

[Link to Discussion Contents Page](#)

**From T. Ijaz, January 29, 2004.**

A response to what some of what Zahid Aziz sahib posted recently is given below. The purpose is to refute some new material he has presented and to repeat the important points, with references of course.

I am sure many readers have been following the exchange. I would like to open the floor to them. I would welcome any questions. My email address is [ijaz@doctor.com](mailto:ijaz@doctor.com).

As a preamble, I would like remind people that it is in the words of Prophet Muhammad we say the Promised Messiah attained the status of prophethood, who called the Messiah of the future by the spiritual title *Nabi-Ullah*.

It is in the words of the Promised Messiah, we ask, “Why are you annoyed and irritated with the word *Nabi*?” (*Zameema Barahini Ahmadiyya* Part V, page 184).

Lahoris want us to believe the Promised Messiah did the works of a prophet, showed even greater signs than some prophets, experienced revelations of such magnitude only Nabi can attain, and yet **still** is a mere wali.

Are these the words of a mere muhuddus, who only resembles a prophet?:

“To prove I am from Allah He has shown through me signs– so many signs that if you divide them up and distribute them to a **1000 prophets, each** can prove the truth of **their prophethood** from just those” (*Chashma – i – Marifat*, RK Vol 23 page 332).

If he is only a wali this is one huge paradox!

The Qadiani thesis I have laid out in a nutshell is that the pathways of progress for an ummati are mentioned in the Quran, the top level being *nabuwwat*. These levels are obtained by *zill*, in obedience to the Holy Prophet. Thousands in the ummah reached that level, which is why in one tradition it was stated by the Prophet that many saints were like the prophets of Israel. They were small ‘p’ prophets so to speak, with the title not given openly to them. The title ‘Prophet’ was reserved for the Messiah of the future who attained the rank of *nabuwwat*. His spiritual stature was far greater than anyone else in the ummah. The Promised Messiah held the office of Prophethood, a Warner to the world, in the style of Prophet Muhammad.

I will touch on these themes again and again, and prove this from the writings of the Promised Messiah.

These are my comments on each section, numbering follows yours. Again, readers should print out, fasten their seat belts and follow along.

I. If you are saying Sirhindi only wrote ‘muhuddus’, and the Promised Messiah replaced that word with ‘nabi’ in *Haqiqatul Wahyi*, then that settles it. He replaced the word muhuddus with *nabi*. He brought in the term ‘*nabi*’ to describe the grandeur of his revelations from Allah, thus his spiritual status.

Nowhere in the discussion under reference here in *Malfoozat* or *Haqiqatul Wahyi* he stated ‘replace nabi with muhuddus’ or ‘nabi is merely a metaphor, a Sufi term for high rank’ or ‘saints do the work of prophets now’. Readers should reflect that the future Messiah was bestowed the name ‘Nabi’, not ‘Wali’ or other term of rank, and the Promised Messiah justified the term and applied it to himself.

If you read his references to Sirhindi on qualities of revelation, MGA evaluated the term *nabi* and stated this was indeed the term that described high quality, high volume revelations he received. That is why he is quoted in *Malfoozat* just before he quoted Sirhindi on the very same page:

“There are differences in dreams of ordinary people and dreams and revelations of Prophets. The dreams and revelations are distinct in terms of quality, amplitude and nature. **I do not claim to be a law bearing prophet**”.

He is not a **law-bearing prophet** and as quoted above he compared himself to the Israelite non law-bearing prophets who too were called nabis on the quality of revelation they received. These are his words in *Malfoozat* on this point:

“Among the Israelites there have been several **nabis to whom no law was revealed**. They only announced prophecies which they received from God and which served to establish truth and prestige of the Mosaic religion. It was these prophecies that entitled them to be called nabis. **The same is the case with my mission. If I am not to be called nabi, what other distinctive word is there which will distinguish me from other recipients of divine revelation**”?

He did not mean a non-law bearing prophet is another name for muhuddus. He **defined** two types of prophethood: law bearing and non-law bearing, and he put himself in the latter category, the non-law-bearing prophets of the Israelites. You still have not produced a single reference after 1901 to refute the above and to support your view that saints do the work of prophets now. I have more to say on this in section VIII.

Your quote from *Haqiqatul Wahyi*, page 389 (footnote) further bolsters my position. Regarding some of his own prophecies that were not fulfilled, he said, “The tribulation about which Allah gives information through a *nabi* or rasul or muhuddus...”

He found it necessary to add in ‘*nabi*’ as he was conscious of being one, and did not consider himself just in the category of saints. He always insisted *nabi* is the appropriate word that described his spiritual rank and corrected a follower of his who wrongly said he was not an actual prophet (section II).

Your quotes from *Tazkiratush Shahadatain* and *Malfoozat* powerfully support my position and contradict yours. The readers should look at them again together right now. You say here that the reason why previous auliyya were not called *nabi* is that since no prophet was to come after the Holy Prophet, this would have *compromised* the belief in the finality of his prophethood. But the Promised Messiah did not say *compromised*, he said *doubtful*.

The Promised Messiah is saying many in the ummah before him have certainly attained the spiritual rank called *nabi*, and deserve the title “*nabi*”; the title was not openly given to them for a period of time until the advent of the Promised Messiah. As to why they were not given the title *nabi* openly I will get to shortly, but this statement of the Promised Messiah and another similar statement in *The Will* that some in the ummah reached the stage of revelation to the highest degree, which is the stage of *nabuwwat*, supports, my position and what I have been saying all along.

The *Malfoozat* quote says it explicitly also, “thousands of persons in the ummah of the Holy Prophet Muhammad **received the rank of prophethood**”.

They were blessed with that highest state in accordance as all four pathways open to an ummati (4:69), which are the pathways we pray for in the Surah Fatihah prayer, as explained in *The Will*:

“It is not possible that a nation which has been described thus, and which has been taught the above prayer (*Fatihah*) should be entirely deprived of the **status of prophethood**. If so the ummat of Muhammad would be deemed imperfect”.

Maulvi Muhammad Ali, commenting on Surah Fatihah, said, “acceptance of this prayer is a foregone conclusion, **no matter how an opponent understood it**, and applied it...**Allah can raise prophets whenever and wherever in His wisdom He might choose to do so**. Also he can confer the rank of **siddiq, shaheed and saleh** on whomsoever he likes. The only thing needed was a sincere applicant. (*Al Hakam* July 18, 1908).

Thus if *siddiq, shaheed, saleh* is obtainable, so is *nabuwwat*.

Later, he changed his views, and thus became his **own opponent!**

For a period of time after Prophet Muhammad, Allah did not give these thousands of pious souls the title “nabi” though they were in the rank. If **all** these people had been bestowed the title, finality would become **doubtful** says the Promised Messiah, not compromised. To take it to the next logical conclusion then, theoretically if only a few people in the ummah before the Promised Messiah who **attaining** the spiritual station nabi, were **called** nabi also, there is **no** conflict with last prophet!

The fact is although term *khatamin nabiyyin* has the primary meaning of last in perfection and not time, it **does** secondarily embody elements of “no prophet after” and “finalization” and “completion” in the definition and thus the formal application of the term became restricted.

For a period of time after Muhammad, the title “prophet” was not used for an ummati nabi due to one sense of khatamin nabiyyin being finalization of the office of prophethood. The title was not given openly despite an ummati attaining that high status. Later, Allah **did** appoint an ummati prophet, and **openly called him a prophet**. Thus the ummah of Muhammad became like the ummah of Moses. The Promised Messiah was trying to show the similarity of the two dispensations, which is why these questions came up with Sahibzada Abdul Lateef.

The similarity is **only** established if in the ummah of Muhammad an actual prophet arises, a prophet raised by Allah with the office and mission. **If in the ummah of Muhammad no actual prophet appeared and was only metaphorically called such, then there is no similarity at since khalifas of Moses were actual prophets!**

To say Allah called a person in the ummah of Muhammad a nabi, but really was not one in rank, is a **cheap and empty gesture** in trying to show “similarity” of the respective ummahs.

In fact the ummah of Muhammad is far greater than Moses’, as thousands have achieved the highest level of spiritual status and nearness to Allah called *nabuwwat*, through prayer and obedience to the Holy Prophet. They were just not openly called ‘nabi’. That was to be reserved for the Promised Messiah.

Again, a person attaining the spiritual rank of prophet, then called ‘Nabi’ and then appointed by Allah as a Warner, who formed a Jamaat and made incumbent to accept him according to the words of Muhammad can only be a real prophet, in station and office. MGA was openly called Nabi therefore.

There is another reason why some of the great saints of Islam, though prophets in fulfillment of 4:69 that the spiritual stage is attainable through prayer, were not openly

called prophets. The fact is the definition of “prophet” became **completely transformed** with the advent of Prophet Muhammad. The title “prophet” was to be reserved now for the prophet with the same type of worldwide mission as the Prophet Muhammad had – the same characteristics. Such was the universal mission of the Promised Messiah, addressing and challenging the world community.

As long as he thought an ummati could not be a nabi, he interpreted nabi to be mere muhuddus, as you quote (yawn) from the pre 1901 books, *Tauzi Maram, Izala Auham, and Hamamatul Bushra*.

He denied an ummati could be a real prophet since according to him, in Islamic terminology actual prophets:

“Bring shariah or cancel some edicts of previous shariah or **they are not called the followers of the preceding prophet and keep in touch with God directly without receiving any benefit from any other prophet**” (*Al Hakam* 1899). Thus an ummati cannot be a real prophet, only metaphorically.

Divine revelation guided him to the fact an ummati can become an actual nabi. It was on the **point of prophethood** he proclaimed himself categorically superior to *nabi* Jesus:

“In the beginning I believed that I had no comparison with Jesus son of Mary; **he was a prophet** and one of the chosen ones of God. If there was disclosed anything indicating my superiority, I considered it as a minor and partial phase. However when God poured upon me like rain I could not keep this belief. I was clearly given the title **prophet** – one respect **prophet and also ummati**”.

It is very clear “in the beginning” is the time when he did not appreciate the fact that an ummati could be actual rank of nabi. **He did not gradually realize he was an ummati. He gradually realized the true meaning of ‘nabi’**. Once he became aware of his true status he called himself categorically superior to Jesus in station. I will go into more detail in section IV.

His awareness of his rank, an ummati **and** actual prophet is stated:

“In the course of wahyi coming down on me, Allah has repeatedly called me an ummati as well as a prophet. Hearing myself called by these two names gives me great joy...our master the holy prophet was a prophet of such extraordinary eminence, that even **a member of his ummat could become a nabi, called Isa, even though an ummati, a follower of the holy Prophet** (*Zameema Barahini Ahmadiyya* Part V, page 184).

His words ‘a member of his ummat can become a prophet, **even though he is an ummati**’ clearly indicate that the Promised Messiah is a real Prophet, as well as ummati, not only wali.

Remember he had written before in 1895:

“Those who create a link, a communion with God, directly **without following a nabi**, they are called **prophets**. Those who create such a link with God, by **following the teaching given by a prophet are called wali**” (*Sat Bachan*, page 66-7).

And, actual prophets in Islamic terminology **cannot** “be called followers of a preceding prophet”. (*Al Hakam*, 1899)

Thus looking at the quotes together, by following the other prophets one could become a wali; by following the Holy Prophet Muhammad, in the opinion of the Promised Messiah, one could not only rise to be wali, one could **even** rise to be a prophet, although he was no more than an ummati of the Prophet.

**II.** Regarding *Ek Ghalti ka Izala*, what is **truly remarkable and amazing** to me is the fact though the follower was being corrected for stating Promised Messiah was not a real prophet, Lahoris continue to believe in the misguided follower and continue to say he is not a prophet but mere muhuddus!

Oh, and thank you for calling my words beautiful but regrettably, you have not grasped my beautiful point.

The opponent criticized the follower that he had pledged allegiance to real, actual prophet. The follower responded he was not a real, actual prophet, not knowing Allah called the Promised Messiah ‘nabi’. So the Promised Messiah told his follower, he had been addressed as nabi, not once or twice but hundreds of times. He is saying: he has been called prophet so many times, revelations pouring down like rain to this effect. Why are you saying I am not a prophet?

Nowhere in this book he wrote saints performed the work of prophets now, as you like to quote again and again from his older works and nowhere he stated replace the word “nabi” with “muhuddus”. The entire book is about justification of word ‘nabi’ for him. It makes no sense to write a dissertation if nabi was only a figure of speech, a Sufi metaphorical expression as he wrote in *Anjam i Atham*.

He demolished the idea that law bearing is necessarily a feature of prophethood showing he is speaking of real prophethood. “To bear or bring a new law is no *sine qua non* of prophethood.” He put it quite clearly: “The contention that the word *muhuddus* can adequately describe the spiritual status of such a person (i.e. himself) receives no support from any lexicon”. He described the spiritual advancement of an ummati, on the basis of the verse “Guide us in the right path, the path of those on whom Thou hast bestowed thy

blessings”. He became a nabi by way of *zill*, and I have already defined *zill* based on the Promised Messiah’s writings.

He is justifying the word ‘nabi’ because **he is one**, and this is why the Prophet Muhammad called the future Messiah ‘nabi’, not ‘wali’.

Your rebuttal to *Badr*, 1908 that he was a non-law bearing prophet like the Israelite non-law bearing prophets, falls flat using *Shahadat-ul-Quran* from 1893 that mujaddids do the work of prophets now among Muslims. He did not say that in 1908. Show me a quote from his later writings.

Your quotes from the Promised Messiah only a few days before his death that the dictionary term nabi is the appropriate word for him shows that is his **spiritual status**. The quote from Maulvi Nurrudin made it clear. In the exact same way Maulvi Nurrudin used the dictionary to prove he is a prophet, but without a shariah, to dispel the notion that a prophet must be a law-bearer or modifier, a concept so entrenched in the minds of Muslims.

### III. Several points to make in this section.

All spiritual ranks that people may obtain in the ummah are by *zill*. I have already quoted MGA statement on this.

“No rank of honor, no perfection, no respect and reverence, nor nearness to the Master can be attained without a complete and implicit obedience to the Holy Prophet. Just whatsoever is granted to us it is by **zill** and tufail”. (*Izala Auham* page 139).

This completely undermines your statement that a reflection, however perfect, is not real. It is these spiritual heights that people obtain, by obedience to the Prophet that qualify them for titles we bestow, like auliya, muhuddus, etc. These are **real** spiritual ranks of honor. These stations of honor and rank are mentioned in Quran as siddiq, saleh, shaheed and nabi. I have more to say on this, on my refutation of your *majaz* quotation.

You criticize my statement that the Promised Messiah for some 10 years did not understand his status of nabi vs. muhuddus, and you imply that I insult the Promised Messiah by saying this. **You ignore that the Promised Messiah did not even initially**



**understand his claim in regards to Messiahship**, so why do you balk at his gradual realization of nabuwwat? MGA wrote:

“For nearly **12 years**, which is a long time, I remained entirely oblivious of the fact that with great persistence and emphasis Allah had proclaimed in my Barahini Ahmadiyya that I am the Promised Messiah; **and I remained clinging to the formal, prevailing belief in regard to the second advent of Hazrat Isa**. When a full 12 years had passed, the time came for the correct position folded, and persistent revelation started to come down on me that I myself was the Promised Messiah” (*Ijaz-i- Ahmady*, page 7)

For twelve years the truth remained hidden from the mind of the Promised Messiah. Though he was called Messiah, he continued to believe in the Isa doctrine of orthodox Muslims. With persistent revelation, he realized his true status. The exact same is with his nabuwwat. Though he was called nabi since the beginning, he continued to believe in the nabi doctrine of orthodox Muslims, that a nabi couldn't appear now. After all, nabis, as he had written were either law bearing or independent, not ummati. But due to persistent revelations, he realized his true status and now insisted nabi is the appropriate title for his rank! At this point he proclaimed himself superior to Isa, once he realized he was ummati AND nabi. (*Haqiqatul Wahyi*).

It was in 1891 he finally claimed to be the Promised Messiah though Allah called him Messiah repeatedly in revelation for years. Note that when he claimed to be mujaddid in 1885 he did not understand he was indeed **the** Messiah. Even in 1889, at the time of formal initiation of people into his movement, he **still** did not appreciate his true status. He simply thought Allah had bestowed on him messianic qualities and merely resembled the first Messiah.

Apparent paradoxes and inconsistencies are always corrected, and it makes perfect sense he ultimately should have announced to be the Messiah, performing miracles even greater than the first Messiah. It also makes perfect sense that ultimately he would say he has the rank of nabi, based on the very nature of his mission and the fact he was greater than many previous prophets.

He believed that an ummati could become a prophet, nabuwwat being a spiritual gift. I have quoted from *Will* the prayer from surah Fatiha, that blessings, including the highest blessing (nabuwwat) are open to the ummah. Such a nabi will not bring new religious truths, and is not a new independent prophethood – the latter type of prophethood has ended as stated, so there is no contradiction to what you quote in *The Will*.

Also, as MGA states in the *Will*, and as you quote, many in the ummah reached the spiritual state of nabi. What made the Promised Messiah distinct from others was Allah appointed him with a mission, formed a community, and required all people to pledge allegiance to him. His spiritual height was unmatched by others he writes, since in the ummah in the past 1300 years, no one matched him in abundance and amplitude of

revelations (*Haqiqatul Wahyi*). He thus was truly a nabi in the sense previous nabis were called nabis and singled out to be called nabi by Prophet Muhammad in *Muslim*. While other righteous servants in the ummah were *nabi* in their own sphere and bore a perfect reflection to the Prophet, they were imperfect compared to the Promised Messiah.

You comment on my statement he formed a community and required people accept him before his realization he was a prophet. The fact is, he was a prophet from the beginning, and did the works of a prophet. Because realization is always gradual, apparent inconsistencies are always created, but in the end corrected, as already stated.

Then you say: “you have to clarify how incumbent? Is it as incumbent as accepting the Holy Prophet or as incumbent as accepting a true leader of the Muslims who is preaching and defending Islam?”

If you accept Muhammad, it is **incumbent** to accept all that he says, and **he** said it is **incumbent** for people to accept the Promised Messiah. To accept the Promised Messiah is to accept Prophet Muhammad.

The Prophet Muhammad says: “convey my salaam to him (Messiah) and go to him even if you have to crawl on your knees on glaciers. Extend you hand of bai’at to him and obey him”.

Does that sound like an option? Does Messiah sound like a mere reformer?

Your comment on Maulvi Amrohi that the ulema had prophets in fulfillment of the Quranic verse that all four stages of progress are open does not refute my point. The ulema he refers to have reached the spiritual zenith termed “nabi” and he spoke in reference to the Hadith that some in the ummah are like the prophets of Israel. He is not disputing they reached the top spiritual state. We already quoted *Malfoozat* that some attained prophethood, but **just not given the name openly**. I have quoted *The Will* where prophethood can be attained, and the commentary of Maulvi Muhammad Ali himself.

The problem you are having is, you consider only an appointed person by Allah an actual prophet. The Promised Messiah’s statement contradicts such a belief. Prophethood is a spiritual state. Of course, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was also openly called ‘Nabi’, and held the office in the style of Prophet Muhammad.

**IV.** You have started this section with factual error. What the Promised Messiah has written on his inferiority to Isa in the book *Tiry-ul-Qulub* is from 1899 not 1902!

You are completely wrong when you say the Promised Messiah did not admit a contradiction with his previous writing, he said so clearly there was. Also he **did** call himself a prophet in *Haqiqatul Wahyi*, a status he realized gradually. The evolution of his self-conception, he compared to his **gradual realization** of him being the real Messiah, all on the same page!

The contradiction was, in *Tiry-ul-Qulub* he stated Isa was superior since he was nabi, while he was not, despite the fact he had shown greater miracles and signs. In writings after 1901, the first being *Kishti Nuh* (1902), he categorically called himself superior, with no qualifications. The same continues on, with the book *Haqiqatul Wahyi*. The reason for the superiority was his realization that he was an *ummati and nabi*.

His words are: (words in brackets mine):

“Why has this contradiction crept in...this contradiction is of the same kind as in *Barahin i Ahmadiyya*. I wrote, at one time that the Messiah, son of Mary could descend from Heaven. Later on, however, I put forth that I myself am the Messiah to come in later times. The basis of the contradiction is the same...I **watered down** the interpretation and clung to the former view I shared with rest of the Muslims (i.e. not a real Messiah as the real Messiah is in Heaven)... Revelations came down on me, like rain from heaven, to the effect I **was** the Promised Messiah”...

“Similarly, to begin with it was my belief that I was in no way comparable to Jesus, He was a Prophet...when something occurred which appeared to establish my superiority over him, I took it to apply some limited and partial preference... later on however, the *wahyi* sent down on me by the Lord, like pouring rain, it did not allow me to remain clinging to this belief (i.e., Promised Messiah is inferior to Isa). I found the title **nabi** clearly conferred on me, **nabi** from one angle and **ummati** from another”.

Thus the Promised Messiah excelled Isa in miracles and signs (as you quote), but out of humility he watered down the idea he was an actual nabi. Once he realized through persistent revelation he **was** nabi, though an ummati, just as he realized through persistent revelation he was Messiah, he declared himself categorically superior to Jesus, as he performed greater miracles.

I have already discussed your quote of the Promised Messiah “my prophethood is the zill of the Holy Prophet, not real prophethood”. It presents no difficulty. I will review it again below, section VII.

Regarding dictionary term, nabi, I have already shown it means the religious term; he was a non-law bearing nabi like the non-law bearing nabis of the Israelites (*Badr*, 1908). By

what other term can he be known by, he states. Maulvi Nurrudin also used the dictionary term only to counter the idea he was a *shariah* nabi, not his *status* of nabi.

The quote from *Anjam i Atham* (pages 26-8) that Nabi in Hadith for the Promised Messiah is meant in the metaphorical sense (as in Sufi literature), since the Prophet is *khatam-al anbiyya* is pre 1901. This not the explanation given again in *Barahin i Ahmadiyya* part V, (see section VIII). There, he has dispelled the notion that a nabi must bear a law; He was a non law- bearing nabi just as Israelites had non law-bearing nabis.

The verse (72:26-7), in *Ek Ghalti ka Izala* he takes it mean actual nabi, not mere muhuddus.

In *Ek Ghalti ka Izala*, speaking of Nabis, he mentions the high spiritual characteristics of nabis and quoted the verse “**He does not vouchsafe knowledge of the unseen, unknown except to one who has been chosen and selected by Allah as an Apostle**”. He then said if no nabi is raised after the prophet, it “amounts to believing in the total deprivation of the followers of the holy prophet of revelation and of communion with God because the definition of nabi applies only to that person through whom the secrets of the unknown are revealed”

Here, he is obviously answering to objections by non Ahmadi Muslims who believe nabuwwat has ended. Nabi *can* come he says, otherwise it is total deprivation of the greatest blessing for the ummah. If he is just speaking of saints or mujjadids coming or partial prophethood in relation to the verse, that is hardly a rebuttal, since other Muslims already believe that.

Also, the Hadith about the descent of the Messiah near a minaret east of Damascus, the *Nabi-Ullah* being supported by angels, wearing yellow sheets, is not completely metaphoric. Muhammad Ali wrote in *The Split* that all is metaphoric, and therefore *nabi* should be taken as a metaphoric term. While there are metaphoric meanings in the tradition some of it can be taken as literal and one should not paint with a broad brush. In *Chashma-i- Masihi* (RK Vol 20, p 377) the Promised Messiah wrote: “Let it be noticed that Qadian, my place of residence is exactly east of Damascus; today therefore is fulfilled the prophecy of the Holy Prophet”. In *Tadhkirah Shahadatain* MGA also stated the Promised Messiah was to appear east of Damascus, which he identified as India. He mentioned this fact in also in 1900, in the announcement for collection for funds for building of *Minaratul Masih*. He stated that his village is Qadian, situated east of Damascus.

V. Your statement “there is no fourth source here called my book which are my revelations correcting the false beliefs that Muslims adopted”. The Quran, Sunnah, Hadith are, I agree all that a Muslim needs. But why even have Promised Messiah at all if all complete? Why do we need someone appointed directly by Allah again for the Muslims? The fact his words serve to reinforce existing teachings. You are still stuck in the mode that *kitab* means to bring something new to Islamic doctrine. I have quoted Muhammad Ali himself that *kitab* has a broad meaning, which he has relegated to a footnote in his book *Religion of Islam*. Solomon’s small letter of warning and advice is called *kitab* in the Quran.

It is in this sense all prophets brought a book, including the Promised Messiah. However to claim all prophets brought a book in the law/legal sense to bring or modify an existing law is completely wrong, and I have quoted relevant passages from the Quran to prove my point. Readers can see the previous post.

If you think I am out an a limb, at odds with other Qadianis on this, please read A.R Dard’s *Life of Ahmad*, chapter 77, entitled “Removes a Misconception” and compare it to what I have written on the subject of *kitab* in the posts submitted and tell me if you see a discrepancy. He was a Qadiani Imam of London Mosque appointed by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad.

I have shown quite clearly from *The Will*, that the revelations vouchsafed to the Promised Messiah was at a level **the prophets agree is nabuwwat itself**.

So I don’t understand why you don’t understand. My position is that his revelations did not add or subtract anything from the Quran, the final Law. You agree Hazrat Isa and other Israelite prophets received authoritative revelations; yet, they did not replace or change the Torah, the book of Law of the Israelites.

VI. Readers can judge for themselves. Answering a question with a question. They were well aware of the doctrinal shift.

VII. I did not say **you** used the expression, ‘calling one a lion does not make one a lion’, I said *some people* have used that expression in your Lahore Movement to say Promised Messiah was not a real Nabi. My father, who used to be Lahori and later became Qadiani, himself heard that in the Lahori gatherings he used to attend. Of course, the analogy of lion is completely inappropriate.

Lahoris have not understood the meaning of ‘zill’, ‘majaz’, ‘asli’ ‘haqiqi’, and therefore when the Promised Messiah said he is a prophet by way of *zill* not reality you become

confused. Your response shows you **still** have not grasped it. When I say previous Books are not real, you say I am in apparent violation of a basic teaching of Islam, that we accept all Books. **But I am only quoting the Promised Messiah!**

“Those books (earlier scriptures) **were not real books** intended to endure. Rather they served a temporary passing need. The only **real book** is the Holy Quran. (*Minanur Rahman*, page 7).

The previous books were real, but compared to Quran not real. I have already given other examples of this expression. The Promised Messiah’s nabuwat on his own is real, but relative to the Prophet it is not. The Prophet is the only real Mahdi, not Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. Relative to the Prophet Muhammad, nothing is real.

It is a wonderful statement of praise for the Holy Prophet, that all, even the Prophets, are nothing compared to him. The readers can draw their own conclusion.

Your *majaz* quotation from *Haqiqatul wahyi* is perfectly correct, but as you have already quoted from *Chashma marifat* (RK Vol 23, p 340), the Promised Messiah said in the identical fashion: “I was given this name by way of *zill*, not in a real way”. I have already proven, from the Promised Messiah’s writings, reflection is real. **All** spiritual attainments are by way of *zill*. And those spiritual attainments are real, not artificial. He was a *zilli nabi*.

Thus the words ‘prophet metaphorically not real’ present no difficult at all.

You sarcastically say how could you say the door to prophethood is wide open? Only one has passed through. Please read *Malfoozat* again, quoted above. Thousands have attained the rank of prophethood. They were just not given the name openly. I have already reviewed why for the benefit of the readers.

Your question to Qadianis, how can a prophet arise if the Qadiani Khilafat is forever? This question has already been answered in light of the above.

You have tried to contradict my statement that all prophets before Muhammad were ummati in a sense. The Hadith is: “Had Moses or Jesus been alive, they would have been my followers”. We use this quote to prove the death of Jesus in our debates with non-Ahmadis. The quote from *Barahini Ahmadiyya* Part 5, that Jesus cannot be an ummati, is a rebuttal to those non-Ahmadis who believe the same Jesus of 2000 years ago, the Jew,

will come back. This clearly shows an ummati can rise to rank of nabi. We don't need a nabi of old to do the job, but thanks anyway!

In *Chashma-i-Masihi* (1906) he has also explained this. He stated:

“The maulvis offer an indignity to our Holy Prophet when they say this ummah cannot out of their own ranks have the like of Jesus, son of Mary since that is breaking *khatme nabuwwat*. They say God will send the same Israelite Jesus... They are guilty of not one but two sins... they have to hold the belief that while a servant of God called Isa (Hebrew *Yasu*) having acted for 30 years upon the **law of Moses**, the apostle of God, became an elect of God, and had the honor of being made a prophet; **as against this no man can attain to that honor even if he acts upon the law of the Holy Prophet... They do not see that it becomes fraudulent on part of God to inculcate the prayer: “The path of those on whom thou has bestowed thy blessings”... in this ummat too there should be an ummati from one point of view and a prophet from another... Jesus cannot combine these two characteristics, for ummati is one who attains to spiritual excellence by solely following the Prophet – but Jesus was already possessed of that excellence**”.

Thus again and again, the Promised Messiah stated the path to the highest stage is open, the status of *nabuwwat* in accord with Surah Fatiha and *Al Nisa* 4:69, by following the Holy Prophet.

**VIII.** You state in regards to *Barahin Ahmadiyya V* (RK Vol 21 p. 306), “nabi in this hadith report in Sahih Muslim, it is not *definition* of nabi”. **Completely wrong!** It is so clear, I will present it for the readers for them to decide.

The person is asking how can a nabi appear in the ummah of Muhammad? The answer should have been seven words: “nabi is a metaphor expression for muhuddus” as he described in *Izala Auham*. It was not. The Promised Messiah started by saying, the “**meaning of nabi**” and said it is **not essential** they bring a law and he **must** they be an ummati. A **meaning** has been set down. Some nabis bring law some don't. It is **not essential**. To bring a law is an additional feature nabis had. To deny this is to deny the light of the midday sun. I hope the reader can see it if you can't.

Here are other quotes, which support my position:

“No Prophet, with a shariah, can come; **but a prophet not bearing a new law can most surely appear.**” (*Tajalliyati Ilahiya*, page 25, RK Vol 20, page 412).

Maulvi Nurrudin said, definition of nabi is one who receives abundant revelations, “not one who brings a Shariah” (*Badr*, Oct 27, 1910).

“Law bearing is no *sine qua non* of prophethood” (*Ek Ghalti ka Izala*).

“Among the Israelites there were **several nabis to whom no law was revealed**...it was these prophecies that entitled them to be called nabis...**same is the case with my mission**. If I am not a nabi, what other distinctive word is there which will distinguish me from other recipients of divine revelation?” (*Badr*, 1908 already quoted before).

Thus in the way some previous nabis were non-law bearing among the Israelites, he was non-law bearing nabi also.

Readers can decide if a definition of nabi has been set down, or whether your excuses can stand critical analysis.

I would like to say this is not some kind of Qadiani make-believe. The *mujaddid*, Shah Wali Ullah Muhuddus of Delhi has said:

“Prophets have been ended with Muhammad in the sense that there will be found no one after him who is commissioned by God with Shariat for men” (*Tafheemat I Ilahiyya*, p 72-3).

As already shown, your quote from *Barahin Ahmadiya* part 5, RK Vol 21 p364, is not against the **principle** of ummati being a nabi. It is against the principle of the old Jesus, the Jew, coming back, as the context clearly shows. He followed a different book, the Promised Messiah argued. The ummati nabi must be a disciple of Muhammad, an Imam from **among** you (*imam mu kum min kum*), as *Sahih Bukhari* puts it. So your conclusion is plain wrong.

Regarding the question presented to MGA, can it be shown from Quran or Hadith a muhuddus be called a nabi? The very question shows he is asking for a definition and meaning of nabi. The answer should have been simple. “Yes, because in the Sufi books you will read nabi is a metaphoric term for one close to God. And God forbid a muhuddus can really be a nabi, for Muhammad is the last prophet”. That is not the answer! His answer gives you **no support** whatsoever. It is essentially the same as before, that the **meaning** of nabi is a person with certain spiritual status. It is that status that makes a mere muhuddus a nabi. He also said earlier in an answer to a similar question, that law bearing is **not essential** as a function of a nabi. It is merely an extra feature and position for some prophets, depending on the needs of the people of the time.



The quotation where auliyya is mentioned in the same paragraph as nabi, and attempting to construe auliyya is the same as nabi I have already explained it in the previous post, and readers can judge. Auliyya can reach the excellences of prophethood and attain that spiritual stature. I see no contradiction to what I presented.

**IX.** Bahais? They believe Bahauallah to be a prophet-God, and his teachings replaced the shariah of Islam as you say. Which *Al-Fazl* articles state Promised Messiah replaced the shariah of Islam?

The quotes from Muhammad Ali from 1906, I will touch on in the next section below.

**X.** There is nothing in Sadiq's sahib's words against the belief of the actual prophethood of the Promised Messiah. He is not saying 'we don't preach his prophethood', he is saying 'we don't **go around** preaching his prophethood' (read the Urdu). It is a matter of responsible speech so as to prevent a misunderstanding an independent prophet, a co-nabi or replacement nabi has arrived. This is what he wanted for Shilbi to understand, who may not be familiar with the concept of zill, and Muslims in general took the term 'nabi' to mean a type of legislative position. He meant to tell him: Qadianis are not replacing Ahmad's prophethood with Muhammad's prophethood!

There is absolutely no contradiction in Sadiq sahib's words with the Qadiani belief that the river of nabuwat is still flowing, and God speaks to his chosen servants as he has done in the past. Jamaat publications vigorously and openly expound this, while Lahoris and Orthodox Muslims sadly, want to believe the greatest Divine gift is now history.

Thus your outrageous comment, steeped in prejudice, that converts to Qadian jamaat are duped into thinking he was not really a prophet and misled is absurd. Our interpretation of khatam is world famous, not hidden.

Maulvi Nurrudin statement that the Promised Messiah is a nabi, using a dictionary and not a person bringing a shariah, is clear proof that the only thing being denied is law-bearing prophethood.

Also, to say he only said '*Mujaddid*' in the letter referring to the Promised Messiah, thus in effect negating actual prophethood is wrong. Prophet Muhammad was called *Mujaddid e Azam* by the Promised Messiah himself (*Lecture Sialkot*, page 4). Thus if a law-bearer can be called mujaddid, so can a non-law bearing prophet.

I have already provided quotes from 1906 and 1911 that show Mirza Mahmud, Mufti Sadiq and those who later formed the Lahori branch were on the same page on the spiritual status of Promised Messiah. The information you provide on Kamaluddin and his interactions with Mirza Mahmud Ahmad is not convincing at all, readers can read it for themselves online and draw their own conclusions.

To say Mirza Mahmud Ahmad believed the Promised Messiah was not a prophet based on *Badr*, March, 1911 is false, since he said clearly no person can be *mamur minallah* unless he bears the seal of the prophet's obedience; this means an *ummati* and *zilli nabi*. He also said many in the ummah attained the rank of prophethood, contradicting what you are trying to show.

Moreover, his article from 1906, five years earlier is very clear, endorsed by Muhammad Ali. Readers can refresh their memory by looking at previous posts where I quote the statements. **Nowhere** you will find in the writings of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and Maulvi Muhammad Ali **before the split** stating saints do the work of prophets now, or that 'nabi' is a metaphorical term. In the same way Allah revived communities in the past with Prophets, he did in the present case also, as Muhammad Ali so beautifully wrote.

Muhammad Ali has used *mujaddid* interchangeably with prophet, but that is not necessarily an exclusive term to mean non-prophet. Shah Wali-Ullah of Delhi called prophets of Israel who served the Law of Moses, '*mujaddids*', and I have already quoted the Promised Messiah above.

Your quote of Muhammad Ali from *Review of Religions*, 1906, pp 253-4 does not help you. He stated, "No Divine blessing can be attained **except** through the Holy Prophet" and "no **old prophet** can come back and he "must be follower of the Holy Prophet who should be raised to the dignity of Messiah..." He clearly implied an old prophet is not required and in fact, an insult. For by following the Prophet Muhammad, an *ummati* can attain great spiritual heights, as he himself had written (already quoted). The top category is **nabi**. He again repeated it in 1908, in *Review of Religions*, page 186:

"This movement holds no Prophet old or new, can come as a direct recipient of Prophethood without a link with the Holy Prophet...all doors leading to prophethood are closed **except** for one who should enter in complete obedience to him...for him the **door remains open** in Divine discretion".

If he meant only wali, this was the place to say it.

Unfortunately only seven years later, in 1915 he was to write in *Paigham i Sulha*:

"As far as I can see, the view that the Promised Messiah was a Prophet is tantamount to pulling up and destroying Islam by the roots...if you do not close the door to Prophethood, in my opinion, it is an extremely dangerous path".

In 1912, the entire Jamaat was on the same page on the prophethood of Promised Messiah. *Badr*, March 22, 1912 published a highly acclaimed article on family tree of Maulvi Nurrudin. Recounting he was from the family of Umar the second Khalifa of a Prophet, it was stated:

**“Allah made one from the sons of Umar (i.e. Nurrudin) the first Khalifa of a Prophet”.**

Later that year in 1912, a member of the community published a book on the biography of Maulvi Nurrudin making reference to that article. If anyone wants further information on the book, they can contact me.

Your comments on *Tajalliyat Ilahiyya* are meaningless to the discussion. Not all righteous persons, though status of nabi, are appointed as such. They are non-prophets in the sense they are not appointed, but their spiritual status is that of nabi. And all nabis are muhudduses also. Many so-called non-prophets were actually in *nabi* in stature. One such person was Mary, mother of Jesus.

But MGA **was** appointed by Allah and received high-grade Divine communion, which the prophets agree is nabuwat (*The Will*). When a disciple of his said to an opponent MGA did not have the status of nabi, he was corrected. MGA moreover was instructed to form a community and the Prophet Muhammad **required** Muslims to accept Messiah when he appeared. Thus he was a nabi like other nabis.

**XI.** Re: Ahmad prophecy in Quran. Readers should look at the Qadiani commentary and Muhammad Ali’s commentary. To deny that the Ahmad prophecy is related to the second coming of Isa fulfilled by MGA is ignoring what the Promised Messiah himself wrote and the words of Muhammad Ali himself.

I have already quoted the words of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad in the first book after becoming khalifa. The readers should see the so-called contradictory words of Mirza Mahmud in *Anwar i Khilafat* and the rebuttal in the book *Truth Prevails*, online chapter 4.

The most reasonable conclusion is the prophecy of Ahmad is a dual one as the Qadiani commentary states, while there remains **complete denial** in Muhammad's Ali's commentary under this verse that MGA also fulfilled the prophecy of the future rasul. I can only repeat what I have said before for readers to judge.

The Promised Messiah said (*Ijazul Masih* Chapter II, page 22-3):

“**Isa** has pointed out to the people coming later to join the ranks of the companions of the Holy Prophet with **their Imam quite clearly identified by the name Ahmad**”.

This is not merely an *ishara*. He is *the* Ahmad. The fact that *Ijazul Masih* was written before *Ek Ghalti ka Izala* is not a rebuttal. The quote proves Promised Messiah is also the object of the prophecy and has applied the prophecy to himself in a plain and open manner. He is the Imam, i.e. Imam Mahdi and his name is Ahmad.

In revelation he has been addressed such:

“O, Ahmad you have been made an Apostle”. (Tadhkirah)

I have already quoted *Al Hakam*, 1905, where the Promised Messiah said:

“They do not seem to be aware that **Allah name me Ahmad**. The pledge of bai'at is taken in the name of Ahmad. **Is not this name found in the Quran?**”

Muhammad Ali: (ROR Vol 12 No 7 page 236, 1913)

“Who is Mirza Ghulam **Ahmad**? In **words of the Quran** we reply, ‘He will come after me his name will be **Ahmad**’”.

Here he identifies MGA with rasul prophecy of the Quran, **quoting the very Quranic words we are discussing**. In his Quran commentary on this verse, he does not write Mirza Ghulam Ahmad fulfilled the prophecy.

The statement in the *Review of Religions* is very bold, and if you infer from Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's words there was no agreement in the interpretation of this verse, no one told Muhammad Ali that!

He further stated in his Quran commentary the names Muhammad and Ahmad are of *jalal* and *jamal* names respectively, and both these elements combined in one person, the Holy Prophet. This is very true, but does not mention MGA as having fulfilled it also.

Yet, the open and full manifestation of *Ahmad* is in the **second coming**. Says the Promised Messiah: “The Holy Prophet had a hidden and sensitive likeness with Hazrat Isa as well therefore, in the manner of boruz, he manifested that hidden likeness to the **fullest extent** in his advent as **Ahmad, the counterpart of Hazrat Isa** (*Tohfa Golarwiah*, page 96).

Thus very dogmatically, Muhammad Ali in his Quran commentary under this verse has denied MGA has fulfilled the prophecy in name, Faruqi, the Lahori author is downright angry that MGA is made the object of the prophecy and you continue to say in your post, the word 'rasul' can **only** refer to the Holy Prophet.

Qadianis also say the prophecy applies to Muhammad, who came right 'after him', so that is not an issue. The prophecy **also** related to a messenger to come in the future, the second coming of Muhammad, fulfilled in the person of Ahmad, who is also *Ghulam* of Ahmad!

## **XII.** Implications.

Your remark about the Promised Messiah not knowing he was indeed a nabi until later I have already addressed. It doesn't bother you in the least that MGA did not initially understand his own status regarding his Messiahship and appointment as Imam Mahdi. He formally invited people into his community believing Jesus is alive in Heaven and will come back one day, and then later declared he actually **was** the Messiah through down pouring of revelation to that effect.