ba'ad* cannot possibly mean anything other than “after,” what is the meaning of the following?

3. If the word *ba'ad* cannot possibly mean *in parallel to* or *in opposition to*, then what did the Holy Prophet(sa) intend to say when he said the following?

\[
\text{اذَا هَلَكَ قَيَّرُ فَلاً قَيِّرُ بَعْدَه} \\
\text{وَاذَا هَلَكَ كَسَرِّي فَلاً} \\
\text{كَسَرِّي بَعْدَه}
\]
In his chapter entitled Hadīth of [Hazrat] ʿAlīra and Lā Nabī Baʿadī, Farhan Khan discusses the following hadīth:

The Messenger of Allāhsa went out for Tabūk, appointing ʿAlī as his deputy [in Medina]. ‘Alī said, “Do you want to leave me with the children and women?” The Prophet said, “Will you not be pleased that you will be to me like Aaron was to Moses? But there will be no prophet after me.”

A detailed discussion of the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding of this hadīth has already been given in the previous chapter but more discussion is being made here in order to refute Farhan

---

101 Sahīh Bukhārī, Volume 5, Book 59, Number 700
Khan’s points. He misrepresents Ahmadiyya Muslim beliefs by describing them in the following words:

In this usage, the word *ba’ad* does not mean *after*. According to Lane’s Lexicon, page 225, the word *ba’ad* also means *behind*. Based on the usage of the Prophet, one can see that the actual meaning of this statement is *no Prophet behind me* in the sense that the Prophet Muhammad was departing to Tabūk and was not leaving behind a Prophet, as Mūsā did when he left Harūn behind.\(^\text{102}\)

This is another one of those *dishonesties* of Farhan Khan! Ahmādī Muslims did not just open the dictionary and chose to take a secondary meaning of *ba’ad* in order to conform the meaning of the *hadith* to their understanding. This is a blatant lie against Ahmadiyya Muslim beliefs!

First, as shown in the previous chapter, this understanding is in absolute accordance with the understanding of Hazrat Shāh Waliullāh Mohaddes Dehlavī\(^\text{th}\), universally acknowledged as the Mujaddid of the 12th century, who writes in *Qurat-ul-Ainīn Fī Tafsīl Al-Shaikhain*, Page 602:

> It must be clearly understood that the object of this *hadīth* is to highlight the appointment of Hazrat ‘Alī\(^\text{ra}\) to act in the place of or as an in charge of the region while the Holy Prophet\(^\text{sa}\) was to be absent from Medina during his expedition to Tabūk. It was also done to highlight Hazrat ‘Alī’s\(^\text{ra}\) resemblance to Hazrat Hārūn\(^\text{as}\) when Hazrat Mūsā\(^\text{as}\) had journeyed to

\(^{102}\) Khan, *With Love*, Page 17
the Mount. It is to be noted that the word بعدی [ba’adî] here means غیری [ghairî: besides me]. It does not mean after me in time. As we say that in:

قَمَّنُ يَهْدِيهِ مِنْ بَعْدِ اللَّهِ

(Who, then, will guide him other than Allāh?¹⁰³). بعد الله [ba’d-Allāh] means other than Allāh.

He further states in the same book:

Here the word بعدی [ba’adî] is not in the context of بعدی زمانی [after his time] because Hazrat Hārūn as did not outlive Hazrat Mūsā as. Hence, the implied conclusion was not for a period after the Holy Prophet sa for Hazrat ‘Alî ra. As a result, there was no reason to make the exception of a period after the Holy Prophet sa for Hazrat ‘Alî ra.

Farhan Khan is more than welcome to disagree with the reformer of the 12th century. It is up to him. The argument given by Hazrat Shāh Waliullah Mohaddes Dehlavī is irrefutable. The word ba’ad can only mean beside in this context because Hazrat Hārūn as died during the lifetime of Hazrat Mūsā as and was a prophet beside him, as his helper. The Holy Prophet Muhammad sa only stated that there is no prophet beside him, as his helper. The Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding is always

¹⁰³ Sūrah Al-Jāthiyah, 45:24
based entirely on the context of the statement and the situation at hand.

Second, in his desperation, Farhan Khan not only disagrees with a great *mujaddid* but tries to distort facts. He writes, “‘Alīra was exactly like Hārūn as in that they were both guardians over their people in the absence of the ‘master’ Prophet, except, unlike Hārūnas *who later became a Prophet*, there were no prophets after Muhammad, so ‘Alīra was not destined to become a Prophet.”

While we cannot know for sure if Farhan Khan did this on purpose but it can definitely cause some readers to think that Hazrat Hārūnas was made a prophet after the incident of Hazrat Mūsā’s as absence from his people for 40 nights. The fact of the matter is that Hazrat Hārūnas was a companion prophet to his brother from the very start of his mission before they even confronted Pharaoh. In the very first meeting between Allāh, the Exalted, and Hazrat Mūsā as, he had asked Him for a helper as shown by the following verses:

\[
\text{وَأَجْعَلُنِي وَزِيرًا مِّنَ أَهْلِي وُزِيّرًا مِّنَ أَهْلِي وَأَشْدُدُ يَٰبُتْ أَزْرُى}
\]

And grant me a helper from my family — Aaron, my brother; Increase my strength with him and make him share my task.

The words *share my task*, clearly indicate that Hazrat Mūsā as wanted him to become a prophet like him. As a result, this

---

104 Khan, *With Love*, Page 19
105 Sūrah Tāhā, 20:30-33
prayer was accepted and they were both sent as prophets to take their message to Pharaoh as shown by the following verse:

فَأَتِيَهُ فَقُولَا إِنَّا رَسُولَا رَبِّكَ قَارِئُ مَعَنَا بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ وَلاَ نَطَعْهُمْ قَدْ جَنَّكَ بَيْنَ مَنْ رَبِّكَ وَالسَّلَامُ عَلَيْنَا مِنْ آيَةٍ نَّبِيٍّ

“So go ye both to him and say, ‘We are the Messengers of thy Lord; so let the children of Israel go with us; and afflict them not. We have indeed brought thee a Sign from thy Lord; and peace shall be on him who follows the guidance.”106

This shows that Hazrat Hārūn as was made a prophet long before the time when the Jews migrated with Hazrat Mūsā as and Allāh, the Exalted, instructed him to separate himself from his people for a period of 40 nights, during which he appointed Hazrat Hārūn as as leader of the Jews. In summary, here is how the various events took place during the life of Hazrat Mūsā as in sequential order:

1. Hazrat Mūsā as perceives a fire on the Mount
2. Upon his arrival there, he is told of his mission to warn Pharaoh
3. He asks that his brother, Hazrat Hārūn as, be appointed as his helper
4. Allāh, the Exalted, makes Hazrat Hārūn as a prophet to help Hazrat Mūsā as
5. Eventually, the Jews embark upon the Exodus from Egypt under the leadership of Hazrat Mūsā as and Hazrat Hārūn as

106 Sūrah Tāhā, 20:48
6. Pharaoh is killed during the pursuit
7. Later on, during the journey, Hazrat Mūsāas is absent from his people for 40 nights and he appoints Hazrat Hārūn as a leader for the Israelites during his absence

This is the sequence of events according to the Holy Qur’ān. Allāh, the Exalted, did not appoint Hazrat Hārūn as a prophet after that absence. Trying to obscure historical facts in order to promote one’s interpretation of the finality of prophethood is ridiculously shameful!

The context should be quite clear now that when Hazrat Muhammad sa was about to leave Medīnah and left Hazrat ‘Alīra in charge during his absence, he meant to say to him, “You are to me as Hārūn was to Mūsā, except there is no prophet other than me.”

Third, let us reconsider what Farhan Khan wrote: “[Hazrat] ‘Alīra was exactly like [Hazrat] Hārūn as in that they were both guardians over their people in the absence of the “master” Prophet, except, unlike [Hazrat] Hārūn as who later became a Prophet, there were no prophets after Muhammad sa, so [Hazrat] ‘Alī was not destined to become a Prophet.” Not only does this statement attempt to distort facts, it ignores the very basis of the Ahmadiyya Muslim interpretation, that is, Hazrat Hārūn as died during the life of Hazrat Mūsāas! If he had lived on after the death of Hazrat Mūsāas, he could have been deemed a prophet after Hazrat Mūsāas. Instead, Hazrat Mūsāas was a prophet before and after Hazrat Hārūn as. This is precisely the reason given by Hazrat Shāh Waliullāh Mohaddas Dehlavī. Let us read his quotation again:

---
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Here the word بعد [ba’adī] is not in the context of بعديت زمانی [after his time] because Hazrat Hārūn as did not outlive Hazrat Mūsā as. Hence, the implied conclusion was not for a period after the Holy Prophet sa for Hazrat ‘Alī ra. As a result, there was no reason to make the exception of a period after the Holy Prophet sa for Hazrat ‘Alī ra.

Farhan Khan did not write his chapter in criticism of Islām Ahmadiyya alone. He wrote it also in criticism of Hazrat Shāh Waliullāh Mohaddas Dehlavī, who was one of the greatest scholars of hadīth in the history of Islām.

The problem is that Farhan Khan continues to insist upon his meanings in order to believe in the coming back of Hazrat ʿĪsā as as a Prophet after the Holy Prophet Muhammad sa. He should learn that Hazrat ʿĪsā as has died according to the Holy Qur’ān and this has been proven in the chapter entitled The Death of Hazrat ʿĪsā as.

**Question for Farhan Khan:**

1. Does he think that the conclusions drawn by Hazrat Shāh Waliullāh Mohaddas Dehlavī rh are wrong or just lengthy reinterpretation108? If the answer is ‘no’, why does he not accept it?

---

108 Khan, *With Love*, Page 19
Nothing has remained of Prophethood except *Mubashirāt*

In a *YouTube* video, Farhan Khan presents another *hadīth* to claim that prophethood has ended:

ان ابا هريرة قال سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقولُ لم يبق من النبوة إلا المبشرات قالوا وما المبشرات؟ قال الروَّى الصَّالِحَة

Hazrat Abū Hurairah ῶ narrated: I heard Allāh’s Apostle ῶ saying, “Nothing is left of prophethood except *mubashirāt.*” They asked, “What are *mubashirāt*?” He replied, “The true good dreams”.

In order to understand this *hadīth* properly, it is important to look at similar narrations that come in the books of *ahādīth*. For instance, *Fath-ul-Bārī* records the following in the commentary to the above *hadīth*:

---

109 *Sahih Bukhārī, Kitāb-ut-Ta’bīr, Bāb: Al-Mubashirāt*

110 *Sahih Bukhārī, Kitāb-ut-Ta’bīr, Bāb: Al-Mubashirāt*
This hadith states that one day, when the Holy Prophet (sa) was ill – and this was a short while before his demise and he had tied his head (due to the severity of the illness) – he lifted the curtain of his door and saw that people were arranged in rows in order to pray behind Hazrat Abū Bakr (ra). Addressing them, he said, ‘O people, listen! Indeed nothing has remained of prophethood except the good dream which a Muslim sees or it is shown to him’.

Another two narrations state the following:

Atā’ bin Yasār narrates that the Holy Prophet (sa) said, “Nothing remains of prophethood after me except mubashirāt.” The companions said, “What are Mubashirāt, O Prophet of Allāh?” He said, “The true dream which a sālih [i.e., righteous] man sees or it is
shown to him. It is a part of the 46 parts of prophethood”.

It has been narrated to us by Anas bin Malik that he said that the Holy Prophet said, “Surely, Ar-risālah [i.e., messengership] and An-nubuwwah [i.e., prophethood] have ended; hence, there is no messenger after me, nor a prophet. The narrator said that this [statement] saddened the people. Hence, the Holy Prophet said, “Except mubashirāt”. The sahaba asked, “O Messenger of Allāh! What are mubashirāt?” He said, “The dream of a Muslim and it is a part of the parts of prophethood”.

After studying all these ahādīth, the context becomes much clearer. These are the great statements of the Holy Prophet Muhammad which demonstrate the spiritual strength and influence of the Holy Prophet. This is from that جوامع الكلم [i.e., the ability to make statements full of meaning] which was granted to

112 Muwattā‘ Imām Mālik, Kitāb-ul-Jāmi‘, Bāb: Mā Jā’ fir-Ru’yā
113 Jāmi’ Tirmidhī, Abwāb-ur-Ru’yā, Bāb: Dhababat-in-Nubuwwah
him from God Al-Mighty as a special blessing. Farhan Khan’s understanding is now refuted with the following points.

**Everyday Language**

First, one must pay a little attention to the actual words of the Holy Prophetṣa. He says, “Nothing remains of prophethood except *mubashirāt*”. How beautifully has the Holy Prophetṣa made the prophecy of the continuation of prophethood in this *ummah*. Look at the sentence structure! We casually make similar statements every day.

If there is a baseball game that is about to end, we say, “The game is over except one inning.” A baseball game is made up of several innings, but the game is not over if there is still one inning left open for play.

For any tournament that is about to end, we say, “Now there are only 1 or 2 matches remaining” or “Nothing remains of the tournament except 1 or 2 matches”. An open match is still an inseparable part of the tournament and we cannot say that the tournament is finished so long as that match is still open.

If one wants to say, “The food is finished, except some bread,” it is translated in Arabic as follows:

لا يبق من الطعام إلا الخبز!

It would be wrong to say that the bread is not food for we know that the bread is a part of the meal. So long as that bread still exists, we cannot say that the food is finished.

These are all the examples where the components are inseparable parts of the whole, and the difference is only in terms of magnitude and/or frequency. In the same way, the Holy Prophetṣa said: “Nothing remains of prophethood except
Nothing has remained of Prophethood except *Mubashirāt*. It does not mean that prophethood has completely terminated, but simply that a ceiling has been placed upon its magnitude – and that ceiling we Ahmadi Muslims recognize as the *Seal* of the Holy Prophet(s.a). So long as *mubashirāt* is still open, we cannot say that prophethood has ended.

Expounding on the same subject and discussing the stages of a *majzūb*, ‘Allāma Hakīm Tirmidhī writes, “Some of them attain a third of prophethood, and some attain half (of it) and some attain more than half. And some attain a very large portion of prophethood and they are called *Khātam-ul-Awliyā*.“

**The Essence or Foundation of Prophethood**

Another factor that should be considered is the essence of prophethood. Prophethood, in and of itself, is the abundance and excellence of *mubashirāt*. The fact of the matter is that *mubashirāt* and *munzirāt* [glad tidings and warnings – and these go hand in hand] represent the very essence of prophethood, as Allāh, the Exalted, explains:

وَمَا نَرْسِلُ الْمُرْسَلِيْنَ إِلَآ مُبَشِِّرِيْنَ وَمُنْذِرِيْنَ فَمَنْ أَمَّنَ أَصْلَحَ فَلَا حَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَبُونَ ۚ

And We send not the Messengers but as bearers of glad tidings and as warners. So those who believe and reform *themselves*, on them shall come no fear nor shall they grieve.¹¹⁵

---

¹¹⁴ *Tadhkaratul Awliyā (Urdu)*, Page 253, Published by: Sheikh Ghulām ‘Alī and sons, Tājirān Kutab Kashmīrī Bazār, Lahore

¹¹⁵ Sūrah Al-An‘ām, 6:49
This is the essence and core of prophethood. It is the base or the very foundation of prophethood. The truth is that glad tidings and warnings are not an ordinary phenomenon. When these glad tidings and warnings are granted to someone in abundance and excellence in quantity and quality, that person is called a prophet. Certainly, in low quantities, these can be found in most believers. Just as the owner of a few dollars cannot be called rich, the one who receives these glad tidings and warnings in a small quantity cannot be called a prophet. Only that person can be called a prophet whom Allāh, the Exalted, blesses with unmatched abundance and unparalleled excellence just as He says in the Holy Qur’ān:

\[
\text{الْعَلِيمُ ٱللَّهُ ﻟَا يَبْيَضُ عَلَىٰ عَيْنِيهِ أَحَدًا} \quad \text{رُسُولٍ فَٱلَّذِينَ يَشْكُلُونَ مِنْ نَفْسِهِنَّ} \\
\text{ۚ مِنْ أَيْلَىٰ يَدِيهِ وَمِنْ خَلْفِهِ رَضِيَۚ} \\
\text{He is the Knower of the unseen; and He reveals not His secrets to any one, except to him whom He chooses, namely a Messenger of His. And then He causes an escort of guarding angels to go before him and behind him.}^{116}
\]

Hence, in reality, the difference lies in the scale of abundance. Prophets are defined as those blessed with an abundance of glad tidings and warnings.

All other things such as the bringing of a law or sharī’ah are additional features, which are not necessarily present in every prophet. They are found in some prophets, yet not in others. Therefore, the Promised Messiah\textsuperscript{sa} says:

---

\textsuperscript{116} Sūrah Al-Jinn, 72:27-28
Nothing has remained of Prophethood except Mubashirāt

This whole misfortune has borne out of a lack of contemplation over the true meanings of the word Nabī [prophet]. The word Nabī only refers to one who receives revelations from God and is granted the honour of converse and communication with Him. It is not necessary for him to bring a law, nor is it necessary for him to not be a follower of a law bearing messenger.118

In another place, he says:

As the Mujaddid [Alaf Thānīth] hailing from Sirhind has written in his writings that some people in the ummah will remain blessed with the honour of divine

---

117 Appendix of Brāhīn Ahmadiyya Part V, Rūhānī Khazā’in, Volume 21, Page 306
118 Appendix of Brāhīn Ahmadiyya Part V, Rūhānī Khazā’in, Volume 21, Page 306
119 Appendix of Brāhīn Ahmadiyya Part V, Rūhānī Khazā’in, Volume 21, Page 306
converse, but he who is a recipient of divine revelation in abundance and hidden matters are revealed to him plentifully, is called a prophet.120

The fact of the matter is that this was also the faith of other Awliyāʾ Allāh [Friends of Allāh]. Other saints have supported this concept and one of them is ‘Abd-ul-Wahāb Shi’rānī who says, “Let it be known that the order of prophethood has not totally ceased; it is indeed only the law-bearing prophethood which has discontinued. The statement of the Holy Prophetsa:

لا نبي بعدي ولا رسول بعدي

means that after him there shall be no law-bearing prophet”.121

Al-Muslim, Al-Muʿmin and As-Sālih

One question that one might still have could be: Did the Holy Prophetsa not specify the meaning of mubashirāt in response to the question of the sahib? It is true that, in response to their question, “What are mubashirāt?”, the Holy Prophetsa replied, “True dreams” or “The dream of a Muslim” or “The dream of a muʿmin” or more clearly “The true dream which a sālih [righteous] man sees or it is shown to him”. The fact of the matter is that the Holy Prophetsa actually gave the ummah glad tidings in this hadīth that there shall be those in his ummah – al-muslim, al-muʿmin, and as-sālih – who shall be the recipients of mubashirāt [glad tidings]. The usage of the words al-Muslim, al-muʿmin, and as-sālih is not pointless and it is meant to point out that the generally pious followers of his ummah will

120 Haqiqatul Wahī, Rūhānī Khazāʾin, Volume 22, Page 406
121 Al-Yawāqīṭ wa l Jawāhir, Part 2, Page 39
not be deprived of his beneficence. In other words, it is through the spiritual grace and beneficence of the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} that a muslim, a mu’min or a sālih sees true dreams.

To understand this better, we must turn to the Holy Qur’an. In the terminology of the Holy Qur’an, a sālih is that person who is rewarded and in the group of those people who are rewarded, a sālih is at the first stage. When we look at the ummah of the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa}, the large majority is made up of the sālihin [the righteous]. When the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} uses the words, dream of a muslim or a dream of a mu’min or a dream that a righteous person is shown, it means that true dreams will continue to be experienced by the large majority of the Muslims. However, those who are at higher levels or stages, namely, the shuhadā’ [witnesses], the siddīqīn [truthful], and the nabīyyīn [prophets], among the disciples of the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa}, were not under discussion in this particular hadith.

In this sense, the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} did not deprive the generally pious followers of his ummah from that part of prophethood which is the 46\textsuperscript{th} – the ru’yā sāliha [true dream]. On the other hand, the greater stages achievable through the spiritual beneficence of the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} are also clearly evident from the extraordinary aspects of al-mubashirāt and ar-ru’yā sāliha. This is better understood when one studies the following verse of Sūrah An-Nisā’:

\begin{quote}
\textit{وَمَنْ يُعْلِمُ اللهَ وَالَّذِينَ أَتَمَّنَّ بِهِذَا الْدِّينَ عَلَىٰهُمْ مَنَ}
\textit{الْيَتِينَ وَالسَّلِيمَانَ وَالسَّلِيمُانَ وَالصَّالِحَانَ وَالصَّالِحْانَ وَحَسَنَّ أَوْلِيَّاَكَ رَفِيقًا ۗ}
\end{quote}

And whoso obeys Allāh and this Messenger of His shall be among those on whom Allāh has bestowed His blessings, namely, the Prophets, the Truthful, the
Witnesses, and the Righteous. And excellent companions are these.\textsuperscript{122}

This verse clearly states that only those who are obedient to Allāh and His Messenger can become prophets. Hence, they are the ones who are ummatī prophets or subordinate prophets, that is, subordinate to the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa}. According to the verse, there are four ranks of a believer:

1. The Sālihūn/Righteous
2. The Shuhadā’/Witnesses
3. The Siddīqūn/Truthful
4. The Nabiyyūn/Prophets

As a result, one can conclude that if ru’yā sāliha is meant for al-muslim, al-mu’min, and as-sālih, then, for the higher ranks, there are kushūf [visions] and revelations. This is evident from the experiences of thousands of saints and righteous believers of high status. Their experiences were not limited to ru’yā sāliha. They received powerful revelations from God!

Imām Abul Hasan agrees with us on this concept in his commentary of Sunan Ibn Mājah [one of the 6 most reliable ahādīth collections] in these words:

\begin{quote}
المراد انها لم تبق على العموم والا فالالهاء والكشف
للاولياء فموجود
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{122} Sūrah An-Nisā’, 4:70
\textsuperscript{123} Imām Abū Al-Hassan, Sharah Sunan Ibn Mājah, Voluem 2, Page 448

[ابن ماجه مصنفه امام ابو الحسن- جلد 2- صفحه 328]
He says that the hadīth uses the words *true dreams* in reference to ordinary people. Otherwise, revelations and visions of saints is an existing reality.

About the revelations and visions of saints, Hazrat Shaikh ‘Abd-ul-Qādir Jailānī\(^{rh}\) states:

\[ أوتى الأنبياء اسم النبوة وأوتينا اللقب أي حبر علينا اسم النبوة مع أن الحق سوى يخبرنا في سرايرنا معاني كلمته وكلام رسوله وصاحب هذا المقام من أنبياء الأولية \]

*Anbiyā’* have been given the name of *nubuwwah* and we [those of his ummah] get the title [of *nubuwwah*]. This means that the name of *nubuwwah* has been stopped from us despite the fact that we have full right [to it]. We are informed [by Allāh, the Exalted] in solitude about the meanings of His Word and the words of the Holy Prophet\(^{sa}\). And the person of this status is from the *Anbiyā’-ul-Awliyā’* – *The prophet among the saints*.

As a result, the name of *nubuwwah* was saved for the one who was to descend as the Holy Prophet\(^{sa}\) said:

\[ ليس بيني وبينه يعني عيسى عليه السلام نبي وانه نازل... \]

“There is no prophet between me and him, i.e., ʻĪsā\(^{as}\), and he shall descend (in the future)…”\(^{124}\)

---

\(^{124}\) Abū Da‘ūd, Kitāb-ul-Malāhim, Bāb Khurūj-ud-Dajjāl
What is a Ru’ya (Dream/Vision)?

Another thing that should be understood is: What is a رؤيا [ru’yā]? Is it not possible to receive orders and commandments from God through a ru’yā? Regarding a vision of the Holy Prophetṣa, Allah, the Exalted, says:

وَمَا جَعَلْنَا الرُّؤْيَا الَّتِي آرِيَنَكَ إِلَّا فِتْنَةً لِلنَّاسِ

... And We made not the vision which We showed thee but as a trial for men... 125

It is obvious that since this verse is in Sūrah Al-Isrā’, the word ru’yā here refers to the Isrā’ of the Holy Prophetṣa. Even Hazrat Ibn Abbāsra confirms this when he says:

هي رؤيا عيين أرييها رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ليلة أسيريه

It was an actual eye-witness which was shown to Allah’s Apostleṣa during the night he was taken on a journey. 126

Everybody knows that in this ru’yā, Allah, the Exalted, clearly showed signs to the Holy Prophetṣa. The angel Gabrielas was with him but only up to a point beyond which the Holy Prophetṣa advanced on his own. This is the greatness of this ru’yā!!

It is in this vision or ru’yā of the Holy Prophetṣa that even commandments concerning the sharī‘ah were revealed to him.

125 Sūrah Al-Isrā’, 17:61
126 Sahih Bukhārī, Kitābut Tafsīr, باب: وَمَا جَعَلْنَا الرُّؤْيَا الَّتِي آرِيَنَكَ إِلَّا فِتْنَةً لِلنَّاسِ
As a result, how is it possible for us to take the word *ruʿyā* so lightly? In view of the experiences of the Holy Prophet(sa) in this *ruʿyā* or *isrāʾ*, it can be said that a *ruʿyā* can contain the high and lofty features of prophethood. It is a part of the essence of prophethood. It has so many heights that one cannot imagine. Consider this *hadith* narrated by Hazrat Ayeshāra:

> “The commencement of the Divine *Wahī* [Revelation] to Allāh’s Apostle(sa) was in the form of *ar-ruʿyā as-sāliḥah*…”

Another narration is:

> The commencement of the Divine *Wahī* [Revelation] to Allāh’s Apostle(sa) was in the form of *ar-ruʿyā as-sādiqa*…

In other words, *ar-ruʿyā as-sāliha* was a part of the *wahī* or revelation of the Holy Prophet(sa). How can we ever take it so lightly?

---

127 *Sahih Bukhārī*, Kitāb Badaʿul Wahī, باب: اقرأ قال ما أتانا بقارئ قال فأخذني فغطني حتى بلغ مني.

128 *Sahih Bukhārī*, Kitab-ut-Taʿbir, باب: أول ما بدئ به رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من الودي.
Are only Dreams left for the ummah?

Analyzing this issue further, one should ponder over these questions: Do only plain dreams remain for the ummah? Has God stopped speaking to this ummah completely? Can it be possible to assume that this is all that is left for the Best ummah which has been praised in these words of the Holy Qur’ān, ﷺ ﷺ (You are the best people raised for the good of mankind)?

If we take the ahādīth in question to be referring to only ordinary dreams, then such a statement cannot be attributed to the Holy Prophet sa. There are countless examples of saints and pious individuals in this ummah right from the sahāba ra until this time who have experienced kalām or converse with God. Is this the kind of comfort that the Holy Prophet sa gave the ummah that we should keep on sleeping and trying to see true dreams?

The Fear of the Companions ra

Another point worth noting is the reaction of the companions ra. One narration states that the Holy Prophet sa made the statement in question during his final illness and when he said, “Surely, ar-risālah [messengership] and an-nubuwwah [prophethood] have ended; hence, there is no messenger after me, nor a prophet,” the reaction of the companions ra is expressed in these words:

129 Sūrah Āle Imrān, 3:111
This means that they reacted with sadness and shock and perhaps wondered why all kinds of prophethood, including the prophethood of the Holy Prophet ﷺ, have ended. While the companionsra were in a state of shock, they were mollified to some extent when he completed his statement by adding the clarifying clause, “لَكِنَّ الْمُبَشْرَاتُ”, meaning that mubashirāt or glad tidings remain. This indicated that prophethood had not ended absolutely or in totality. Its essence remains in the ummah.

In other words, this statement was made in a specific context and time. He made this statement about his type of prophethood keeping in view his death, which was near. Correspondingly, leading scholars of Islām have made this interpretation as well. Allāma Ibn Hajar, one of the greatest scholars of hadīth, writes:

اللَّهُمَّ فِي النِّبَوَةِ لِلْعَهْدِ وَالْمُرَادِ نُبِيَّتِهِ وَالْمَعْنَى لَمْ يَبْقَ بَعْد

الْمُبَشْرَاتِ الْمُخْتَصَّة بِيِّ الْمُبَشْرَاتِ

The implication of the [definite article] “ال” in the word [an-nubuwvrah] refers specifically to the prophethood of the Holy Prophet ﷺ [not to prophethood in general] and the meaning is: “nothing remains from prophethood specific to myself except mubashirāt”.130

Therefore, it refers to his prophethood specifically, after which only mubashirāt (glad tidings) have remained. Intellectually, this was necessary for the time of the Holy Prophet ﷺ when the scope of revelation could not be expanded to a great extent because

---

there was a danger of confusion being made between the revelation of the Holy Qur’an and others. Based on this situation, the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} only made this singular interpretation of the word \textit{mubashirāt} by saying that it refers to “true dreams.” Allāma Ibn Hajar illustrates this further when he writes:

\begin{center}
\textit{وَكَانَ السَّرُّ فِي نَدُورَةٍ أَلاً لِهَمِ فِي زَمَنِهِ وَكَثِيرَةً مِنْ بَعْدِهَ...}
\textit{لِمَنْ أُخْتَصَصَهُ اللَّهُ بِهِ للآمِنِ مِنْ الَّذِينَ فِي ذَلِكَ}
\end{center}

He states that the frequency of revelation (for others) was minimal close to the time of the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} as compared to the later period due to this secret of the Decree of Allāh that the revelation of the Qur’ān may not be mixed with any other type of revelation.\textsuperscript{131}

\textit{The Clue in the Word Al-Mubashirāt}

The final point to be noted is that the word \textit{al-mubashirāt} indicates a very important message of the Holy Qur’ān. When we search the Holy Qur’ān for the mention of any \textit{bashārat} or glad tiding, we are obliged to say that there is a \textit{bashārat} given to the people by Hazrat ‘Īsā\textsuperscript{as} with the very words:

\begin{center}
\textit{وَمُبَشِّرًا يُرْسُوْلٍ يَأْتِي مِنْ بَعْدِي فَتَبَارَى اسْمُهُ أَحْمَدُ}
\end{center}

…giving glad tidings of a Messenger who will come after me. His name will be Ahmad…\textsuperscript{132}

\textsuperscript{131} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{132} Sūrah As-Saff, 61:7
He directed us towards that Prophet whose name is ‘Ahmad’ and there are two aspects of this prophecy. One was fulfilled in the person of the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} and the other was to be fulfilled in his second advent in his \textit{ummah}. That prophecy was fulfilled when the Promised Messiah and Imām Mahdi – Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad\textsuperscript{as} – came. We cannot belittle the words “الإلا المشيرات” that is, prophethood has ended “except the glad tidings” for these include the prophetic tidings of the coming of the Promised Messiah\textsuperscript{as}.

\textbf{Questions for Farhan Khan:}

1. Does he believe that only ordinary dreams are left for this \textit{ummah}? If yes, does he reject the revelations and visions of all the saints, ā‘immah, and mujaddid\textsuperscript{īn} of this \textit{ummah}?
2. Does he believe that when the Promised Messiah\textsuperscript{as} comes, his only means of communication with Allāh will be through dreams?
“I am the Last Brick and I am the Last of the Prophets”

Ahmādī Muslim Argument

In his chapter entitled *I am the Last Brick and I am the Last of the Prophets*, Farhan Khan discusses the following *ahādīth* of the Holy Prophet Muhammad ﷺ:

 حدثنا محمد بن سنان حدثنا سليم بن حيان حدثنا سعيد بن ميناء عن جابر بن عبد الله رضى الله عنهما قال قال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم مثلى و مثل الانبياء كرجل بنى دارا فاکملها و أحسنها الا موضع لبنة فجعل الناس يدخلونها يتعجبون و يقولون لو لا موضع اللبنة

Narrated Jābir bin ‘Abdullāh: The Prophet ﷺ said, “My similitude in comparison with the other prophets is that of a man who has built a house completely and excellently except for a place of one brick. When the
people enter the house, they admire its beauty and say: ‘But for the place of this brick (how splendid the house will be)!’"  

Abū Hurairahṣa reported Allâh’s Messengerṣa as saying: “The similitude of mine and that of the apostles (before me) is that of a person who constructed a building and he built it fine and well and the people went round it saying, ‘Never have we seen a building more imposing than this, but for one brick,’ and I am that brick (with which you give the finishing touch to the building).”

133 Sahîh Bukhârî, Volume 4, Book 56, Hadîth Number 734
134 Sahîh Muslim, Book 30, Hadîth Number 5673
Narrated Abū Hurairah ‏: Allāh’s Apostle ﷺ said, “Surely, my similitude in comparison with the other prophets before me, is that of a man who has built a house nicely and beautifully, except for a place of one brick in a corner. The people go about it and wonder at its beauty, but say: ‘Would that this brick be put in its place!’ So I am that brick, and I am the Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn.”

These ahādīth speak of a parable given by the Holy Prophet ﷺ and parables are not meant to be understood literally. A literal understanding of these ahādīth would make absolutely no sense. The status of the Holy Prophet ﷺ is too high for him to be simply considered “a brick” in one of the corners! Ahmadī Muslims strongly reject any such understanding as it violates the sanctity of the station of the Holy Prophet Muhammad ﷺ. If this had been a literal comparison, it would have placed the Holy Prophet ﷺ in the best place of the palace, not somewhere in one of its corners. One of the narrations even explains that the brick is actually the khātam (seal) which verifies and completes the palace. The khātam or seal of authentication was not present before the advent of the Holy Prophet ﷺ but when he came, the palace was completed. In other words, when the Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn – the Holy Prophet Muhammad ﷺ – came, the palace representing the prophets was completed because he verified the truth of all the prophets.

135 Sahīh Bukhārī, Volume 4, Book 56, Hadīth Number 735
Second, notice the language of the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa. He begins his statement with the following words:

إن مَثْلِي وَمِثلِ الَّآنيِبَآءِ مَنَ قَبْلِي

Surely, my similitude in comparison with the other prophets before me...

This is a clear indication that this example is about the previous prophets and it has nothing to do with future prophets. The main issue is about the prophethood of the Promised Messiah who was to come after the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa. Hence, this analogy has nothing to do with this issue. It is only about the previous prophets.

Third, the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding of this hadith is discussed in The True Meaning of Khatme Nubuwwat in the following words:

Our opponents put forth another hadith, which, according to them, conclusively debars the advent of any ummatī prophet. The hadith runs as follows:

Hazrat Abū Hurairahra reports: “The Messenger of Allāḥṣa said: ‘The previous prophets and myself are like a palace exquisitely built except for a missing brick in its wall. People wonder why such a blemish was not attended to. I am that brick that completed and perfected the edifice of the palace. That is why I am called the Khātam of the messengers’.” In another version of the hadith, the Holy Prophetṣa said: ‘I am that

Based on this *hadīth*, our opponents state that it has been unambiguously stated that there will be no more prophets of any kind. When the last ‘brick’ has been laid, it is all over. Yet, they have no problem with the second coming of Jesus as. This would mean that a brick from a lower level of the palace was taken out and sent up to the heavens to be brought back in the Latter Days!

Let us see how some eminent scholars understand this *hadīth*. Allāma Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalānī [d. 852AH/1448CE] writes in his famous commentary of *Sahīh al-Bukhārī*, *Fath-ul-Bārī*, Volume 6, Page 361, “The completion of the palace means that the Muhammadan *sharī‘ah* is more complete than previous complete *sharī‘ahs*.” They have very conveniently failed to mention this commentator and his interpretation of the *hadīth*. He is not included in their list of commentators. A commentator who is included in their list is Allāma Ibn Khaldūn and, about this *hadīth*, he is noted to have said, “People interpret *Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn* to mean the brick that completed the palace. However, it means that the prophet with whose advent prophethood was perfected has come.” (*Muqaddima Ibn Khaldūn*, Page 271). Here again, the term *Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn* has been taken to mean the prophet in whom
prophethood found its consummation. No mention of termination of prophethood has been made.\textsuperscript{136} This quotation shows the Ahmadiyya Muslim stance on this hadith and explains the beauty of the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding. Let us now consider how Farhan Khan has criticized this understanding.

\textit{Refuting Farhan Khan’s Arguments}

First, Farhan Khan says, “… it is important for one to re-read the text of the Hadith from an unbiased perspective and note that the Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} is comparing himself to all of the Prophets, not his law to other laws.”\textsuperscript{137} This argument is already refuted in the beginning of this chapter. Farhan Khan is merely suggesting that we re-read the parable of the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} in literal terms and no Ahmadī Muslim is willing to do that because it lowers the dignity of the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa}. Since it includes an analogy, we will only take a meaning that upholds this dignity and that meaning has been presented above in the quotation from \textit{The True Meaning of Khatme Nubuwwat}. Moreover, this is the Ahmadiyya Muslim approach to studying \textit{all} the ahādīth of the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa}, especially the analogies. We always make sure that we are careful in the study of the sayings of our beloved Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} because many a nation has been the recipient of the wrath of Allāh because they took God’s word or their prophet’s words in literal terms. For instance, the Jews of the time of Hazrat ‘Īsā\textsuperscript{as} rejected him because they were waiting for the literal return of Elijah\textsuperscript{as} from the heavens, just as it was stated in

\textsuperscript{136} \textit{The True Meaning of Khatme Nubuwwat}, Page 23

\textsuperscript{137} Khan, \textit{With Love}, Page 13
their books. They misunderstood the sayings of their prophets because they took them too literally.

Second, if Farhan Khan’s understanding is accepted, the matter will remain unsolved. This is because the analogy only speaks of one missing brick when, according to Farhan Khan, there are supposed to be two missing bricks in the palace. Farhan Khan believes in the physical ascent of Hazrat ‘Īsāas to heaven and if the hadīth is taken literally, the brick representing Hazrat ‘Īsāas should also be missing. A question that arises from this acceptance of Farhan Khan’s meaning is: When Hazrat ‘Īsāas comes back, where will that brick go? As it can now be seen clearly, this is a flawed understanding and Ahmadī Muslims are not willing to accept it.

Third, Farhan Khan brings a quotation of Hazrat Imām Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalānīrh and writes, “[Hazrat] Mirzā Tāhir Ahmad[rh] quoted Ibn Hajar Al-Asqalani out of context in regards to the rest of his statement.”138 Farhan Khan then goes on to emphasize that the hadīth is about the prophets and the discussion about their laws is a separate one. However, the fact of the matter is that the conclusion drawn by Imām Ibn Hajarrh at the end of his paragraph is identical to the conclusion drawn by the Ahmadī Muslims. There is no denying that! Ahmadī Muslims firmly believe that this analogy is about the prophets but not in the literal sense. The purpose of the analogy is to speak about the laws brought by those prophets. This is the same as the conclusion drawn by Imām Ibn Hajarrh and it has even been recorded by Farhan Khan on Page 13 of his book:

---

138 Ibid.
Hence, the *purpose here* is to refer to the completion with a comparison of the Muhammadan *sharīʿah* with what has passed from the complete *sharīʿahs* (of past Prophets).

No matter how much Farhan Khan tries to throw dust in the eyes of the reader, the conclusion drawn by Imām Ibn Hajar th is *exactly* the same as the conclusion drawn by Ahmadī Muslims. In fact, he even disagrees with the above statement of Imām Ibn Hajar th when he writes, “However, the Hadīth itself speaks about Prophets, not laws.”

Fourth, Farhan Khan writes, “the Ahmadī [Muslims] quote Ibn Khaldūn in his great work *Al-Muqaddimah*. Yet they selectively leave out the part of the excerpt that goes against their beliefs.” This is *not true!* The way that Ibn Khaldūn understood the hadīth is *exactly* the same as the way Ahmadī Muslims understand it. Here is a look at the original Arabic quotation of Ibn Khaldūn:

[Page 261]

---

139 Ibid., Page 14
140 Ibid.
They interpret “the Seal of the prophets” as the brick needed for the completion of the building, while it (actually) means the prophet who has achieved An-Nubuwwah Al-Kāmilah (Complete prophethood)\(^{142}\)

Just like he did in the case of Imām Ibn Hajar al-ʿAsqalānī\(^{th}\), Farhan Khan has only tried to throw dust in the eyes of the readers in order to overshadow and hide the main purpose of the statement of Ibn Khaldūn given above. However, the truth of Ibn Khaldūn’s interpretation of the hadīth under discussion glares at him regardless. Ibn Khaldūn even goes a step further and explains how he understands the word “khātam” in terms of status:

و يمثلون الولاية في تفاؤت مراتبها بالنبوة، و يجعلون صاحب الكمال فيها خاتم الأولياء أي حائز الرتبة التي هي خاتمة الولاية كما كان خاتم الأنبياء حائزاً للمرتبة التي هي خاتمة النبوة. فكنى الشاعر عن تلك المرتبة الخاتمة بلبنة البيت في الحديث المذكور.

The perfect saint is considered to be the “seal” of the saints, that is, the saint who is in the possession of the rank that is the **final stage of sainthood**, exactly as “the seal (Khātam) of the prophets” was the Prophet who was in possession of the rank that is the **final stage of prophethood**. In the tradition quoted, the

\(^{142}\) Translated by the authors

\(^{143}\) Ibid.
Lawgiver (Muhammad) used the phrase, “the brick (that completes) the house”, for that final stage.\footnote{144} This quotation expresses the same understanding that the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamāʿat believes. Ahmadī Muslims believe that Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn distinguishes the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} with the highest status of perfection, or the final stage. Ibn Khaldūn even goes on to say that the Messiah of the latter days will be the Khātam of the saints in the sense that he will be the best of the saints. Farhan Khan should re-read Ibn Khaldūn’s quotation without his pre-disposed belief of the “end of prophethood” to understand what Ibn Khaldūn is really saying.

Fifth, Farhan Khan says, “…suppose the Ahmadī [Muslims] consider Ibn Khaldūn an authoritative figure and use his statements as proof of the interpretation of the hadīth. They conveniently fail to quote him when he says that from now until the end of time, there will be no more prophets.”\footnote{145} When an Ahmadī Muslim reads this, he is shocked at the extraordinary bias with which it has been written. Ahmadī Muslims do not quote Ibn Khaldūn’s quotation to show that he believed in the continuation of prophethood. They merely quote his position on the hadīth under discussion. They show that they are not alone in such an understanding of that hadīth and these interpretations belonged to previous scholars. Moreover, Ibn Khaldūn is quoted by Hazrat Mirzā Tāhir Ahmad\textsuperscript{rh} in his book, Irfāne Khatme Nubuwwat, and it was written in response to a booklet


\footnote{145 Khan, With Love, Page 15}
published by the government of Pakistan. Hazrat Mirzā Tāhir Ahmad⁴ th explains the reason behind quoting Ibn Khaldūn in the following words:

...Ibn Hajar al-ʻAsqalānī is not included in that list [of 4 scholars contained in the booklet] which consists of those whom they consider to be the greatest, well-accepted elders, thinkers and philosophers of Islām. However, among those four, Allāma Ibn Khaldūn is included. Let’s see what he has said regarding this...¹⁴⁶

This is the reason why Ibn Khaldūn has been quoted by Hazrat Mirzā Tāhir Ahmad⁴ th. It is only about his opinion about that particular hadīth, and not about his opinion about the end of prophethood. However, since Farhan Khan has brought up the issue, let us quote directly from his book where he states that Ibn Khaldūn wrote the following in Al-Muqadimah: “... there will be no other prophet and no other religious law (in the short time) between (Muhammad) and the Hour.”¹⁴⁷

This is exactly what Ahmadī Muslims believe. Between the Holy Prophet⁵ sa and the Hour there would be no prophet and no new religious law, but in the Last Hour a prophet would rise and he would be the Messiah⁶ as. This is confirmed in several ahādīth. For example, in Abu Daud we read: “Abu Hurairah⁷ ra narrated: ‘The Prophet⁵ sa said, “There is no prophet between me and him, that is, Jesus⁶ as. He will descend...’”.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁶ Irfāne Khatme Nubuwwat, Page 353 [Translated from Urdu by the authors]
¹⁴⁷ Khan, With Love, Page 15
¹⁴⁸ Kitāb-ul-Malāhim, Bāb Khurūj-ud-Dajjāl or Book of Battles, hadīth no. 4310
It is also mentioned in several reliable *ahādīth* that the descent of Jesus<sup>as</sup> is one of the events that will occur in the Last Hour. For example, in *Sahīh Muslim*, *Kitāb-ul-Fitan wa Ashrat As-Sa’ah* or the *Book of Conflicts and Signs of the Last Hour*, *ḥadīth* no. 6931, it is mentioned that the Holy Prophet<sup>sa</sup> stated ten signs of the Last Hour and one of those is the descent of Jesus<sup>as</sup>.

All Sunni Muslims believe this and if Farhan Khan denies it, then he does not know his own beliefs. Nevertheless, living up to his academic dishonesty, Farhan Khan modifies Ibn Khaldūn’s above statement to literally mean: “…he [i.e., Ibn Khaldūn] says that from now until the end of time there will be no more prophets.” Khan apparently confuses Ibn Khaldūn’s words and does not realize that Ibn Khaldūn simply stated what all Sunni Muslims believe: there is no prophet between the Holy Prophet<sup>sa</sup> and the Last Hour in which the Promised Messiah<sup>as</sup> would appear.

It is a shame that Farhan Khan then tries to discredit Ibn Khaldūn by writing that “he was not a muhaddith, nor was this his specialty. Expertise in social sciences does not automatically translate into expertise in ḥadīth interpretation.”

The fact of the matter is that Ibn Khaldūn was a great scholar and is still highly regarded all over the world. He knew the Arabic meaning of *khātām* and the context within which it is used to praise people. Farhan Khan does not. It is a serious pity that a person like Farhan Khan would dare flatter himself into thinking that we would ever take his opinion over the likes of a great scholar like Ibn Khaldūn, regardless of his expertise or not. Farhan Khan’s *wakeup call* is long overdue.

Sixth, no matter how Farhan Khan understands Imām Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalānī<sup>th</sup> or Ibn Khaldūn, the fact of the matter is that both of them believed in the coming of a latter day prophet, that is, the Promised Messiah<sup>as</sup>. 
Seventh, Hazrat Muhy-ud-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabī also supports the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding and this is proven in the following quotation:

الله صلی الله علیه وسلم نے نبوت کو خخت کی ویاگار سے تختی پھیپ دیا- ور ویاگار کے سوا وہ ایک خخت کی چمک کے پوری ستھیلی کئی- ور خود ررسول اللہ صلی الله علیه وسلم وہ خخت اشتریت کر ررسول اللہ صلی الله علیه وسلم نے اس کو ایک خخت وی ایک خخت بی ہدیہ۔ جیسا کہ آخیرت ملک صلی الله علیه وسلم نہیں زبان مبارک سے فرمایا اور ختم اولیاء (ہندی امام مبہدی) کوی کیتی ضرورت سے کہ وہ میں نبوت کو ویاگار کے معاہدہ پہنچے جیسا کہ آخیرت ملک صلی الله علیه وسلم نے اس کو اشتریت دی پہ اور ختم اولیاء نبوت کی ویاگار

بن دوائیت کی چد خانے پر دوئین- ایک ایک سوتے کی اورودو سری اینج جاندی کی بن دوائیت کے بھیڑ دوائیت کو نا قبض پتے تین- ان دوائیوں سے لئی نہیں ائر جاندی کی دوائیت سے اس کو کاہل پتے تین- بن ضرور پہ کہ وہ اپنے اپنے کو دوائیوں اینج کی جگہ پہ کہ پر منظی بھوڑے ہوے وہ پہنچے۔

اب خاتم اولیاء نہ وہ دوائیوں اینج پہے اورا بھی نے وہ دوائر پوری جوٹی

سے- خاتم اولیاء کے اس دوائیوں کو خخت کا پر سب پہ کہ وہ طاہر شیخ ختم

ارسول صلی اللہ علیه وسلم کے نشان تحت اور اس معاہدہ سے وہ اشتریت خخت

کے معاہدے پسند- اور پہر ان کا طاہر شیخ اوراء ان کے معاہدہ اکام کی

صورت پھی- اورا بھی پہ لئی خاتم اولیاء ان پرور کو اللہ سے لائیہ پہ جس میں

dوسرول کے امام اور منقوط پرین کیوک کو امام کو اصل حالات پر دکھتی
The Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} compared prophethood to a brick wall. And the wall was complete, except the place of one brick, and the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa}, himself, was that last brick. However, the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} only saw it as one brick, just as he said it. And the \textit{Khātam-ul-Awliyā’} (that is, the Imām Mahdī) should see that he also finds prophethood similar to a wall, just as the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} has given the analogy. And the \textit{Khātam-ul-Awliyā’} finds empty a place for two bricks in the wall of prophethood. One is a gold brick and the other is a silver brick. Hence, without the two bricks, he finds the wall incomplete. With the insertion of these, that is, the gold and silver bricks, he finds it completed. Hence, it is necessary that he sees himself as hidden in the place of both bricks.

Now, the \textit{Khātam-ul-Awliyā’} is the two bricks and the wall is completed with him. The reason behind seeing the \textit{Khātam-ul-Awliyā’} in the place of two bricks is that he is subordinate to the \textit{sharī‘ah} of the \textit{Khātam-ur-Rusul} outwardly. And with this subordination, he is at the status of being the silver brick. And this is his \textit{outward} status and the state of him being subordinate to the law. And with regard to the \textit{inner self}, the \textit{Khātam-ul-Awliyā’} takes those things, in which he is the Imām and leader for others, from

---
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Allāh. This is because he sees matters in their original state. And it is necessary to see the Khātam-ul-Awliyā’ in this way. With this, in regard to the inner self, he is the successor of the gold brick because he benefits (spiritually) from the same source from which Gabriel brought revelation to the Holy Prophet.\(^{150}\)

We can see from this quotation how beautifully has Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabī\(^{rh}\) expounded on the analogy of the hadīth and discussed the position of the Promised Messiah and Imām Mahdī\(^{as}\) in relation to the analogy.

Eighth, the explanation of Ibn ‘Arabī\(^{rh}\) has striking similarities with the statements of Ibn Khaldūn quoted by Farhan Khan on Page 14 of his book:

In his Kitāb ‘Anqa’ Mughrib, Ibn Al-Arabi Al-Hatimi called (the Mahdī) the “Seal of the Saints”. He is known under the name of the “silver brick”, with reference to a tradition reported by Al-Bukhārī in the chapter on the Seal of the prophets... In the case of Prophecy (or prophethood), the brick is gold. In the case of sainthood, the brick is silver.... “Gold brick” is used as a name for the Prophet, and “silver brick” as a name for the expected Fatimid saint (or the Promised Messiah of the latter days)...

This explanation is similar to Ibn Al-‘Arabī’s explanation as it discusses the position of the Promised Messiah\(^{as}\) in relation to the analogy discussed by the Holy Prophet Muhammad\(^{sa}\) in the hadīth under discussion. These scholars have given the Promised Messiah\(^{as}\) the position of the ‘silver brick’ and the

\(^{150}\) Fusūs Al-Hikam, Pages 16-17
Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} the position of the ‘gold brick’ to differentiate between their statuses. In the same way, the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jam\'at believes that the position of the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} is that of a ‘gold brick,’ not a brick in one of the corners of a palace in literal terms, and this means that he is the greatest of the prophets. Compared to him, the Promised Messiah\textsuperscript{as} holds the position of a ‘silver brick’ which means that he is subordinate to the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} and gains his position only through utmost obedience to him and through his spiritual grace.

Ninth, Farhan Khan says:

The Ahmadi [Muslim]s argue that the house is a metaphor representing the complete law of Isl\={a}m, and each brick is a law that the prophets brought forth... the Ahmadi analogy would not make sense, because some prophets did not build onto the existing laws, which is analogous to adding another brick. Some completely removed the previous law altogether and established an entirely new one. For example, while there are striking similarities, the Isl\={a}mic shar\'{i}‘ah is not based upon the 613 Jewish mitzvahs. The only way those kinds of prophets would fit into the Ahmadi [Muslim] analogy would be if they completely destroyed the structure and started anew.\textsuperscript{151}

This is an amusing argument presented by Farhan Khan. It displays how he not only tries to take an analogy literally himself but tries to apply the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding of the

\textsuperscript{151} Khan, With Love, Page 15
hadīth literally as well. The fact of the matter is that this hadīth is simply an analogy and whether the brick represents a ‘Prophet’ or the ‘law of a Prophet,’ it cannot be taken literally. Nevertheless, this explanation of the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding, presented by Farhan Khan, is faulty in itself. Ahmadī Muslims see this hadīth as an explanation of the following verse of the Holy Qur’ān:

\[
\text{فِيَّا كُتِّبَ قَيْمَةٌ}
\]

Therein are lasting commandments.\textsuperscript{152}

This means that the Qur’ān contains a combination of teachings and commandments of previous laws. The laws and teachings of the previous prophets contributed to the structure of the Muhammadan Law. While some laws were definitely abrogated by others, there is no denying the fact that each prophet brought the same basic teachings, such as the belief in One God, His angels, His prophets, and so on, and these teachings became increasingly complex with the advancement of the human mind over the ages until the revelation of the Holy Qur’ān – the most complete, universal law. In other words, the laws of any given prophet were not abrogated in their entirety. Only those laws which dealt with the specific needs of specific nations were abrogated, while the main teachings continued to be taught as they were.

In conclusion, the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding is supported by the previous sages of Islām, while the explanation of Farhan Khan is wrong and unacceptable to any Muslim as it is against the very status of the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa}. The analogy given by the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} should be studied with

\textsuperscript{152} Sūrah Al-Bayyinah, 98:4
care and understanding, without jumping to faulty conclusions based on a literal misunderstanding.

Questions for Farhan Khan:

1. Does he believe that the Holy Prophet sa is only a brick in one of the corners of a palace?
2. Since he believes that Hazrat ‘Īsāas is alive in the heavens, where is the brick representing him?
In his chapter about the writings of Hazrat Muhy-ud-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabīrh, Farhan Khan writes, “[Ibn ‘Arabī rh] did not write his book with conventional definitions to Islāmic vocabulary used by most non-Arabs. Often, he would employ terms according to his custom understanding or its linguistic definition, demanding an active, contemplative reader.”153 Then, without quoting from the actual writings of Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabīrh or Hazrat ‘Abd-ul-Wahhābrh, Farhan Khan says that Imam ‘Abd-ul-Wahhābrh believed that Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabīrh spoke of two kinds of wahī (revelation):

1. Wahī Tashrī‘ī – Revelation to the Prophets
2. Wahī Ilhām – Revelation to non-Prophets

About these two groups, Farhan Khan declares, “Both groups received wahī from Allāh, and thus Ibn ‘Arabī termed both groups as nabīs according to the linguistic meaning of nabī,
meaning one who brings news of the unseen [from Allāh].”

According to Farhan Khan, Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabīrh wrote of two kinds of nubuwwah:

1. *Nubuwwah at-Tashrī‘ī* (Law bearing prophethood)
2. *Nubuwwah al-‘Āmah* (prophethood for the common man)

Before proceeding further, let us analyze the contradiction Farhan Khan has created for himself. If he considers Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabīrh as an authority on this issue, then in accordance with his practice, he should have disagreed with him. He should have perhaps written a book against Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabīrh and criticized him for applying the term *Nabī* to people after the Holy Prophet Muhammadsa. He should have written that since the Holy Prophet Muhammadsa has written, “Lā Nabīyya Ba‘adī” (There is no prophet after me), it was not only inappropriate, but kufr (disbelief) for Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabīrh to apply this term to anyone in any sense of the term whatsoever! Regardless of the meanings and applications of the term *Nabī* used by Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabīrh, the absoluteness of Farhan Khan’s stance on the finality of prophethood is severely damaged when he accepts that the term *Nabī* can be applied to others after the Holy Prophet Muhammadsa in another form. In his chapter, he has made an announcement to the world that he is willing to accept that one form of nubuwwah (prophethood) has continued after the Holy Prophet Muhammadsa and in one sense, the Holy Prophet Muhammadsa is not the last prophet or *Nabī*! This is further illustrated, as follows:

---
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Ahmadiyya Muslim Stance: 

One form of nubuwwah continues after the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} but it is lesser than his prophethood in status and contains no laws.

Farhan Khan’s understanding of Ibn ‘Arabī\textsuperscript{rh}:

One form of nubuwwah continues after the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} but it is lesser than his prophethood in status and contains no laws.

Despite the exactness of the premises of both arguments, Farhan Khan insists that the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding is incorrect. How strange!

Secondly, it must be remembered that the term \textit{wahī ilhām} that Farhan Khan uses several times is new to Islām. It has not been used by the Holy Qur’ān, the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} or his Companions\textsuperscript{ra}. It seems to be a latter-day innovation to differentiate between \textit{wahī} and \textit{ilhām} when in fact they both refer to the same thing. Farhan Khan says that it has been used by Hazrat Imam ‘Abd-ul-Wahhāb\textsuperscript{th} but he fails to produce quotations as proper evidence to his claims. The dictionary, \textit{Al-Munjid}, makes the following entry on the word \textit{wahī}:

(وَحَیِّيَّةُ وَحِيّيَةُ) اِلَيْ فُلَانِي: اِشْأَرَ أَلِيَّهُ: اَمْ كَ تَرْفُ اِذَا نَأْدَهُ

اِرْسَلَ اِلِّيَّهَ رَسُولًا: اَمْ كَ تَرْفُ نَبِيْمُ (يُبِينُ) كَبِيرًا وَحِيّيَّةَ أَوْ وَحِيّيَّةَ اِلِّيَّهَ كَلَامًا: كَلَامُهُ يُصُفُّيْهِ عَنْ غَيْرِهِ كَأَنَّهُ

لَوْ شَدَّهُ كَلَامُ كَلَامُ يَا: يَا اَلْكَلُّمَاتُ كَيْمَكُو يُوْرُسُهُمْ: يَا نَيْرُ كَلَامُ جَاءَهُ.)
With Love to Muhammad ﷺ the Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn

وَحِيُ اللهُ فِي قُلُبِهِ كُدَّذًا: الْهَمَّةُ، إِيَاهُ: اللهُ نَّعْلُوَ الْحَمَّامِ كَيْلَ

اسْكَنِي: He pointed towards it.

آَرَسَّلَ إِلیهِ رَسُوْلًا: He sent a messenger towards him

وَحِيُ إِلیهِ أَوْ وَحِيُ إِلیهِ كَلَامًا: كَلَامِهِ يَقْفُفُ عَنْ غِیْرِهِ

وَحِيُ اللهُ فِي قُلُبِهِ كُدَّذًا: الْهَمَّةُ، إِيَاهُ: Allāh revealed to him. He placed something in his heart.

This dictionary entry clearly shows that wāḥī and ilḥām are interchangeable words and should not be taken to mean separate things. Furthermore, it is interesting to see what the commentators have written about the following verse:

وَمَا كَانَ لِبَشْرٍ أَنْ يُكِلْمَهُ اللَّهُ إِلَّا وَحِیًا أَوْ مِنْ وَرَآئِی جِبَابٍ أَوْ يَرْسِلَ رَسُوْلًا فِی وَحِیٍّ بَأْدِنَهُ مَا يَشَآءُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَیْ حِکِیْمٍ

And it is not for a man that Allāh should speak to him except by revelation or from behind a veil or by sending a messenger to reveal by His command what He pleases. Surely, He is High, Wise.  

In Tafsīr Jalālayn, it is written regarding the word وَحِیٍّ (by revelation), “فِی المَنَامَ أَوْ بِالْإِلَهَامِ” “which means that wāḥī refers to such communication of Allāh which is received through dreams or by way of ilḥām. In Tafsīr Jāmī’-ul-Bayān, ‘Allāma Mu’īn bin

155 Sūrah As-Shūrā, 42:52
Safi writes regarding the same word, “وَهُوَ الإِلَهَامُ أوَّلَ آمَاتٍ”, which means that wahī refers to either ilhām or communication through dreams. Hazrat Imām Rāzi
\[\text{rh}\] writes regarding the same word, “وَهُوَ الإِلَهَامُ وَالْكَذْفُ فِي الْقَلْبِ أوَّلَ آمَاتٍ” \[\text{156}\], which means that wahī is ilhām or inspiration to the heart or (seeing dreams during) sleep. In other words, wahī and ilhām are interchangeable words with the same meaning. If ilhām was a different type of communication of Allāh, the Exalted, He would have mentioned it in the above verse.

Thirdly, it is important to note that Farhan Khan has assumed that there are only two kinds of nubuwwah – nubuwwah at-Tashrī‘ī and nubuwwah al-‘Āmah. The main issue of dispute is regarding the nubuwwah of the Promised Messiah of the Latter Days. What kind of nubuwwah would he have? If Farhan Khan says that it would be nubuwwah At-Tashrī‘ī (Law bearing prophethood), then this is wrong. Hazrat Muhy-ud-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabī
\[\text{rh}\] has himself written that the prophethood of the Promised Messiah would not be law-bearing. It would be subordinate to the law of the Holy Prophet Muhammad
\[\text{sa}\]. This is proven with the presentation of a complete quotation of Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabī
\[\text{rh}\] later in this chapter. On the other hand, if Farhan Khan says that the nubuwwah of the Promised Messiah would be nubuwwah al-‘Āmah (prophethood for the common man), he would still be wrong. Hazrat Muhy-ud-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabī
\[\text{rh}\] has not termed the prophethood of the Promised Messiah as “common” prophethood. He has spoken of its grand status and of it being a “special” kind of prophethood. Seeing this prophethood as no greater than the “prophethood” of the mother of Hazrat Mūsā
\[\text{as}\] or the “prophethood” of the

\[\text{156}\] \textit{At-Tafsīr Al-Kabīr}, Part 7, Page 406
hawāriyyūn (disciples of Jesus\textsuperscript{as}) is not only unacceptable to Ibn ‘Arabi\textsuperscript{th} but would also be unacceptable to every Muslim. Hence, the prophethood of the Promised Messiah can be termed nubuwwah al-Khāssah (special prophethood).

**Definition of Nubuwwah**

Analyzing this issue further, Farhan Khan states, “...those who receive other forms of wahī ilhām can be termed as Nabīs, but are not prophets according to the common understanding of the term.”\textsuperscript{157} This raises a question: What is the common understanding of the term Nabī? The answer is that Muslims at the time of the Promised Messiah\textsuperscript{as} commonly defined a Nabī as one who:

1. Brings a complete new sharī’ah, or abrogates a previous sharī’ah
2. Is not the follower of a previous Nabī, but acquires an independent status on his own merit.

In order to prevent this “common understanding” of the word Nabī to be applied to him, the Promised Messiah\textsuperscript{as} writes:

Since according to the definition, Nabī and Rasūl in Islām means one who brings a complete new sharī’ah, or abrogates some of the ordinances in the previous sharī’ah, and since the Anbiyā’’ are not known as the followers of a previous Nabī and instead attain relationship with God without the intermediation of any other Nabī, therefore, let everyone be aware lest

\textsuperscript{157} Khan, *With Love*, Page 38
the same meaning is applied here also. I have no book other than the Holy Qur’ān and have no Rasūl other than the Holy Prophetṣa. And I believe that our Holy Prophetṣa is Khātam-ul-Anbiyā’ [Seal of the Prophets] and the Holy Qur’ān is Khātam-ul-Kutub [final religious book].158

Clarifying this position further, he writes:

In His revelations, Almighty Allāh has used the term nubuwwah and risālah with reference to me hundreds of times. But it refers to the converse with God, which is frequent and contains knowledge of the unseen, nothing more. Everyone has a right to adopt an idiom, and this is the definition adopted by God that He has given the title of nubuwwah to the frequent converse with Him.159

Again, he writes:

By nubuwwah I only mean frequency of converse with God, which is granted as a consequence of following the Holy Prophetṣa. You also believe in converse with God; so the disagreement is on the terminology only. What you call converse with God, I call its frequency as nubuwwah in accordance with the commandment of God.160

158 Letter of the Promised Messiah ḥ as, dated August 17, 1899, in Al-Hakm, Volume 3, Page 29
159 Chashmae Ma’arifat, Rūhānī Khazā’īn, Volume 23, Page 341
160 Haqiqatul Wahī, Rūhānī Khazā’īn, Volume 22, Page 503
Defining his personal view of a *Nabī*, he writes, “In my view, a *Nabī* is one upon whom the words of God descend in a manner that is unambiguous, definite, in abundance, and it contains knowledge of the unseen. That is why God has granted me the title of *Nabī*”. These quotations simplify the matter tremendously. The Promised Messiah has clearly rejected the common understanding of the term *Nabī* to be applied to him.

**Nabuwwah of Awliyā’ Allāh and the Promised Messiah**

In order to try to prove that Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabī has rejected the continuation of prophethood after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, Farhan Khan presents two quotations from his book, *Fūtūḥātul Makkiyyah*. The main points of the quotations are as follows:

1. Allāh, the Exalted, crushed the backs of the *Awliyā’* by cutting off *nabuwwah* and *risālah* after the passing of Hazrat Muhammad.
2. Only a part of *nabuwwah* remains with the *Awliyā’*, that is, true visions
3. Only a share of the name *risālah* can now be applied to the followers of the Holy Prophet Muhammad
4. Only those who transmit the revelation of the Holy Prophet Muhammad in its original wording can share the name of *risālah*
5. In this sense, the *sahaba* became the messengers of the messenger of Allāh and the *tabi’īn* became the messengers of the *sahaba*, and so on

---

161 *Tajalliyāte Ilāhiyyah*, Rūhānī Khazā’īn, Volume 20, Page 412
In essence, the quotations presented by Farhan Khan only state that the *Awliyā’ Allāh* cannot attain the status of *nubuwwah* and by presenting them, he has committed the fallacy of *false attribution*. He has gone to a portion of the writings of Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabi\(r\h\) that has little to do with the main issue of dispute and the only reason that compelled him to do so is his strong bias against Islām Ahmadiyya. The issue at hand is not whether the *Awliyā’ Allāh* are prophets or not. The issue is whether the Promised Messiah\(as\) of Islām, whose appearance was predicted by the Holy Prophet Muhammad\(sa\), would be a prophet or not. If Farhan Khan had presented a quotation of Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabi\(r\h\) where he had written that the coming Messiah would not be a prophet of Allāh because *nubuwwah* has ended with the Holy Prophet Muhammad\(sa\), it would have been relevant to this discussion. Below is an extract from *Futūḥatul Makkiyyah* which discusses the *nubuwwah* of the Promised Messiah\(as\) and is *relevant* to the discussion in hand:

اَلْعَلِيمُ أَيْدِنَا اللَّهُ وَيَاكُ بَوْرُحُ مِنْهُ أَنَّ هَذَا الْبَابُ يَتَضَمَّنُ أُصِنَّفَ الرَّجَالِ الْلَّذِينَ يَحْصِرُهُمُ الْعَدُوُّ وَالْذِينَ لَا تَوْقِيتُ لَهُمْ وَيَتَضَمُّ النَّسَائِ الْمَسَائِلِ الَّتِي لَا يَعْلَمُهَا إِلَّا الْأَكَابِرُ مِنْ عِبَادِ اللَّهِ الَّذِينَ هُمْ فِي زَمَانِهِمْ بِمَنْزِلَةِ الْإِنْبِياءِ فِي زَمَانِ النَّبِيْةِ وَهَيْ النَّبِيَّةُ الْعَالِمَةُ فَانَالْنَّبِيَّةِ الَّتِي اَنْقَطَعَتْ بِوُجُودِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم أنَّا هُيَ نَبِيَّةُ الْتَشْرِيعِ لَمَّا مَقَامَهَا فَلَا شَرِعُ يُكُونُ نَاسِخًا لِشَرْعِهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم وَلَا يُزِيدُ فِي حُكْمِهَا شِرْعًا أَخَرَ وَهَذَا مَعْنِى قُولُهُ صلى الله عليه وسلم أَنَّ الرَّسَالَةَ وَالْنَّبِيَّةُ قَدَ
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\begin{quote}

ootnotesize

\textbf{Futūḥāt al-makkiyyā.} al-Majd al-dhāli al-`ālam al-musulmān al-sab`ūn. \textsuperscript{899}

\end{quote}

Know that Allāh helped (me) and (it is) with His Spirit that this chapter contains (a discussion of) the qualities of those men who are countless and have appeared in all ages, and it contains (a discussion of) those issues which are known by none except the elders among the servants of Allāh who, in their eras, had the status of prophets, in the era of the prophethood (of the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa}) and that is an-

\begin{quote}

\textbf{Nubuwwah al-`Āmah} [general prophethood]. Hence, the prophethood which terminated with the person of the Prophet of Allāh, peace be on him and His blessings, was no other than the law-bearing prophethood, not prophethood itself. Hence, there will be no (new) law which abrogates the law of the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} and there can be no additional law in

\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{162}
his law. And this is the meaning of his statement, “Verily, apostleship and prophethood have ceased. Hence, there will be no messenger after me and no prophet”. That means, “There can be no prophet after me upon a law in opposition to my law. Instead, whenever there will be (a prophet), he shall be subject to my law. And, “there can be no Rasūl (after me)” means “no Rasūl can come after me for anyone in the creation of Allāh with a (new) law towards which he calls others”. Hence, this is what has been terminated and its door has been shut; not the maqām an-Nubuwwah (the status of nubuwwah). Therefore, this is not against the fact that ‘Īsā as shall be a Nabī and Rasūl. And surely, it is not against the fact that he shall descend in the latter days as a just and fair judge, (who shall judge) with our law; not any other (new) law, nor with a law according to which the Israelites worship Allāh from where it descended. Instead, what is manifested from it is (only) what has been decided (or established) by the law of Hazrat Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him). And the prophethood of Hazrat ‘Īsā as is firmly established and proven… ¹⁶³

The following points can be clearly understood from the above quotation:

1. Hazrat ‘Īsā as, who shall descend in the latter days in this ummah, shall be a Nabī and Rasūl

¹⁶³ Futūhātul Makkiyyah, Volume 2, Chapter 73, Page 899
2. The prophethood of Hazrat 'Īsā(sa), who shall descend in the latter days in this ummah, is firmly established and proven
3. He shall come after the Holy Prophet(sa)
4. The door of prophethood itself is not closed. Instead, the door of law bearing prophethood is closed
5. No such prophet can come who abrogates the law of the Holy Prophet(sa)
6. The narration, “Verily, apostleship and prophethood have ceased. Hence, there will be no messenger after me and no prophet”, means that no such prophet can come who opposes the law of the Holy Prophet(sa) or abrogates it

All these points are in complete harmony with the understanding of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at. It is clear now that the Promised Messiah(as) of Islām shall be a prophet and no one can dispute this fact.

Taking the discussion further, Farhan Khan might want to argue that Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabi(rh) believed that the Promised Messiah(as) would be a prophet because he was referring to ‘Īsā(as) who came before the Holy Prophet(sa). But, this argument would be of no avail to him! Take a look at the following statement of Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabi(rh) which clearly explains what he believed about the ascent and descent of Hazrat ‘Īsā(as):

رفع عيسى عليه السلام، اتصال روحه عند المفارقة عن العالم السفلي بالعالم العلوي و لما كان مرجعه الى مقربه الأصلي، ولم يصل الى
The rafa’a (ascent) of ‘Īsā as refers to the separation of his soul from the lower world and its connection with the superior world.... And since it is important for his soul to return to its real place of rest, and it has not reached its actual perfection, its descent in the last days shall definitely be in a different body.\textsuperscript{165}

In this quotation, Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabī\textsuperscript{rh} says that the descent of ‘Īsā as would be in a different body and he would not descend with his old body. Hence, he would have to be born as a prophet and this destroys Farhan Khan’s argument that no prophet can be born after the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa}. This also shows that Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabī\textsuperscript{rh} believed in the death of Hazrat ‘Īsā as and that the Promised Messiah\textsuperscript{as} would be someone else with qualities similar to those of Hazrat ‘Īsā as.

Moreover, as pointed out earlier, Farhan Khan attributes certain sayings to Hazrat Imām ‘Abd-ul-Wahhāb Shi’rānī\textsuperscript{rh} in his chapter without giving any reference. Perhaps he was afraid that the actual quotation might further add to his list of intellectual dishonesties, or better yet, his reference may actually agree with the Ahmadiyya Muslim point-of-view.

On that note, it is worth mentioning what Hazrat Imām ‘Abd-ul-Wahhāb\textsuperscript{rh} wrote in relation to the topic at hand: “The statement of the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} ‘there is no prophet after me

\textsuperscript{164} Tafsīrul Qur‘ān Al-Karīm, Volume 2, Page 296

\textsuperscript{165} Tafsīrul Qur‘ān Al-Karīm, Volume 2, Page 296
and no messenger’ means, ‘there can be no one with a (new) law after me.’”\textsuperscript{166}

Therefore, it can be concluded that both Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabi\textsuperscript{rh} and Hazrat Imām Shi‘rānī\textsuperscript{rh} did not believe in the absolute end of prophets based on the statement “there is no prophet after me” and it can also be concluded, without doubt, that the Messiah for the Latter Days would be a prophet of Allāh!

**The Status of the Promised Messiah\textsuperscript{as}**

At the end of his chapter, Farhan Khan criticizes the writings of the Promised Messiah\textsuperscript{as} by saying, “If by zill and buruz, [Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām] Ahmad [\textsuperscript{as}] was referring to the type of nabī detailed by Ibn ‘Arabi\textsuperscript{rh}, then the only difference between Ibn ‘Arabi\textsuperscript{[rh]} and what Ahmad\textsuperscript{[as]} wrote is semantic.... If this is the case, then this is not a special status nor one special glory or honor beyond the other awliya.’”\textsuperscript{167}

This is yet another ridiculous argument! As we asked earlier, Farhan Khan should first explain this: What will be the status of the nubuwwah of the Promised Messiah\textsuperscript{as} of the Latter Days? Will he be a prophet with a special status and special glory beyond the other Awliyā’ or not? If he says “no,” then this is against the following statements of the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa}:

\textsuperscript{166} *Al-Yawāqīt wal Jawāhir*, Volume 2, Page 42
\textsuperscript{167} Khan, *With Love*, Page 40
Hazrat Anas ra narrates that the Holy Prophet Muhammad(sa) said, “Whoever meets ‘Īsā, he should convey to him my salām”.

[The Holy Prophet(sa) said:] “When you see him, offer allegiance to him even if (you have to go) on your knees over snow-covered mountains because he is the Khalīfa of Allāh, the Mahdī”

Hazrat ‘Abd-ur-Rahmān Ibn Jubair Ibn Nufair ra relates from his father that the Holy Prophet Muhammad(sa) said, “Certainly, Ad-Dajjāl shall meet a
nation like you or better than you,” three times, “And Allāh, the Exalted, shall never disgrace a nation, at the beginning of which is me, and at the end of which is ‘Īsā bin Mariam.””\(^{173}\)

All these narrations clearly demonstrate that the Promised Messiah and Imām Mahdī\(^{as}\) has a great status in the eyes of the Holy Prophet Muhammad\(^{sa}\). Regarding this, Hazrat Imām Qāshānī\(^{dh}\) beautifully states the following:

المهدي الذي يجيء في آخر الزمان فانه يكون في الاحكام الشرعية تابعًا لمحمد صلى الله عليه وسلم و في المعارف و العلوم والحقيقة تكون جميع الانبياء والأولياء تابعين له، كلهم ولا ينقض ما ذكرناه لان باطنه باطن محمد عليه السلام\(^{174}\)

The Mahdī, who is to make his advent in the Latter Days, would certainly be subservient to the commandments of the sharī‘ah of the Holy Prophet\(^{sa}\). However, in the matters of knowledge of the secrets and intricacies of religious sciences and insight into the attributes of the Divine Being, all the prophets and Awliyā’ would indeed be under him. And this does not contradict what we have said for the

---

\(^{173}\) Mustadrak Hākim, Book: The wars, Chapter: In discussion of the qualities of Ja‘far\(^{ra}\)

\(^{174}\) شرح فصول الحكم - صفحة ۵۳
intrinsic qualities of the Mahdī would be essentially those of the Holy Prophet sa himself.¹⁷⁵

This is the greatness of the Promised Messiah and Imām Mahdī as! However, it seems that Farhan Khan insists upon belittling the status of the Messiah.

Other than the above, Farhan Khan criticizes the Promised Messiah as again by saying, “[Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad as] understands khātam al-nabīyīn to mean finality of prophethood, but in the same sentence, he says all future prophets will be zillī or burūzī prophets. The finality of prophets is an unconditional statement leaving no room for exceptions. Zillī or burūzī prophets are a subset of prophets that khātam al-nabīyīn has terminated. This is a contradiction.”¹⁷⁶

This is in fact not a contradiction in the writings of the Promised Messiah as. Instead, it most certainly is a contradiction in Farhan Khan’s arguments! When Ibn ‘Arabī rh says that one form of prophethood continues after the Holy Prophet sa, he does not have any problem with that but when the Promised Messiah as says that one form of prophethood continues after the Holy Prophet sa, then it becomes a contradiction! How ridiculous and unacceptable! Why did he not apply the same rule to Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabī rh and write a book against him? Why did he not try to refute Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabī rh that the phrase Khātam-an-Nabiyyīn does not allow any kind of prophethood to continue, whatsoever? In addition, in accordance with his usual practice, the actual quotation of the Promised Messiah as was not presented. Khan was deceptive enough to know that his criticism would have been invalidated had he presented the

¹⁷⁵ Sharah Fusūs Al-Hikam, Page 35
¹⁷⁶ Khan, With Love, Page 40
actual quotation. Here is the actual extract which offers a wonderful explanation of the concept of burūz and is a complete response to any criticism of this concept and it affords no contradictions whatsoever:

If this concept of burūz was not true, then why were the companions of the Promised One designated as companionsra of the Holy Prophetsa in the following verse:

\[
\text{ logits } \quad 177
\]

One has to deny this verse before he denies the concept of burūz. People, who think in physical terms, sometimes link the Promised One with the progeny of Hasanra, sometimes to Husainra, and sometimes to ‘Abbāsra. But what the Holy Prophetsa really meant was that the Promised One would be his heir, just like a son, i.e., he would inherit his name, his character, his knowledge, his spirituality, and would reflect his very image. He will acquire nothing on his own but will acquire everything from the Holy Prophet, and will so lose himself in himsa as to reflect hissa very image. Just as he would acquire—by way of zill—his name, character and knowledge, so

\[177 \text{ [God has raised a Messenger, i.e., the Holy Prophetsa, among the unlettered people...]} \text{ And among others from among them who have not yet joined them.—Al-Jumu’ah, 62:4. When Abu Hurairahra questioned the Holy Prophetsa how he could be raised amongst the aakhareena, or those who have not yet joined them, he put his hand on Salman Farsi and replied, “If Faith ascended to the Pleides, even then a man from these people [i.e., the Persians] would bring it back.” – Sahih Bukhari, Kitab Tafsir or Book of Commentary [Publishers]}\]
would he also acquire his title of Prophet, for the image formed by the burūz is never complete unless it reflects the excellences and perfections of the original in every aspect. Since prophethood is the hallmark of a prophet, it is essential that it too should be reflected in the image formed by the burūz. All prophets have continued to believe that a burūz is a complete reflection of his original, so much so that even their names become identical. Thus, just as it is evident in this context that naming someone Muhammad and Ahmad, by way of burūz, does not make two Muhammads or two Ahmads, likewise, addressing someone as prophet or messenger—by way of burūz—does not break the Seal of Khātamun Nabiyyīn, for the person of the burūz has no independent existence. The prophethood of Muhammad, therefore, remains confined to Muhammad alone. All prophets are agreed that burūz involves no duality, as his status conforms to this Persian verse:

\[
\text{من توشرح م توشرح شری م تن شرم توچال شری}
\]

\[
\text{تاکس گلوید بعد زین من وگرم تو وگری}
\]

On the other hand, if Jesus comes back to the world, he cannot do so without breaking the Seal of Khātamun Nabiyyīn.

---

178 I have become you and you have become me, I have become the body and you have become the soul; So none should henceforth say, You are one and I another. [Publishers]
In short, the term Khātamun Nabiyyīn is the Divine Seal which has been set upon the prophethood of Muhammadṣa. It is now impossible for this seal ever to be broken. What is possible, however, is that the Holy Prophetṣa may appear in the world in the form of a burūz, not once, but even a thousand times, and may, by way of burūz, proclaim his prophethood with all its splendour and perfection. The advent of such a burūz was ordained by God Almighty, as He says:

\[
\text{ سبحانه و تعالى}
\]

Prophets are never jealous of their burūz for he reflects their own image and character, but they are jealous of others. Just consider how Prophet Mosesṣ-as wept and cried on the night of Mi‘rāj and expressed his envy that the Holy Prophetṣa had left him far behind. Just imagine how hurt the Holy Prophetṣa would be if God were to say that there would be no prophet after him, and yet He were to send Jesusṣ-as in contravention of His own word! Thus, prophethood by way of burūz neither detracts from Khatm-e-Nubuwwat, nor breaks the Seal; but the advent of any independent prophet would hit at the very core of Islām. And it would be extremely derogatory to the Holy Prophetṣa to imagine that the monumental task of vanquishing the Dajjāl should be performed by

\[179\text{ And among others from among them who have not yet joined them.—Al-Jumu’ah, 62:4 [Publishers]}\]
Jesus as and not by him. It would also amount—God forbid—to falsifying the verse:

\[
\text{وَلَكِنْ رَسُولُ اللّهِ وَخَاتِمَ الْنَّبِيُّينَ}
\]

This verse contains an implied prophecy that prophethood has now been sealed till the Day of Judgement, and no one—with the exception of the burūz, who is [metaphorically] the Holy Prophet sa himself—has the power to receive such manifest divine knowledge as is received by prophets as. Since I am the Burūz of Muhammad sa that has been ordained since eternity, I have, therefore, been granted prophethood in the form of burūz, and the entire world is powerless to stand against it, for a Seal has been set upon prophethood. A burūz of Muhammad sa was destined to come in the latter days with all the perfections of Muhammad sa, and so he has come. Now this is the only window through which one can get water from the fountainhead of prophethood.181

This quotation is so clear and so vivid in its explanation of the concept of burūz that only the bias of Farhan Khan’s mind can refuse to understand it. Hence, the onus of proving that a contradiction somehow exists in the above quotation is upon Farhan Khan.

In another book, the Promised Messiah as provides further explanation:

---

180 But he is the Messenger of Allāh and the Seal of the Prophets.—Al- Ahzāb, 33:41 [Publishers]

181 A Misconception Removed, Pages 15-19
I have already proved the death of the Messiah as and his spiritual exaltation. Now, after the death of the Messiah as, the next question is, what are the authorities contained in the Qur‘ān and ahādīth and other sources from which it is established that the Promised Messiah will appear from among the ummah? I will set out these authorities below, please read them with care. Hopefully, God the Compassionate will guide you.

One of the arguments which prove that the Messiah who was promised to appear in this ummah would be from among the Muslims is this hadīth set out both in Bukhārī and Muslim: Ṭālim ʾImām ʾImām ʾImām ʾImām. It means that he will be your ʾImām from among you. Since this hadīth relates to Jesus as and it is he who has been described in this hadīth as Hakam and ‘Adal [Arbiter and Judge], it follows, therefore, that the word ʾImām also refers to him. It is true that the words ‘from among you’ were addressed to the companions of the Holy Prophet as, but we know that none of them claimed to be the Promised Messiah. This, therefore, shows that the words ‘from among you’ are meant for someone who, in the Knowledge of God Almighty, would be a substitute for the companions and is the one referred to in the verse:

\[
\text{وَأَخَرِينَ مِنْهُمَّ لَمَّا يَلْتَخِقُّوا بِنَيْمٍ}
\]

182 And among others from among them who have not yet joined them.—Al-Jumu‘ah, 62:4 [Publisher]
This verse shows that he will be instructed through the spiritual power of the Holy Prophetṣa, and will, in this sense, be one of the companions. This verse is further explained by the hadīth:

لو كان الإيمان معلقاً بالثريا لناله رجل من فارس

Here the quality which was particularized in the Promised Messiah and Mahdī has been attributed to this man from Persia. This quality is to replenish the earth with justice after it has been filled with wrongdoing and has become empty of faith and the belief in the Unity of God. Thus, this man is the Promised Messiah and Mahdī; and I am he.

Just as the prophesied eclipse of the sun and the moon in the month of Ramadān has not occurred during the time of any other person claiming to be Mahdi, likewise, during the thirteen hundred years that have elapsed since the time of the Holy Prophetṣa, no one has claimed, on the basis of divine revelation, to be ‘the Man of Persia’ about whom the hadīth says that he will bring faith down from heaven.184

To clarify this issue further, the Promised Messiahṣa explains the grammatical structure of the related verses to prove the soundness of his commentary in the following quotation:

183 Had faith ascended to the Pleiades, it would be brought down by aman from among the Persians. [Publisher]
184 Tohfah Golarviah, Rūḥānī Khazā’in, Volume 17, Pages 114-115, trans. in The Essence of Islām, Volume 4, Pages 179-180
Meaning: That Gracious God is that God who sent a messenger among the unlettered people from among them, who recites unto them His verses, and purifies them, and teaches them the Book and Wisdom, although they had been, before, in manifest misguidance. And in the same way, that Messenger, who is training them, shall train another group who shall become a part of them and shall develop the same excellences but they have not yet joined them. And God is Mighty and Wise. Here, it should be remembered that the word اخرين in the verse وأخرين منهم لاما يلحقوا بهم is maf‘ûl [object]. It is as if the entire verse, with its preceding words, is this:

Meaning, other than the sahâba [companions], there are others who are Our sincere and perfect men, a large group of whom shall be born in the Latter Days. The way the Holy Prophet trained the sahâba, he shall also train this group, indirectly. This means that those people shall come in a period in which direct provision or receipt of help shall be no more. The religion of Islām shall become filled with many
mistakes and innovations. The inner light of the hearts of the *fuqārā*’ [those devoted solely to God] shall be no more. Then, Allāh, the Exalted, shall enable a fortunate soul to attain spiritual perfection only through training received from the spirituality of the Holy Prophet	extsuperscript{sa}, without the intervention of worldly religious groups and communities. He will then turn him into a group and that group shall attain extreme similarities with the group of the *sahāba* because it will entirely be the cultivation of the Holy Prophet	extsuperscript{sa}. The [spiritual] beneficence of the Holy Prophet	extsuperscript{sa} will benefit them constantly. They shall meet the *sahāba* in the sense that they shall become similar to them by virtue of their excellences...\textsuperscript{185}

The preceding quotations demonstrate the rock solid fortitude of the Promised Messiah’s arguments, while illustrating the incomparable spiritual beauties he derives from the Holy Qur’ān. His reflections have mined the most priceless jewels which, for centuries, were deeply buried within the verses of the Holy Book. The reader is welcome to compare the above commentary with any scholar’s previously documented commentary to see the unparalleled excellence of the Promised Messiah’s	extsuperscript{as} interpretations.

Finally, Farhan Khan argues that the Promised Messiah	extsuperscript{as} cannot be considered Persian because nationality is “based on where someone lived, not where their ancestry hailed.”\textsuperscript{186} In his desperation to discredit the Promised Messiah	extsuperscript{as}, Khan fabricates

\textsuperscript{185} Ā‘īna Kamālāt Iслām, Rūḥānī Khazā’īn, Volume 5, Pages 208-210
\textsuperscript{186} Khan, *With Love*, Page 41
this fiction and presents it as if it is a well established principle of truth. In attempts to legitimize his fraud, Khan cites two examples: (1) Suhayb ar-Roomi who Khan states was an Arab sold into the Byzantine lands, but was called *The Roman* even upon his return to Arab lands; and (2) Ahmad ibn Ibrahim who Khan states was called *al-Dimashqi (the Syrian)* but later called *al-Dumyati* (a city in Egypt) when he relocated to Egypt. From this faulty logic, Khan claims the Promised Messiah should be called *the Indian* or *al-Hindi* because he lived in India.

Farhan Khan needs to realize that just because someone was called *The Roman* because he resided in the Byzantine Empire or someone was called *Al-Dumyati* because he spent some time in Egypt, does not change the concept of ancestry. Since when did one’s residence alter one’s ethnicity?! Did Farhan Khan stop to think what the Byzantines called Suhayb? A Roman or an Arab? They certainly did not consider him a Roman, and his residence in the Byzantine Empire as a slave did not make them think he was any less an Arab.

If Farhan Khan’s fabricated principle were held true, Hazrat Salman Farsi**ra** should have been called Salman *Arabī**ra* because he lived in Medina. Nevertheless, Khan’s argument is irrelevant because the words in the *hadith* are یکر سخ من فارس – a Man *from* Persia or of Persian descent. The word “من” [*min:* from] is an indication that he shall have Persian ancestry, but will not necessarily be living *in* Persia.

**Questions for Farhan Khan:**

1. Why does he have a problem with the premise of the Ahmadiyya Muslim argument for the continuation of subordinate prophethood when Hazrat Ibn ‘Arabī**th** has
used the same premise for the continuation of *nubuwwah al-Āmah*?

2. What happens to the absoluteness of his belief in the end of prophethood when he approves of Hadhrat Ibn ‘Arabī’s rh writings?
The Death of Hazrat ‘Īsā bin Mariam

In his chapter entitled *The Return of ‘Esā bin Mariam*, Farhan Khan makes an attempt at being cunning by arguing that the finality of the Holy Prophet Muhammad is linked to the concept of the return of Hazrat ‘Īsā. According to him, Ahmadī Muslims say, “If Prophet Muhammad is the last Prophet, then it is impossible for ‘Esā bin Mariam to return to this dunya because that would make ‘Esā the last Prophet since he came after Muhammad”. While this argument definitely represents a portion of the Ahmadiyya Muslim arguments, it is not the complete picture. In fact, Farhan Khan deliberately picks out this part so that he does not have to deal with the actual argument. The actual argument is that it is impossible to accept the belief in the return of Hazrat ‘Īsā himself because he is already dead, according to the Qur’ān and ahādīth!

It is true that the Holy Prophet Muhammad was sent, by God, as a prophet after Hazrat ‘Īsā and it is also true that the

---

187 Khan, *With Love*, Page 25
name of the Promised Messiah\textsuperscript{as} for the Latter Days is ‘Īsā in the \textit{ahādīth}. Based on this, there can be only two propositions:

1. The same Hazrat ‘Īsā\textsuperscript{as}, who came for the Israelites, about 600 years before the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa}, comes back in the Latter Days as the Promised Messiah\textsuperscript{as}
2. Another person is raised by Allāh, the Exalted, bearing the name of “‘Īsā” in the spiritual sense because of his similarities with him

The first proposition is rejected because the Holy Qur’ān and the authentic \textit{ahādīth} declare that Hazrat ‘Īsā\textsuperscript{as} is dead. Thus, the only possibility left is that another person bearing the name of ‘Īsā in the spiritual sense is raised by Allāh, the Exalted, in the Latter Days as the Promised Messiah and Imām Mahdī. This has already happened with the advent of Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiānī\textsuperscript{as}, the Promised Messiah and Imām Mahdī of the Latter Days.

Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiānī\textsuperscript{as} has made very powerful and irrefutable arguments for the death of Hazrat ‘Īsā\textsuperscript{as} or Jesus Christ\textsuperscript{as}. Below are some extracts that provide a glimpse of these arguments:

We have so many certain and conclusive proofs of the death of Jesus, son of Mary, that they cannot all be set out in this brief publication. Read the Holy Qur’ān carefully and you will find the death of Jesus mentioned so clearly and definitely that it is not possible to interpret it otherwise. For instance, the Holy Qur’ān reports the acknowledgement of Jesus:
Can we interpret the word tawaffī in this verse as meaning sleep? Would it be right to understand this verse as meaning: Since Thou didst cause me to sleep Thou hast been the One to watch over them? Of course not. The only appropriate interpretation of tawaffī in this context is the straightforward one of death; and the context does not permit us to interpret that death will occur after Jesus’ bodily ascent to heaven. This is because the question put to Jesus refers to the going astray of his people, which had happened after his supposed bodily ascent to heaven and had been completed before the advent of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him).

The hadīth also confirms the death of Jesusī. On page 162 of the Commentary Ma’ālim it is mentioned on the authority of ‘Alī bin Talhah that Ibn-e-‘Abbāsra interpreted the verse:

\[ \text{‘O Jesus, I will cause thee to die.\text{’}} \]

This is supported by other verses like:

\[ \text{‘Since Thou didst cause me to die, Thou hast been the Watcher over them.’ — Al-Mā‘īdah, 5:118 [Publisher]} \]

\[ \text{‘O Jesus, I will cause thee to die a natural death and will exalt thee to Myself.’ — Āl-e-Imrān, 3:56 [Publisher]} \]
Thus Ibn-e-'Abbās, may Allāh be pleased with him, believed that Jesus as had died. Our readers must be aware that Ibn-e-'Abbās was among the foremost of those who comprehended the Holy Qur’ān perfectly. The Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) had prayed for him that he might be bestowed true knowledge of the Holy Qur’ān.¹⁹³

At another place, he writes:

It is for this purpose that Imām Bukhārī (may Allāh have mercy on him), has quoted the verse:

\[
\text{قَلَمَا تَوَفَّيْتَيْنِ كَنَّتَ آَنَّتَ الرَّقِيبَ عَلَيْهِمَ} 
\] ¹⁹⁴

in Kitāb-ut-Tafsīr. In so doing, he intended to convey that the correct interpretation of the word tawaffaitanī is the one which the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) attributed to it, that

¹⁹⁰ Say, ‘The angel of death…will cause you to die.’—As-Sajdah, 32:12 [Publisher]
¹⁹¹ ‘Those whom the angels cause to die while they are pure.’—An-Nahl, 16:33 [Publisher]
¹⁹² ‘Those whom the angels cause to die while they are wrongdoing their souls.’—An-Nahl, 16:29 [Publisher]
¹⁹³ Izāla-e-Auhām, Rūhānī Khazā’īn, Volume 3, Pages 224-225, trans. in The Essence of Islām, Volume 3, Pages 193-194
¹⁹⁴ ‘Since Thou didst cause me to die, Thou hast been the Watcher over them.’—Al-Mā’īdah, 5:118 [Publisher]
is to say, “Thou didst cause me to die.” In the following hadith:

The Holy Prophet sa says: “On the Day of Judgement some of my people will be driven to hell, and I will supplicate, ‘Lord! These are my companions.’ Then it will be said to me, ‘You know not what they did after you.’ Upon this I will say what the righteous servant of God, i.e., Jesus son of Mary, had said when he was asked: ‘Did you teach your people that they should worship you and your mother as gods?’ I will say what Jesus had then said: ‘I was a witness over them while I was amongst them; but since Thou didst cause me to die, Thou hast been the One to watch over them.’” (Bukhārī)

The Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) meant that he would make the same affirmation as Jesus would make when he would be asked whether he had taught his people to take him and his mother as gods. In this manner the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him)
interpreted the expression *tawaffaitanī* as meaning death.\(^{195}\)

Again, he writes:

In the idiom of the Holy Qur’ān, the word *tawaffī* has always been used in the connotation of death and taking possession of the soul. A minute study of Arabic prose and poetry—both ancient and modern—shows that wherever the expression *tawaffī* is used for a human-being and the action is attributed to Allāh the Glorious, *tawaffī* invariably means death and taking possession of the soul. In this context, there is not a single instance, where this expression means anything other than taking possession of the soul. Those who are wont to refer to lexicons like *Qāmūs, Sihāh, Sarāh*, etc., have not found a single instance where, in the context that we have mentioned, any other connotation has been attributed to the expression *tawaffī*. There is not the slightest indication of the possibility of any other connotation. Then I studied the books of *hadīth* to discover whether the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) or his companions had on any occasion applied the expression *tawaffī* to a human being in any other connotation than that of death and taking possession of the soul. I had to labor hard in this search. What I discovered on checking every page of the compilations of *Sahīh Bukhārī, Sahīh Muslim, Tirmidhī, Ibn-e-Mājah, Abū*

\(^{195}\) *Izāla-e-Auhām, Rūhānī Khazā’in, Volume 3, Pages 585-586, trans. in The Essence of Islām, Volume 3, Page 194-195*
Death of Hazrat Ïsâ as bin Mariam ra

Dāwūd, Nasa‘ī, Dārimī, Mu‘attā and Sharh-us-Sunnah etc., was that the expression *tawaffī* has been used three hundred and forty six times, and in no single instance has it been used, either by the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) or by his companions, to mean anything other than *death*, or *taking possession of the soul*. I have gone through these books with great care line by line, and I can say that on each and every occasion the expression *tawaffī* has been used only in the connotation of death or taking possession of the soul. A careful perusal of these books also establishes that, from the moment of the Call and all through his life, the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) never used the expression *tawaffī* in any connotation other than death and taking possession of the soul....

Imam Muhammad Ismā‘īl Bukhārī has made a fine point in his compilation which indicates that the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) used the expression *tawaffī* at least seven thousand times between his Call and his death, and every time he used it in the connotation of death and taking possession of the soul. Seekers after truth should be grateful to Imām Bukhārī for this information.\(^{196}\)

Again, he writes:

The Holy Qur‘ān clearly states that there never was a prophet who did not pass away:

190 With Love to Muhammad the Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn

وَمَا مُحَمَّدٌ إِلَّا رَسُولٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ مِنْ فَتْحِهِ الرُّسُلُ أَقْبَانُ مَاتِ

197 ‘Muhammad is only a Messenger. Verily, all Messengers have passed away before him. If then he die or be slain, will you turn back on your heels?’—Āl-e-Imrān, 3:145 [Publisher]

198 ‘We granted not everlasting life to any human being before thee.’—Al-Anbiyā’, 21:35 [Publisher]

199 ‘And We did not give them bodies that ate no food, nor were they to live forever.’—Al-Anbiyā’, 21:9 [Publisher]

200 Ibid.

What is more is that the Qur’ān clearly states, “‘کَا تَا يَأْكُلوُنَ الْطَّعَامُ’ (Jesus and his mother used to eat) in Sūrah Al-Mā‘īdah, 5:76, and this clearly means that Jesus does not eat anymore and, therefore, he is dead!

To conceive of Jesus as alive in the face of these verses, and to believe, contrary to the purport of the verse:

201 I again affirm that if Jesus is alive in heaven in his physical body, then the Divine Reasoning set out in one of the above verses—that if the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) were to
die it would not be inconsistent with his prophethood as all prophets before him have been subject to death—would be accounted as defective and meaningless. Surely God Almighty is far above saying that which is not true and is against the facts.202

Another verse that clearly and absolutely declares the death of Hazrat ‘Īsāas, without any doubt whatsoever is discussed by the Promised Messiahas in the following quotation:

The Holy Qur’ān says:

\[
\text{\\ (Sūrah An-Nahl, Part 14)}
\]

This means that: ‘Those who are worshipped and called upon beside Allāh cannot create anything but are themselves created. They are dead, not living. They do not know when they will be resurrected.’

Just see how clearly these verses affirm the death of all those human beings who were worshipped as gods by the Jews and Christians and some of the Arab tribes and to whom they supplicated. If you are still not convinced of the death of Jesus son of Mary,

202 Izāla-e-Auhām, Rūhānī Khazā’in, Volume 3, Pages 277-278, trans. in The Essence of Islām, Volume 3, Pages 198-199
203 Sūrah An-Nahl, 16:21-22
why don’t you simply admit that you are not prepared to believe in the Holy Qur’an?²⁰⁴

It is clear from this verse presented by the Promised Messiah as in the above quotation that all those who are worshipped by others are dead, not living. This includes Hazrat ‘Īsā as and no one can argue that he is not worshipped by his followers.

*Challenge of the Promised Messiah*²⁰⁵

Regarding the usage of the word *tawaffī* to connote “death,” the Promised Messiah as has given the following challenge:

Let it be understood by all Muslims that it has been established beyond any doubt, according to the Holy Qur’an and *hadīth*, that Jesus son of Mary (peace be upon him) died on earth after fulfilling the span of his life in accordance with the verse:

*فيها تموتون وفيها تحيتون* ²⁰⁵

It is further clear on the authority of sixteen verses of the Holy Qur’an, and a number of *ahādīth* contained in *Bukhārī, Muslim* and other authentic compilations, that those who die are never sent back to dwell in this world, nor is anyone subjected to death twice, nor does the Holy Qur’an lay down any

---

²⁰⁴ *Izāla-e-Auhām, Rūhānī Khazā’in, Volume 3, Page 431, trans. in The Essence of Islām, Volume 3, Pages 199-200
²⁰⁵ ‘Therein shall you live, and therein shall you die.’—Al-A’rāf, 7:26 [Publisher]
law of inheritance for anyone who might return to earth after death. Yet some of the divines insist that Jesus son of Mary has not died but was raised bodily to heaven, and is alive in his physical body. They dare to suggest that the expression *tawaffî*, which has been applied to Jesus as in the Holy Qur’ān, does not connote death, rather it means taking full possession of both body and soul. But this interpretation is utterly false. In the idiom of the Holy Qur’ān, this expression is consistently employed to connote taking possession of the soul and the death of the body. The same idiom is employed in all the *ahādīth* and sayings of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him).

Ever since the Arabian Peninsula has been populated and the Arabic language has come into use, there is not a single ancient or modern instance of the expression *tawaffî* being employed taking possession of the body. Whenever this expression has been employed for the description of the action of God Almighty in relation to a human being, it has always connoted death and taking possession of the soul. No lexicon and no Arabic saying contradict this. There is not the slightest room for any different interpretation. If anyone should cite a single instance from the Holy Qur’ān or from the *ahādīth* or from ancient or modern poetry, or ode, or prose of the Arabs, wherein the expression *tawaffî* has been employed when indicating the action of God Almighty concerning a human being, as connoting anything beyond death and taking possession of the soul, that is to say, as connoting the taking possession
of the body also, I call God to witness that I shall hand over to such a person one thousand rupees in cash and also acknowledge that he possesses expert knowledge of hadīth and the Holy Qurʾān.\textsuperscript{206}

In another place, he writes:

If anyone can cite a single instance from the Holy Qurʾān or hadīth, or from ancient or modern Arabic poetry and prose, that the word tawaffī, when applied to a human being, God being the subject, has been used in any connotation other than death and taking possession of the soul, for instance, in the connotation of the taking the body, I bind myself on oath that I shall pay that person one thousand rupees in cash by selling some of my property and shall always hold him in high esteem as a great scholar of the Holy Qurʾān and hadīth.\textsuperscript{207}

This challenge is now being extended to Farhan Khan! To earn his reward, he can go ahead and cite a single instance from the Holy Qurʾān or from the ahādīth or from ancient or modern poetry, or ode, or prose of the Arabs in which the expression tawaffī has been employed when indicating the action of God Almighty concerning a human being, as connoting anything beyond death or taking possession of the soul, that is to say, as connoting the taking possession of the body in addition to the soul. If he can do that, the Ahmadiyya Muslim theology falls

\textsuperscript{206} Izāla-e-Auhām, Rūhānī Khazāʾin, Volume 3, Pages 602-603, \textit{trans. in} The Essence of Islām, Volume 3, Pages 375-377

\textsuperscript{207} Izāla-e-Auhām, Rūhānī Khazāʾin, Volume 3, Page 603, \textit{trans. in} The Essence of Islām, Volume 3, Page 198
apart and he wins. If he cannot, and most certainly he will not (Inshā’ Allāh), he should give up his claims and accept the truth of Islām Ahmadiyya.

**Why is it not possible for Hazrat ‘Īsā as to return?**

Farhan Khan says, “Muhammad sa was the last person given this position of prophethood. After him, no one else is given the position of prophethood, not even ‘Esā bin MARIAM as, because he never lost his status as a Prophet.” This is true but irrelevant. The Ahmadiyya Muslim argument is that the very coming of ‘Īsā as a prophet breaks Khan’s absoluteness of the concept of the “end of prophethood.” What is more important is that it breaks the Seal of prophethood! The Promised Messiah explained this when he wrote as follows:

The true connotation of Khātamun Nabiyyīn requires that if anyone calls himself a prophet while there remains the slightest veil of estrangement, such a person will be guilty of breaking the Seal of Khātamun Nabiyyīn. But he who is so lost in the Khātamun Nabiyyīn sa that he receives his sa name and reflects his sa countenance, will, on account of this complete unity and harmony, be called a prophet without contravening the Seal; for he is Muhammad sa, though by way of zill. Thus, despite the claim of prophethood by the person who is named Muhammad and Ahmad by way of zill, our lord and master Muhammad sa would still be the Khātamun Nabiyyīn, inasmuch as this second Muhammad is a

---

208 Khan, *With Love*, Page 25

209 Estrangement between him and the Holy Prophet sa. [Publishers]
reflection of the same Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} and bears his name. But Jesus\textsuperscript{as} cannot come without breaking the Seal inasmuch as his is a separate and distinct prophethood.\textsuperscript{210}

One can see the great care and veneration the Promised Messiah\textsuperscript{as} had for the Seal of prophethood borne by the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa}. By bringing back Hazrat ‘Īsā \textsuperscript{as}, Farhan Khan is committing a serious offense against this Seal and he is disrespecting it even though he casually points the finger at others.

Second, the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} did not say that no one can be given prophethood after him. He simply said, “Lā nabiyya ba‘adī” (There is no prophet after me), and to manipulate this to mean that prophethood cannot be given to anyone after the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} is a far-fetched interpretation. The word given has been inserted by Farhan Khan himself and he cannot prove its existence in any hadīth.

Third, in support of his argument, Farhan Khan gives an example by writing, “... a mother has three children: Ahmad, Yahya, and Fatimah, aged ten, seven, and four, respectively. If she was asked who her last child is, she would reply Fatimah, because Fatimah was the last to be born in the family.”\textsuperscript{211}

This is an invalid comparison. Physical birth is something that, by definition, can only occur once in a unique sequential order which cannot change, but the issue we are discussing is the appearance of a prophet for the guidance of humankind. This, according to Farhan Khan’s sect of Muslims, can occur more than once, particularly in the case of Jesus\textsuperscript{as}.

\textsuperscript{210} A Misconception Removed, Page 7
\textsuperscript{211} Khan, With Love, Page 25
How can Khan compare the finality of an event that can only occur once in a sequence, to an event that can occur multiple times in a sequence? One is fixed and cannot change, whereas the other is variable. Thus, this example is simply not applicable to the discussion at hand.

Khan’s invalid example is somewhat interesting in that it relates to children and the Khātam-un-Nabīyyīn verse [33:41] was revealed in a similar scenario to rebut the insults of the Holy Prophet’s enemies. When the Holy Prophet’s adopted son, Zaid ra bin Hārith, had divorced his wife Zainab ra, the Holy Prophet sa was commanded by God to marry her. The enemies of the Prophet sa insulted him saying that he married the wife of his son. To address this slander, the verse [i.e., 33:41] starts off by reminding his critics that “Muhammad is not the father of any of your men,” because Zaid ra was an adopted son. This then opened the way for another insult, that he sa was abtar or issueless with no male heir to carry on his name or his movement. In rebuttal to this insult God continued in the verse with the ultimate praise, saying, “but he is the Messenger of Allāh and he is Khātam-an-Nabīyyīn.”

Being praised as the Seal of prophets is perfectly relevant in this context. As the Seal, he becomes the Spiritual Father of all of the prophets, who are themselves the spiritual fathers of their respective nations. In essence, the Holy Prophet sa is being praised by God as the Spiritual Father of all spiritual fathers. Further, he has given spiritual life212 to millions upon millions who carry on his legacy through his sharī’ah and sunnah. Truly, the Holy Prophet sa has been immortalized by all of his spiritual

212 Note in the Qur’an: “O ye who believe! Respond to Allah and the Messenger when he calls you that he may give you [spiritual] life…” [Sūrah Al-Anfāl, 8:25]
children following his faith, whereas Jesus’ true teachings are no longer practiced nor preached. His teachings are lost and his religion is dead. This is why the Promised Messiah as repeatedly taunted the invading Christian missionaries that Jesus as lays dead while Muhammad as lives on.

To paraphrase this particular interpretation of the verse, God is saying that Muhammad as is not guilty of marrying the former wife of his son, for he is not his biological son. In fact, the Holy Prophet as is not the father of any of your sons from a physical perspective, but should you insult him as abtar, know full well that in My Eyes, not only is he the Spiritual Father giving life to your dead nation through Islām, but he is the Spiritual Father of all spiritual fathers, none of whom have any honour save those bearing his Seal. In your world of jahiliyyah (ignorance) he may be nothing, but in the My World and the Kingdom of Heaven, he is the King of Kings – the Best of My creation.

It is truly sad that in the presence of such a deeply beautiful verse that shouts profound praise upon the Holy Prophet as, people like Farhan Khan would be so shallow to state it could mean nothing more than the Holy Prophet as being the last prophet in the sense of time. To add insult to self-inflicted injury, they say the Holy Prophet as lies buried beneath the earth, while Jesus as lives high in the heavens. Their superficial scholarship and mockery of Islām testifies to the need for the Promised Messiah as.

Emphasizing our fundamental point, no prophet can come after the Holy Prophet Muhammad as without his seal of approval. Hazrat ‘Īsā as was never a follower of the Holy Prophet Muhammad as and is an independent prophet. He does not have the authority to come in the Latter Days because he was never a follower of the Holy Prophet Muhammad as. In contrast, Hazrat
Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad as attained his status of prophethood by being a follower of the Holy Prophet Muhammad sa and came with his seal of approval. In simple terms, the Holy Prophet sa is a teacher of Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad as but not a teacher of Hazrat ’Īsāas. In fact, the Holy Qur’an restricts the prophethood of Hazrat ’Īsāas to the Israelites in the following words:

وَرَسُولًا إِلَى بَني إِسْرَائِيلَ

And (he was) a Messenger to the children of Israel... 213

What will become of this statement of the Holy Qur’ān if Hazrat ’Īsāas returns as a prophet for the whole of mankind?

Fourth, discussing this issue further, Farhan Khan presents the following hadīth to support his viewpoint:

وَأَخْرَجَ ابْنِ أَبِي شَيْبَةَ عَنِ الشَّعَابِي رَضِي اللهُ عَنْهُ قَالَ: قَالَ رَجُلٌ عَنْدَ الْمُغَيْرَةَ بْنِ أَبِي شَعْبَةِ صَلِى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ مُحَمَّدٍ رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ الْأَرْضِ وَالْيَمَانِ: حَسَبَ أَنَّ الْآخِرَةَ شَهَّدَ وَلَا نَزَى أَفَانَا نَهَدّي أَنْ يَعِسَى عَلَيْهِ السَّلاَمُ خَارِجًا، فَأَنَّهُ خَيْرًا فَقَدْ كَانَ قَبْلَهُ وَبَعْدَهُ

Ibn Abī Shaybah reported that As-Shabīra said,“A man in the company of Al-Mughīrah bin Abī Shu’bahra said, ‘May Allāh bless Muhammad, the Seal of the Prophets, there is no prophet after him.’ Al-Mughīrah said, ‘It was enough for you when you said, ‘The Seal of the Prophets,’ for we used to discuss

213 Sūrah Āle Imrān, 3:50
that ‘Īsā as shall appear. So, when he appears, he shall be before him [the Prophet Muhammad sa] and after him.”

It is hard to understand how the above hadīth supports Farhan Khan’s understanding. In fact, this hadīth supports the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding. Hazrat Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd Ahmad ra explains this further when he writes:

The following matters are apparent from this hadīth:
1. According to Al-Mughīrah bin Shu’bah, the phrase Khātam-un-Nabīyyīn does not mean that no prophets can come after him [the Holy Prophet Muhammad sa]
2. According to him, the words لَا نَِئِيَ بَعْدَهُ (there is no prophet after him) are not as authentic as the phrase Khātam-un-Nabīyyīn
3. According to Al-Mughīrah bin Shu’bah, there was the possibility of the coming of a prophet after the Holy Prophet sa
4. He did not believe that Hazrat ‘Īsā as is alive in heaven. That is why he did not say that Hazrat ‘Īsā as shall descend from heaven. Instead, he says:

(We used to say that he shall appear on land). It appears that he believed that Hazrat ‘Īsā as has

214 For full reference, see chapter entitled Opinion of the Sahāba, Ā’immah, and Mujaddidīn
died but he shall be sent back after resurrection. This is why he did not say “"نَازِلٌ مِنَ السَّمَّاءِ” ([‘Īsā	extsuperscript{as} shall] descend from heaven). Instead, he used the word خارج (he shall appear).

Based on this logical understanding of the hadīth, it is impossible to assume that it speaks of the life of Hazrat ‘Īsā	extsuperscript{as}. The Holy Qur’ān declares him dead and so does the above hadīth!

Finally, Farhan Khan says, “The only way that Muhammad	extsuperscript{sa} could no longer be the last Prophet is if one of two things were to occur: The first occurrence would be if a new Prophet came after Muhammad	extsuperscript{sa} and claimed finality. Ahmadī [Muslim]s will claim this has happened with the coming of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad... The second situation would be if ‘Esā bin Mariam	extsuperscript{as} lost his status of prophethood after his ascension and thus, when he returns, he has to be reassigned this blessed status...”

This is another one of Farhan Khan’s gross misrepresentations of Ahmadiyya Muslim beliefs. The Ahmadī Muslims do not say that Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad 	extsuperscript{as} is the last prophet!

The authors challenge Farhan Khan to present a single quotation of the Promised Messiah	extsuperscript{as} where he has claimed to be the last prophet and has claimed finality of prophethood for himself!

The fact of the matter is that the Promised Messiah	extsuperscript{as} upheld the finality of the prophethood of the Holy Prophet	extsuperscript{sa} and this is

---

215 Tafsīr Kabīr, Volume 10, Page 381
216 Khan, With Love, Page 26
evident from the various quotations from his writings presented in this book. The “second situation” of Farhan Khan would only apply if the nature of the prophethood of Hazrat ‘Īsā as was to be converted from prophethood for his people, the Israelites to prophethood for the whole of humankind. The Holy Qur’ān restricts the prophethood of Hazrat ‘Īsā as to his nation only, that is, the Banī Isrā‘īl as it says:

وَرَسُّوَلًا إِلَى بَني إِسرَائِيلَ

And (he was) a Messenger to the children of Israel...

The only way Farhan Khan’s argument can be applied is if the above verse is removed from the Holy Qur’ān or is considered abrogated. However, the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at defiantly holds the belief that not a single verse, not even a syllable, of the Qur’ān has been or can be removed or abrogated.

Question for Farhan Khan:

1. Why does he continue to run away from a discussion on the death of Hazrat ‘Īsā as?

---

217 Surah Āle Imrān, 3:50
Before getting into a discussion of Farhan Khan’s chapter on the opinion of the mujaddidîn\textsuperscript{rh} regarding the finality of prophethood, it is important to note here that Ahmadî Muslims definitely hold the belief in the finality of prophethood. No new or old prophet can come after the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa}. His prophethood shall continue till the Day of Judgment and will not experience any change or innovation by an old or new prophet. Only such a one can come who is a \textit{perfect} and \textit{complete} follower of the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} and has attained prophethood through the spiritual prowess and beneficence of the prophethood of the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa}. In other words, his prophethood would not be a \textit{new} prophethood, neither would it be an \textit{old} prophethood. It would be part of the prophethood of the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa}. This is the essence of the claim to prophethood made by Hazrat Mirzâ Ghulâm Ahmad Qâdiînî\textsuperscript{as}.

It is interesting to note that before presenting quotations of the mujaddidîn, Farhan Khan creates an escape route for himself by writing, “Hypothetically, even if some Islâmic
personalities of the past agreed with the Ahmadi\textsuperscript{1} position, their views do not define Isl\textsuperscript{m}, and Muslims are not obligated to follow them.\textsuperscript{218} This is a very cunning way of covering up the weakness of his claims. What Farhan Khan is afraid of is the fact that he will be proved wrong and the mujaddid\textit{in} are shown to disagree with him and agree with the Ahmadiyya Muslim position. This will be demonstrated in this chapter, \textit{Insh\textsuperscript{a} All\textsuperscript{a}h!}

The fact of the matter is that the references quoted by the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jam\textsuperscript{at} are from scholars and mujaddid\textit{in} who are accepted by all Muslims, not just the Ahmadi Muslims. It has been the practice of common people ever since the earlier centuries of Isl\textsuperscript{m} that whenever a claim was made in such a way that was beyond their comprehension or was apparently against their popularly held beliefs, they would oppose it, sometimes violently. Almost all of the holy saints of Isl\textsuperscript{m} experienced this. For example, despite his very high rank amongst the mujaddid\textit{in}, Hazrat Mujaddid Alaf Th\textsuperscript{a}n\textit{ī} was declared to be a disbeliever because of his broad knowledge and understanding of the attributes of All\textit{ā}h. Unfortunately, the same has happened today with the opposition of Hazrat Mirz\textsuperscript{ā} Ghul\textsuperscript{ā}m Ahmad\textsuperscript{as} of Q\textsuperscript{ā}di\textsuperscript{ā}n who claimed to be the Messiah and Mahd\textsuperscript{ī} of this age. Although his claims are exactly in accordance with those foretold for the Messiah by the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} and by the saints and mujaddid\textit{in} of the past, people still oppose him, due to ignorance, just as all prophets were opposed.

Similarly, Hazrat Muhy-ud-D\textit{ī}n Ibn \text{\textprime} Arab\textsuperscript{i} was known to be one of the greatest saints of Isl\textsuperscript{m}, was the first amongst the sufis to explain the concept of \textit{wahdat-ul-wuj\textsuperscript{ū}d} (the concept of believing All\textit{ā}h to be One, but being everything). He claimed that All\textit{ā}h has ordered him to do so and if he had not

\textsuperscript{218} Khan, \textit{With Love}, Page 75
rendered this service, he would have burned himself into ashes. However, the so called scholars, who were not very familiar with the attributes of Allâh, opposed him and declared *fatâwâ* (pl. of *fatwâ*) of *kufr* (disbelief) against him. This opposition was so severe that when Hazrat Sheikh Shahâb-ud-Dîn ‘Umar Suhrawardî*rh* was asked about Imâm Ibn ‘Arabî*rh*, he said “هذا رجل زنديق” (he is a man of no faith). Later on, when Hazrat Imâm Ibn ‘Arabî*rh* passed away, he said to the people with great sorrow that a *qutab*219 has passed away. Upon this, the people were very surprised and asked Sheikh Shahâb-ud-Dîn*rh* what made him call Ibn ‘Arabî*rh* a man of no faith earlier and change his mind later. He replied that he said that in order to stop people from meeting him because he was a man of a very high status and one who presented such facts which were beyond their calibre. He also said that he was afraid that due to their limited understanding of the attributes of Allâh, their faith could be endangered by him. Some of his followers whom he prevented from meeting Hazrat Imâm Ibn ‘Arabî*rh* included the likes of Hazrat Sheikh Baha-ud-Dîn Zakaria Multânî and Hazrat Sheikh Sa’îdî Sherâzî! If these great scholars were prevented from listening to his explanation of *wahdat-ul-wujûd*, one wonders: What was the level of the understanding of common people?

The *mujaddidîn*219 that are presented by Farhan Khan are those whom we, Ahmadî Muslims, accept wholeheartedly. Their views do not differ from the views of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamâ’at. None of them denied the advent of the Promised Messiah and Imâm Mahdî as a prophet after the Holy Prophet*sa*. This is the one concept that all the *mujaddidîn*219 and

---

219 Literally means, “star”, and refers to a spiritual master or sheikh who provides focus for spirituality
ā’immah agreed upon. We simply disagree with the translation and commentary that Farhan Khan derives from their sayings.\textsuperscript{220} He has tried to show that they did not believe in the coming of any kind of prophet whatsoever and this is against the sayings of the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} as well as the will and practical testimony of Allāh the Almighty.

We reinforce our position with the opinion of the sahāba\textsuperscript{ra}. In our research, we have discovered that there were at least six sahāba\textsuperscript{ra} who interpreted the phrase Khātam-un-Nabīyyīn in exactly the same way as the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamāʿat. No one can deny this interpretation because it was promoted by those sahāba\textsuperscript{ra} who were held in high esteem among the companions\textsuperscript{ra} of the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa}. The next four pages are an extract of Ad-Durr-ul-Manthūr, which is basically a book containing prophetic narrations in commentary of verses of the Holy Qur’ān. It was compiled by Hazrat Imām Jalāl-ud-Dīn Suyūṭī\textsuperscript{rh}, mujaddid of the 9\textsuperscript{th} century after Hegira.

\textsuperscript{220} This has \textit{specifically} been proven in the cases of Hazrat Imām Jalāl-ud-Dīn Suyūṭī\textsuperscript{rh}, Hazrat Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindī\textsuperscript{rh} and Hazrat Shāh Wali-ullāh Muhaddas Dehlawī\textsuperscript{rh} later in this chapter.
الدلائل المنتوهة في التفسير المنطقي

لجيل الذين السيؤتي

(849 هـ - 1641 هـ)

 På ناصح

الدكتور عباس بن عبد الله التركي

بالتعاون مع

مركز بحوث الدلائل في الفكر الإسلامي

الدكتور عباس بن نصر يامز

أجزاء الثاني عشر
حقوق الطبع محفوظة
الطبعة الأولى
القاهرة ١٤٢٤ هـ - ٢٠٠٣ م

مركز هيئة جلالة الدكتور عبد الرحمن يامعر
الدراسات العربية الإسلامية

مكتب: ٤٤ ش ترعة الزمر - المهندسين
ت: ٣٦٠١٠٢٧-٠٢٠٢٧٠٢٥٨
فاكس: ٣٦٠١٧٥٦
فيها موضوع لينة لم يضعها، فجعل الناس يطولون بالثنين ويغشبون (1) منه، ويقولون: لو ثم موضوع هذه اللينة، فأننا في اللتين موضوع تلك اللينة (2).

وأخرج ابن مزددك بن ثواتي قال: قال رسول الله ﷺ: «إنه سيكون في أمتي كذاً أنجح ثلاثون، كلهم يزعم أنه نبي، وأنا خاتم النبيين لا نبي بعدئ» (3).

وأخرج أحمد بن حكيم عن حذيفة بن النبهان قال: «في أمتي كذاً أنجح ودجالون سبعة وعشرون منهم أربع نسوة، وإني خاتم النبيين لا نبي بعدئ» (6).

وأخرج ابن أبي شبابة عن عائشة فالتقولا: قولوا: خاتم النبيين، ولا تقولوا: لا نبي بعدئ (1).

وأخرج ابن أبي شبابة عن الشعبي قال: قال رجل عند المغيرة بن سهيلة: صلى الله على محمد وأصحابه الذين نبي بعدئ، فقال المغيرة: حسبك إذا قلت: خاتم الأنبياء، فإننا نحن نحسب أن عيسى خارج، فإن هو خرج فقد كان قبه وبعده (7).

وأخرج ابن الأنصاري في «المصاحف» عن أبي عبد الرحمن الشلمي قال: كنت أقرئ الحسن والحسين، فمربي علبي بن أبي طالب، وأنا (1)

(1) في الأصل، ح 1: 141 يعيجبون.
(2) أحمد 25/68، 167 2/706 (7143)، والترمذي 3/16117، صحيح سن الترمذي.
(3) الحديث عند أبي داود 4/2152، صحيح سن أبي داود 6/357.
(4) في الأصل، ح 1: 104.
(6) ابن أبي شبابة 9/110، 111.
(7) ابن أبي شبابة 8/111.
سورة الأحزاب: الآية 41

"أَقْرَنُوهُمَا {وَخَاتَمُ النَّبِيِّينَ} . فَقَالَ لَهُمَا: {وَخَاتَمُ النَّبِيِّينَ} .

بفتح الناء.

قوله تعالى: {كَانَ أَيُّهَا الْجِبَالُ يَكُونُوا أَذُرُوا الله ذُو كِيْرَانٍ} .

أخبر ابن حريث، وابن المنذر، وابن أبي حاتم، عن ابن عباس في قوله:

{أَذُرُوا الله ذُو كِيْرَانٍ} . يُقولُ: لا يُفترض على عباده فريضة إلا جعل لها حدًا معلومًا، ثم غذر أهلها في حال غذاء، غير الذكر فإن الله لم يجعل له حدًا يُنتقى إليه، ولم يُنظر أحدًا في تركه إلا مغلوًا على عقله فقال: أذُرُوا الله قيامًا وقعودًا.

وعلى جموك، بالليل والنهار، في البحير والبحر، في السر وال труб، في الغوطة والفقيه، والصحة والصفام، والسر والعلنية، على كل خالٍ، وقال: {وَسَيَصْحَبُكُمْ بَيْكَرَةُ وَآيِسَالَةُ} . فإذا فعلتم ذلك صلى عليهم هو وملائكته، قال الله تعالى:

{هُوَ الَّذِي يُفْضِلُ عَلَيْكُم مَّثَلَهُمَا} .

وأخبر ابن أبي حاتم عن مقاتل في قوله:

{أَذُرُوا الله ذُو كِيْرَانٍ} .

قال: بالنساء، بالنسب، والتكبير، والتهليل، والتحميد، واذكروه على كل خالٍ، {وَسَيَصْحَبُكُمْ بَيْكَرَةُ وَآيِسَالَةُ} . يقولُ: صلى الله {بَيْكَرَةً} . بالغدالة، {وَآيِسَالَةً} بالغشية.

وأخبر أحمد، والترمذي، والبيهقي، عن أبي سعيد الخدري، أن

(1) سفط من ص، فإس م. وهي قراءة نافع، وابن كنبر، وأبي عمر، وأبو عامر، وحمزة، والكسائي.

(2) ابن جرير 191.

(3) الأدب المصور 582.
The *ahādīth* compiled by Hazrat Imām Jalāl-ud-Dīn Suyūtīrh show that the following six *sahaba*ra interpreted the phrase *Khātam-an-Nabīyyīn* exactly in accordance with the interpretation of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at.

1. **Hazrat Ayesha**ra

   Say that he was *Khātam-un-Nabīyyīn*, but do not say that there will be no prophet after him.

2. **Hazrat Mughīrah**ra

   A man in the company of Al-Mughīrah bin Abī Shu‘bah said, “May Allāh bless Muhammad, the Seal of the Prophets, there is no prophet after him.” Al-Mughīrah said, “It was enough for you when you said, ‘The Seal of the Prophets,’ for we used to discuss that ‘Īsāas shall appear. So, when he appears, he shall be before him [the Prophet Muhammad sa] and after him”.

3. **Hazrat ‘Alī**ra

4. **Hazrat Abū ‘Abd-ur-Rahmān Al-Sulamiyya**ra, the teacher of Hazrat Imām Hassanra and Imām Hussainra

5. **Hazrat Imām Hassan**ra

6. **Hazrat Imām Hussain**ra

   Hazrat Abū ‘Abd-ur-Rahmān Al-Sulamiyya**ra said, “I was appointed to teach Hassanra and Hussainra [the Holy Qur’an]. Then, once, Hazrat ‘Alī bin Abī Tālibra passed by me and I was teaching them to read, ‘wa Khātim-an-Nabiyyīn.’ Then, he [Hazrat ‘Alīra] said to me, ‘Teach them to recite, ‘wa Khātam-an-Nabiyyīn’ with the fatah on tā.’”
It is interesting to note how Hazrat Imām Jalāl-ud-Dīn Suyūtī\textsuperscript{th} brings these narrations at the end of all the narrations. Apparently, he wanted to indicate his own belief as well. He wanted to show the world that he did not interpret \textit{Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn} to mean “the end of prophets of all kinds whatsoever.” He himself brought these \textit{ahādīth} in commentary of the phrase \textit{Khātam-an-Nabiyyīn} to show his agreement with them and this also shows his agreement with the understanding of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at.

7. Hazrat Imām Jalāl-ud-Dīn Suyūtī\textsuperscript{th} also says the following:

\begin{quote}
من قال بسلب نبوته كفر حقا
The one who says that Hazrat ‘Īsā\textsuperscript{as} will not be a prophet after his advent, he is most certainly a disbeliever!\textsuperscript{221}
\end{quote}

Moreover, he says:

\begin{quote}
فهو علي عليه السلام وان كان خليفة في الامة المحمدية فهو رسول ونبي كريم على حاله
Despite the fact that he [the Promised Messiah] will be a Khalīfa of the ummah of Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa}, he shall remain a Nabī and a respected prophet.\textsuperscript{222}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{221} Hijajul Karāmah, Page 431
\textsuperscript{222} Hijajul Karāmah, Page 426
Moving further into this discussion, let us now see what some of the ā’immah have said in commentary of the statement of Hazrat Ayesha ṭa above.

8. **Hazrat Shaikh Al-Imām Hazrat Ibn Qutaiba**  
writes in *Tāwīl Mukhtalif Al-Ahādīth*, Page 236:

   This statement of hers does not contradict the statement of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be on him), “Lā nabiyya ba’adī” [There is no prophet after me] because he meant, “There would be no prophet after me, who abrogates what I came with [or who opposes my law].”

9. **Hazrat Imam Muhammad Tāhir** writes in *Takmilah Majma’ul-Bihār*, Page 85:

   This [statement of Hazrat Ayesha ṭa] had reference to the advent of Ṣās. It is also not in contradiction with the hadīth, “There is no prophet after me,” for he intended [to say], “There would be no prophet [after him] who abrogates his law.”

To bring authenticity to our quotations and to prove we have not taken them out of context, we have chosen to present the actual scans of the quotations of the following mujaddidīn:

i. Hazrat Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindī Mujaddid Alaf Thānī,  
mujaddid of the 11th century

ii. Hazrat Shāh Waliullāh Muhaddas Dehlawi, mujaddid of the 12th century.

The following three pages are scans from the original Persian book of Hazrat Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindī  
*Maktūbāt Imām*
With Love to Muhammadṣa the Ḵhātam-un-Nabiyyīn

Rabbānī, followed by the Urdu translation of maktūb number 310 of the same book on 4 pages.
كتاب مكمل
حضرت مكي بن أبي سفيان
المشرف على المكتبة العامة
مطبعة أثرياء للكتاب
قد اعتبنى طبعة جديدة بالأوفست
حسين حمي بن سعيد استانبولي

طلب من مكتبة الحقوقية بشارع در الشقفة بفتح 57 استانبول - تركيا

من أراد أن يطبع هذه الورقة وحدها أو ترجمها إلى لغة أخرى فله من الله الأجر الجميل والم журнал والعديد من الكتب.

النشر والطبع 1397 هـ ميلادي
كمسوب في عالم وورف

هناك أعمدة مبرمجة وأفكار معينة، ينبغي أن تكون مقترحة بعين الوقت.

وهو عملية تتشكل من خلال التفكير في كل شيء، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات مسبقة.

وكل ذلك في سبيل التعبير عن الفكرة الأساسية، والمفاهيم المترتبة.

لا يوجد حل يعتمد على العقل، بل على الثقة بالمشروطة.

والثقة مفتاح النجاح، والثقة التي تأتي من الصبر والتفاهم.

واختصاراً، كل ذلك يعتمد على التفكير العميق، والتفاهم الشامل.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

وهي عملية تتشكل من خلال التفكير في كل شيء، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات مسبقة.

وكل ذلك في سبيل التعبير عن الفكرة الأساسية، والمفاهيم المترتبة.

لا يوجد حل يعتمد على العقل، بل على الثقة بالمشروطة.

والثقة مفتاح النجاح، والثقة التي تأتي من الصبر والتفاهم.

واختصاراً، كل ذلك يعتمد على التفكير العميق، والتفاهم الشامل.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتحتاج إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.

ويجب أن يكون لكل مقالة مفاهيم محددة، وتتحجب إلى توضيحات بسيطة وواضحة.
مکتوبات امام رضا (ع)

تاریخ الفنی ایشان احمد سراجدنی قم‌زاده

شکرول

تصحیح و دوکیزی (زیرک)

موالا محمد سراج، احمد سراجدنی قم‌زاده

خطبانامه جمعه‌الاکثر

(ناشر)

میهنیت شگال کمکی بندر روست و کاریکی
مکتوب نوبت اول

واکالہ محمد باقر ہنری

اسلام کے پردہ کی رہائی کے حساب میں میں کہتا ہوں کہ ایک درس، مخصوصاً جس کی باعثات نہ متعلق ہیں، اور متعلق کی تعلیم کی ویجیاں، اور خاص طور پر ایک مخصوص نمونہ کی ہے جس کے ذریعہ جو مفہوم جوہری، اور اپنے الحاق میں ایک مخصوص ذوق ہے۔

بہت سے سوالات نے اس مخصوص نمونے کی طرح کی اضافات کیں۔

مکتوب نوبت دو

واکالہ محمد باقر ہنری

اسلام کے پردہ کی رہائی کے حساب میں میں کہتا ہوں کہ ایک درس، مخصوصاً جس کی باعثات نہ متعلق ہیں، اور متعلق کی تعلیم کی ویجیاں، اور خاص طور پر ایک مخصوص نمونہ کی ہے جس کے ذریعہ جو مفہوم جوہری، اور اپنے الحاق میں ایک مخصوص ذوق ہے۔

بہت سے سوالات نے اس مخصوص نمونے کی طرح کی اضافات کیں۔
اورین خبر لفظیہ نازع یہ ہے کہ اسمبلی اسلام آباد میں بچوں کے لیے ایک پرائم ٹی وی کالر سے تعلقات بنا اور بچوں کو تعلیمی حیات میں داخل سازی میں مدد کرنا چاہیے۔

کسی بھی بچے کو تعلیمی حیات میں داخل نہ ہونے کی وجہ سے ہماری اور بغیر ابتدائی تعلیم کے بچوں کو تعلیمی بحالی میں مدد نہیں ہوسکتی۔ اور ہماری اسی ابتدائی تعلیم کے بیان میں تعلیمی حیات میں داخل نہ ہونے کی وجہ سے ہماری اور بغیر ابتدائی تعلیم کے بچوں کو تعلیمی بحالی میں مدد نہیں ہوسکتی۔

یہ کہانی وہ ہے جس میں ہماری ابتدائی تعلیم کے بیان میں تعلیمی حیات میں داخل نہ ہونے کی وجہ سے ہماری اور بغیر ابتدائی تعلیم کے بچوں کو تعلیمی بحالی میں مدد نہیں ہوسکتی।
10. In the relevant portion of the quotation on the above scanned pages, Hazrat Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindīth states:

The mutashābihāt [verses susceptible of different interpretations] of the Qur’ān have to be understood through interpretation, instead of literal meaning. Allāh, the Exalted, says in the Qur’ān:

\[
\text{وَمَا يَعْلَمُ تَأْوِيلَهُ إِلَّا الَّذِي ﷺ}
\]

Hence, we learn that the mutashābihāt are susceptible to interpretation in the sight of Allāh, the Exalted. Their literal meaning is not intended. Allāh, the Exalted, allows those firmly grounded in knowledge to partake of this knowledge of right interpretation. Hence, at a higher level, the knowledge of the unseen specific to Allāh, the Exalted, is only granted to the prophets. This (knowledge of) interpretation should not be understood the same as when the word “yadd” [hand] refers to “power” and the word “wajh” [face] refers to “being.” By any means, this is not so! Instead, the knowledge of this interpretation is only given to the most special servants (of Allāh).

In other words, he is saying that Allāh, the Exalted, teaches the secrets of the Qur’ān through revelations made to the divine scholars of the ummah. However, those who are granted knowledge of the unseen specifically and at a higher stage are called prophets. Moreover, in maktūb Number 301, he has written:

\[\text{223 And none knows its right interpretation except Allāh.—Sūrah Āle Imrān, 3:8}\]
The rising of prophets after the Khātim-ur-Rusul – Hazrat Muhammad, the Chosen One, peace and blessings be upon him – from among his own followers and as a heritage, does not in any way run counter to his status as the Khātim-ur-Rusul. Therefore, O reader, do not be among those who doubt.

While Hazrat Ahmad Sirhindīrh encourages us to refrain from doubt, it is unfortunate that people like Farhan Khan continue to do so and even encourage others to doubt.

The next four pages are scans from *At-Tafhīmāt Ilāhiyyah*, a book of Hazrat Shāh Waliullāh Muhaddas Dehlawi rh.
عندما تصلَّتَ الصالحاء، وصفَةً لله شرب الطبلين، ومن آخرها بدأ يبادر في طريقَةٍ التي ذكرت في نواحيه على حسب الإشارة والرنا:

لاقتَ صداقَتَ الصالحاء، وصفَةً لله شرب الطبلين، ومن آخرها بدأ يبادر في طريقَةٍ التي ذكرت في نواحيه على حسب الإشارة والرنا:

لاقتَ صداقَتَ الصالحاء، وصفَةً لله شرب الطبلين، ومن آخرها بدأ يبادر في طريقَةٍ التي ذكرت في نواحيه على حسب الإشارة والرنا:

لاقتَ صداقَتَ الصالحاء، وصفَةً لله شرب الطبلين، ومن آخرها بدأ يبادر في طريقَةٍ التي ذكرت في نواحيه على حسب الإشارة والرنا:

لاقتَ صداقَتَ الصالحاء، وصفَةً لله شرب الطبلين، ومن آخرها بدأ يبادر في طريقَةٍ التي ذكرت في نواحيه على حسب الإشارة والرنا:
أعتذر إذا كان النص غير قابل للقراءة بشكل طبيعي. السؤال غير واضح أو المحتوى غير واضح.

يرجى تقديم السؤال أو المحتوى بشكل أكبر أو موضحًا السؤال بشكل أفضلがあれば، سأكون سعيدًا بمساعدتك.
11. As the quotations show, **Hazrat Shah Waliullāh, Muhaddas of Delhi**\(^{\text{th}}\), Reformer of the 12\(^{\text{th}}\) century of Islām, writes in *At-Tafhīmāt Ilāhiyyah*:

>The sealing of prophethood with him [the Holy Prophet \(^{\text{sa}}\)] means that there can be no (prophet) after him who is commissioned with a new law by Allāh, the Glorious.

It is clear that Hazrat Shāh Waliullāh Muhaddas Dehlawī\(^{\text{th}}\) has interpreted the phrase *Khātam-an-Nabiyyīn* in exactly the same way as the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at, that is, the Holy Prophet\(^{\text{sa}}\) is the last law-bearing prophet.

12. **Hazrat Imām Ja’far as-Sādiq**\(^{\text{th}}\), one of the greatest scholars of the 1\(^{\text{st}}\) century of Islām and the sixth Imām of the Shiites, is quoted in the book *As-Sāfī Sharah Usūl Al-Kāfī*, Part 3, Page 119, as follows:

*Hazrat Abū Ja’far, while discussing the Qur’ānic verse:*

\[\text{قالَ أُتِبَّنِىَ أَلَّا إِبْرَهِيمَ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحِكْمَةَ وَأَتْبِئِهِمْ مُلْكًا عَظِيمًا} \]

said that God vouchsafed to the children of Abraham, messengers, prophets and Imāms. But what is ironic is that people believe in what God blessed the children of Abraham with and yet they deny this blessing for the progeny of Muhammad.

\[^{224}\text{Surely, We gave the Book and Wisdom to the children of Abraham also and We also gave them a great kingdom. –Sūrah An-Nisā’}, 4:55\]
Here Imam Ja’far as-Sādiqī is quoted as referring to three blessings that the children of Abraham received: messengers, prophets and imams. He is then quoted as saying that Muslims deny these blessings to the children of Muhammad, yet of the three no Muslim denies imams, which means that the other two are the blessings he was referring to, namely messengers and prophets. Here he agrees with the Ahmadiyya Muslim viewpoint that the blessings of prophethood would not be denied to those in this ummah.

13. The quotations of Hazrat Imām ‘Abd-ul-Wahhāb Shi’rānī and Hazrat Muhy-ud-Dīn Ibn Arabī have already been discussed in the chapter entitled Statements of Hazrat Muhy-ud-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabī and those also support the Ahmadiyya Muslim interpretation.

14. Hazrat Maulānā Abul Hasanāt Abul Haye, a distinguished scholar of the Sunnīs, states in Dāfi‘ Al-Wasāwis, Page 16:

*After the demise of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him, or even during his own lifetime, it is not an impossibility for someone to be exalted to the position of a simple prophet. However, a prophet with a new law is, indeed, forbidden.*

15. In Maqāmāt Mazharī, Page 88, a famous Sufī, Hazrat Mirzā Mazhar Jān Jānā has stated:
No perfection, except the perfection of prophethood bearing Law has ended. With respect to the other beneficences of God Almighty, He is neither miserly nor niggardly.

16. Hazrat Sayyed ‘Abd-ul-Karīm Jilānī, a renowned sufi of the 8th century Hijra, expressed his opinion in Al-Insān-ul-Kāmil fi Ma’rifah Al-Awākhir wal-Awā’il, Page 115, in the following words:

The coming of the law-bearing prophets, after the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings on him, has ceased as he has been exalted to be the Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn because he brought with him such a perfect law as no other prophet had brought before him.

17. Maulānā ‘Abd-ul-Hayee Faranghī Mahlī, an eminent scholar of the Sunnīs, has also discussed the significance of the expression, Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn, and on behalf of Sunnī scholars, he has declared in Majmū‘ah Fatāwā, Volume 1, Page 144:

The divines of the Sunnī sects believe in and expound the fact that in the course of the ministry of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him, there cannot appear a law bearing prophet and his prophethood extends to the end of days. A prophet who appears during his ministry shall necessarily be the follower of the Law of Muhammad.

The next two pages are scans from the original Mathnawī of Hazrat Maulānā Rūmī, a great saint of Islām.
کرکسر دہرائی کونے ہدایت مرکزی نہ کریں اور راہ رازی

بیخیال جہل کو نارا گئی ریکھ دب مکار را

نیک دن رواں کونے نہیں کونے نہیں کسی کو نہ کسی کو

خطیہ کے ذریعے کر کے کوئی کسی کو کسی کو نہیں کریں اور راہ رازی۔
18. As demonstrated, **Hazrat Maulānā Rūm** clearly writes in *Miftāḥ Al-ʿŪlūm Sharah Mathnawī*:

Strive hard in the path of service so that you may achieve prophethood while remaining an ummatī [a follower of the Holy Prophet sa].

19. The founder of Madrassat-ul-ʿŪlūm Deoband, **Hazrat Maulwī Muhammad Qāsim Nanautwī** says in *Tahzīr-un-Nas*, Page 3:

The general public may conceive that “Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn” means that the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be on him) was the last of the prophets but people of knowledge and understanding know very well that being the first or last does not necessarily connote excellence. The words

\[\text{وَلَكِنْ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ وَخَاتَمَ النَّبِيّـنَ} \]

are designed to convey the Holy Prophet’s (peace and blessings of Allāh be on him) exalted and unequalled status and this alone is the correct interpretation. Khātamiyyat is not in any way rejected or denied if a prophet appears after the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be on him). However, if Khātamiyyat is only taken to mean the last prophet, this would be a disparaging interpretation. Such an interpretation would not be acceptable to followers of Islām.

\[\text{225...but he is the Messenger of Allāh and the Seal of the Prophets. –Suṣrah Al-Ahzāb, 33:41} \]
20. Hazrat Nawāb Siddīque Hassan Khān writes in Iqtarāb-us-Sā‘ah, Page 162:

The hadith “Lā Wahya Ba‘da Mautī” [There is no revelation after me] has no foundation. Instead, the words “Lā Nabī Ba‘adī” [There is no prophet after me] are correct, which, according to the scholars, mean: “There shall be no prophet after me, with a [new] law that abrogates mine.”

In view of the significant number of quotations presented here, it is obvious that opposition to the Ahmadiyya position will inevitably entail disowning so many of these illustrious saints of Islām. Not to believe in a concept or opinion of a saint or a mujaddid is acceptable but to totally deny his righteousness and his well-proven claims of having a special relationship with Allāh the Almighty is an act which draws the displeasure of God. If someone wishes to deny these statements made by the sahāba, ā’immah, and the mujaddidīn, and chooses to accept Farhan Khan’s version of Islām, then it is his or her personal choice for which they will have to answer to God.

It should be remembered here that regardless of all the criticisms made by non-Ahmādīs against the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community, they themselves hold the belief that the Latter Day Messiah would be a prophet of Allāh! Shaikh Ibn Hajarth comments on this when he says:

Hazrat ‘Īsāas is an honored prophet. After he comes down he would still be a prophet and messenger. An affirmation by a person of no account that he will be only a member of the Muslim community is not correct, inasmuch as he being one of the Muslims and
his giving effect to the Islāmic law is not inconsistent with his being a prophet and a messenger.\textsuperscript{226}

Therefore, all the Muslims are waiting for a prophet to come in the Latter Days as their Messiah. The only difference is summed up in this question: Who is that person? The non-Ahmadīs say that it is Hazrat ‘Īsā as while the Ahmadī Muslims say that he has died, according to the Qur’ān, and the prophecy about his coming has been fulfilled in the person of Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qadiānī as.

As it was mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, it must be remembered that the quotations that Farhan Khan has presented mostly reiterate the sayings of the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} without going into any details. The fact is that all those mujaddidin believed in the coming of a latter day prophet even if some of them considered him to be ‘Īsā as of the Israelites. Their opinion on who that latter day prophet was going to be is merely an opinion of theirs regarding a prophecy of the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} that was never fulfilled in their lifetime. Instead, this prophecy was fulfilled in the year 1891 when Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiānī as claimed to be the Promised Messiah and Imām Mahdī, whose advent was prophesied by the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa}.

To illustrate this, we use the example of Hazrat Imām Ibn Taymiyya\textsuperscript{rh}, mujaddid of the 7th century of Islām. In the same book from which Farhan Khan quoted, that is, Book of Emaan: According to the classical works of Shaikhul Islām Ibn Taymiyya, translated by Dr. Muhammad Naim Yasin, Hazrat Imām Ibn Taymiyya discusses the descent of Jesus\textsuperscript{as} as follows on Page 122:

\textsuperscript{226} Al-Fatāwā Al-Hadithiyyah, Page 129
Some Mu‘tazillah, and those who agree with them, have denied the veracity of those events by claiming that they are negated by the fact that Muhammad is the Last Prophet, something which the entire ummah of Muslims agree upon and to which there is ample evidence in the Qur‘ān and Sunnah, as in Allāh’s saying that he is the Khātam Al-Nabiyyīn, and the Hadīth in which the Messenger of Allāhsa said, “There will be no Prophet after me”. But this is a corrupt deduction. The descent of Jesus does not mean that he will bring with him a new Message and Law that will annul our sharī‘ah, which all Muslims agree is the final Law valid until the Day of Judgment. Nothing to this effect is found in the Ahadeeth or anywhere else. Indeed, the Ahadeeth tell us that Jesus will come on earth to rule justly by the sharī‘ah of Islām, reviving its aspects which have been neglected by the people.227

In the above quotation, Hazrat Ibn Taymiyya interprets the words, “There will be no prophet after me,” exactly how the Ahmadī Muslims do. He says that this statement only means that the latter day Messiah will be a subordinate prophet without a new message or a new law that abrogates the law of the Holy Prophet Muhammadsa. Regarding the correct personality – whether he is ‘Īsāas of the ‘Īsrāelites or another person bearing spiritual resemblance with ‘Īsāas – Hazrat Imām Ibn Taymiyya could not have decided that because he did not see the way the prophecy was fulfilled. In fact, this is something that none of the mujaddidīn could have decided because this

227 He quotes from Sarh Al-Nawawī ‘alā Sahīh Muslim, Volume 18, Pages 75-76
prophecy did not come to pass in their lifetimes. Due to this reason, they also cannot be held responsible for holding this opinion. Instead, we are the ones who are responsible in the Eyes of Allāh, the Exalted, because in our time, a person has claimed to be that Messiah and he has shown very clear and powerful signs of his truth and that person is Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiānīas!

Finally, Farhan Khan criticizes Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiānīas for allegedly changing his opinion in regards to the finality of prophethood. This is not the case! The Promised Messiahas states:

Wherever I have denied being a prophet or messenger, it has only been in the sense that I have not brought an independent law nor am I an independent prophet. I am a messenger and prophet only in the sense that I have received spiritual grace from the Messengeras whom I follow, and, having received his name for myself, and through him, I have received knowledge of the unseen from God. But I have not come with a new law. I have never denied being called a Nabī [prophet] in this sense.228

Further clarification of what he meant to say in all his books is given in the following quotation:

...the charge preferred against me that it is as if I claim a kind of nubuwват which causes me to become separate from Islām, and which means that I consider myself a kind of Nabī who is not bound by the Holy Qurʿān, and that I have instituted a new kalimah and

228 A Misconception Removed, Page 10
have appointed a new *qiblah*, and that I claim to have abrogated the *sharī’ah* of Islām, and that I do not follow and obey the Holy Prophet, may peace be on him, is entirely false. I consider a claim of such *nubuwwat* as amounting to be *kufr* and I have set forth throughout, in all my books, that I do not claim any such *nubuwwat*, and that it is a calumny to attribute such a claim to me. The basis on which I call myself a *Nabī* is that I am honoured with the converse of God Almighty, that He speaks to me frequently, and responds to me, and discloses many hidden things to me, and informs me about future events, in a manner that He adopts only towards one who enjoys special nearness to Him, and that on account of the multiplicity of these matters he has designated me a *Nabī*.\(^{229}\)

As a result, it is now clear that wherever Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādīānī\(^{as}\) said that there are no more prophets after the Holy Prophet\(^{sa}\), he was referring to law-bearing prophethood or independent prophethood. Wherever he accepted prophethood, it was subordinate, non-law-bearing prophethood, earned through the beneficence of and the *Seal* of authentication of the prophethood of the Holy Prophet\(^{sa}\). In fact, this same principle applies to the quotations of the *mujaddidīn* presented by Farhan Khan. Wherever they said that there are no more prophets after the Holy Prophet\(^{sa}\), they were not discussing the latter day Messiah and where they discussed the latter day Messiah, they called him a prophet and one of them went so far as to say that

\(^{229}\) Letter written by the Promised Messiah\(^{as}\) published in *Akhbār-e-‘Ām*, May 26, 1908
whoever denies his prophethood is surely a kāfir (i.e., disbeliever).

**Question for Farhan Khan:**

1. Have any of the mujaddidīn rejected the prophethood of the Latter Day Messiah?
Continuation of Prophethood according to the Holy Qur’ān

*Sūrah An-Nisā’, 4:70*

And whoso obeys Allāh and this Messenger of His shall be among those on whom Allāh has bestowed His blessings, namely, the Prophets, the Truthful, the Witnesses, and the Righteous. And excellent companions are these.\(^{230}\)

**Intellectual Dishonesties of Farhan Khan**

Before getting into a detailed discussion of the chapter entitled *Sūrah An-Nisā’, Verse 70*, we would like to point out some of the intellectual dishonesties of Farhan Khan. First, in the beginning of the chapter, he gives reference to the official

\(^{230}\) Sūrah An-Nisā’, 4:70
Ahmadiyya Muslim translation of the Holy Qur’ān but just next to it, he quotes from an unofficial translation of the Holy Qur’ān, that is, the Muhammad ‘Alī translation. Second, he attributes certain beliefs to the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at under the heading “Ahmadī Argument” but fails to present an authentic quotation from Ahmadiyya Muslim literature.

One may say that perhaps Farhan Khan is doing this unknowingly but this possibility is eliminated when one reads the footnote on Page 3 of his book, “For the sake of intellectual honesty, none of these quotations have been edited in any way from their exact English translations except that the spellings of certain words were changed...” Thus, it can be concluded that “intellectual honesty” is not a term alien to him and he appears to understand that changing a quotation or altering someone’s belief is dishonesty. Despite that, he repeatedly attributes beliefs to the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at in his book without quoting from authentic sources. For example, he writes that Ahmadī Muslims believe “...there is no finality of prophethood.” In the beginning of the previous chapter, it has already been proven that Ahmadī Muslims strongly believe that the coming of Hazrat ‘Īsā as himself would break the Seal of prophethood.

At another place, Farhan Khan writes, “Likewise, while the original meaning of theash-shuhadā’ [ash-shuhadā’] is witnesses, when used in the Qur’ān and Hadīth literature, it always means martyrs...” and, “Never once does Malik Ghulām Farīd translate theash-shuhadā’ [ash-shuhadā’] to mean witnesses.” Both these statements are blatant lies! It is ridiculous how Farhan Khan could

231 Khan, *With Love*, Page 2
232 Khan, *With Love*, Page 6
233 Ibid.
make such bold statements about the Qur’ān and hadīth without doing any research. A few verses are being presented here to prove the foolishness of Farhan Khan’s statements and to show the readers that he is not an authority on the Qur’ān or Ahādīth:

O ye who believe! When you borrow one from another for a fixed period, then write it down. And let a scribe write it in your presence faithfully; and no scribe should refuse to write, because Allāh has taught him, so let him write and let him who incurs the liability dictate; and he should fear Allāh, his Lord, and not diminish anything therefrom. But if the
person incurring the liability be of low understanding or be weak or be unable himself to dictate, then let someone who can watch his interest dictate with justice. **And call two witnesses from among your men;** and if two men be not available, then a man and two women, of such as you like as witnesses, so that if either of two women should err in memory, then one may remind the other. And the witnesses should not refuse when they are called. And do not feel weary of writing it down, whether it be small or large, along with its appointed time of payment. This is more equitable in the sight of Allāh and makes testimony surer and is more likely to keep you away from doubts; therefore omit not to write except that it be ready merchandise which you give or take from hand to hand, in which case it shall be no sin for you that you write it not. And have witnesses when you sell one to another; and let no harm be done to the scribe or the witness. And if you do that, then certainly it shall be disobedience on your part. And fear Allāh. And Allāh grants you knowledge and Allāh knows all things well.\(^{234}\)

A single verse of the Holy Qur’ān uses the word *shahīd/shuhadā’* several times and *every time*, Mr. Ghulām Farīd has translated it as “witness.” Further proof that the word *shahīd* does in fact mean “witness” in the Holy Qur’ān is found in the following verse:

\(^{234}\) Sūrah Al-Baqarah, 2:283
Why did not those, who gave currency to this charge, bring four witnesses to prove it? Since they have not brought the required witnesses, they are indeed liars in the sight of Allāh!  

This is the level of credibility of Farhan Khan who dared to say that when the word ash-shuhadā’ is used “in the Qur’ān and Hadīth literature, it always means martyrs”! There are many other verses to prove that his ridiculous claim is wrong but only two verses should suffice.

In his Mufridāt, Imām Rāghib has also made it very clear that the word shahīd in Sūrah An-Nisā’, verse 70, means “witness”:

With his statement: “And the truthful, and the witnesses, and the righteous” – and shahīd: it is used in the meaning of “witness” and “the witnessing of something”

It gives us no pleasure in saying this but keeping a beard and speaking with an Arabic accent makes no one an authority on Qur’ān and ahādīth. Statements made by Farhan Khan are so strange that we have no choice but to say that he is ignorant of the Arabic language. His translation of shahīd as “martyr” is not

---

235 Sūrah An-Nūr, 24:14
236 Mufridāt Imām Rāghib, under the word شهيد [shahada]
supported by the Holy Qur’ān. Instead, Allāh, the Exalted, has used the word *qatala* (قتل) for the martyrs. For example, He says:

\[
\text{وَلَا تَحْسَبَنَّ الَّذِينَ قُتِّلُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ أَمْوَاتًا بَلْ آخِيَاءٌ عَنْدَ رَبِّهِمْ يُرْزَقُونَ}
\]

Think not of those, who have been slain in the cause of Allāh, as dead. Nay, they are living, in the presence of their Lord, and are granted gifts from Him.237

\[
\text{وَلَا تَقْتُلُوْا لَمْ يُقْتِلُ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ أَمْوَاتًا بَلْ آخِيَاءٌ وَلَكِنَّ لَا}
\]

And say not of those who are killed in the cause of Allāh that they are dead; nay, they are living; only you perceive not.238

In the entire Qur’ān, the word *shahīd* is not used by Allāh, the Exalted, to refer to martyrs. He has always used the word *qatala*. If someone were to ask why the word *shahīd* is translated as *martyr* in translations of the Qur’ān, the answer is that an implied meaning of this word is *martyr* but it is not the intended meaning based on the language of the Holy Qur’ān.

It is indeed hard for us to understand why the title of Farhan Khan’s book boasts, “With Love to the Ahmadis of the World,” yet it is filled with extraordinary bias and prejudiced analyses of Ahmadiyya Muslim beliefs. It is full of statements which have nothing to do with Islām, the Holy Qur’ān, and the

237 Sūrah Āl-Imrān, 3:170
238 Sūrah Al-Baqarah, 2:155
Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him). Our response to Farhan Khan is “Thanks, but no thanks” for this so-called love of yours which can only take one away from Allāh, the Holy Qur’ān, and the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him).

Ahmādī Muslim Argument

In order to properly understand the actual Ahmādī Muslim argument regarding Sūrah An-Nisā’, verse 70, one must first understand the following prayer of the Holy Qur’ān:

اِهْدِنَا الصَّرَاطَ الْمُسْتَقْيِمِ ﻛَيْفَ اِهْدِنَا ﻟِلَّذِينَ آمَنُواْ عَلَّمَ ﻟِلَّذِينَ كَفَارَ ﺗُعْرَبُ ﺑِيْنَهُمْ

Guide us in the right path —The path of those on whom Thou hast bestowed Thy blessings.239

A question from this prayer arises: Who are these recipients of the blessings of Allāh? Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiānīas, the Promised Messiah and Imām Mahdī answers this question beautifully when he writes:

It should never be forgotten that some parts of the Holy Qur’ān explain its other parts. A subject finds a summary mention in one place and is explained at length in another—the latter thus constituting an exposition of the former. Thus: Guide us along the straight path, the path of those on whom Thou hast bestowed favors; is a supplication in the abstract. In another place (4:70) the favored ones have been

---

239 Sūrah Al-Fātihah, 1:6-7
described as the prophets, the righteous, the witnesses and the virtuous.\textsuperscript{240}

The Promised Messiah\textsuperscript{as} further elaborates as follows:

We supplicate in our prayers: Guide us along the straight path, the path of those upon whom Thou hast bestowed Thy favors. This means for the purpose of advancement in faith and for the benefit of mankind we seek four types of signs in the shape of four excellences – the excellence of the prophets, the excellence of the righteous, the excellence of the witnesses, and the excellence of the virtuous. The special excellence of a prophet is to receive from God knowledge of things hidden which should be a sign. The excellence of the righteous is that one should so completely possess the treasure of truth, the verities comprised in the Book of Allāh, that because of their outstanding character they should be a sign, confirming the integrity of the righteous person. The excellence of the witness is that he should possess such firmness of faith and such strength of character and such steadfastness in times of trial and troubles and hardships that they should be a sign for him. The excellence of the man of virtue is that he should so completely discard every type of mischief and become such an embodiment of goodness that his virtue should become a sign, because of its extraordinary character.

\textsuperscript{240} Commentary of The Holy Qur’an- Sūrah Al-Fātihah, Pages 238-239
These are then the four kinds of excellence that we beg of Allāh, the Exalted, five times in our daily prayers. In other words, we seek from God, the Supreme, heavenly signs and whoso does not aspire to them lacks faith. The very purpose of our prayer is this aspiration which we seek from God, the Great, five times in our daily prayers, in four shapes as four signs, seeking thus the magnification of God, the Most High, in the earth, so that our lives may not defile the earth as lives of denial and doubt and indifference. A person glorifies God, the Sublime, only when he begs of Him these four signs.\textsuperscript{241}

About the word \textit{shahīd}, he writes the following and this is the official stance of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamāʿat on the word \textit{shahīd}:

Common people have understood the word \textit{shahīd} to only mean “one who is killed by an arrow or a gun, or dies from an accident.” However, next to Allāh, the Exalted, this is not the only status of \textit{shahādat}.... In my opinion, the actual meaning of a \textit{shahīd} is something other than destruction of the body and it is a state of being in relation to the heart.\textsuperscript{242}

Explaining this further, he writes:

The status of \textit{shahādat} refers to a status at which man, with the strength of his faith, has gained such a conviction in God and the Day of Judgment, that it is

\textsuperscript{241} Commentary of The Holy Qurʾān- Sūrah Al-Fātihah, Pages 241-242
\textsuperscript{242} Al-Hakam, Page 18, Volume 9: May 24, 1905
as if he is seeing Allāh, the Exalted, with his eyes. Then, with the blessing of this faith, the bitterness and difficulty in doing good deeds is removed. Also, the decree of Allāh, the Exalted, descends upon the heart like honey due to harmony. It fills up the chest with sweetness and every trial seems to be a reward. Hence, a shahīd is one who experiences the mushāhidah of God [that is, sees the light of God] with the strength of his faith and gets pleasure from the bitterness of the decree [of God] as if it was sweet honey. In this sense, he is called shahīd and this status is a sign for the perfect believer.243

This is the official understanding of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at of the word shahīd and what has been translated by Mr. Ghulām Farīd at certain places in the Qur‘an is an implied meaning of shahīd.

Furthermore, even if the meaning of the word shahīd is taken to mean martyr, it does not mean that verse 70 of Sūrah An-Nisā’ only applies for the hereafter, because Allāh knows whether or not a person will be a martyr even before the birth of a person. Hence, in the knowledge of Allāh, the Exalted, a person is a martyr long before he or she actually gets the status.

In summary, the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at’s understanding of verse 70 of Sūrah An-Nisā’ is that Allāh, the Exalted, will continue to send the prophets, the truthful, the witnesses, and the righteous, from among those who truly obey the commandments of Allāh, the Exalted, and follow the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa in letter and spirit. The prayer for the achievement of these stages has been taught in Sūrah Al-Fātihah

243 Teryāq-ul-Qulūb, Page 124
and a glad tiding has been given in Sūrah An-Nisā’ that Allāh will continue to bless these people with such spiritual ranks in this life.

*The Grammatical Structure of 4:70*

Taking this discussion further, two things must be borne in mind when studying 4:70. First, Allāh, the Exalted, has used the words “وَهُوَ مَعَ مَن يُطَعُّ” and this means “one who obeys or will obey” because the word “يُطَعُ” is in the فَعَلُ مَضَارِعُ (f’ail mudhāri’) formation and such a formation is used for present as well as future tenses. As a result, the whole phrase would mean, “And whoso obeys or will obey Allāh and this Messenger of His...”. This means that in future, prophets who are subordinate to the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa can continue to come.

Second, the word مع [ma’a] here gives the meaning of من [min: from among] because Allāh, the Exalted, has Himself clarified its meaning by using the word من [min] in the same verse. Allāh stated, “وَهُوَ مَن النَّبِيَّينَ (from among the prophets) not “مع النبيين” (with the prophets). Therefore, the meaning of the whole verse is: “And whoso obeys Allāh and this Messenger of His shall be among those on whom Allāh has bestowed His blessings, namely, the prophets, the truthful, the witnesses, and the righteous.”

*Contextual Use of Ma’a*

The word ma’a can mean “among” or “with” and its meanings vary according to the context it is used in. For example, in the following verse, it means “among”: 
Except those who repent and amend and hold fast to Allāh and are sincere in their obedience to Allāh. These are among the believers. And Allāh will soon bestow a great reward upon the believers. 244

In the above verse, ma’a can only mean “among,” not “with.” Similarly, it is stated in the Holy Qur’ān:

“Our Lord, we have heard a Crier calling us unto faith, ‘Believe ye in your Lord,’ and we have believed. Our Lord, forgive us, therefore, our errors and remove from us our evils, and grant us death among the righteous.” 245

The other meaning of ma’a is “with”. For instance, Allāh, the Exalted, says:

And fear Allāh and know that Allāh is with those who fear Him. 246

Here, it can only mean that Allāh is with those people who fear Him in the sense that His help, assistance, and succour is with

244 Sūrah An-Nisā’, 4:147
245 Sūrah Āle ‘Imrān, 3:194
246 Sūrah Al-Baqarah, 2:195
those who fear Him. A reason why the word *ma’a* cannot possibly mean “among” in the above verse is the fact that *ma’a* is being used in respect of two different species: Allâh and His creation. It is obvious that the creation cannot be *among* Allâh and can only be *with* Allâh. As a result, the meaning “with” is applied to the word *ma’a* in this specific context. Similarly, all other verses where Allâh is being spoken of in respect of His creation, the meaning “among” cannot be applied.

The other thing that should be remembered is that some verses of the Holy Qur’ân explain other verses. If there is any ambiguity left regarding the meaning of a certain verse, things can become clear by pondering over other related verses of the Holy Qur’ân. Allâh, the Exalted, Himself explains the matter under discussion in many verses of the Holy Qur’ân. Consider the way the following two verses explain each other:

\[
\text{And those who believe in Allâh and His messengers and they are the truthful and the witnesses in the Sight of their Lord, they will have their reward and their light.}^{247}
\]

\[
\text{And whoso obeys Allâh and this Messenger of His shall be among those on whom Allâh has bestowed His blessings, namely, the prophets, the truthful, the}
\]

---

247 Sûrah Al-Hadîd, 57:20
witnesses, and the righteous. And excellent companions are these.248

The first verse speaks about people before the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, who believed in Allāh and His messengers and it is stated that they gained the status of the truthful and the witnesses. Comparatively, the second verse speaks about people after the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad and it is stated that those who obey Allāh and His Messenger, that is, the Holy Prophet Muhammad, can achieve the status of the prophets, the truthful, the witnesses, and the righteous. The word هم [hum] can only be translated as “among” in the first verse just as the word مع [ma’a ] can only be translated as “among” in the second verse. In both cases, the translation of “with” is not applicable.

A point to be noted here is that people before the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad were given these ranks directly by believing in Allāh and His messengers but after the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, they are awarded these ranks only through obedience to Allāh and His messenger, the Holy Prophet Muhammad.

Problems with Farhan Khan’s Arguments

There are numerous problems with Farhan Khan’s arguments against the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding of Sūrah An-Nisā’, 4:70. The first problem is that he has accused Ahmādī Muslims of making an attempt to take one specific contextual meaning of ma’a and applying it to other instances249

248 Sūrah An-Nisā’, 4:70
249 Khan, With Love, Page 6
but in reality it is quite the opposite. No one knows the Holy Qur’an better than Allāh Who revealed it. He, Himself, has made it clear that \textit{ma’a} means \textit{min} (among) by using \textit{min} in the same verse! As a result, Ahmadi Muslims do not conform the word \textit{ma’a} to mean \textit{min}. It is Allāh Who has done so!

Nevertheless, let us assume for a minute that Farhan Khan is right. What would be the meaning then? The answer is that the verse would then mean that those people who obey Allāh and His Messenger 	extsuperscript{sa} cannot become prophets and can only be \textit{with} the prophets; they cannot \textit{be} the truthful but \textit{be with} the truthful; they cannot \textit{be} the witnesses but only \textit{be with} the witnesses; and they cannot \textit{be} righteous but only \textit{be with} the righteous. In other words, in the \textit{ummah} of the Holy Prophet Muhammad 	extsuperscript{sa}, no one can become a righteous person, a witness, a truthful person, or a prophet. The application of these meanings to the Holy Qur’an is unacceptable and ridiculous and Farhan Khan does not address this argument in his entire chapter!

If Farhan Khan insists that this is about the union of the believers with the prophets, the truthful, the martyrs, and the righteous in the next life, the meaning would still be unacceptable! It would mean that within this life, there will be no righteous man in the nation of the Holy Prophet Muhammad 	extsuperscript{sa} and they can only be \textit{with} the righteous in the next life, God forbid!

The fact of the matter is that being righteous is the lowest of the four spiritual stages and if a person cannot be righteous in this life, how can he/she even enter into heaven? If one cannot achieve this lowest spiritual status in this life, then what is the benefit of being obedient to Allāh and His Messenger 	extsuperscript{sa}? What was the reason to reveal the verse? Such a meaning is unacceptable and should be discarded with those books which
present it! As opposed to that, the Ahmādī Muslims believe that a person can become righteous in *this world* by obeying Allāh and His Messengerṣa. Once he has become righteous, he can then progress to the higher spiritual stages mentioned in the verse.

As a result, we have no option but to conclude that just as people have been confounding truth with falsehood since time immemorial, the case of Farhan Khan’s book is no different. Allāh, the Exalted, forbids this in the Holy Qur’ān in these words:

> وَلَا تُلْسِمُوا الْحَقَّ بِالْبَاطِلَ وَتَكْتُمُوا الْحَقَّ وَأَتَّمُّ تَعْلَمُونَ

And confound not truth with falsehood nor hide the truth, knowingly.\(^{250}\)

Farhan Khan has done exactly what has been forbidden in the above verse. This is not simply a false allegation on Farhan Khan’s book. The fact of the matter is that his book is filled with dishonesties and fallacies and these have been mentioned throughout this book.

A second problem in his arguments for the topic under discussion is that he has presented a *hadīth*\(^{251}\) related to Thawbānra and laid the entire foundation of his argument on it but he cunningly chose not to give its reference. One wonders why? It may come as a surprise to the readers but that *hadīth* does not appear in any of the six authentic compilations of *ahādīth*. This appears to be the reason why he does not provide the reference. The compilers of the six authentic books of *ahādīth* did not find it authentic enough to include it in their

\(^{250}\) Sūrah Al-Baqarah, 2:43
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continuations. The reader is expected to take Farhan Khan’s word for it when, in reality, it seems to be an exercise meant to confound the truth with falsehood and this is against the very teachings of the Holy Qur’an. It also appears to be a deceptive tactic to misguide those individuals who have a very basic knowledge of their beliefs or those who may not find the time to do proper research to check the validity of Farhan Khan’s faulty claims.

The third problem with his arguments is that he considers that hadith to be informing us of the reason behind the revelation of Sūrah An-Nisā’, verse 70. This is absolutely faulty reasoning. Not only is that hadith too weak to be considered a reason for the revelation of 4:70, it is the practice of Allāh, the Exalted, to elucidate the reason for the revelation of particular verses Himself wherever He deems it necessary. If Allāh, the Exalted, does not provide the reason, it is not appropriate for us to go looking for those reasons in weak ahādīth. We should not try to confine the meanings of clear verses into specific contexts when Allāh, the Exalted, has not intended it Himself. Instead, we should accept the messages of the verses as they are presented. To illustrate this, here are a few examples from the Holy Qur’an:

\[
\text{إِلَّاٰ تَنْصُرُوهُ فَقُدْ نَصَرَهُ اللَّهُ إِذَ أَخْرَجَهُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا تَأْنِيَ اِلْتَّقُيَّينَ إِذِ هَمَا فِي الْقَادِرِ إِذْ يُتْفِكَرُ لِصَاحِبِهِ لَا تَحْزَنُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ مَعَنَا فَاتَّلَ اللَّهُ سُكِينَتَهُ عَلَيْهِ وَأَيْدَىٰ يَجْنُونَ لَمْ تَرَوهَا وَجَعَلَ كَلِمَةَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا السُّفْيَنَ وَكَلِمَةَ اللَّهِ هِيَ الْعَلِيَّةُ وَاللَّهُ عَزِيزٌ حكِيمٌ}
\]

If you help him not, then know that Allāh helped him even when the disbelievers drove him forth while he was one of the two when they were both in the cave,
when he said to his companion, “Grieve not, for Allāh is with us.” Then Allāh sent down His peace on him, and strengthened him with hosts which you did not see, and humbled the word of those who disbelieved, and it is the word of Allāh alone which is supreme. And Allāh is Mighty, Wise.252

It was necessary here for Allāh, the Exalted, to speak about a companion of the Holy Prophetṣa and the background to the statement made by the Holy Prophetṣa and that is why Allāh, the Exalted, chose to discuss it in the verse. Similarly, Allāh, the Exalted, mentions the “blind man” in the following verses because it was important to do so:

![Arabic text]

He frowned and turned aside, because there came to him the blind man.253

What follows is another example of Allāh, the Exalted, choosing to discuss three companions of the Holy Prophetṣa in the context of a revelation:

![Arabic text]

And He has turned with mercy to the three whose case was deferred, until the earth became too strait for them with all its vastness, and their souls were also

252 Sūrah At-Taubah, 9:40
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straitened for them, and they became convinced that there was no refuge from Allāh, save unto Himself. Then He turned to them with mercy that they might turn to Him. Surely, it is Allāh Who is Oft-Returning with compassion and is Merciful.254

There are many such examples in the Holy Qur‘ān where Allāh, the Exalted, Himself discusses the background or purpose of the revelation of certain verses. Comparatively, in 4:70, He chooses not to do that and it is clear that the meaning of that verse is not meant to be confined by a weak hadīth! It is meant to be taken as it is. It should also be noted here that the Holy Qur‘ān is the Last Book sent by Allāh, the Exalted, for the guidance of mankind and its commandments are applicable till the Last Day. Even those verses that are revealed after particular events in the life of the Holy Prophet Muhammad ṣa are applicable to all the people from the time of the Holy Prophet Muhammad ṣa till the Last Day. Hence, confining all or most of the verses of the Holy Qur‘ān to specific events – where Allāh has not done so himself – is not appropriate.

The fourth problem with Farhan Khan’s arguments is that he brings Tafsīr Ibn ‘Abbās ṣa in support of his points but in reality, this considerably weakens them. According to researchers, this tafsīr is filled with such narrators who are not truthful. For instance, it is stated:

وَمِنْ جُمْلَةِ التَّقَلِيدَاتِ الَّتِيْ لَا يُؤْثَرُ قَبْلُ يَهَا تَقْسِيمُ ابْنِ عَبَّاسِ ۚ فَأَنَّهُ مَرْوَى مِنْ طَرِيقِ الْكَذِّبِينَ

254 Sūrah At-Taubah, 9:118
255 Allāma Shaukāfī, Fawā‘id Al-Majmū‘ah fil-Ahādīth Al-Maudhū‘ah, Page 104
Tafsīr Ibn ‘Abbasra is one of the unreliable commentaries because it is narrated by great liars.

Imām Jalāl-ud-Dīn Suyūtīrh says:

هَذِهِ الْتَّفَاسِيرُ الطَّوَالُ أَلْتَيْ أَسْنَدُوهَا إِلَى ابْنِ عَبْـبَّاسِ غَيْرُ مَرَضِيَّةٍ وَرَوْاتِهَا مَجَاهِيْلٌ

These lengthy commentaries which are attributed to Ibn ‘Abbasra by the commentators are unwanted and their narrators are unreliable.

As a result, it is not only proven that Farhan Khan relied upon a very weak hadīth in support of his points, but he also brought a completely unauthentic commentary in support of them! Farhan Khan should bear in mind that:

ۚ يُرِيدُونَ لِيُطْفِئُوا نُورُ اللَّهِ بِآفَوْاهُمْ وَلَوْ نُورُهُ وَلَوْ كَرَهُ الْكُفَّارُۚ

They desire to extinguish the light of Allāh with the breath of their mouths, but Allāh will perfect His light, even if the disbelievers hate it.257

No matter how much people try to extinguish the light which has been kindled by Allāh, they will never succeed! It has been declared by Allāh:

ۚ كَتَبَ اللَّهُ لَأَجْلَبْنَآ أَنَا وَرَسُّلِيْنَ إِنَّ اللَّهَ قَوْىٞ غَزِيْرٞۚ

256 Tafsīr Itqāan, Volume 2, page 188
257 Sūrah As-Saff, 61:9
Allāh has decreed: ‘Most surely I will prevail, I and My messengers.’ Verily, Allāh is Powerful, Mighty.258

All that is decreed for the opposition of Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmadās, a messenger of Allāh, is despair, misery, and humiliating defeat.

The fifth problem with Farhan Khan’s arguments is that he quotes the following hadīth in support of his points:

I heard Allāh’s Apostle’sa saying, “No prophet gets sick but he is given the choice to select either this world or the Hereafter.” Ayeshaas added, “During his fatal illness, his voice became very husky and I heard him saying, ‘In the company of those whom is the Grace of Allāh, of the prophets, the siddīqīn, the martyrs, and the pious’ (4.69). And from this, I came to know that he had been given the option.”

From the above hadīth, Farhan Khan concludes that 4:70 is absolutely about the next life and it cannot possibly be about this life. However, the reality is that this hadīth, itself, categorically rejects his desired meaning. One should ask this simple question: When the Holy Prophet’sa recited this verse, was he a prophet at that time or not? If Farhan Khan’s meaning is applied, it would mean that the Holy Prophet’sa was not a prophet in this life but was only hoping to be with the prophets in the next life (نَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ مِن ذَالِكَ). No Muslim in the world, who truly loves the Holy Prophet’sa, will accept his meaning. Farhan Khan should have put some thought into this. His meanings are

---

258 Qur’ān 58:22
unacceptable as they are against the very nobility and respect of the greatest prophet – the Khātam-ul-Nabiyyīnṣa.

Commentary by Imām Rāghib

At the end of this chapter, we would like to point out that Imām Rāghib has supported the meaning of 4:70 as understood by the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at. It is stated in Tafsīr Bahr-ul-Muhīt:

And the statement of Allāh, the Exalted, “among those on whom Allāh has bestowed His blessings” comes in commentary of His statement, “The path of those upon whom Thou hast bestowed Thy blessings)... And it is clear that His statement, “from the nobility of the prophets” comes in commentary of “from among those who are the noble of the prophets”...
Allāh has bestowed His blessings). In other words, it has been stated that whoever obeys Allāh and the Messenger⁵⁹ from among you, Allāh, the Exalted, will include him in those people who were blessed by Allāh in earlier times. Imām Rāghib has written, “There are four groups of those who are blessed in respect of status and piety – the prophet with the prophet, and the siddīq with the siddīq, and the shahīd with the shahīd, and the sālih with the sālih. And Imām Rāghib has considered it possible that the prophets (of this ummah) are also included with the prophets, just as Allāh, the Exalted, has said, “ومن يطع الله و الرسول” (And whoso obeys Allāh and the Messenger⁵⁹) in the meaning of “من النبيين” (from the prophets) and from after them.²⁵⁹

It is clear from this statement that Imām Rāghib has said something completely in accord with the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding. This quotation has been presented to make it clear that this commentary is not something ‘new’ that the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at presents. It has been done by previous scholars of Islām as well.

Questions for Farhan Khan:

1. Why does he think Allāh, the Exalted, stated, “من النبيين” (from among the prophets), and not, “مع النبيين” (with the prophets), in 4:70?

²⁵⁹ Behr-ul-Muhīt, Volume 3, Page 287
2. Why does he think that Allāh, the Exalted, chose not to give the reason for the revelation of 4:70 which Farhan Khan provides when Allāh, the Exalted, has clearly done that for several other verses of the Qur’ān?

3. Why does he refuse to take 4:70 as it is, without confining its meanings based on a weak hadīth?

4. Does he believe that obedience to Allāh, the Exalted, and His Messenger cannot lead to one becoming truthful (siddīq) or witness (shahīd) or righteous (sālih) in this world?
Sūrah Al-‘Arāf, 7:36

O children of Adam! If messengers come to you from among yourselves, rehearsing My Signs unto you, then whoso shall fear God and do good deeds, on them shall come no fear nor shall they grieve.

Refuting Farhan Khan’s Argument

In his chapter on Sūrah Al-‘Arāf, verse 36, Farhan Khan makes another failed attempt to refute the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding of a verse which clearly supports the continuation of prophethood. His only response is, “It is referring to previous nations. This is clear upon further analysis of both the context of the verse and the language Allāh uses to address humanity... one must look at the verses before and the verses after this one to understand its context...”

In other words, according to Farhan Khan, wherever “اٰدَمَ (O Children of Adam) has been mentioned before and after verse 36 in Sūrah Al-A´rāf, it is only applicable to previous nations, not the Muslims. Let us take a look at verse 27 of Sūrah Al-A´rāf to see whether Farhan Khan’s claim makes any sense. Allāh, the Exalted, says:

260 Khan, With Love, Page 54
With Love to Muhammad(sa) the Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn

O children of Adam! We have indeed sent down to you raiment to cover your shame, and to be an elegant dress; but the raiment of righteousness — that is the best. That is one of the Signs of Allāh, that they may remember.261

According to Farhan Khan, Allāh, the Exalted, has sent down the raiment for previous nations, not for Muslims, and He has exhorted the previous nations to choose the raiment of righteousness, but not the Muslims. Then, in verse 28, Allāh says:

O children of Adam! Let not Satan seduce you, even as he turned your parents out of the garden, stripping them of their raiment that he might show them their shame. Truly he sees you, he and his tribe, from where you see them not. Surely, We have made satans friends for those who believe not.262

Farhan Khan’s understanding of the above verse would be that Satan can only seduce the previous nations, not the Muslims, and satans were made friends of the disbelievers of the previous

261 Sūrah Al-A’rāf, 7:27
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nations, but they were not made friends of those who rejected the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa. Such meanings and distortions of clear-cut messages of the Holy Qur’ān may only be acceptable to Farhan Khan but they are not acceptable to Ahmadī Muslims!

In addition, Allāh, the Exalted, uses the فعل مضارع (f‘ail mudhāri’) formation in the above verse while addressing the children of Adam which means that this still applies to everyone today and will be applicable to everyone until the Last Day. After that, in verse 32, Allāh, the Exalted, says:

وَأَاＸَشَْبُﻮْا وَّإِنَّهُ لَا يُحِبُّ الْمُسْرِفِينَ

O children of Adam! Look to your adornment at every time and place of worship, and eat and drink but exceed not the bounds; surely, He does not love those who exceed the bounds.263

If Farhan Khan’s understanding is applied, this commandment would only be meant for previous nations and Muslims do not have to follow this. How absurd! These are verses revealed by God and it is His responsibility to specify who is exempt from them. It is the height of shirk (or association of partners with God) to manipulate the words of God to suit one’s own predisposed beliefs. Farhan Khan – or anyone else for that matter – does not have the authority to arbitrarily decide to whom God’s verses apply as if God overlooked that key fact (God forbid).

If Farhan Khan’s understanding is given any credibility, there are many commandments of Allāh, the Exalted, in the

263 Sūrah Al-A‘rāf, 7:32
Holy Qur’ān which the Muslims would not need to follow. Consider the following commandment:

Did I not enjoin on you, O ye sons of Adam, that you worship not Satan — for he is to you an open enemy — And that you worship Me? This is the right path.264

All these verses need to be taken as they are and the ridiculous distortions of Farhan Khan should be discarded. These verses contain many commandments which the Muslims adhere to and follow, even today. The reality is that the whole of mankind is the progeny of Adam as and this includes the Muslims.

**Ahmadi Muslim Argument**

In verse 36 of Sūrah Al-A’rāf, the words “‘إِذَاْ يَأْتِيْتُكُمُ (If there come to you) are used by Allāh, the Exalted, and “‘إِذَاْ يَأْتِيْتُكُمُ” is فعل يَأْتِيْتُكُمُ مضارع موَّكَد بنون تقليبه (f’ail mudhāri’ mu’akkad binūn thaqīlah) – a grammatical structure used for present and future tenses with extra emphasis placed to point out the importance of the commandment. In other words, it means that prophets will surely come. Therefore, Allāh, the Exalted, gives the glad tidings in this verse that prophets will continue to come from among you and you should accept them. In our age, Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad as has come as a prophet, reciting many signs of Allāh unto us, and it is required from us to accept him.

264 Sūrah Yā Sīn, 36:61-62
A similar glad tiding is given in another verse of the Holy Qur’ān in a chapter where Allāh, the Exalted, has proclaimed many prophecies about the Latter Days. Allāh says:

ودَا الرَّسُلُ أَقْتَتَ

And when the messengers are made to appear at the appointed time.265

Ahmadī Muslims do not accept Farhan Khan’s meanings because he says no prophet can come whereas Allāh says prophets can come with the condition of complete obedience to Allāh and His Prophet Muhammadsa as foretold in the Holy Qur’ān (4:70).

Finally, it must be noted that Hazrat Imām Jalāl-ud-Dīn Suyūṭīrh has written the following about these verses in Sūrah Al-A‘rāf:

فَأَنَّهُ خَطَّابٌ لَّأَهْلِ ذِلَّكَ الرَّمَّانِ وَلَكِلٌّ مِنْ بَعْدِهِمْ

It is addressed to the people of that age and all the ages to come.

Therefore, Farhan Khan’s understanding is rejected based on its absurdity, disconnect with the language of the Qur’ān, Arabic grammar, context of the verse, and the explicit statement of Hazrat Imām Jalāl-ud-Dīn Suyūṭīrh.

Question for Farhan Khan:

1. Does he not believe that Muslims are the progeny of Adamas?

---
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And Joseph did come to you before with clear proofs, but you ceased not to be in doubt concerning that with which he came to you till, when he died, you said: ‘Allāh will never raise up a messenger after him.’ Thus does Allāh adjudge as lost those who transgress, and are doubters, those who dispute concerning the Signs of Allāh without any authority having come to them. Grievously hateful is this in the sight of Allāh and in the sight of those who believe. Thus does Allāh seal up the heart of every arrogant, haughty person.

**Ahmadi Muslim Argument**

In his chapter on Sūrah Al-Mu’min, verse 35, before a discussion of the Ahmadiyya Muslim argument, Farhan Khan writes, “This argument was presented in The True Meaning of Khatme Nubbuwat, an Urdu speech by [Hazrat] Mirzā Tāhir
Ahmad[rh].” After this, he describes it in his own words and fails to provide a proper quotation containing the argument. As a result, his rebuttal of the Ahmadiyya Muslim argument can be refuted here sufficiently by presenting the original quotation from the book:

Hence, the concept (of the end of prophethood after the passing away of a prophet) – which, according to the Qur’ān, dates back to the time of Hazrat Yusufas – is not new. It is not an innovation in the Muslim ummah. People may say this [principle] may apply till the time of the Holy Prophetas. After him, it is as if a new law was passed. The Holy Qur’ān, however, leaves no room for [such] doubt or misgivings. Hence, there is no question of one trying to defeat the Qur’ān with tricks of his mind. As a result, the same subject is discussed in another verse and it is a verse of Sūrah Al-Jinn, in which Allāh, the Exalted, says:

\[
\text{وَ أَنَّ خٰلِقَهُمَا عَلَى اللَّهِ شَطْنًا}
\]

When the Jinn had made the pledge of allegiance to the Holy Prophetas and were going back [home], they were saying to each other, “How foolish were our ancestors? They used to forge such big statements against Allāh, the Exalted, without any knowledge”. What were these statements? One such statement is as follows:

---
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That Allāh will never send anyone as a prophet. In reality, earlier peoples used to indulge in such foolish talk just as you indulge in today. You also say that God shall not send anyone now [as a prophet]. If, according to the ‘ulemā of today, this decree had changed in the time of the Holy Prophetṣa and the practise of sending no more prophets has been initiated [by Allāh, the Exalted], then what was the reason for God to say this in the Qur’ān? Instead, the reality is that Allāh, the Exalted, is saying this to the Holy Prophetṣa as a foolishness of the earlier peoples.270

This is the Ahmadiyya Muslim argument and this is what Farhan Khan should have refuted if he had been honest! It is surprising, even shocking, to see that he totally ignores the main argument and goes into a completely different discussion. Allāh, the Exalted, says in verses 35 and 36 of Sūrah Al-Mu’min that those people who think that prophethood has come to an end are “transgressors and doubters” and such a one is an “arrogant and haughty

**Question for Farhan Khan:**

1. Why did he hide the original argument presented by Hazrat Mirzā Tahir Ahmadrh and committed the straw man fallacy of refuting something that was a distorted

---

269 And indeed they thought, even as you think, that Allāh would never raise any Messenger. –Sūrah Al-Jinn, 72:8

270 Irfāne Khatme Nubuwwat, Page 347 [Translated from Urdu by the authors]
version of our position, and completely bypassing our main argument?
Other Verses on the Continuation of Prophethood

There are other verses of the Holy Qur’ān which prove the fact that prophethood continues, that is, prophets may come from among the followers of the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa. For instance, Allāh, the Exalted, states:

وَعِدَ أَخْذَ اللَّهُ مِيثَاقًا لَّمَّا أَنْتُكُمْ مِنْ كِتَابٍ وَحِكْمَةٍ حَمَّ جَاهِمَ
رَسُولٌ مُّصَدِّقٌ لَّمَا مَعَكُمْ لَوْ تَنْصُرُهُ بِهِ وَلَتَنْصُرُنَّهُ قَالَ (مُحَرِّرُ مُثْلِي)
وَأَحْدَثَمُ عَلَى ذِلَّكَ إِصْرَىٰ قَالُوا أَفْرَّنَا قَالَ فَأَسْتَوِيَتْ وَأَنَا مَعْكُمْ

And remember the time when Allāh took a covenant from the people through the prophets, saying: “Whatever I give you of the Book and Wisdom and then there comes to you a messenger, fulfilling that which is with you, you shall believe in him and help him.” And He said: “Do you agree, and do you accept the responsibility which I lay upon you in this matter?” They said, “We agree;” He said, “Then bear witness, and I am with you among the witnesses.”

This verse is known as the verse of “ميثاق النبيين” (The Covenant of the Prophets) and Hazrat Mirzā Tāhir Ahmadra, the 4th successor of the Promised Messiahṣa, explains it as follows:

The verse speaks of a covenant Allāh had taken from the People of the Book through their prophets. The covenant bound them to believe in all the messengers.

---

271 Sūrah Āle ‘Imrān, 3:82
coming to fulfill all that had been given to them of His Word and Wisdom and to help them in their mission. The verse also lays down that the people had solemnly agreed to abide by the covenant. Then He said to the people to bear witness to this covenant and that He too would bear witness along with them.\textsuperscript{272}

Similarly, Allāh, the Exalted, says in Sūrah Al-Ahzāb:

\[
\text{وَأَذَّ أَخْدَا مِنْ الْبَيِّنَاتِ مِيثَاقَهُمْ وَمِنْ نُوحٍ وَأَبِنَاءِهِمْ وَمُوسِىٞ}
\]

\[
\text{وَعِيسَى بِنِّيَّةِ وَأَخْدَا مِنْهُمْ مِيثَاقًا عَلَيْهِمَا لَّيْسَ مِيثَاقٌ صَدِيقٌ عَنْ صَدِيقٍ وَأَعَدَّ لِلْكَفَّارِ عَذَابًا آلِيمًاٞ}
\]

And remember when We took from the prophets their covenant, and from thee, and from Noah, and Abraham, and Moses, and Jesus, son of Mary, and We indeed took from them a solemn covenant; That He may question the truthful about their truthfulness. And for the disbelievers He has prepared a painful punishment.\textsuperscript{273}

Hazrat Mīrzā Tāhir Ahmad\textsuperscript{r}h explains the above verse as follows:

Here is another verse dealing with the covenant Allāh had taken from the prophets and, through them, from their peoples. The gist of the covenant was that if a future prophet came supporting what is contained in the Book and the Wisdom bestowed on

\textsuperscript{272} The True Meaning of Khatme Nubuwwat, Pages 58-59
\textsuperscript{273} Sūrah Al-Ahzāb, 33:8-9
them then the people should not oppose him but support him and assist him and believe in him. The prophets are being placed under obligation to enjoin their people not to reject a claimant to prophethood in the future who meets these criteria. What a remarkable covenant! Having said this, the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be on him) is addressed directly in this verse: “And remember when we took from the prophets their covenant, and from thee...”

That is to say the Holy Prophetṣa was pointedly charged with the responsibility to place his ummah under obligation to believe in the prophet appearing after him with the condition that this prophet would support the Book and Wisdom previously bestowed on the people and would devote himself to the service of the Faith. This covenant was taken from the Holy Prophetṣa even when the teaching and prophethood had achieved perfection.

Commenting on this verse, Allāma Fakhr-ud-Dīn Rāzī says in At-Tafsīr-ul-Kabīr, Volume 8, Page 114 (published in Tehran): “The only meaning of this verse is to clearly state that Allāh had made it incumbent on all prophets (and their followers) to believe in every prophet who comes ‘fulfilling that which is with them’.”

Allāma Rāzī has made a very subtle point. It means that as long as a Divine Dispensation remains operative and it is not abrogated by God, a false prophet would not come and work towards the

274 Ibid.
fulfillment and completion of the Divine Dispensation. A false prophet would come to work against the truth. [However] A claimant to prophethood who works in the service of the Faith must be fully supported by the people. The covenant is addressed to the prophets since they are the leaders of the people. The prophets themselves would never oppose the truth.275

As a result, it is clear that this covenant of prophethood was taken from the Holy Prophetṣa just as it was taken from all the other prophets and all those who believe in the Holy Prophetṣa are obliged to accept the prophethood of one who comes in support of the religion of Islām.

Another verse of the Holy Qur’ān which proves that prophethood continues is as follows:

الله يُضْطَفِي مِنَ المَلَائِكَةِ رَسُولاً وَمِنَ النَّاسِ إِنَّ اللَّهَ سَمِيعٌ بَصِيرٌ

Allāh chooses His messengers from among angels, and from among men. Surely, Allāh is All-Hearing, All-Seeing.276

God, the Almighty has used the word “يُضْطَفِي”, which is مضارع (f’ail mudhāri’) and, as explained earlier, this is used for present as well as future tenses. In other words, the verse means that Allāh, the Exalted, chooses and will continue to choose prophets from among the angels and the people. Hazrat Mirzā Tāhir Ahmad reports criticism comments on this verse in the following words:

275 The True Meaning of Khatme Nubuwwat, Page 59
276 Sūrah Al-Hajj, 22:76
According to our opponents, this verse was revealed after it had been pronounced that the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa} was ‘\textit{Khātam-an-Nabiyyīn}’ and no prophets were to come. However, the verse says “Allāh chooses His Messengers from among angels and from among men” instead of saying “Allāh used to choose His messengers...” This clearly means that prophethood has not been terminated. A proof to support our argument is seen in the Holy Qur’an where Allāh says with regards to Jesus and his mother “\textit{kāna yāklān} \textit{al-ṭūmān}” (they both used to eat food).\textsuperscript{277} It is a fundamental rule of grammar that present continuous cannot be used for an action that has come to an end. The Qur’an proves this here. So, in case Allāh Ta’ālā had totally stopped sending messengers from among men, He would have said so in the words, “\textit{kān allāh yustaffi min al-milākhat rasūlā min al-nāsur}” (Allāh used to choose His messengers from among angels, and from among men).

A prominent Shia commentator, Tibrisy, comments on this verse in his book, \textit{Majma’ul-Bayān} (Part 7, Page 96): “Allāh chooses His messengers from angels, that is, Gabriel and Michael, and from among men, that is, the prophets”. Here a mere messenger is not implied; instead, it refers to a Nabī.\textsuperscript{278}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{277} Sūrah Al-Mā’idah, 5:76
  \item \textsuperscript{278} \textit{The True Meaning of Khatme Nubuwwat}, Page 57
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Therefore, this verse only strengthens the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding that Allāh, the Exalted, can continue to choose prophets after the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa.

**Question for Farhan Khan:**

1. Why does he keep denying these numerous verses about the continuation of prophethood after the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa?
Continuation of Prophethood according to Ahādīth

“I am the Ākhir-ul-Anbiyā’ and my Mosque is the Ākhir-ul-Masājid”
Hazrat Abū Hurairah ra reported: “Prayer in the mosque of Allāh’s Messenger sa is more excellent than a thousand prayers in other mosques except the Masjid Al-Harām, for Allāh’s Messenger sa is the Ākhir-ul-Anbiyā’, and his mosque is the Ākhir-ul-Masājid”. Abū Salama and Abū ‘Abdullāh (two of the narrators in this chain of narrations) said: “We had no doubt that what Abū Hurairah ra had said was from Allāh’s Messenger sa, and so we did not like to get an attestation from Abū Hurairah ra about this hadīth until Abū Hurairah ra died. We discussed it (the issue of getting attestation from Abū Hurairah ra) amongst ourselves and blamed one another as to why we did not talk about it to Abū Hurairah ra so that he could attribute its transmission to Allāh’s Messenger sa in case he had heard it from him. While we were discussing it as we sat with ‘Abdullāh b. Ibrāhīm b. Qāriz, we made a mention of this hadīth, and our omission (in getting its attestation) about its direct transmission by Abū Hurairah from him (the Holy Prophet sa); thereupon, ‘Abdullāh b. Ibrāhīm said to us: ‘I bear witness to the fact that I heard Abū Hurairah ra say that Allāh’s Messenger sa said: ‘I am the Ākhir-ul-Anbiyā’ and my mosque is the Ākhir-ul-Masājid’.” 279

279 Sahih Muslim, Book 7, Chapter 90, Hadīth 3211
Ahmadi Muslim Argument

In order to see the Ahmadiyya Muslim point-of-view, let us first see how Hazrat Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mehmūd Ahmad, the second successor of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at, has presented the argument, something which Farhan Khan obviously fails to do:

It is also asserted that some sayings of the Holy Prophet are contrary to a belief in the continuity of prophethood. For instance, he said, “I am the last of the prophets,” and again: “There is no prophet after me.” From these sayings, it follows that there can be no prophet of any kind after the Holy Prophet! It is a pity that those who cite these sayings of the Holy Prophet forget that the words I am the last of the prophets are followed by the important words and my mosque is the last of the mosques. The whole saying is: “I am the last of the prophets and my mosque is the last of the mosques.” If, therefore, the Holy Prophet is literally the last of the prophets, then the mosque which he built in Medina is literally the last of the mosques. It would be wrong to build any mosque after the Holy Prophet’s mosque at Medina. But nobody sees any contradiction between the meaning put today on the first part of the saying and the meaning put on the second part of the same saying. The first part is taken to mean the termination of every kind of prophethood with the advent of the Holy Prophet. But the second part is not likewise taken to mean the end of mosque-building. Those very people who believe in the termination of
prophethood see no harm in building more mosques. In fact, their zeal for building mosques is excessive. There are towns which contain more mosques than are really required; many, therefore, remain without worshippers. In many towns mosques are to be found at short distances from each other, so that their superfluity is evident. If the expression *the last of the prophets* entails the abolition of prophethood, the expression *last of the mosques* must entail the abolition of mosque-building after the prophet’s mosque.

To be sure, solutions of this difficulty are attempted. It is said that mosques built by Muslims after the Holy Prophet’s time are mosques devoted to the form of worship instituted by the Holy Prophet. They are built for the same purpose as the Holy Prophet built the first mosque. Mosques built by Muslims, therefore, are the Prophet’s own mosques. They cannot be separated from the model which they imitate. Such mosques cannot and do not contradict the fact that the Prophet’s mosque is the last. The solution is a valid one. But it is equally valid to say that the expression *the last prophet* does not prohibit the coming of prophets who imitate the life and example of the Holy Prophet, teach nothing new, and only follow him and his teaching; who are charged with the duty of spreading the Holy Prophet’s teaching; who attribute their spiritual acquisitions including prophethood to the spiritual example and influence of their preceptor and master, the Holy Prophet. The coming of such prophets does not offend against the Holy Prophet’s prerogative as *the Last Prophet*, in the same way and
Continuation of Prophethood according to Ahādīth

for the same reason that the building of mosques today does not offend against the status of the Prophet’s mosque as *the Last Mosque.*

This is the irrefutable logic of the Ahmadiyya Muslim argument which Farhan Khan has tried to distort.

*Refuting Farhan Khan’s Argument*

In order to refute Farhan Khan’s argument, let us first understand the word “آخر” (ākhir). This word can be used in respect of time, area, and status, i.e. it can mean *last in terms of time,* or *last in terms of area,* or *last in terms of status.* As a result, there can only be three possibilities for the translation of the Holy Prophet’s words in the *hadīth* under discussion, that is, he is the last of the prophets in respect of time, or area, or status.

The Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at categorically rejects the notion that the Holy Prophetṣa could be the last prophet in respect of time because this would naturally cause us to reject the coming of the Latter Day prophet foretold by the Holy Prophetṣa himself. The Holy Prophetṣa could also not have been the last prophet in respect of area because it would not make sense. Hence, he can only be last in respect of status.

This belief is reinforced when one sees the rest of the *hadīth* without any predisposition to the belief in the “end” of prophethood. The complete statement of the Holy Prophetṣa is: “I am the ākhir of the prophets, and my mosque is the ākhir of the mosques.” The only logical conclusion is that the Holy Prophetṣa is using the word ākhir here in respect of status. In other words, his statement is, “I am the last of the prophets (in

---

280 *Invitation to Ahmadiyyat,* Part I, Pages 45-46
status) and my mosque is the last of the mosques (in status).” This understanding is supported by previous scholars as it has already been shown in the chapter *Opinions of the Sahāba, Ā’immah, and Mujaddidīn*. Other than those, Hazrat Abū ‘Abdullāh Muhammad bin ‘Alī Husain Al-Hakīm At-Tirmidhī writes:

The notion that the term *Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn* signifies that the Holy Prophetṣa was the Ākhir of the Prophets in terms of time – What glory is there in this [being the last]? And what wisdom underlies this [interpretation]? This interpretation is that of the foolish and the illiterate!²⁸¹

As a result, Ahmadī Muslims do not make such an interpretation which is devoid of purpose or meaning, and which does not glorify the status of the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa.

Second, Farhan Khan claims:

In the above Hadīth, the Prophetṣa is saying that after this masjid, referring to Masjid an-Nabawi, no masjid exists that holds special blessings from Allāh. Indeed, all masjids are blessed places in general, but no masjid, be it an ornate sanctuary for the worship of Allāh or a small tabernacle of mud and stone, carries any special significance over another except these

²⁸¹ *Khātm Al-Awliyā’,* Page 341
three holy sites. **Masjid an-Nabawi is the last of these types of masjids**”\(^{282}\)

The premise of the argument made by Farhan Khan is *exactly* the same as the premise used by Ahmadi Muslims to say that the Holy Prophet Muhammad\(^{sa}\) is the last of the prophets among the law-bearing prophets. There will be no new or old prophet after him in opposition to his law or having a status equal to or greater than him. Again, he writes, “المساجد (the masjids, plural) refers to the specific set of masjids, namely Masjid al-Aqsa, Masjid al-Harām, and Masjid al-Nabawi.”\(^{283}\) It is absurd how he uses this premise while criticizing the same premise used by Ahmadi Muslims! His arguments are self-destructive and actually promote the Ahmadiyya Muslim point-of-view.

Third, Farhan Khan says:

Before the advent of Islām, the pre-Islāmic Arabs would construct shrines and temples to honor the memory of a deceased person of high social or moral standing. The mushrikeen (polytheists) claimed that special barakah (blessings) exist at these locations, and those who frequent them would be blessed. This practice of creating “holy blessed sites” was terminated with Islām. The Prophet specified that only three special holy sites exist: first, Masjid al-Haram (in Makkah), second, Masjid al-Aqsa (in

---

\(^{282}\) Khan, *With Love*, Page 22

\(^{283}\) Ibid., Page 23
Jerusalem) and last, Masjid al-Nabawi (in Madinah).²⁸⁴

He then goes on to support his point with the following hadīth:

Qaza’ā Maulā (freed slave of) Ziyād said: “I heard Abū Sa‘īd Al-Khudrīra narrating four things from the Prophet⁵⁴ and I appreciated them very much. He said, conveying the words of the Prophet⁵⁴,
(1) ‘A woman should not go on a two-day journey except with her husband or a Dhī Mahram.
(2) No fasting is permissible on two days: ‘Īdul Fitr and ‘Īdul Adhā.
(3) No prayer after two prayers, i.e. after the Fajr prayer till the sun rises and after the ‘Asr prayer till the sun sets.
(4) Do not prepare yourself for a journey except to three Mosques: Al-Masjid-Al-Haram, the Mosque of Aqsa (Jerusalem), and my Mosque’.”²⁸⁵

Then, he says, “...the three masjids are specified as the only masjids worth traveling for and Masjid an-Nabawi is the آخَر (last) to be built.” This is a serious disaster in scholarship and is some of Khan’s most incoherent reasoning concocted in his book! He has tried to put together two completely unrelated statements of the Holy Prophet Muhammad⁵⁴ to reach a faulty conclusion! In an attempt to prove that the Holy Prophet⁵⁴ spoke of Masjid-an-Nabwī as the last mosque, he has presented a hadīth where the Holy Prophet⁵⁴ only happened to mention Masjid-an-Nabwī at the end of his sentence. There are other similar ahādīth

²⁸⁴ Ibid.
²⁸⁵ Sahih Bukhārī, Volume 2, Book 21, Hadīth Number 288
where the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa did not speak of Masjid-an-Nabwī as the last in a sequence. Consider the following ahādīth:

Hazrat Abū Hurairahra reported Allāh’s Messengerṣa as saying: “One should undertake journey to three mosques: the Mosque of the Ka’abah, my Mosque, and the Mosque of Eliā (Bait-ul-Muqaddas)”.286

Hazrat Abū Hurairahra reported it directly from Allāh’s Apostleṣa that he said: “Do not undertake journey but to three mosques: this Mosque of mine, the Mosque of Al-Haram and the Mosque of Aqsa (Bait-ul-Muqaddas)”.287

---

286 Sahih Muslim, Book 7, Hadith Number 3220
287 Sahih Muslim, Book 7, Hadith Number 3218
It is simply ridiculous to see Farhan Khan’s extraordinary bias against the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamāʿat. The above ahādīth are recorded right next to the hadīth under discussion, but Farhan Khan deliberately chose to not mention them. Instead, he went out of his way to select a narration where the sequence of his liking was found and he used that to prove his points. However, the truth is that the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa did not speak of Masjid-an-Nabwī as the last of the mosques in any of these narrations. He merely pointed out the importance of these three mosques, that is, Masjid-an-Nabwī, Masjid Al-Harām, and Bait-ul-Muqaddas, and he has spoken of them in different sequences. There are times when he mentioned Masjid-an-Nabwī first, and there are times when he mentioned it second, and there are times when he mentioned it last. What does this tell us? This tells us that he had no intention to speak of Masjid-an-Nabwī as the last mosque!

Fourth, Farhan Khan’s argument is inconsistent with the context of the hadīth under discussion. The Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa himself clarified that he is only speaking of mosques in respect of their greatness or status as indicated by the words:

صلاة في مسجد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم
أفضل من ألف صلاة فيما سواه من المساجد إلا المسجد الحرام

Prayer in the mosque of Allāh’s Messengerṣa is more excellent than a thousand prayers in other mosques, except the Masjid Al-Harām

Hence, he was speaking in terms of status and this clearly demonstrates that, later in the same narration, he used the word
ākhir in respect of status, not in respect of time or place. Farhan Khan’s objection to this understanding is, “...if آخر means best, as the Ahmadi Muslims say, and the Prophetṣa referred to his masjid as آخر المساجد, which would translate to mean best of the masjids, this would mean that prayer in the best of the masjids is rewarded less than prayer in Masjid al-Harām. This is a logical inconsistency.”

This is just another lame attempt to hopelessly try to invalidate the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding. Khan overlooks the fact that there is an exception here. Nevertheless, a general rule is a rule, regardless of the exceptions. We do not make up exceptions like Farhan Khan does, and in this case the Holy Prophetṣa himself makes the exception in the following words, making the meaning clear:

إِلَّا الْمَسْجِدُ الْحَرَامَ

...except the Masjid Al-Harām

The only exception from the masājids is the Masjid Al-Harām! Just as the statement, “Prayer in the mosque of Allāh’s Messengerṣa is more excellent than a thousand prayers in other mosques,” is not invalidated by the words, “except the Masjid Al-Harām,” in the same way the statement, “my mosque is the best of the mosques,” is not invalidated by the exception of Masjid Al-Harām. Consider the following similar hadith:

وَحَدَّثَنِي زَهْيَرُ بنُ حَرْبٍ وَمُحَمَّدُ بنُ الْمُشَيْثَي قَالَ أَخْبَرْنِي نَافِعٌ عَنْ يَحِيى وَهُوَ الْقَطَانُ عَنْ عَبْيَدِ اللَّهِ قَالَ أَخْبَرْنِي قَالَ الَّذِي قَالَ أَخْبَرْنِي نَافِعٌ عَنْ

288 Khan, With Love, Page 24
Ibn ‘Umarra reported Allāh’s Apostleṣa as saying: “Prayer in this mosque of mine is better than a thousand prayers (observed in other mosques) besides it, except that of Ṣaḥjid Al-Harām.²⁸⁹

It is very clear that whenever the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa spoke of his mosque as the best of the mosques, he only made one exception, that is, Ṣaḥjid Al-Harām. This exception does not invalidate the statement, “My mosque is the best of the mosques.”

Fifth, Farhan Khan supports his arguments with the following hadith:

أنا خاتم الانبياء ومسجدي خاتم مساجد الانبياء وأحق المساجد أن يزار ويشد إليه الرواح مسجد الحرام ومسجدي وصلاة في مسجدي أفضل من ألف صلاة فيما سواه إلا المسجد الحرام

²⁹⁰ (الديلمي وابن النجار - عن عائشة)

I am the best of the prophets, and my Mosque is the best of the mosques of the prophets, and the most worth of the mosques to be visited and for luggage to be tied up are the Ṣaḥjid Al-Harām and my Mosque

²⁸⁹ Sahih Muslim, Book 7, Hadith Number 3213

²⁹⁰ كنز عمال - فضل الحرمين والمسجد الاقصى من الاكمال - حديث 3333
and prayer in my Mosque is better than a thousand prayers (observed in other mosques) besides it, except the Masjid Al-Harām.291

This hadīth also invalidates Farhan Khan’s perspective in every way. It is clear that the Holy Prophetṣa is speaking of the status of his Mosque as indicated by the context in which the statement is being made. The Holy Prophetṣa says that his Mosque is the Khātam-ul-Masājid-ul-Anbiyā’ and as a tashrīḥ (or explanation), he says that prayers performed at his Mosque are a thousand times better than those performed at other mosques. The context itself shows that the idiomatic meaning of khātam, that is best, is being applied here. In other words, the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding is that the Mosque of the Holy Prophetṣa is the best in respect of the mosques before and after him.

On the flip side, if Farhan Khan’s meanings are taken, it would mean that after the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa, there are no more mosques of the prophets. This would mean that when Hazrat ‘Īsāṣ come in the Latter Days as a prophet for the Muslims, he would not be able to build any mosques! The moment he tries to build a mosque, people like Farhan Khan would cite the above hadīth saying that there are no more mosques of the prophets! No intelligent Muslim would ever accept such comedy!

Sixth, another objection to Farhan Khan’s understanding is the fact that the narrator of the hadīth is Hazrat Ayeshaṣ, and she herself did not consider Khātam-ul-Anbiyā’ to mean the Last of the prophets as shown by her statement:

291 Kanzul ‘Ummāl, Chapter: The Virtue of the two Sanctuaries and Masjid Al-Aqsā from completion, Hadith Number 34999
With Love to Muhammadṣa the Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn

قولوا إنّه خاتم الأنبياء ولا تقولوا لا نبي بعده
Say, “He is the Khātam-ul-Anbiyā’,” but do not say, “There is no prophet after him.”

She has categorically rejected Farhan Khan’s desired and concocted meanings. A more detailed discussion of this hadīth follows in the next section.

In conclusion, it can be understood that the Holy Prophetṣa spoke of the greatness of three mosques in the following order:

1. *Masjid Al-Harām* – the best and greatest mosque
2. *Masjid An-Nabwī* – the best of the mosques, except for *Masjid Al-Harām*
3. *Bait-ul-Muqaddas* – another mosque which the Muslims should visit.

This is how anyone, without preconceived notions and bias, would understand the statements of the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa. As a result, the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding is logical, simple, and straightforward, while Farhan Khan’s understanding requires lengthy, unnecessary interpretations and faulty conclusions.

**Questions for Farhan Khan:**

1. Why would the Holy Prophetṣa call his Mosque the last mosque in the same sentence where he is speaking of the greatness of his Mosque?
2. Why doesn’t he accept the logical conclusions drawn by the Ahmadi Muslims instead of going into extra-long
interpretations and re-interpretations to try to prove his biased opinion?

3. Does he believe that when Hazrat ‘Īsāas comes as a prophet, he cannot build any mosques?
Do not say: “There is no Prophet after him”

قولوا إِنّهُ خَاتِمُ الْأَنْبِيَّاَلَّوَلا تَقُولُوا لَا نَبِيٌّ بَعْدَهُ
Say, “He is the Khâtam-ul-Anbiyâ’,” but do not say, “There is no prophet after him.”

This statement has already been presented in the chapter entitled *Opinion of the Sahâba*, Ā’immah, and Mujaddidîn, along with the interpretations of the above hadîth by various scholars of Islâm, all of which support the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding. Farhan Khan tries to refute the Ahmadiyya Muslim view with a hadîth narrated by Hazrat Mughîrah ra which we thoroughly discussed in the chapter *The Death of Hazrat ‘Îsâ bin Mariam* as. No matter how hard Farhan Khan tries, the truth is that these statements do not support him at all and are completely consistent with the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding.

Farhan Khan’s only excuse is to bring the subject of the return of the Israelite prophet – Hazrat ‘Îsâ as – to prove his points. About that, it must first be noted that both Hazrat Ayesha ra and Hazrat Mughîrah ra believed in the death of Hazrat ‘Îsâ as. Hazrat Ayesha ra is reported to have said:

إنَّ عِيْسَى بْنُ مَرْيَمَ عَاشَ عَشَرِيَّنَ وَمِائَةَ سَنَةٍ
Surely, ‘Îsâ Ibn Mariam as lived for 120 years.292

Similarly, Hazrat Mughîrah ra is reported to have said:

---
292 Hijajul Kirâmah, Page 428, and Mawâhib Ad-Dunya, Volume 1, Page 42
Hazrat Mughirah\textsuperscript{ra} specifically chose the word “\textit{خارج}” (\textit{will appear}) instead of “\textit{نزل من السماء}” (\textit{will descend from heaven}) and this clearly shows that he did not believe that the Israelite \textit{\'Is\textsuperscript{as}} ascended bodily into the heavens, and therefore, must inevitably have died. Now it is left up to Farhan Khan to wait for a deceased Israelite prophet or accept the prophet who was sent by Allâh, the Exalted, from among the followers of the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{\textit{sa}}. One thing is certain – and Farhan Khan will also agree to this – that once a person dies, he never returns to this world. So, good luck!

Second, Farhan Khan accuses the Ahmad\textsuperscript{i} Muslims when he says, “…what they (Ahmad\textsuperscript{i} Muslims) conveniently fail to report is the Hadîth immediately below the Hadîth of A’isha\textsuperscript{ra} in \textit{Al-Dûr Al-Manthûr}, which explains the narration of Aisha\textsuperscript{ra}.”\textsuperscript{293} Not only is this untrue as shown in the chapter entitled \textit{The Death of Hazrat \textit{\'Is\textsuperscript{as}}}, it is completely illogical. Essentially, Farhan Khan is saying that a statement of Hazrat Ayesha\textsuperscript{ra} is explained by a statement of Hazrat Mughirah\textsuperscript{ra} when, in fact, both their statements are completely independent of each other.

Third, the absoluteness of Farhan Khan’s beliefs is utterly shattered when he says, “…Al-Mughirah preferred \textit{seal of the Prophets}, because \textit{no prophets after him} may create the impression that \textit{\'Es\textsuperscript{a} bin Mar\textsuperscript{i}am} will not return.”\textsuperscript{294} In his entire book, Farhan Khan has been emphasizing that there can be no more prophets \textit{whatsoever} after the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{\textit{sa}} but

\textsuperscript{293} Khan, \textit{With Love}, Page 9
\textsuperscript{294} Ibid., Page 10
here he admits that “no prophets after him” may create wrong impressions.

Fourth, another argument that we would like to address here has been given by Farhan Khan at certain occasions. He says that the Holy Prophet sa was the last prophet in the sense that he was the 124,000th prophet to come in the chain of prophets. Since Hazrat ‘Isa as came before the Holy Prophet Muhammad sa, it makes him the 123,999th prophet. Now, if he comes back after the Holy Prophet sa, he will still be the 123,999th prophet which will not conflict the position of the Holy Prophet sa as the last of the prophets. The response to this argument is something that could even be explained by a kindergarten student who can only count up to 10. One can even ask a 4 year old boy or girl to read the following in order to show him or her how Farhan Khan counts:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
10
9

After reading the above, he or she may not express his feelings in words but will surely think of Farhan Khan as a person who should be demoted to pre-school to learn how to count. Just as the digit 9 has to appear before 10 and after 8, the number 123,999 has to appear before 124,000. It cannot appear after it. Hence, this is only superficial gibberish that Farhan Khan has come up with in order to prove his points. Also, it is important
to understand that whatever is before 10, *even* if it comes after 10, it is *after* it, regardless. No word other than *after* applies. Whatever number is assigned to Hazrat ʿĪsāras, he comes *after* the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa as a prophet. Since he is dead and cannot return, another prophet must come in his stead *after* the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa.

**Question for Farhan Khan:**

1. Why is he subjecting a simple statement of Hazrat Ayesharas to his own distorted interpretations, when it can be understood simply as it stands?
“Had he Lived, he would have been a Prophet”

Hazrat Ibn ‘Abbās’sa narrated: “When Ibrāhīm, the son of the Prophetss of Allāh died, the Holy Prophetss performed his funeral prayer and said, ‘There is a maid for him in Paradise, and if he had lived, he would surely have become a prophet...’.”

This hadith about the Holy Prophet’ssa son, Ibrāhīm, is clear, absolute proof of the continuity of prophethood. However, Farhan Khan chooses to make certain criticisms, the first of which is as follows:

The entire statement is closed in an if-statement. An if-statement does not necessarily mean that something is possible... For example, in Sūrah Banī Isrā’īl, verse 43, Allāh says:

١٦٥ فَلَوَّ كَانَ مَعَهُ إِلَهَةٌ كَأَنَّ يَقُولُوْنَ إِذَا لَبِنَغُوا إِلَى ذِئْبِ الْعَرْشِ سَبِيلَاً

295 Ibn Mājah, Book: What is mentioned about the Funeral Prayer, Chapter: What is mentioned about the prayer for the son of the Prophetss of Allāh
Say, had there been other gods with Him, as they say, then they (idolaters) would have surely sought out a way to the Owner of the Throne.

Based on this verse, the Ahmādī [Muslims] would have to accept that it is possible for there to be other deities worthy of worship besides Allāh because the same if-statement is used.²⁹⁷

Again, as usual, Farhan Khan used his bias to make another straw man fallacy by attributing ridiculous beliefs to the Ahmādī Muslims while failing to address the actual argument.

*If-then statements* imply that if a certain condition were to exist, then a result would occur. Even if the *if condition* did not occur, it does not negate the truth of the *then result*. Ahmādī Muslims do not believe in hypothetical statements; however, if the statements come from God or the Prophet⁵⁴, they are stated with a purpose to guide us towards truth. The fact of the matter is that the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding is based on an “if-then statement,” which is perfectly logical. The Holy Prophet⁵⁴ did not say, “If... he would have been a prophet.” Instead, he said, “If he had lived, [then] he would surely have been a prophet.” In other words, in the mind of the Holy Prophet Muhammad⁵⁴, prophethood continues.

Second, Farhan Khan presents a verse of the Holy Qur‘ān, as shown above, to refute the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding, and to dupe a person who lacks knowledge of the Holy Qur‘ān or the Arabic language. However, to an honest person with knowledge of the Holy Qur‘ān and the Arabic language, it clearly demonstrates the devious way with which

²⁹⁷ Khan, With Love, Page 27
Farhan Khan has made his argument. The verse that he has presented is a perfect example of قياس مع الفارق, that is, to use an example in an argument which has nothing to do with the subject of discussion. If Farhan Khan has an objection to such “if-then statements,” then it is very likely he would not believe in the following verse of the Qur’ān:

وَلَوْ أَنْ تَبَشُّرُوهُمْ أَمَّنُوا وَاتَّقُوا لَمْ تَنْتَفِعِهِ مِنْ عِندِ اللَّهِ خَيرٍ

And if they had believed and acted righteously, better surely would have been the reward from Allāh.298

As a result, the Ahmadiyya Muslim understanding can be illustrated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If he had lived, [then] he would have been a prophet</td>
<td>Prophethood continues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If they believe and act righteously, [then] they will be rewarded from Allāh.</td>
<td>Allāh rewards the believers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Farhan Khan’s understanding can be summarized as follows:

298 Sūrah Al-Baqarah, 2:104
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If he had lived, [then] he would have been a prophet</td>
<td>Prophethood does not continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If they believe and act righteously, [then] they will be rewarded from Allāh.</td>
<td>Allāh does not reward the believers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No sane person would accept Farhan Khan’s conclusions!

Third, Farhan Khan writes, “It was the decree of Allāh that his son would pass away, thus proving that no more prophets could come.”

The response to this is given by Hazrat Mirzā Tāhir Ahmad in the following quotation:

The narration states, “Had he lived, he would have been a true prophet...”. Our opponent ‘ulemā’ make this criticism that the Holy Prophet sa has only said that if he remained alive, he would have been a prophet, but God caused him to die so that he does not remain alive to become a prophet. This is His wisdom. However, the truth of the matter is that this is entirely false! There is no wisdom in this! This is a gross attack on the eloquence of the Holy Prophet sa.

The background of this hadīth is that Hazrat Ibrāhīm died in the beginning of 9th Hijrah and the verse of Khātam-an-Nabiyyīn was revealed in 5th Hijrah.

---
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other words, the death of Hazrat Ibrāhīm occurred 4 years after the revelation of the verse of Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn. Now, an ordinary, dull person can understand that if the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa understood the verse of Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn to mean that every kind of prophethood has ended forever, he could never have made this statement, “If he had lived, he would have become a prophet.” He could have said, “He did not remain alive so that he does not become a prophet,” but he did not say this. Instead, he said, “If he had lived, he would have become a prophet,” even though he should have said, “If Ibrāhīm lived for a thousand years, he would not have been a prophet.” This is because a prophet, who has been told that no prophet shall come after him till the Day of Judgement, can only say at the most, at the time of the death of his son in front of him, that, “He was a good and pious boy, but since my God has told me that no prophet shall come in this ummah, as long as this child had remained alive, he would not have become a prophet.” This would have been his statement, but he did not say this.

Other than that, there is another narration, and it is very interesting. In it, the issue of ba‘ad has been ended completely. Hazrat ‘Alī bin Abī Tālibra narrates:

قال لما توفي إبراهيم ارسل النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أمه ماريه وجنايته وغسلته وكفنته وخرج به وخرج الناس معه فدفنه ودخل النبی صلى
Hazrat ‘Ali ra narrates that when the son of the Holy Prophet sa, Ibrāhīm, died, he sent a message to his mother, Maria, to prepare for the funeral. Hence, she bathed Ibrāhīm and wrapped him in the shroud. Thereafter, the Holy Prophet sa brought the body out with his companions, buried him in the cemetery, and placed his hand on the grave and said, “By God, he is a prophet, the son of a prophet.”

Since Hazrat ‘Ali ra was a member of the household, his narration is clearer and has details of the actual event.

This event took place about 4 years after the revelation of the verse of Khātam-an-Nabiyyīn… What do the scholars conclude from this? Hazrat Mullā ‘Alī Qārī th said:

وَمَعَ هَذَا لَوْ عَاشَ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَصَارَ نَبِيًا وَكَذَا لَوْ صَارَ عُمَّرُ نَبِيًا لَكَانَا مِنْ أَتْبَاعِهِ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ كَعِيسَى وَالخَضْرُ وَالْيَاسِ عَلَيْهِمْ السَّلَامُ فَلَا يَنْقَضِ بِقَوْله تَعَالَى خَاتَمُ النَّبِيَّينَ أَذَا الْمَعْنِىِّ الَّذِيْ لَا يَاتِى نَبِيٍّ بَعْدَهُ يَنْسُخُ مَلَتَهُ وَلَمْ يَكْنَ مِنْ أَمْتِهِ

If Ibrāhīm had lived and become a prophet [and] if ‘Umar had also become a prophet, then both would have been from the followers of the Holy Prophetṣa, just like ‘Īsā, Khidr, and Ilyās (peace be on them). Hence, this is not against the saying of Allāh, the Exalted, “Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn,” because it means that there will be no such prophet after him who ends his religion and is not from his ummah.\(^{301}\)\(^{302}\)

It should now be clear that Farhan Khan’s excuse is meaningless and only born out of his bias. He should bear in mind that selective obedience to some ahādīth while disregard for others leads to disobedience of the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa!

**Questions for Farhan Khan:**

1. Does he disregard the conclusions drawn from all the if-then statements of the Holy Qur’ān?
2. Why does he highlight certain ahādīth as a basis of his faith while totally ignoring ahādīth like the ones about Ibrāhīm, the son of the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa?
3. If the Holy Prophetṣa really believed in the end of prophethood of every kind, why did he not clearly say, “Ibrāhīm died so that he does not become a prophet,” instead of saying something that indicates the continuity of prophethood?
4. Why does he not accept this hadīth as-is instead of going into lengthy interpretations?

---

\(^{301}\) Maudhuʿāt Kabīr Arabī, Pages 58-59

\(^{302}\) Irfān Khatme Nubuwwat, Page 358-360 [Translated by the authors]
Other Ahādīth on the Continuation of Prophethood

There are other ahādīth which prove the fact that prophethood continues after the Holy Prophet Muhammad sa. For instance, about Hazrat Abū Bakr ra, the Holy Prophet Muhammad sa said:

َبِهِنَا ۚ أَبُوبِكْرَ أَفْضَلُ هَذِهِ النَّاسِ إِلَّا أَنْ يَكُونَ نَبِيٌّ
Abū Bakr ra is best in this ummah, except that there comes a prophet [who will be better than him].

َبِهِنَا ۖ أَبُوبِكْرَ خَيْرُ النَّاسِ إِلَّا أَنْ يَكُونَ نَبِيٌّ
Abū Bakr ra is best of people, except that there comes a prophet [who will be better than him].

If, according to the Holy Prophet Muhammad sa, there was never going to be a prophet after him, he would not have made an exception in the words, “لا أن يكون نبيّ” (except that there comes a prophet). The Holy Prophet sa is simply saying that if a prophet comes from the ummah, his status would be greater than that of Hazrat Abū Bakr ra. With that exception in mind, Abū Bakr ra is the best of the people or the best person in the ummah.

Another hadith which speaks about the continuity of prophethood is as follows:

---
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304 Tibrānī wa Ibn ‘Adī Fil-Kāhil, quoted from: Jāmi’ Al-Saghīr As-Suyūtī, Page 5
There shall remain in you prophethood as long as Allāh wills.... Then there will be Khilāfah upon the footsteps of prophethood as long as Allāh wills... Then there will be kingdom and it shall remain as long as Allāh wills... Then there will be Khilāfah upon the footsteps of prophethood.\textsuperscript{306}

The last portion of this hadīth specifically mentions that Khilāfah shall be established upon the footsteps of prophethood. In other words, just as Khilāfah was established upon the footsteps of the prophethood of the Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa}, the Khilāfah of the Latter Days was also meant to be established on the footsteps of prophethood. As a result, the Khilāfah of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at has already been established on the footsteps of the prophethood of Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad\textsuperscript{as}.

**Question for Farhan Khan:**

1. Why does he hide or make ridiculous interpretations and re-interpretations of all these ahādīth about the continuity of prophethood?
Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiānī as came as a prophet of Allāh, the Exalted, and as the Promised Messiah and Imām Mahdī, whose advent had long been awaited by the Muslims. His claims are exactly in accordance with the criteria set by the Holy Qur’ān and he fulfilled all the signs of his arrival recorded in authentic ahādīth. Acceptance of the Messiah of the Latter Days has been emphasized in countless traditions of the Holy Prophet Muhammad sa and disbelieving in him amounts to disregard for those traditions. For instance, the Holy Prophet sa is reported to have said:

فاذًا رأيتموه فبايعوه ولو حبوًا على الثلج فانه خليفة الله المهدي٣٠٧

“When you see him, offer allegiance to him even if (you have to go) on your knees over snow-covered
mountains because he is the *Khalīfa of Allāh, the Mahdī*.\(^{308}\)

We call upon all the Muslims of the world to accept this Messiah who has been sent by God and to embrace Ahmadiyya as the True Islām and become united as one under the banner of a single leader – a single *Khalīfa*. It is an Islām not based on sects, division, disunity, hatred, violence and disharmony, but an Islām based on *Love for All, Hatred for None*.

*But what about the return of ‘Īsā bin Mariam\(^{\text{as}}\)?*

For many Muslims, the main obstacle to the acceptance of Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad\(^{\text{as}}\) as the Promised Messiah is the belief and expectation that Hazrat ‘Īsā\(^{\text{as}}\) shall bodily descend from heaven. We would like to humbly convey to them this message that Hazrat ‘Īsā\(^{\text{as}}\) is dead according to several verses of the Holy Qur’ān, *ahādīth*, and historical proofs. We encourage them to research this issue and a great place to start is the book “Jesus in India”\(^{309}\) written by Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad\(^{\text{as}}\).

*How do I know if Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad \(^{\text{as}}\) is true?*

After learning that Hazrat ‘Īsā\(^{\text{as}}\) is dead and cannot come back to this world, the most logical question that arises is regarding the truth of Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad\(^{\text{as}}\). We encourage the reader to research this issue and we humbly suggest that he or she can begin by reading the book “Invitation

\(^{308}\) *Ibn Mājah*, The Book of Trials, Chapter: The coming of the Mahdī

to Ahmadiyyat” written by Hazrat Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd Ahmad, the Second Successor of the Promised Messiah. This book shall, Inshā’ Allāh, help him or her understand the claims of Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad and learn about the proofs of his truth.

**The Anti-Ahmadiyya Campaigns**

It has long been the custom of man to oppose a prophet and his community. This custom has continued to this day with the presence of the anti-Ahmadiyya hate campaigns against the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at. In recent years, as an outlet for their envy, they have hopelessly and desperately used the internet as another tool to spread hate-filled propaganda against the Promised Messiah, his successors, and the system of Khilāfah. However, the authors can declare from personal experience that most of that information is completely false, and whatever is true is presented in cunningly distorted ways for the sole purpose of deception. We encourage the readers to visit [www.alislam.org](http://www.alislam.org) to see the true face of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at and learn its history, beliefs, and achievements.

A common stereotype used by the opponents of the community is to dismiss it as a small group from the Indo-Pak subcontinent, similar to the way Farhan Khan portrays the community in the words, “Most Ahmadi [Muslims] stem from the Indian sub-continent...” This is a common stereotype held against the community but the truth is that this community is established in 204 countries and present on all continents of the world.

---

310 This book is available at: [http://www.alislam.org/books/invitation/index.html](http://www.alislam.org/books/invitation/index.html)
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world, with membership spanning across various ethnicities, races, and cultures.

_The Revival of Islâm_

The main goal of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamâ’at is to revive Islâm and regain its glory and greatness of its early days. Over the course of its history, the community has built over 15,000 mosques, over 500 schools, and over 30 hospitals. It has translated the Holy Qur’ân into over 70 languages, and it runs a 24-hour satellite channel, MTA – Muslim Television Ahmadiyya, for the propagation of the true teachings of Islâm and the message of peace and tolerance. It has also greatly contributed to humanitarian aid by working with an independent charitable organization, Humanity First.

>Contact Information

The authors can be contacted as follows:

Farhan Iqbal:
farhan.iqbal@ahmadiyya.ca
Twitter: @FarhanIqbal1

Imtiaz Ahmed Sra:
imtiaz.ahmed@ahmadiyya.ca
Twitter: @ImtiazAhmedSraa

We pray that Allâh, the Exalted, may make this book a source of guidance for the Muslims and enable them to see the truth of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamâ’at and lead to their acceptance of the Promised Messiah and Imâm Mahdî as! Āmin! Thumma Āmin!
We also pray that Allāh, the Exalted, may make it a resource that Ahmadī Muslims are able to use for the exposition as well as the defence of the Ahmadiyya Muslim position. Āmīn!
Appendix I: Sayings of the Promised Messiah as on the Finality of Prophethood

Below are a series of quotations of Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiānī as, the Promised Messiah and Imām Mahdī, on the issue of the finality of prophethood. They expound his stance on this issue and serve to dispel misconceptions and misunderstandings about his writings that are spread by the anti-Ahmadiyya.

My critic has further objected that God Almighty has said:

\[
\text{اَﻟْﻴَﻮْمَ اَﻟْﻠَّهُ ﺃُﻛْرِمَ ﻟُكمَ ﺪِينُكمَ وَأَتْمِمَ ﻋَلِيكمَ نَعْمَتِي وَرَضَيْتُ ﻟُكمَ ﺔِﺳْﻼَمَ ﺪِينًا}
\]

Therefore no reformer or prophet is now needed. In so thinking the critic has raised an objection against the Holy Qur’ān itself, inasmuch as the Holy Qur’ān has promised the appointment of successors from among the Muslims and has said that through them faith would be strengthened, doubts would be set at rest and security would be restored after a state of fear. Thus, if

\footnote{312 ‘This day have I perfected your religion for you and completed My favour upon you.’—Sūrah Al-Mā’īdah, 5:4}
nothing is permissible after the perfection of the Faith [i.e., Islām], then, according to the critic, the Khilāfah that continued for thirty years after the Holy Prophet's death would also be rendered unnecessary, as the Faith had been perfected and nothing more was needed.

The citation of the verse 313 אֱלֹיָֽוּם אָמַּלְתָּ לְפַנְּיָֽךְ by the critic is out of place. We do not allege that a reformer or a muhaddath detracts anything from the Faith or adds anything to it. What we say is that when, after the lapse of time, the holy teaching of the Faith is covered with the dust of wrong thinking and the pure countenance of truth becomes hidden, then reformers, muhaddathīn and spiritual successors appear to reveal the true and beautiful countenance of the Faith.

We do not know whence our poor critic has learnt that reformers and spiritual successors arrive for the purpose of adding to or abrogating the Faith. Their purpose is not to abrogate but to display the light and brilliance of the Faith. The conception of the critic that there is no such need reveals that he does not have much regard for the Faith. He has never reflected on what Islām is, what its progress signifies, how its real progress can be achieved, and who can be considered a true Muslim. That is why he considers it enough that the Holy Qur‘ān being available, and there being a plethora of divines, the hearts of most people are automatically drawn to Islām and no reformer is needed. He does not appreciate the fact that reformers and spiritual successors are needed among the Muslims, in the same way as prophets are needed among other people. It cannot be denied that Moses (peace be upon him) was a prophet and a messenger and that the Torah was a complete code for the children of Israel; and just as the Holy Qur‘ān
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contains the verse so does the Torah contain verses to the effect that the children of Israel have been given a perfect and glorious Book. The Holy Qur'an also describes the Torah as such. Yet hundreds of prophets appeared among the children of Israel after the Torah, who brought no new book and whose function was to pull people who had departed from the teachings of the Torah back to it and to purify the hearts of those who had been afflicted with doubts, atheism and lack of faith. God the Exalted has affirmed in the Holy Qur'an:

\[
\text{وَلَقَدْ أَنْبِئْنَاهُ مُوسَىَ الْكِتَابَ وَقَضَيْنَآ مِنْ بَعْضِهِ بِالرَّسُلِ}
\]

That is: ‘We bestowed the Torah upon Moses and thereafter sent many messengers in its support and to testify to its truth.’

\[
\text{وَمُرْسَلَتُنَا رُسُلَتَا تَتَّرَا}
\]

That is: ‘Then, We sent Our messengers one after the other.’

All these verses show that it is the way of Allāh that after sending down His Book He sends prophets in support of it. In support of the Torah sometimes as many as four hundred prophets were sent at one and the same time; as testified by the Bible.

The reason for sending so many prophets is that God Almighty has warned emphatically that abiding hell is the punishment for denial of His Book; as is said:

\[
\text{وَالَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا وَكَذَّبُوا بِآيَاتِنَا أُلْلَهُ أُصْحَبُ النَّارِ هُمْ فِيهَا خَلْدُونَ}
\]

\[
\text{Ibid.}
\]
\[
\text{Sūrah Al-Baqarah, 2:88}
\]
\[
\text{Sūrah Al-Mu’minūn, 23:45}
\]
This means that: ‘Those who are disbelievers and reject Our signs are condemned to the fire and shall abide therein forever.’

Thus, as the punishment of rejection of a Divine Book is so severe and the phenomenon of prophethood and divine revelation is so difficult of comprehension, indeed God Almighty Himself is so transcendent that unless the human eye is illumined by divine light it is not possible to achieve true and holy comprehension of Him, let alone the comprehension of prophets and divine books, therefore, the Rahmāniyyah of God demanded that His blind and unseeing creatures should be helped very greatly, and it should not be considered enough that a messenger and a Book having been sent, thereafter, despite the passage of a long period of time, the disbelievers may be committed to the everlasting torment of hell on account of the denial of such doctrines as later generations can comprehend as merely pure and excellent statements.

It should be clear to a thoughtful person that God, Who is Rahmān [Gracious] and Rahīm [Merciful], cannot, without convincing explanation, prescribe so great a punishment as condemnation to everlasting hell for people of different countries who have heard of the Qur’ān and of the Holy Prophetsa after centuries and who, not being proficient in Arabic, cannot perceive the excellence of the Holy Qur’ān. Nor can human conscience reconcile itself to the fact that a person may be condemned without being convinced that the Holy Qur’ān is the Word of God. That is why God Almighty has promised that He will continue to appoint vicegerents so that they, being invested reflectively with the lights of prophethood, should demonstrate the excellences of the Holy Qur’ān and its holy

317 Sūrah Al-Baqarah, 2:40
blessings to the people and thus make them responsible for believing in it and acting upon it.

It should also be remembered that such exposition has to adopt different forms in every age, and that a reformer is equipped with the faculties, capacities and qualities which are suited to the reform of the mischief which is current in his time. Thus, God Almighty will ever continue to do so, as long as He wills, so that reform and virtue may continue to flourish. These statements are not without proof and are testified by an unbroken series of precedents.

Apart from the prophets, messengers and muhaddathin who appeared at different times in different countries, if one takes into account only those who appeared in Israel, it would be discovered that in the fourteen centuries between Moses and Jesus, thousands of prophets and muhaddathin appeared and occupied themselves diligently in the service of the Torah. The Holy Qur’ān and the Bible both testify to this. Those prophets brought no new book and taught no new faith. They only served the Torah. They appeared whenever atheism, disbelief, misconduct, and hard-heartedness became prevalent in Israel.

It is a point to ponder that the Law of Moses was limited in its scope and was not meant for the whole of mankind, nor was it to last forever, yet God Almighty took care to send thousands of prophets for the revival of that law and those prophets exhibited such signs as enabled the children of Israel to behold God afresh. Then how can it be that Muslims, who have been designated the best of people, and are attached to the Best of the prophets (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) be accounted so unfortunate that God Almighty looked at them with mercy only for thirty years and after exhibiting heavenly lights to them during that time, turned His face away from
them. Centuries passed after the departure of the Holy Prophet s.a., and thousands of disorders arose, and great earthquakes were felt, and diverse forms of corruption spread, and a whole world mounted attacks against Islām, and all its blessings and miracles were denied, and that which was acceptable was declared unacceptable, and yet God Almighty never again looked upon the Muslims nor had mercy on them, nor did He consider that the Muslims were also weak human beings and, like the children of Israel, their plants also were in need of heavenly water. Could the Beneficent God, Who had sent the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) to remove all corruption forever, turn away from the Muslims like this? Can we conceive that God Almighty was so Merciful towards previous people and, having revealed the Torah, sent thousands of prophets and muhaddathīn in support of the Torah and for the repeated revival of the hearts of the children of Israel, but that the Muslims were subject to His Wrath and, therefore, after the revelation of the Holy Qur’ān, He forgot them and left them forever to the reasoning and deduction of clerics? God clearly stated concerning Moses a.s:

318 Sūrah An-Nisā’, 4:165
319 Sūrah An-Nisā’, 4:166

That is to say: ‘Allāh spoke to Moses a.s’ and ‘sent messengers bearing glad tidings as well as warnings to help him and to testify to his truth, so that people may not have any excuse after
that, and, after witnessing a host of prophets, should believe in the Torah with all their heart.’

Then He says:

\[
\text{وَرُسُالتُ قَدْ قَصَصْتُهُمُ عَلَيْكَ مِنْ قَبْلُ وَرُسُالتُ لَمْ تُقَصِّصْتُهُمِ عَلَيْكَ}
\]

That is: ‘We sent many messengers before thee, some of whom We have mentioned to thee and some We have not so mentioned.’

But God made no such arrangement for the Muslims and withheld from them the Mercy and Grace He had bestowed upon the people of Moses as! It is obvious that, with the passage of time, previous miracles and wonders became mere tales. Succeeding generations, finding themselves bereft of all such wonders, begin to entertain doubts about miracles and extraordinary happenings. Having the example of thousands of prophets of Israel before them, the Muslims would be disheartened and, considering themselves unfortunate, would either envy the children of Israel or would consider the history of Israel also a chain of imaginary tales. It is idle to assert that, as there have been thousands of prophets and many miracles have been shown in the past, the Muslims were in no need of extraordinary events and wonders and blessings and that is why God Almighty held everything of that kind back from the Muslims. This is the kind of thing that is asserted by those who have no regard for the Faith. Man is very weak and always needs strengthening of faith. In this respect no help can be derived from self-conceived arguments. It is necessary to realize afresh that God exists. False belief, which is not effective in

\[320\text{ Sūrah An-Nisā’, 4:165}\]
restraining a person from misconduct, may however, continue to exist as a matter of speculation and form.

**Need for Reformers after the Perfection of Faith**

It should be remembered that the perfection of faith does not dispense with the need of safeguarding it. For instance, if a person builds a house, sets all its rooms in order and fills all the needs relating to its structure, and, after a long time, dust settles on it because of rains and dust storms, and its beauty is covered up; if, at such a time, a person who inherits this house wishes to undertake its cleaning and whitewashing, would this not be the height of folly to stop him from doing so for the reason that the house had been completed long ago? These people do not reflect that the completion of a structure is one thing and its seasonal cleaning is quite another. It should be remembered that reformers do not add anything to or subtract anything from the faith. They restore to the hearts that which had been lost. To assert that it is not necessary to believe in reformers is disobedience of a Divine Command. He has directed:

\[
\text{وَمَنْ كَفَرَ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ فَأَوَلَىِّكُمْ هُمُ الْفَسَّٰقُونَ}
\]

‘Whoever rejects the Khulafā’, after they have been sent, is indeed from amongst the sinners.’

To summarise, it was necessary that after the death of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) reformers should have appeared among the Muslims at times of disorder and trials, who should have been entrusted with one of the functions of the prophets, namely that they should call men to

---
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the true faith and remove all innovations and exhibit the truth
of the Faith from every point-of-view with the help of heavenly
light and invite people to truth, love and piety by the force of
their example. The reasons for this are:

Firstly, reason affirms that matters relating to God and
the hereafter are very fine and imperceptible. One has to believe
in the unseen and the supernatural. No one has ever seen God
Almighty or observed heaven and hell, or met the angels. What
is more, Divine Commandments are opposed to the desires of
the ego and restrain from that in which the ego delights. There
therefore it is necessary that either the prophets of God, who
bring the law and the Book and possess spiritual power, should
live long and continue to bless their followers in each century
with their company, and should train them under their own
graceful supervision and convey to them the blessing, light and
spiritual comprehension which they had done in the early part
of their ministry. Or, if that should not be possible, then their
spiritual heirs, who are equipped with their high qualities and
can set forth the verities and insights comprised in the Divine
Book under the guidance of revelation, and can illustrate in
practice that which is related to the past and can lead a seeker
after truth to certainty, must continue to appear in times of
trouble and trials so that man who is afflicted with doubt and
forgetfulness should not be deprived of the true grace of the
prophets.

It is obvious that when the time of a prophet comes to an
end, and those who have witnessed his blessings pass away,
their experiences become tales in the eyes of the people of the
next generation. The moral qualities of the prophet, his worship,
his steadfastness, his devotion, Divine support, extraordinary
events, and miracles which testified to his prophethood and the
truth of his claim become fictional in the estimation of
subsequent generations. Therefore, the freshness of the Faith and the eagerness of obedience that are the characteristics of those who are favored with the company of the prophet are not found in those who come after them. It is clear that the kind of sincerity and devotion with which the companions of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) sacrificed their wealth, lives, and honor in the cause of Islām were not to be found even among the second century Muslims, let alone Muslims of subsequent centuries. Why was this so? It was because the companions, may Allāh be pleased with them, had beheld the countenance of the true one, whose love for Allāh was so spontaneously testified even by the disbelieving Quraish. These people, observing his daily supplications, his loving prostrations, his condition of complete obedience, the bright signs of perfect love and devotion on his countenance, and the rain of Divine light on his face, were compelled to affirm:

عَشِيقَ مُحَمَّدٍ عَلَى رَبِّه
‘Muhammad has fallen in love with his Lord.’

The companions not only observed the devotion, love and sincerity which surged up in the heart of our lord and master Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) like a raging ocean, they also observed God Almighty’s love for him, in the guise of extraordinary support and help. Then they realized that God exists and their hearts testified that He stood by the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him). They had witnessed so many Divine wonders and so many heavenly signs that they were left in no doubt about the existence of a Supreme Being Who is God, Who controls everything and for Whom nothing is impossible. That is why
they exhibited such devotion and made such sacrifices as are not possible for anyone until all his doubts have been resolved. They realized that to win His pleasure it was necessary to accept Islām and to obey the Holy Prophet ṣa with complete sincerity. After this absolute certainty, the kind of obedience they exhibited and the feats they performed and the manner in which they laid down their lives at the feet of their Holy Preceptor, were matters which were not possible for anyone who had not witnessed what the companions had witnessed.

Such high qualities cannot be developed and salvation cannot be truly achieved without such means. It is, therefore, necessary that the Beneficent God Who has invited everyone to salvation should make a similar arrangement in every century so that His creatures should not fail in any age to attain the stage of absolute certainty.

**Need of the Company of the Righteous**

The affirmation that the Holy Qur’ān and the ahādīth alone suffice us and that we do not need the company of the righteous is opposed to the teachings of the Holy Qur’ān, as Allāh the Exalted has said:

322 َوَكُونُوا مَعَ الصَّدِيقِينَ

The truthful are those who have recognized the truth through their spiritual insight and are devoted to it. This high grade of spiritual insight cannot be achieved unless heavenly guidance conveys a seeker to the stage of certainty by experience. In this sense the truly righteous are the prophets, the messengers, the muhaddathīn and the perfect auliya’ who are guided by heavenly light and who behold God Almighty with the sight of certainty

322 ‘And be with the truthful.’—Sūrah At-Taubah, 9:119
in this very world. The verse that we have just quoted indicates that the world is never left without the truthful, as the commandment كُونُوا مَعَ الْضَّدِّيْنِ necessitates the presence of the truthful at all times.

Besides, observation confirms that the learning and knowledge of those who do not seek the company of the righteous does not help to rid them of their physical passions, and that they do not achieve even that minimum status in Islām which generates the certainty of belief that God does indeed exist. They do not believe in the existence of God with the same certainty as they feel with regard to their wealth, which is locked in their boxes, or about the houses which they own. They dread swallowing arsenic, as they are certain that it is a fatal poison, but they do not dread the poison of sin, though they read in the Holy Qur’ān:

إِنَّهُ مَنْ بِرَّ رَّبِّهِ مُجْرِمًا فَلَنَّ أَنْ لَهُ جَحَمٌ لَا يَمُوتُ فِيهَا وَ لَا يَخْيَتُ

The truth is that he who does not recognize God Almighty cannot recognize the Holy Qur’ān. It is true that the Holy Qur’ān has been revealed for guidance, but the guidance of the Qur’ān is bound up with the personality of the one to whom it was revealed or of one who is appointed his substitute by God. Had the Qur’ān alone been enough, God Almighty had the power to have the Qur’ān inscribed on the leaves of trees or could have made it descend from heaven in the form of a book, but this was not what He did. He did not send the Qur’ān into

323 Ibid.
324 ‘Verily, he who comes to his Lord a sinner—for him is hell; he shall neither die therein nor live.’—Sūrah Tāhā, 20:75
the world till the teacher of the Qur’ān had been sent. You will find that at several places the Holy Qur’ān affirms:

\[
\text{يَعْلَمُهُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَلَحْمَةُ}
\]

That is: ‘The Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) teaches the Qur’ān and its wisdom to the people.’ At one place it is said:

\[
\text{لَا يَمْسَهُ إِلَّا الْمُطْهَرُونَ}
\]

This means that: ‘The verities and the insights of the Qur’ān are revealed only to the purified.’

**Need for Teachers and Fresh Exposition of the Holy Qur’ān**

This shows clearly that for the true understanding of the Holy Qur’ān a teacher is needed who is purified by God Almighty Himself. Had a teacher of the Qur’ān not been needed, there would have been no such need from the beginning of time. It is idle to assert that in the beginning a teacher was needed for the exposition of the difficult parts of the Qur’ān, and that exposition having been made, a teacher is no longer needed. Fresh exposition is needed from time to time. The Muslims are confronted with new difficulties in every age. It is true that the Qur’ān comprises all knowledge but not all its knowledge is disclosed at one time. It is revealed as difficulties and problems are encountered. Spiritual teachers, who are the heirs of the prophets and are reflectively invested with their qualities, are sent to resolve the difficulties that arise in every age. The reformer whose functions closely resemble the

\[325\text{ Sūrah Al-Jumu’ah, 62:3}\]
\[326\text{ Sūrah Al-Wāqi’ah, 56:80}\]
functions of a messenger bears the name of that messenger in the estimation of Allāh.

Teachers are also needed, because some portions of the teaching of the Holy Qur‘ān are matters of ḥāl as opposed to qāl. The Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him), who was the first teacher of the Holy Qur‘ān and the true heir of its teaching, demonstrated its teachings to his companions by his own practice and example. For instance, the Divine affirmation that He knows the unseen, accepts prayer, has power to do all that He wills, leads His seekers to the true light, sends His revelation to His sincere servants, and causes His spirit to descend upon whomsoever He wills out of His creatures, are all matters that can be understood only through the example of the teacher himself.

It is obvious that the superficial clerics, who are themselves blind, cannot illustrate these teachings. On the contrary, they teach that all these matters have been left behind and can no longer be experienced. Thus they create doubts in the minds of their disciples concerning the greatness of Islām. They teach that Islām is no longer a living faith and there is no way now to discover its true meaning. It is obvious, however, that if God Almighty designs that His creatures should always drink from the spring of the Holy Qur‘ān, He would have made provisions for it as He has always done. Had the teachings of the Holy Qur‘ān been limited, as the teaching of an experienced and right thinking philosopher is limited, and did it not comprise the heavenly teaching which can only be demonstrated by practice, then, God forbid, the revelation of the Qur‘ān was needless. But I know that if one were to reflect upon

---

327 ḥāl here means the practical demonstration of faith, as opposed to qāl, which connotes only verbal acceptance.
the distinction between the teaching of the prophets and the
teaching of the philosophers, assuming both to be true, the only
distinction that would be discovered is that a great portion of
the teaching of the prophets is metaphysical and can only be
understood and appreciated through practical demonstration,
and can be illustrated only by those who have the personal
experience of it....

If Allāh the Glorious has so willed that this portion of the
teaching of His Book should not be confined to the early ages,
then He must have arranged for the teachers of that portion to
be available at all times, since the portion of the teaching which
relates to personal experience cannot be comprehended except
through teachers who have experienced it. Therefore, if after the
Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him),
teachers who were guided by the reflection of the light of
prophethood had not been available, it would mean that God
Almighty, having removed from the world at an early stage
those who understood the Holy Qur’ān truly and correctly,
deliberately let the Qur’ān become useless. But this would be
contrary to His promise:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نُحْفِظُونَ يَمْنُونَ الْبِنْتِ نَزْلَنَا ﻋَلَيْهِ ﻣَالَا لَنُخَفَّفَ ﻋَلَيْهِ

That is: ‘It is We Who have sent down the Qur’ān and We shall
continue to safeguard it.’

Fulfilling the Need of Safeguarding the Holy Qur’ān

I am unable to understand that if those with complete
understanding of the Qur’ān and belief in its certainty through
personal experience have all passed away, then how has the

328 Surah Al-Hijr, 15:10
Qur’ān been safeguarded? Does safeguarding it mean that the Qur’ān, beautifully inscribed, would be preserved forever locked in safes like treasures that lie buried under the earth and are of no use to anyone? Can anyone imagine that this is the true meaning of this verse? If so, there is nothing extraordinary about it. Rather, such a claim is laughable and amounts to inviting ridicule from the enemies of Islām. Of what use is the safeguarding which does not serve the true purpose? It is quite possible that a copy of the Torah or the Gospel may be found which has been similarly safeguarded. There are thousands of books, which have continued to exist entirely unaltered and which are for certain the writings of a particular person. There is no particular merit in such preservation, and such safeguarding of the Qur’ān would be of no benefit to the Muslims. It is true that the safeguarding of the text of the Holy Qur’ān is greater than that of all other books and is in itself extraordinary, but we cannot imagine that God Almighty, Who always has a spiritual purpose, meant only the safeguarding of the text of the Holy Qur’ān. The very word dhikr [remembrance] clearly indicates that the Holy Qur’ān will be preserved forever as a remembrance, and its true dhākirin\textsuperscript{329} will always be present. This is confirmed by another verse, which says:

\begin{align*}
\text{بَلْ هُوَ أَيْتَ تَبَتَّ بِهَا فِي صُدُورِ الَّذِينَ أُوْتُوا الْعَلْمَ}
\end{align*}

‘The Holy Qur’ān is composed of clear signs in the bosoms of those who have been bestowed knowledge.’

\textsuperscript{329} Those who learn the Qur’ān, act according to it, and recite it to others.
\textsuperscript{330} Sūrah Al-‘Ankabūt, 29:50
This verse clearly means that the believers have been bestowed knowledge of the Holy Qur’ān and they act upon it. As the Qur’ān is preserved in the bosoms of the believers, the verse:

\[\text{إِنَّا نَحْفَظُ الْذِّكْرَ وَاِناَّ لَأَخْفِطْوُنَّ} \]

means that it would not cease to dwell therein....

**Secondly**, reason demands that for the teaching and understanding of Divine books, it is necessary that, like the advent of the prophets, recipients of revelation and persons equipped with spiritual knowledge should also continue to appear from time to time. Similarly, when we study the Qur’ān and deliberate upon it we discover that the availability of spiritual teachers is part of the Divine design. For instance God has said:

\[\text{وَآَمَّا مَا يَنْتَفَعُ النَّاسُ قَيْمَكُتُ فِي الْأَرْضِ} \]

(Part Number 13)

‘That which benefits people endures in the earth.’

The prophets who strengthen people’s faith through miracles, prophecies, verities, insights and the example of their own righteousness, and benefit the seekers after truth, are obviously the greatest benefactors of mankind. And it is also obvious that they do not remain upon the earth for a long time and pass away after a short existence. Yet the purport of this verse cannot be contradictory to this reality. Therefore, with reference to the prophets, this verse means that they continue their beneficence
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331 ‘Verily, We Ourself have sent down this Exhortation, and surely We will be its Guardian.’ —Sūrah Al-Hijr, 15:10

332 Sūrah Ar-Ra’d, 13:18
by way of reflection. God Almighty at the times of need raises a servant of His who becomes their example reflectively and thus continues their spiritual life. It is for this purpose that God has taught the prayer:

333 Sūrah Al-Fātihah, 1:6-7

‘O Allāh, guide us along the straight path, the path of those servants upon whom Thou has bestowed Thy favors….’

Not only has He taught this prayer, but has also promised in another verse:

334 Sūrah Al-‘Ankabūt, 29:70

‘Those who strive in Our path—which is the right path—We will surely guide them along Our ways.’

It is clear that the ways of God Almighty are those that have been disclosed to the prophets.

[Shahādat-ul-Qurʿān, Rūhānī Khazāʿin, Volume 6, Pages 339-352]

Divine Promise of Khilāfah

There are other verses which also indicate that it is God’s design that spiritual teachers, who are the heirs of the prophets, should always continue to be available. For instance:

333 Sūrah Al-Fātihah, 1:6-7
334 Sūrah Al-‘Ankabūt, 29:70
Meaning: ‘O True believers among the followers of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him), Allāh has promised those among you who believe and act righteously, that He will surely make them successors in the earth, as He made successors among those who were before them.’

‘Those who disbelieve will continue to be afflicted with a calamity, physical or spiritual, or would descend close to their dwellings till the Divine promise is fulfilled. Surely Allāh doeth not contrary to His promise.’

‘And We send not a punishment till after We have raised a messenger.’

If a person reflects upon these verses he will realize that God Almighty has clearly promised the Muslims a permanent Khilāfah. If this Khilāfah were not permanent there would have been no sense in describing it as resembling the Khilāfah of the Mosaic dispensation....

A Khalīfa is a reflection of a prophet. As man is mortal, God Almighty designed that prophets, who are more exalted and honored than all other beings, should be reflectively

335 Sūrah An-Nur, 24:56
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337 Sūrah Banī Isrā’il, 17:16
preserved forever. For this purpose, God instituted *Khilāfah* so that the world should at no time be deprived of the blessings of prophethood. He who limits it to thirty years, foolishly overlooks the true purpose of *Khilāfah*, and does not realize that God did not design that the blessings of *Khilāfah* be limited to thirty years after the death of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) and that, thereafter, the world may go to ruin....

There are many other verses in the Holy Qur’ān, which give tidings of a permanent *Khilāfah* among the Muslims, and there are also several *ahādīth* to the same effect. But what I have said already should suffice for those who accept established verities as great wealth.

There is no worse concept concerning Islām than to say that it is a dead religion whose blessings were confined only to its beginning. Can the Book that opens the door of perpetual good fortune inculcate so discouraging a doctrine that there is no blessing or *Khilāfah* in the future and that everything has been confined to the past? True, there will be no independent prophets among the Muslims. But if there were also to be no *Khulafā*’ to demonstrate the proofs of spiritual life from time to time, that would spell the end of spirituality in Islām....It causes one’s heart to tremble to imagine that Islām has now died and that no such people would arise in it, whose spiritual manifestations would be a substitute for miracles and whose inspiration a substitute for revelation, let alone that a Muslim should believe in any such possibility as a doctrine. May God Almighty guide those who are involved in such misguided thinking.

*[Shahādat-ul-Qur’ān, Rūhānī Khāzā’īn, Volume 6, Pages 352-356]*
The Divine revelation:

338 

means that God felt that, because of its widespread corruption, mankind was in need of a grand reformer, so the Seal of God blessed a follower of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) with the rank of being a follower on the one hand, and a prophet on the other. Allāh the Exalted, bestowed upon the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) the Seal for the purpose of conveying spiritual excellence, which had not been bestowed on any other prophet and that is why he was named the Seal of prophets. This means that obedience to the Holy Prophet ṣa bestows the excellences of prophethood and his spiritual attention fashions prophets. No other prophet has been granted such spiritual power. This is the meaning of the hadīth:

‘The divines from among my people will be like the prophets of Israel.’

There were many prophets from among the children of Israel, but their prophethood was not because of their obedience to Moses ṣa; rather it was a direct bounty from God. That is why they were not designated prophets in one aspect and the followers of a prophet in another, but were called independent prophets and the dignity of prophethood was bestowed directly upon them. Leaving them aside, if we look at the rest of the children of Israel, we observe that they had very little guidance

338 ‘What a grand task has been accomplished by the ‘feeling’ of God and His Seal.’ Note: This Urdu revelation contains the actual English word ‘feeling’.
and righteousness. Few auliya’ullah [friends of Allâh] appeared among the followers of Mosesas and Jesusas. Most of them were disobedient, vicious and worshippers of the world. That is why the Torah and the Gospel make no mention of the evidence of their spiritual influence. The Torah frequently designates the companions of Mosesas as disobedient, hard-hearted, sinful and rebellious. The Holy Qur’ân mentions that their disobedience had reached such a degree that on the occasion of a battle, their response to Mosesas was:

قَذَّهَا بِالْيَدِينَ وَرَبَّكَ فَقَاتِلَا إِنَّا هَيْنَا فَعُودُونَ

That is: ‘Go thou and thy Lord and fight the enemy; here we shall sit.’

Such was the measure of their disobedience. In contrast, the hearts of the companions of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allâh be upon him) were so inspired by love of God, and they were so affected by the spiritual attention of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allâh be upon him), that they sacrificed themselves in the cause of God like sheep and goats. Can anyone show us followers of any previous prophet, who demonstrated such sincerity and devotion? We have mentioned the companions of Mosesas. Now let us turn to the Jesus’ disciples. One of them, Judas Iscariot, betrayed him in return for thirty pieces of silver. Peter, to whom had been committed the keys of heaven, cursed Jesus to his face and the remaining disciples deserted Jesus at the time of his trial. Not one of them remained steadfast. They all turned out to be cowards. In contrast, the companions of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allâh be upon him) demonstrated such

---

339 Sûrah Al-Mâ‘idah, 5:25
steadfastness and were so reconciled to death that any mention of their devotion brings tears to one’s eyes.

What was it that inspired them with such devotion? Whose hand was it that brought about such a change in them? In their pre-Islamic ignorance, there was no sin and no wrong that they did not commit. On becoming the followers of the Holy Prophet, they were so drawn to God, as if God dwelt within them. I tell you truly that it was the spiritual attention of the Holy Prophet that pulled them out of a low life into a holy one. Those who later entered Islam in hosts did not do so under the threat of a sword. They did so in consequence of the sincere supplications and humble and passionate prayers which the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) offered in Mecca for thirteen years, so that even the soil of Mecca confessed that it was under the blessed feet of him whose heart proclaimed the Unity of God so passionately that heaven was filled with his cries. God is Self-Sufficient. He does not care whether anyone is rightly guided or goes astray. The light of guidance which was so extraordinarily manifested in Arabia, and then spread to the rest of the world, was a consequence of the heartfelt desire of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him.) Followers of every religion had digressed and strayed away from the spring of Tauhīd [belief in the Unity of God] but it continued to flow in Islam. All these blessings were granted in answer to the supplications of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) as God Almighty has said:

\[340\text{Sūrah As-Shu’arā’, 26:4}\]
Meaning that: ‘Will you grieve yourself to death because they did not believe?’

The reason why the followers of previous prophets did not achieve such a high grade in righteousness was that those prophets did not have the same degree of concern and anguish for their followers as did the Holy Prophet. It is a pity that ignorant Muslims of this age do not appreciate the Holy Prophet as he deserves, and therefore they stumble at every step. They interpret the Seal of prophethood in a manner that is derogatory of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) and does not hold him up to praise as if he had no power to bestow spiritual grace upon his followers or to help perfect them spiritually, and had been appointed merely to teach them the law. God Almighty has taught Muslims the prayer:

إِهْدِنَا الْصِّرَاطَ الْمُسْتَقْيِمَ ۛ صِرَاطَ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا ۛ عَلَيْهِمْ

If the Muslims are not the heirs of the previous prophets and have no share in the favors that were bestowed upon them, why were they taught this prayer? It is a pity that Muslims, on account of their bigotry and ignorance, do not reflect duly on this verse. They are too eager to see Jesus descend from heaven, while the Holy Qur’an testifies that he is dead and was buried in Srinagar, Kashmir, as God Almighty has said:

وَأَوْنِهِمَا إِلَى رَوْعَةٍ ذَاتِ قَرَارٍ وَمَعِينٍ

341 ‘Guide us along the straight path, the path of those upon whom Thou has bestowed Thy favours.’—Sūrah Al-Fātihah, 1:6-7
342 Sūrah Al-Mu’minūn, 23:51
That is: ‘We delivered Jesus and his mother from the hands of the Jews and conveyed them to a region of high mountains which was a place of security and was watered with clear springs.’

This was Kashmir. And this is why Mary’s tomb is not to be found in Palestine, and the Christians claim that she too disappeared like Jesus. How unjust it is of the ignorant Muslims to believe that the followers of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) are deprived of converse with God while at the same time they repeat the sayings of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) that among his people there will be those who will resemble the prophets of Israel, and there will also be one who will be a prophet in one aspect and the follower of the Holy Prophetṣa in another. He would be the one who will be called the Promised Messiah.

[Haqīqat-ul-Wahī, Rūhānī Khazā‘in, Volume 22, Pages 99-104, footnote]

I tell you truly that Islām is so patently true that if all the disbelievers of the world were to stand in prayer on one side, and I were to stand alone on the other, in supplication before God for a particular purpose, God will support me, not because I am better than all others, but because I believe sincerely in His Messenger and know that all prophethood ended with him and that all law is comprised in his law. Yet one type of prophethood has not ended, that is to say, the prophethood which is granted in consequence of complete obedience to the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) and which is illumined by his lamp. This prophethood has not ended inasmuch as it is a reflection of his prophethood and is
given through him and is his manifestation and receives grace from him. God is the enemy of whoever regards the Holy Qur‘ān as abrogated and follows a law opposed to the law of Muhammad and seeks to put his own law in practice and does not follow the Holy Prophetṣa and seeks to set up himself in his place. But God loves him who makes the Holy Qur‘ān his code and regards the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) as the Seal of the prophets and knows that he is dependent upon his grace. Such a man becomes the beloved of God Almighty. God’s love pulls him towards Him and honors him with His converse and displays signs in his support. When such a person’s obedience to the Holy Prophetṣa arrives at its climax, God bestows a prophethood upon him which is a reflection of the prophethood of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him), so that Islām may continue to remain fresh and alive through such people and should remain supreme over its opponents.

A foolish one, who is in truth an enemy of the faith, does not desire that converse with God should continue as a characteristic of Islām. He rather wishes that Islām too should become a dead religion like all the others; but that is not what God desires. In the revelation vouchsafed to me, God Almighty has employed the expression prophet and messenger concerning me hundreds of times, but these expressions mean only frequent converse with God which comprises the unseen. Everyone is entitled to use an expression in a particular sense. God too designates frequent experience of converse with Him as prophethood, meaning that such converse comprises a great deal of that which is unseen. Accursed is he who claims to be a prophet, but whose prophethood is divorced from the grace of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him). The prophethood that has been bestowed on me belongs to the
Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) and is not a new prophethood. Its only purpose is to make manifest to the world the truth of Islām and to display the righteousness of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him).

[Chashma-e-Ma‘rifat, Rūhānī Khazā‘in, Volume 23, Pages 339-341]

Remember, I am not a messenger or prophet by virtue of a new law, a new claim or a new name; but I am a messenger and prophet by virtue of perfect reflection. I am the mirror in which the form and the prophethood of Muhammad are perfectly reflected. Had I been a claimant of distinct prophethood, God Almighty would not have named me Muhammad and Ahmad and Mustafā and Mujtabā. Nor would I have been bestowed the title of Khātam-ul-Auliā’ [Seal of the Elect of God], resembling the title of the Seal of the prophets. In such a case, I would have been given a separate name. But God Almighty admitted me completely into the being of Muhammad, so much so that He did not desire that I should have a separate name or a separate tomb, for a reflection cannot be separated from its original. Why did this come about? It came about because God had appointed the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) as Seal of Prophets, and, in order to maintain the parallel between the Mosaic dispensation and the Muhammadī dispensation, it was necessary that the Muhammadī Messiah should be bestowed the dignity of prophethood like the Mosaic Messiah, so that the Muhammadī prophethood should not be considered deficient in any respect when compared to the Mosaic prophethood. Therefore, God Almighty created me as a perfect reflection, and invested me with the reflection of Muhammadī prophethood, so that in one aspect I should bear the title of
Nabī’ullāh [Prophet of God], and in another aspect the Seal of prophethood should be safeguarded.

[Nuzūl-ul-Masih, Rūḥānī Khazā’īn, Volume 18, Pages 381-382, footnote]

The charge advanced against me and my Jamā’at, that we do not believe in the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) as the Seal of Prophets, is altogether false. The strength, certainty, comprehension and insight with which we acknowledge and believe in the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) as the Seal of the Prophets, cannot even be dreamed of by the other Muslims; they do not have the capacity to comprehend the reality and the mystery comprised in the Seal of prophethood. They have merely heard an expression from their ancestors but they are unaware of its import and do not know what it signifies and what is meant by believing in it. But we believe with full comprehension—and God Almighty knows this well—that the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him) is the Seal of the prophets. God Almighty has disclosed the reality of the Seal of prophethood in such a manner that we derive special delight from its contemplation which cannot be conceived of by anyone except those who have drunk deep at this fountain.

We can illustrate the Seal of prophethood by the example of the moon, which begins as a crescent and arrives at its perfection on the fourteenth night when it is called the full moon. In the same manner the excellences of prophethood reached their climax in the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him.) Those who believe that prophethood has been closed compulsorily, and that the Holy Prophet (peace and
blessings of Allāh be upon him) should not be regarded as being superior even to the Prophet Jonas have not understood the reality of the Seal of prophethood and do not have true knowledge of his superiority and excellences. Despite their own ignorance and lack of understanding, they charge us with denying the Seal of prophethood. What shall I say concerning such invalids and how shall I express my pity for them!

[Malfūzāt, Volume 1, Pages 342-343]
Appendix II: The Future of Islām Ahmadiyya

Below are a series of quotations of Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiānī-as, the Promised Messiah and Imām Mahdī, on the future of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at. The Anti Ahmadiyya would like to see this Community perish while God has other plans as shown by these quotations.

Appeal to Give up Vilification and Abuse

Purely by way of advice, and for the sake of Allāh, I tell the opposing clerics and their soul mates, that abuse and vilification is not the way of decency. If this be your disposition, then so be it. But if you consider me false in my claim, you also have the option to come together in your mosques and pray to God for my ruin, or you can do the same individually. If I am false in my claim, your prayers are bound to be heard. Indeed, you have been praying against me already. But remember, even if you continue to pray thus until your tongues are bruised, and you go on bewailing in your prostrations until your noses are rubbed out, and your tears wipe out your eyelashes, and the
weeping reduces your vision, and your brains are so affected that you begin to suffer from epilepsy or melancholia, still your prayers will not be heard; for I have come from God, and anyone who curses me will himself be afflicted with such a curse, though he may not be aware of it. He who enters into a prayer duel with me and supplicates that the one among us who is false may die in the lifetime of the other, will come to the same end which overtook Ghulām Dastgīr of Qasūr....

No one can die on earth unless his death is decreed in heaven. My soul is inspired with the same truth with which the soul of Abrahamas was inspired. I have a relationship with God like that of Abrahamas. My secret is known to God Alone. My opponents ruin themselves in vain. I am not the plant that can be uprooted by their hands. If their predecessors and their successors, and their living and their dead, were all to come together and pray for my ruin, my God would convert their prayers into curses and would fling them back upon them. Do you not see that hundreds of wise people from among you continue to join my Jamā’at? There is uproar in heaven and God’s angels are pulling pure hearts in our direction. Can man obstruct this Movement that is proceeding in heaven? Try to obstruct it if you think you have the strength. Use all the cunning and deceit that the opponents of the prophets employed against them in the past, and leave nothing untried. Use your utmost strength. Call down ruin till you arrive at the door of death. Then see what harm you can bring upon us. Heavenly signs are descending like rain, but the unfortunate ones continue to raise objections from afar. What remedy can we provide to the hearts which have been sealed up. Lord, have mercy on this ummah, Amīn.
O Ye Maulavīs and custodians of shrines who oppose me, the contentions between us have exceeded all limits. My Community is much smaller in number than yours, and at the moment does not exceed four or five thousand. Nevertheless, be sure that this tree has been planted by the Hand of God Who will not let it be destroyed. He will not be pleased till He carries it to perfection. He will water it and enclose it within a compound and will foster it in a wonderful manner. Have you spared any effort in trying to destroy it? Had it been a human project, it would have been destroyed long ago...

Be sure, therefore, it is not me you are fighting, but you are fighting God. Can you not distinguish between fragrance and foul smell? Can you not observe the majesty of truth? It would have been much better for you if you had shed tears before God Almighty and had sought guidance from Him concerning me with a trembling heart, and had then followed a certainty and not pursued doubts and delusions.

God Almighty has not yet exhausted His support and His signs, and I declare on oath in His name that He will not desist till my truth is manifested throughout the world. O Ye people, who hear my voice, fear God and do not transgress. Had all this been a human project, God would have destroyed me, and not a trace would be left. But you have seen how the
help of God Almighty has supported me all along, and numberless signs have been manifested in my support. How many of my enemies have perished as a consequence of holding mubāhalah with me. O servants of God, do reflect, does God Almighty accord such treatment to liars?

[Haqīqat-ul-Wahī, Rūhānī Khazā’īn, Volume 22, Page 554]

They must remember that all the abuse that issues from their mouths, and the insults that dwell upon their lips, and the filthy papers which they publish in opposition to the truth, all this furnishes the material for their spiritual chastisement which they have prepared with their own hands. No life is more cursed than the one spent in lying. Do they imagine that by their designs, their baseless lies, their allegations, their ridicule and their mockery, they can frustrate the Will of God? Or can they, by deceiving the world, put on hold what God has willed in heaven? If ever in the past the opponents of truth succeeded through these means, then they too shall succeed, but when it is an established fact that those who oppose God, and oppose the purpose which He has willed in heaven, are always humiliated and defeated, then there must come a day when these people too shall meet with defeat and humiliation. The word of God has never remained, nor will it ever remain, unfulfilled. He says:

كَتَبَ اللَّهُ لَأَطَلِبَنَّ آنَا وَرَسُولِي إِنَّ اللَّهَ قَوِىٰ عَزِيزٌ 343

It means that God has ordained from the beginning and has declared it to be His law and His practice, that He and His

343 Sūrah Al-Mujādalah, 58:22
messengers shall always prevail. Since I am His messenger, who has been sent by Him, though without any new shari‘ah or any new claim or any new name, rather I have come in the name of the Noble Prophetṣa—the Seal of Prophets—and through him, and as his manifestation, I therefore proclaim that, just as this verse has been proven true from the time of Adam to the time of the Holy Prophetṣa, so will it prove to be true in my case. Do these people not notice that at the time when these maulavīs and their camp followers had launched a campaign of rejection and vilification against me, there was not a single person in my bai‘at, and all I had were a few friends who could be counted on fingertips. But now, by the Grace of God, the number of those who are in my bai‘at has reached nearly seventy thousand. This has not come about due to any effort on my part, it is in fact the wind blowing from heaven that has made them rush towards me. Let these people think for themselves, how they strived to destroy this Jamā‘at and how they used all kinds of deceit and went to the extent of giving information to the authorities and appearing before courts as witnesses in falsely instituted murder cases, and thus incited the Muslims against me. And how they wrote thousands of posters and pamphlets, and issued edicts of disbelief and proclaimed verdicts of death against me, and how they met in committees to devise schemes against me. But did all these efforts end up in anything other than failure? Had this mission been man-made, it would certainly have been annihilated through their strenuous efforts. Can anyone cite a single precedent in which so much effort was deployed against an impostor, but, instead of being destroyed, he grew a thousand-fold? Is this not a great sign that, despite all efforts to destroy this seed and to leave no trace of it on the face of the earth, it germinated and burgeoned and grew into a tree
and its branches spread far and wide and it has now grown so big that thousands of birds are resting upon it?!

[Nuzūl-ul-Masīh, Rūhānī Khazāʿīn, Volume 18, Pages 379-384]

The following prophecy is mentioned in Brāhin-e-Ahmadiyya:

This means that the opponents will desire to extinguish the Light of Allāh with the breath of their mouths, but Allāh will perfect His Light even though the disbelievers hate it. This prophecy dates back to the time when I had no opponents, in fact, no one even knew my name. Then, in accordance with the prophecy, I became known in the world with honor and respect and thousands accepted me. This was followed by fierce opposition. People of Mecca were told misleading things about me and an edict of disbelief regarding me was acquired from Mecca. A universal cry of heresy was raised against me, edicts were issued urging my assassination, the authorities were provoked against me, and the common people were alienated from me and my Jamāʿat. In short, every effort was made to destroy me. But, in keeping with the Divine prophecy, all the maulavīs and their ilk completely failed in their efforts. How blind are my opponents, for they do not see the grandeur of these prophecies: they do not realize how far back these prophecies were made, and with what majesty they have been fulfilled! Can this be the work of anyone but God Himself? If it can, then please come forward with a precedent. Do they not realize that had this been the work of man and against the Will of God, they would not have been frustrated in their efforts?
Who was it that frustrated them? It was the same God Who is with me.

[Haqīqt-ul-Wahī, Rūhānī Khazā’īn, Volume 22, Pages 241-242]

If these ignorant maulavīs choose to deliberately close their eyes, it is up to them. They can do no harm to the truth. But the time comes when many Pharaoh-natured people will ponder over these prophecies and be saved from drowning. God says: ‘I shall mount attack after attack, until I have established your truth in the depths of their hearts.’

So, O maulavīs! If you possess the strength to battle with God, then carry on. Was the humble Son of Mary, before me, spared any torment at the hands of the Jews? They even thought that they had crucified him, but God saved him from death upon the cross. So, while there was a time when he was considered no more than a fraud and a liar, another era dawned when his greatness was accepted in the hearts of people. Now there are four hundred million people who worship him as God. Although, they committed an act of disbelief by making God of a humble man, it serves as a befitting reply to the Jews that the same Jesus, Son of Mary, whom they regarded as a liar and wished to trample under their feet, has now reached such glory that four hundred million people prostrate themselves before him, and kings bow their heads in respect at the very mention of his name. Although I have prayed that I should not become an instrument for the promotion of idolatry, as happened with Jesus, Son of Mary—and I am sure God will not let this happen—God has informed me again and again that He will grant me great glory and will instil my love in people’s hearts. He shall spread my Movement all over the world and
shall make my sect triumphant over all other sects. The members of my sect shall so excel in knowledge and insight that they will confound everyone with the light of their truth, and by dint of their arguments and signs. Every nation will drink of this fountain, and this Movement will spread and blossom until it rapidly encompasses the entire world. Many tribulations and obstacles shall come, but God will remove them all and will fulfil His promise. God addressed me and said: ‘I shall grant thee blessing upon blessing until kings shall seek blessings from thy garments!’

So O ye who listen! Remember these things and keep these prophecies safe in your boxes, for they are the words of God that will one day come to pass. I do not observe any goodness in my own self, and I have not done the things which I should have done. I consider myself no more than an unworthy laborer. God’s grace was all that helped me through. Therefore, boundless gratitude is due to the All-Powerful and Merciful God Who accepted this handful of dust despite all its ineptitude.

[۱۴۴ In a vision, I was shown those kings, and they were on horseback. I was told that these are the kings who shall bear the yoke of thy obedience and God shall bless them.

345 Practice, Way, Law, of God.
346 Practice, Way, Law]
old. So do not grieve over what I have said to you; nor should your hearts be distressed. For it is essential for you to witness the second manifestation also, and its coming is better for you because it is everlasting the continuity of which will not end till the Day of Judgement. And that second manifestation cannot come unless I depart. But when I depart, God will send that second manifestation for you which shall always stay with you just as promised by God in *Brāhīn-e-Ahmadiyya*\(^{347}\). And this promise is not for my person. Rather the promise is with reference to you, as God [addressing me] says: I shall make this Jamā’at who are your followers, prevail over others till the Day of Judgment. Thus it is inevitable that you see the day of my departure, so that after that day the day comes which is the day of ever-lasting promise. Our God is He Who keeps His promise and is Faithful and is the Truthful God. He shall show you all that He has promised. Though these days are the last days of this world and there are many a disaster waiting to happen, yet it is necessary that this world continues to exist until all those things about which God has prophesied come to pass. I came from God as a manifestation of Divine Providence and I am a personification of His Power. And after I am gone there will be some other persons who will be the manifestation of the second Power [of God]. So, while waiting for the second manifestation of His Power, you all together keep yourselves busy praying. And let a Jamā’at of righteous people, one and all, in every country keep themselves busy in prayers so that the second manifestation may descend from the Heaven and show you that your God is such a Mighty God. Consider your death to be close at hand for you never know when that hour will strike...

---

\(^{347}\) The first book of the Promised Messiah, published in four parts in 1880, 1882 and 1884.
Don’t think that God will let you go to waste. You are the seed which the Hand of God has sown in the earth. God says that this seed will grow and flower and its branches will spread in all directions and it will become a huge tree.

[Al-Wasiyyat, Rūhānī Khazā‘īn, Volume 20, Pages 305-306, 309]

O ye people, hearken to my call! Remember that this is a prophecy from Him Who created the earth and the heaven. We will cause this, His Own Movement, to spread in all countries and shall cause them to triumph over all others through reasoning and argument. The days are approaching, nay they are near at hand, when only this religion shall be spoken of with honor and respect. God shall grant this religion and this Movement His choicest blessings and unprecedented success and frustrate the designs of all those who seek to destroy them and shall perpetuate their ascendancy till the time the world comes to its end. They jeer at me now but their jeering shall cause no harm, for there has not been a prophet who has not been jeered at. It was, therefore, incumbent that the Promised Messiah be also jeered at, as God Almighty says:

بِحَسَرَةٍ عَلَى الْعَبَّادِ مَا يَأْتِهِمْ مِنْ رَسُولٍ إِلاَّ كَانُوا يُسَتَّهْرُونَ

Alas for My servants! There comes not a messenger to them but they mock at him\(^{348}\).

It is, therefore, a sign from God; because every prophet has been mocked at. Who would laugh at a person who comes down from heaven with a host of angels? Even from this, one could

\(^{348}\) Sūrah Yā Sīn, 36:31
understand that the story of the Messiah coming down from heaven is no more than a myth.

Remember, that no one will descend from heaven. All our opponents who are alive today will die and no one will see Jesus son of Mary descending from heaven. Then their next generation will pass away and no one of them will see this spectacle. Then the generation next after that will pass away without seeing the son of Mary descending from heaven. Then God will make them anxious that though the time of the supremacy of the cross had passed away and the world had undergone great changes, yet the son of Mary had not descended from heaven. Then the wise people will suddenly discard this belief. The third century after today will not yet have come to a close when those who hold this belief, whether Muslims or Christians, will lose all hope and will give up this belief in disgust. There will then be only one religion that will prevail in the world and only one leader. I have come only to sow the seed, which has been sown by my hand. Now it will sprout and grow and flourish and no one can arrest its growth.

[Ταδκαρατος Σουλτάν, Το ρουχανις Καζαν, Volume 20, Pages 64-65]

True, there are men steeped in darkness or in thoughts of their own. They will not accept. But the time is near when God will make plain to them their error. God has said:

‘A warner came into the world but the world accepted him not. God, however, will accept him and manifest his truth by mighty signs.’
These words proceed not from the mouth of man. They are God’s words, words of the Mighty Lord Himself. The mighty attacks mentioned in this prophecy are near. But these attacks are not by physical weapons, not swords or guns. These are spiritual weapons, which will come as help from God...All those who resemble the Anti-Christ, those who love this world overmuch and who have only one eye, having lost the eye for spiritual truth, all of them will end by the sword of solid unanswerable arguments. Truth will prevail. A new bright day will dawn again for Islām. Same as it did before. The sun of Islām will rise in full bloom, same as it did before.

[Fathe Islām, Rūhānī Khaza‘īn, Volume 3, Pages 9-10]

A few days ago God Almighty vouchsafed to me the following revelation:

قل ان كنتم تحبون الله فاتبعونى يحبكم الله اني متو فيك و رافعك الى و جاعل الذين اتبعوك فوق الذين كفروا الى يوم القيامة و قالوا اني لك هذا قال هو الله عجيب يجتبي من يشاء من عباده و تلك الايام تداولها بين الناس

Say: ‘If you love Allāh, then follow me, Allāh will then love you. I shall cause you to die and shall raise you towards Me and shall place those who follow you above those who reject you till the Day of Judgment.’ People will say: ‘Whence have you obtained this?’ Say: ‘Allāh is Wonderful. He chooses whom He wills from among His servants. We revolve these days among people.’
The verse, ‘I shall place those who follow you above those who reject you till the Day of Judgment’ has been revealed to me repeatedly—so many times that God Alone knows the count—and with such emphasis that it has penetrated my heart like a steel nail. This indicates that God Almighty will greatly bless all those friends who follow my way and will grant them victory over those who follow other ways and this superiority shall be maintained till the Day of Judgment. No one will come after my humble self who will be opposed to my way. God Almighty will destroy any one who opposes my way and his way will not endure. This is a promise by God, the contrary of which will never happen.

[Tadhkirah, Page 62]
Appendix III: Ahmadiyya Muslim Beliefs

What follows is a list of beliefs central to the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at. Unlike the ‘Aqīdah at-Tahawī (quoted in Farhan Khan’s book), it is a simple list without long elaborations and complicated statements. It is based entirely on the Holy Qur’ān and ahādīth. It has been extracted from the booklet, Our Teaching, Pages 33-36.

1. We believe that God exists and to assert His existence is to assert a most important truth.
2. We believe that God is ONE without an equal in heaven or in earth. Everything else is His creation, dependent upon Him and His subsistence. He is without son or daughter or father or mother or wife and brother. He is one and unique.
3. We believe that God is Holy; free from all imperfections and possessed of all perfections. There is no imperfection which may be found in Him. His power and knowledge are unlimited. He encompasses everything and there is nothing which encompasses Him. He is the First, the Last, the Manifest, the Hidden, the Creator, the Master.
He is the Loving, the Enduring. His actions are willed, not constrained or determined. He rules today as He ever ruled before. His attributes are eternal.

4. We believe that angels are a part of God’s creation. As the Qur’ān has it, angels do what they are bidden to do. They have been created in His wisdom to carry out certain duties. Their existence is real and references to them in the Holy Book are not metaphorical. They depend on God as do all men and all other creatures.

5. We believe that God speaks to His chosen servants and reveals to them His purpose. Revelation comes in words. Man lives by revelation and through it comes to have contact with God. The words in which revelation comes are unique in their power and wisdom. Their wisdom may not be revealed at once. A mine may be exhausted but not the wisdom of revelation. Revelation brings us Divine ordinances, laws, and exhortations. It also brings us knowledge of the unseen and of important spiritual truths. It conveys to us the approval of God as well as His disapproval and displeasure, His love as well as His warnings. God communicates with man through revelation. The communications vary with circumstances and with the recipients. Of all Divine communications the most perfect, the most complete, the most comprehensive is the Holy Qur’ān. The Holy Qur’ān is to last forever. It cannot be superseded by any future revelation.

6. We also believe that when darkness prevails in the world and man sinks deep in sin and evil, it becomes difficult for him to rise again without the help of God. Then out of His Mercy and Beneficence God chooses one of His Own loving, loyal servants, charges him with the duty to lead
and guide other men. As the Qur’ān says, “...There is no people to whom a warner has not been sent.” (35:25). God has sent messengers to every people. Through them God has revealed His Will and His Purpose. Those who turn away from them ruin themselves; those who turn to them earn the love and pleasure of God.

7. We also believe that divine messengers belong to different spiritual ranks and contribute in different degrees to the fulfilment of the ultimate Divine Design. The greatest of all messengers is the Holy Prophet Muhammad (on whom be the peace and the blessings of God!). He is the chief of all men, messenger to them all. The revelation he received was addressed to all mankind. The whole of this earth was a mosque for him. Time came when his message spread to lands and climes beyond Arabia. People forsook gods of their own conception and began to believe in the One and Only God that the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa taught them to believe. The coming of the Holy Prophetṣa marked an unparalleled spiritual revolution. Justice began to reign instead of injustice, kindness instead of cruelty. If Moses and Jesus had existed in the time of the Holy Prophet Muhammadṣa they would have had to believe in him and to follow him.

8. We also believe that God hears our prayers and helps us out of difficulties. He is a living God, His living character being evident in all things at all times. God continues His benevolent interest in His servants and His creatures. When they need His help He turns to them with His help. If they forget Him, He reminds them of Himself and of His concern for them. “I am near indeed; I answer the prayer of every supplicant when he supplicates to
Me. Let them, therefore, hearken unto Me and believe in Me, so that they may go aright.”(2:187)

9. We also believe that from time to time God determines and designs the course of events in special ways. Events of this world are not determined entirely by unchanging laws called the Laws of Nature. For, besides these ordinary laws there are special laws through which God manifests Himself. It is these special laws which bring to us evidence of the Will, the Power and Love of God. Too many there are who deny this. They would believe in nothing besides the laws of nature. Yet laws of nature are not all the laws we have. Laws of nature are themselves governed by the wider Laws of God. Through these laws, God helps His chosen servants. Through them He destroys His enemies. Moses\textsuperscript{as} could not have triumphed over a cruel and mighty enemy, but for the special laws of God. The Holy Prophet Muhammad\textsuperscript{sa} could not have triumphed over Arabs determined to put an end to him and his mission except for the laws of God, which worked on his side. In everything that he encountered God helped the Holy Prophet\textsuperscript{sa}. At least with 10,000 followers he re-entered the valley of Mecca out of which 10 years before he had to flee for his life. Laws of nature cannot account for these events.

10. We also believe that death is not the end of everything. Man survives death. He has to account for what he does in this life, in the life hereafter. The Power of God guarantees human survival.

11. We believe, that unless forgiven out of His Infinite Mercy, nonbelievers go to Hell. The object is not to give pain to the inmates but only to reform them. In Hell nonbelievers and enemies of God spend their days in
wail and woe and continue so until the Mercy of God
encompasses the evil-doers and their evil. Truly did the
Holy Prophet say, “A time will come when Hell will be
emptied of all sinners.” (Tafsīr-ul-Ma‘ālam-ut-Tanzīl)

12. Similarly we believe that those who believe in God, and
the prophets, the angels and the Books, who accept the
guidance which comes from God, and walk in humility
and abjure excesses of all kinds, will all go to a place
called Heaven. Peace and pleasure will reign here and
God will be present to all. Low desires will disappear.
Men will have attained everlasting life and become an
image of their Creator.

It is important to note here that Farhan Khan presents the
‘Aqīdah at-Tahawī in his book to discredit the Ahmadiyya
Muslim belief in the continuation of prophethood. However,
there is no denying that this ‘Aqīdah also supports the belief in a
latter day prophet, that is, the coming of Hazrat ‘Īsā as based on
the statements of the Holy Prophet Muhammad sa:

100. We believe in the signs of the Hour such as the
appearance of the Antichrist (Dajjal) and the descent of
‘Isa ibn Maryam, peace be upon him, from heaven, and
we believe in the rising of the sun from where it sets
and in the emergence of the Beast from the earth.349

Since this was a prophecy for the writers of the ‘Aqīdah, they just
wrote it as-is and did not comment on how this prophecy was
to be fulfilled. It is in this age that this prophecy has been
fulfilled in the person of Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad as, the
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Promised Messiah and Imām Mahdī, and it is up to us to choose to accept him due to the numerous signs God has shown to prove his truthfulness.
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With Love to Muhammad the Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn

About the Book

With love to Muhammad the Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn is a book of arguments proving the harmonious nature of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community’s belief in the finality of prophethood. A malicious allegation is made against the Community that it considers Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiānī a Prophet in a sense that goes against the statements of Prophet Muhammad. The opponents of the Community sometimes attribute fictitious beliefs to it in order to prove their points to the lay man, and a similar attempt has been made recently by Farhan Khan (from USA). This book responds to these allegations and addresses questions related to the finality of the prophethood of the Holy Prophet and the coming of an ummatī (or subordinate) Prophet in Islam.

“A brilliant, very useful and well researched English addition of books on the subject penned by our two young missionaries. Mashā’Allāh! Written with clarity and passion. Dripping in the love of the lofty status of the Holy Prophet. A must for all seekers of truth on the subject.”

Maulānā Mubarak Ahmad Nazir
Missionary In charge and National Vice President, Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā’at, Canada

“This book clarifies all the ambiguities and misunderstandings on the topic of Khatme Nubuwwat/Khātamun Nabiyyīn. It contains good research, and has been put together well. It’s a piece of literature that was much needed. God bless the writers.”

Maulānā Mirza Muhammad Afzal
Missionary Peel Region
Toronto, Canada