

THE  
AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT

II

THE DOCTRINE.

BY

MUHAMMAD ALI, M.A., LL.B.,

*Author of an English translation of the Holy Qur-an  
with commentary, the Principles of Islams, etc.*

1918.

LAHORE.

---

Coloured Printing Press, Rang Mahal, Lahore.

[www.aail.org](http://www.aail.org)

## PREFACE.

THIS is the second tract of the series on the Ahmadiyya movement, and like the first tract, this is also partly a reproduction of what I wrote in May 1906 in the Review of Religions under the heading "A short sketch of the Ahmadiyya movement." It deals briefly with the special doctrines of the Ahmadiyya movement leaving the fuller discussion of the more important subjects connected with it for treatment in separate tracts.

MUHAMMAD ALI.

LAHORE :

AHMADIYYA BUILDINGS ;

July 1917.

For over ten years the movement founded by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian was not known by any particular name, and the name Ahmadiyya was adopted by him in November 1900 for the purpose of ascertaining the number of his followers in the census of 1901. The announcement giving the name was published on the 4th November 1900, and the reason for appropriating this name is given as follows at the end of that announcement :

“ And the reason for giving to this sect the name *Muslims of the Ahmadiyya sect* is this that our Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, had two names, one Muhammad and the other Ahmad. Now the name Muhammad was indicative of glory, and in it there was a hidden prophecy that the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, would punish with the sword those enemies of Islam who attacked Islam with the sword and killed hundreds of Muslims. But the name Ahmad was a name expressive of beauty, the significance underlying which was that the Holy Prophet would spread harmony and peace in the world.

So Almighty God brought about a division relating to these two names in this manner that at first in the Meccan period of the Holy Prophet's life, there was a manifestation of the name Ahmad, and stress was laid upon patience and forbearance. Then, in the Medina period, there took place a manifestation of the name Muhammad, and Divine wisdom ordained the punishment of the opponents. But it was prophesied that, in the latter days, there would be a manifestation of the name Ahmad again, and a person would appear through whom the attributes of Ahmadiyyat, i.e., attributes expressive of beauty, would be manifested and there would be an end of all fights. Owing to this reason, it seems proper that this sect should be called the Ahmadiyya sect, so that every one on hearing this very name should come to know that this sect has come into existence to spread harmony and peace."

This quotation shows clearly that the name Ahmadiyya is not after the founder but after the name Ahmad of the Holy Founder of Islam.

The central doctrine of the Ahmadiyya movement is that its founder is the Promised Messiah and the Promised Mahdi. And first we have to see **what** is the significance underlying these two

names. The following passage from a writing of the founder himself will best explain this. He writes: "As I have been given the name of Messiah by God with reference to the creatures' rights and am an incarnation of Jesus Christ on account of having been sent in his spirit and character and cast in the same mould, so I have received the name of Muhammad Ahmad by virtue of my functions as a reformer of the transgression of the Creator's authority. To spread the Unity of God, therefore, I have been sent in the spirit and character and cast in the mould of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him. Thus I am at once *Isa Masih* and *Muhammad Mahdi*. *Masih* is a title given to Jesus Christ and it means one who is anointed and blessed by God, His vicegerent on earth and a truthful and righteous person. The title of *Mahdi* was given to the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and it means one who is guided and the heir to all truths, and in whom the attribute "Guide" of the Almighty is fully represented. The grace of God and His mercy have made me the heir to both these titles in this age and manifested them conjointly in my person. This is the true interpretation of my claim to the titles of *Isa*

*Masih* and *Muhammad Mahdi*. The way in which this manifestation has taken place is known in Islamic terminology as *baruz*.\* I am, therefore, a *baruz* of Jesus as well as of Muhammad, peace be with them, and my person is spiritually a combination of the persons of these two eminent prophets." (Jehad and the British Government, Supplement, page 5.)

The claim of the founder of the movement to be the Promised Mahdi strikes at the root of the orthodox but erroneous doctrine that the Mahdi will be a warrior, who along with the Messiah will wage wars against the non-Muslims until they are all slain or accept the faith of Islam. As against this doctrine, the Ahmadiyya movement holds that the reports speaking of a fighting Mahdi are all unreliable, and this is the reason that both *Bukharee* and *Muslim*, the two most reliable collections of reports, omit all reports relating to the advent of the Mahdi; that the Messiah and Mahdi are two names of one and the same person whose advent in the last ages was foretold as is indicated in the report "There is no Mahdi other

---

\* *Baruz* in Sufi terminology means the spiritual appearance of one in the person of another, the two bearing a striking resemblance to each other in their qualities and character. *Baraza* literally means *he appeared*.

than the Messiah", which is met with in one of the six authentic works on reports; and that the only reliable report in connection with the nature of the message of that person is that recorded in the *Sahih Bukharae*, the most reliable work on reports, which says that "he will put an end to war." The significance of these words is that in bringing about the supremacy of Islam, he shall not encounter the difficulties which were met with in the spread of Islam at its birth, and the conditions of the time would not require his having recourse to war.

The most important doctrine of the Ahmadiyya movement arises out of the claim of its founder to be the Promised Messiah. This doctrine may be considered from two different points of view, firstly in its relation to Christianity and secondly in its relation to Islam. In its relation to Christianity, the doctrine is interpreted in the same light as the doctrine of the advent of Elijah was interpreted by Jesus Christ. The distinguishing sign of the appearance of the true Messiah, according to the Jewish Scriptures, was the second advent of Elijah before that of the Messiah. Accordingly, when Jesus claimed to be the Promised Messiah of the Israelites, they questioned him about the prophecy relating to the advent of Elijah. The

interpretation given by Jesus was that John the Baptist was the Elijah of the prophecy (Matt. xi : 14) because he came " in the spirit and power of Elijah " (Luke i : 17). It is exactly in accordance with the interpretation given by Jesus that the Ahmadiyya movement interprets the doctrine of the second advent of Christ, and looks upon the advent of its leader " in the spirit and power " of Christ as the second advent of Christ. It is a remarkable fact that long before he claimed to be the Promised Messiah and to have come in the spirit and power of Christ, and while he, as yet, adhered to the orthodox Muslim doctrine regarding the second advent of Jesus, he saw a vision, which he published in the *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya*, to the effect that he and Jesus were parts of the same spiritual essence, *i.e.*, one in spirit and power. This revelation, received nearly ten years before he claimed to be the Promised Messiah, shows clearly that Almighty God meant him from the beginning to fill that office, although he himself did not know it; for in the same book in which this revelation was published, the author expressed his adherence to the ordinary doctrine of the second advent of Jesus. It shows clearly that the claim to Promised Messiahship was not the idea of his own

brain. Besides this vision, there are many revelations published in the same book in which their recipient is plainly addressed as Jesus, and all this while he knew nothing that he was to fill the office of the Messiah.

The claim to Promised Messiahship, in the sense explained above, brought the movement face to face with Christianity with respect to the central doctrine of that religion, *viz.*, the resurrection of Jesus. As the Jews believe on the strength of their sacred books that Elijah had been taken up alive into heaven, the Christians entertain a similar belief with respect to Jesus. But they further maintain that Jesus died on the cross, was buried, and rose on the third day. The Gospels do not tell us what explanation Jesus gave of the alleged ascent of Elijah to heaven when he interpreted his second advent as the advent of John in his "spirit and power". But in the case of the Ahmadiyya movement such explanation has not been wanting. It holds as against the orthodox Christian doctrine that Jesus did not die on the cross but only swooned, that he was not buried but placed in a comfortable spacious room hewn into a rock, that he did not rise from the dead but only recovered from the swoon, that he did not ascend to heaven, but

came to Afghanistan and India to preach to the lost tribes of Israel, and that he now lies buried in the Khan Yar Street at Srinagar, Cashmere, where he is known under several names, *Yus Asaf* (*Yus* is only a corruption of the Hebrew *Yasu'* for which we have Jesus), *Shahzada Nabi* (which means a prince-prophet, being a title of Jesus), and *Nabi Sahib* (*i.e.*, the prophet). The evidence for these assertions is given below.

(i) Evidence from the Gospels. (1) Jesus prophetically likens his own fate to that of Jonah (Matt., 12 : 39, 40 ; Luke, 11 : 29, 30). But Jonah never died in the whale's belly, though he could not have been taken but for a dead man. Jesus, therefore, prophesied that he would remain alive like Jonah. (2) Jesus said that he had been sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt. 15 : 24), and that he had come " to *seek* and *save* that which was lost " (Luke 19 : 10). It is certain that the Jews at Palestine did not represent more than two tribes of Israel and the other ten tribes had long before settled in the East. These were, therefore, properly the *lost* sheep and they were to be *sought* and saved. It was, therefore, to these tribes that Jesus betook himself after the crisis of crucifixion. (3) The dream of Pilate's wife (Matt.

27 : 19) was meant to save the life of Jesus. Why should have the angel appeared to the Magistrate's wife pleading for the safety of Jesus if it had not been God's will that he should be saved. (4) The prayer of Jesus the night before his arrest affords another very strong evidence of his being taken down alive from the cross, for the prayer of a righteous man in distress and affliction is never rejected by God. In fact, Almighty God had promised to save him from the disgraceful death on the cross, and Jesus was referring to this promise when he cried " My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me " (Matt. 27 : 46). Heb. 5 : 7 makes the matter still more clear, for there the acceptance of this prayer of Jesus is admitted in clear words : " When he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him *that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared.*" In fact no clearer evidence than this is needed to show that Jesus did not die on the cross. (5) Jesus remained on the cross for a few hours only, but death by crucifixion was always tardy. The two men crucified along with Jesus were still alive when taken down from the cross, and therefore Jesus could not have died so soon. (6) The breaking of legs which was resorted

to in the case of the other two criminals was dispensed with in the case of Jesus. (7) The side of Jesus being pierced, blood rushed out, and this was a sure sign of life. (8) Even Pilate did not believe that Jesus could die so soon (Mark 15 : 44). (9) Jesus was not buried like the other culprits, but was taken in charge by a wealthy disciple of his, who lavished care upon him and put him in a spacious room, hewn in the side of a rock. (10) When the tomb was seen on the third day, the stone was found to have been removed from its mouth, which would not have been the case if there had been a supernatural rising. (11) Mary, when she saw him, supposed him to be the gardener (John 20 : 15), which shows that Jesus had disguised himself as a gardener. Such disguise would not have been needed if Jesus had risen from the dead. (12) It was in the same body of flesh that the disciples saw Jesus, and the wounds were still deep enough for a man to thrust his hand in, and he still felt hunger and ate as his disciples ate (Luke 24 : 39-43). (13) Jesus undertook a journey to Galilee with two of his disciples walking side by side with him. It shows clearly that he was flying, as an ordinary man would have fled, from the country where he was

persecuted, to some place of safety. If his object had been to rise to heaven, he would not have undertaken a journey to Galilee. It can hardly be assumed that Galilee was a station where tickets were available for an upward journey. (14) In all the post-crucifixion appearances Jesus is found concealing and hiding himself as if he feared being discovered. A risen Jesus should have made a public appearance and should not have shown any fear of being discovered by the persecuting Jews.

(ii) The evidence furnished by the other sources is conclusive in itself. One of these sources is the ointment which is known under several names, the ointment of Jesus, the ointment of the disciples, the ointment of the apostles. It is mentioned in numerous works on medicine. This ointment is said to have been prepared for Jesus by his apostles, and the different names given to it corroborate this statement. It is spoken of highly by medical authorities as having an extraordinary

---

\* A list of the names of these works is given in the Review of Religions, Vol. II, No. 10. Some of the most important of these are, the *Qanun* by Avicenna (Bu Ali Sina), three of its commentaries, the *Majmu'ah Baqai*, the *Iksir-i-A'zam*, the *Umda-tul-Muhtaj*, the *Muhit-ut-Tibb*, and the various *qarabadins*.

efficacy in healing wounds. Since there is no evidence that Jesus ever received any wounds besides those which he received on the cross, the conclusion arrived at is clearly this that the ointment was prepared by the apostles for the wounds of their master which he received on the cross.

(iii) The discovery of the tomb at Srinagar is the third source of evidence showing that Jesus did not die on the cross. Several circumstances may be mentioned as supporting this conclusion. (1) Oral testimony, based on tradition, of the people of Cashmere, tells us that the tomb belongs to one who bore the name of Yus Asaf, who was known as a *Nabi* (i.e., prophet) and as *Shahzada* (prince) who came to Cashmere from some country in the West some 1,900 years ago. The tomb is also known as that of *Nabi Sahib*. (2) The *Tarikh Azmi*, a history of Cashmere written some two hundred years ago, says referring to this tomb on page 82: "This tomb is generally known as that of a prophet. I have seen in a book on history that a prince came to Cashmere (from an other land). He was perfect in his piety, righteousness and devotion. He was made a prophet by God and was engaged in preaching to the people of Cashmere. His name was

Yus Asaf". (3) The *Ikmal-ud-Dīn*, an Arabic work a thousand years old, says: "He (Yus Asaf) wandered about in several lands and towns until he reached a land and lived and stayed therein until death overtook him." (4) Joseph Jacob also states on the authority of a very old version of the story of Yus Asaf that he (Joasaph) at last reached Cashmere and there died. (*Barlaam and Josaphat*, p. cv). (5) There are many circumstances which identify Yus Asaf with Jesus.

(a) There is conclusive testimony that he was a foreigner and not a resident of Cashmere or India.

(b) He is universally known as a *Nabi* or a prophet among the Muslims, and therefore he cannot be a Muslim saint; for no Muslim saint has been called a *Nabi* after the Holy Prophet. The word *Nabi* occurs only in two languages, viz., Arabic and Hebrew, and no Indian saint could be called a *Nabi*. But the only *Nabi* in Arabia was the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and therefore Yus Asaf can only be a Hebrew prophet.

(c) The time which tradition and history ascribe to Yus Asaf is the time of the prophet Jesus.

(d) The name *Yus* is clearly the same as *Yasu*, the Hebrew original of the word Jesus.

(e) It is even stated that Yus Asaf was an Israelite fugitive who came

from Syria. It is easy to see that such a fugitive could be none but Jesus, for the time of the two is the same. Moreover, the life of no other Israelite prophet is attended with the mysterious circumstances with which the life of Jesus is attended. (f) Besides being called *Nabi*, Yus Asaf is called a *Shahzada* or a prince, and this also identifies him with Jesus. (g) The teachings of Yus Asaf have a striking resemblance with those of Jesus. Some of the parables in the two are quite identical. For instance, compare the following parable uttered by Yus Asaf with Matt. 13 : 3, Mark 4 : 3, and Luke 8 : 5 : "When the sower sows his seed, some falls on the highway where the passengers tread it under foot. Others are blown away by the wind. Others picked up by the birds. Some seeds fall on rocky ground and grow only till the roots reach the rock. Others fall among the thistles. Only a small portion falls in rich earth, where it grows and brings forth fruit. The sower is the sage ; the seed is his wisdom. The seeds that fall by the way side, &c., are pieces of wisdom that come into one ear only to go out of the other. Those falling on rocky ground are not taken to heart. Those among thorns meet with opposition from the senses. Only that which

takes root in the heart brings forth fruit in the character" (Barlaam and Josaphat, page cxi). (h) Still more striking is the circumstance that the prophet Yus Asaf gives the name *Bushrá* (Hebrew and Arabic for *Gospel*) to the word he preached, as in the following passage from the *Ikmal-ud-Din*: "Then he began to compare the tree to *Bushra* (*Gospel*) which he preached to the people, and he likened the spring of water to the wisdom and knowledge which he possessed, and the birds he compared to the people that swarmed round him and accepted his religion." The identity in parables and names of the books preached by Jesus and Yus Asaf clearly shows that Yus Asaf was no other than Jesus. (i) The book of Yus Asaf was translated into almost all the European languages, and the Christian world has always held him in great honour. Even a church was raised in honour of his name in Sicily. These circumstances show that the Christians, even if they did not recognise the actual identity of these two personages, at least admitted a strong and close connection between them. But considering the time of Yus Asaf, the conclusion is inevitable that if Yus Asaf was not Jesus, he was one of his disciples. But as none of his disciples

was ever called a *Nabi* or a prince, the only possible conclusion to which all these circumstances lead is that Yus Asaf was no other than Jesus.

(j) Christian writers have tried to identify Yus Asaf with Buddha asserting that the word is a corruption of Budhistava which was first changed into Josaphet and then into Yus Asaf. But the mere possibility of the corruption of one word into an entirely different word is no proof. Besides this, the remains of Yus Asaf lie at Srinagar while those of Buddha have been discovered elsewhere, which conclusively shows that Budha and Yus Asaf are two entirely different persons.

(iv). The Messiah promised to the Israelites was the Messiah of all the Israelite tribes, ten of which had settled in the East in Afghanistan and Cashmere. Therefore, it was necessary that Jesus should have gone to them. The following evidence shows the truth of the assertion that these two people represent the ten lost tribes of Israel.

(1) The Afghans unanimously claim to be of an Israelite descent. Prejudice against the Jews is so strong that such a claim could never have been made if there had been no truth underneath it. They have also family geneologies through which they trace their descent to Israel. Nor is the

claim a new one ; it is as old as the race itself. (2) In their physical features the Afghans and the Kashmiris bear no resemblance to their neighbours, but their resemblance with the Jews is most striking. (3) In their dress, character and customs there is the same resemblance. (4) Some proper names among the Afghans and the Kashmiris are clearly of Israelite origin, such as the names of certain tribes of Afghans and the names of certain places in Cashmere. (5) The names of certain towns in Afghanistan and Cashmere are the very names which their cities &c. bore in their ancient home. For instance, the modern names Kabul, Punch, Zaida, Himis, Gilgit, Laddakh, Leh, Suro, Suket may be compared with Cabul, Phoenicia, Zidon or Sidon, Hams, Golgotha, Laddah, Lehi, Shur, and Succoth of Ancient Syria. (6) Eminent writers and travellers have borne testimony to the same effect.

Next we take up the question in relation to Islam. There are clear prophecies in the sayings of the Holy Prophet, speaking of the advent of Jesus Christ in the latter days. These prophecies are met with in such reliable collections as the *Sahih Bukharee* and the *Sahih Muslim*, unlike the reports speaking of the advent of the Mahdi, none

of which is met with in these two important collections. The testimony of these reports therefore cannot be rejected, there being a number of reports through various channels in the *Sahih Bukharee* alone. But there are insuperable difficulties in the return of Jesus Christ to this life or to this world, and these must engage our attention first of all.

In the first place, we are encountered with the difficulty that if Jesus Christ should come back, he and not the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, would be the last of the prophets. Now, the Holy Qur-an clearly describes the Holy Prophet Muhammad to be *Khatam-un-nabiyyin*, i.e., the seal or the last of the prophets (33 : 40).

And this verse was explained by the Holy Prophet himself and there is a number of reports of the highest authority in which this explanation is contained. According to one of these reports the Holy Prophet said : "My case and the case of the prophets before me is like this that a man built a house and he made it beautiful and complete with the exception of a brick in the corner, so the people began to make circuits about it and they wondered and said, ' why have you not placed this brick ?' So I am that brick and I am the last of

the prophets." The brick of the corner is evidently the stone which was to become the "head of the corner" having been rejected by the builders (Matt. 21 : 42). Jesus himself explains this, where he says: "The Kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." (Matt. 21 : 43). Evidently he is addressing the Israelite nation, the rejected stone being the Ishmaelites, on account of Ishmael being cast off. Now, if there was only the place of one brick in the house which represents prophethood and that place was filled up by the corner stone of prophethood, the Holy Prophet Muhammad, where is room for Jesus Christ here? If Jesus Christ should ever come back he can have no place among the prophets. The finality of the prophethood of Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, is a bar to the second advent of Jesus Christ, which can only be removed by denying the Holy Prophet Muhammad to be the last of the prophets. Only he can be designated the last of the prophets who appears last in the world, and if Jesus Christ appears after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, he, and not Muhammad, would be the last of the prophets.

Those who have had occasion to consider this

difficulty have tried to overstep it by holding that Jesus Christ would not come back as a *prophet* but simply as a *follower* of the Holy Prophet. But this explanation really creates another equally great difficulty, for one who is made a prophet by God can never be divested of that dignity. The highest honour which Almighty God confers upon a person is to make him His Messenger to His people, to reveal His will to him, to make him an exemplar for them and to grant him a position so great that he must be obeyed in all matters. Now, whenever Almighty God bestows any favour upon a person, He never divests him of it, unless he commits some fault unworthy of that dignity. The question, then, is for what fault will Jesus be divested of the great dignity of prophethood? This explanation, therefore, is inadmissible on the very face of it.

Are the reports speaking of the advent of Jesus Christ, then, to be rejected as being opposed to the very basic principles of Islam? I have already said that these reports are too many and they are credited by the highest authorities on reports unanimously. Therefore we cannot reject them without casting doubts upon the very reliability of reports. A little consideration shows that these

reports may be accepted as substantially true if they are interpreted rightly. The reports speak of the second advent of a person, and sacred history furnishes an example of what the second advent means. There is no doubt that there have been changes in the books of the prophets included in that big collection called the Bible, but their evidence as history cannot be neglected altogether especially when their evidence may explain a moot point.

The question of the second advent of Jesus Christ is indeed a question which deserves the deepest consideration. The second advent is spoken of in many reports of the highest authenticity, but the re-appearance of Jesus Christ in the world is attended with insurmountable difficulties. We can neither accept it literally, nor reject it totally. In the former case, we deny the basic principle of Islam, on which the whole Muslim world has always been unanimous, the principle of the finality of prophethood in Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him; and in the latter case, we attack the reliability of all reports. A study of the Holy Qur-an really solves our difficulty but before considering that, I would give a concrete example of what *second advent* means in

sacred literature. There is a prophecy in Malachi that the prophet Eliljah would re-appear before the advent of Christ: "Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord" (Mal. 4 : 5). This prophecy could have been rejected as a case of alteration but the Gospels contain too strong evidence to dispose of it in this manner. When Jesus claimed to be the Messiah, the objection that Elijah must re-appear before his advent was brought to his notice (Matt. 17 : 10-13):

"And his disciples asked him saying, why then say the scribes that Elias must first come.

"And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly shall first come and restore all things.

"But I say unto you that Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed.....

"Then the disciples understood that he spoke unto them of John the Baptist."

This incident is described in almost similar words in Mark 8 : 11-13, while Luke making up the deficiency gives the explanation why the appearance of John the Baptist was to be looked upon as the second advent of Elias, for he thus relate the prophecy regarding the birth of John :

“ And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias ” (Luke 1 : 17). The synoptics are thus agreed that there was a prophecy of the second advent of Elias, and that Jesus Christ explained this as meaning the appearance of John the Baptist, the reason being that he came in the spirit and power of Elias. Even if a single Gospel had mentioned this incident we could not have rejected it, for the record could not have been altered in a matter which stood as an objection against the claims of Jesus. But here there is an agreement of the synoptics and their evidence cannot be lightly set aside.

This incident, therefore, settles conclusively that Jesus Christ explained the second advent of a prophet as meaning the appearance of one in his spirit and power, and adopting this explanation there remains not the least difficulty in connection with the prophecies of the second advent of Jesus Christ, for his own explanation settles the point beyond all doubt. We can accept the reports as quite true and interpret them as signifying the appearance of a person in the spirit and power of Jesus Christ, and this interpretation is not only not opposed to any basic principle of Islam but it is really quite in accordance with the testimony of

the Holy Qur-an and authentic reports.

We will, therefore, now see to what conclusion the Holy Qur-an leads us. According to it, Almighty God laid down the foundation of the Israelite law with Moses, the great law-giver of Israel, and brought the Mosaic dispensation to a close by raising a Messiah. Thus Moses was the first and Christ the last prophet of the Mosaic dispensation. Almighty God had moreover promised to Moses that another prophet "like unto" him would be raised from among his brethren (Deut. 18 : 18 and Qur-an 46 : 10). He also said to the Holy Prophet Muhammad that he was the promised prophet who was the like of Moses : "Surely We have sent to you an Apostle, a witness over you as We sent an apostle to Pharaoh" (Qur-an 73 : 15). Again He promised that He would raise successors to the founder of Islam "like unto" the successors that had been raised to Moses (Qur-an 24 : 54). In accordance with this promise it was necessary that the last successor of the Holy Prophet Muhammad should be the like of the last successor of Moses, i.e., not the Israelite Messiah but a Messiah like him should appear among the Muslims.

There are so many points of resemblance

between the two Messiahs that there remains no doubt as to the likeness. (1). The Jews expected a Messiah who should be a temporal ruler, and delivering them from foreign yoke establish a Jewish kingdom throughout the world. The Muslims also expect a Messiah who would wage wars against the non-Muslims and slay all of them, and establish a Muslim empire in the whole world. (2) As quite against the expectations and cherished hopes of the Jews, the Messiah that appeared among them was a man of peace, in like manner the Messiah that has appeared among the Muslims has come to preach his word in peace and establish the superiority of Islam, not by the sword, but by arguments and heavenly signs. (3) At the appearance of the Jewish Messiah, the Jews were divided into various contending sects, so are the Muslims at the appearance of the Muslim Messiah. (4) In the country where the Israelite Messiah appeared, the Israelites were the subject people. Similarly Muslim dominion has ceased to exist in the country in which the Muslim Messiah has made his appearance. (5) The English rule under which the Muslim Messiah has appeared bears a striking resemblance to the Roman rule under which the Israelite Messiah

made appearance. (6) As the Jews had fallen off from true purity and righteousness at the advent of their Messiah, similar is the case now with the Muslims. (7) The Jews were punished with a severe spread of plague on their persecution of their Messiah; the people of this country have also been punished with a terrible plague on account of their rejection of the Promised Messiah. (8) As the Jews sought to have their Messiah tried at law and put to death, the opponents of the Muslim Messiah also sought to have him put to death by involving him in a case, and as the Pharisees there appeared in court to give evidence against Jesus, the Maulvis here appeared to give evidence that the claimant to Messiahship deserved to be put to death.

The most important point, however, which settles conclusively that Jesus Christ himself could not come back and that therefore the prophecy of his second advent could only be fulfilled by the appearance of some body in his spirit and power is the fact that the Holy Qur-an settles conclusively that Jesus Christ died a natural death, and it is clear that one who is dead cannot return to this life. As this point requires a full discussion, I leave it for separate treatment, but may refer to

one verse here to show how conclusive is the testimony of the Qur-an on the death of Jesus. In 5 : 117, Jesus is made to say in answer to a question from Almighty God if he had taught the people to take him for a God : " And I was a witness of them so long as I was among them, but when Thou didst cause me to die, Thou wert the watcher over them." The word *tawaffa* which has been here translated as *causing (a man) to die* never carries any other significance, and those who think that it means "taking up with the physical body to heaven" attach to it a significance which is against all authorities, for the word has never been used in this sense even once in the whole of Arabic Literature including the Holy Qur-an and the reports. The verse, therefore, signifies that the Christians departed from the true teachings of Jesus after his death. If, therefore, the Christians had departed from the true teachings of Christ before the advent of our Holy Prophet, there can be no denying the fact that Jesus was dead before his appearance. The verse moreover contradicts the personal second coming of Jesus, for he shows his ignorance of what the Christians did after him which he could not have done if he had come a second time and seen what

errors they were involved in.

This double testimony from the Qur-an settles conclusively that the second advent of Jesus spoken of in the reports means only the appearance of a person in the spirit and power of Jesus Christ. The Holy Qur-an states clearly that Jesus died before the advent of the Holy Prophet and it further states that successors like the successors of Moses shall be raised after the Holy Prophet, leading to the undeniable conclusion that Jesus Christ could not come back and that some one resembling him must make his appearance among the Muslims. Even the reports contain clear indications that the Messiah whose advent is prophesied is different from the Israelite Messiah. For instance, in the report relating to Ascension, it is clearly stated that the Holy Prophet saw Jesus and John in one and the same place. If, therefore, John died, Jesus must also have died. There is another report which says that Jesus lived 120 years. There is a third, according to which the Holy Prophet said: "If Moses and Jesus had been living, they would have had to follow me". This shows clearly that the Holy Prophet knew that Moses and Jesus were both dead. The report speaking of

the advent of Jesus Christ as narrated in the *Bukharee* states clearly that the Messiah is *imam-ukum minkum*, i.e., “your *imam* from among yourselves.” But conclusive testimony on this point is supplied by two other reports both narrated in the *Bukharee*. One of these reports gives a description of Jesus Christ, the Israelite prophet, and the other of the Jesus Christ who should appear among the Muslims, and the two descriptions are entirely different, the Israelite Christ being described as *ahmar* (i.e. of white complexion), and the Christ of the second advent as *alam* (i.e. of a brown colour, or of a black complexion, mixed with whiteness, the average complexion of a Punjabee). Had the self-same Christ to come in his second advent, there would have been no difference in their complexions and features. The difference in descriptions is quite inexplicable except on the supposition that the Holy Prophet was speaking of two different persons, the Israelite Christ being different from the Christ of the second advent.

So far as to what the Holy Qur-an and the reports say as to the Promised one. There are however, some other aspects of this question which show that the founder of the Ahmadiyya movement is the Promised Messiah and Mahdi of the

Muslims. The clearest evidence on this point is the evidence of that saying of the Holy Prophet which promised a *Mujadid* or an inspired reformer at the commencement of every century of the Hejirah. It says: "Surely Allah will raise for this people at the commencement of every hundred years one who shall renew its religion". The one who is *raised* for renewal of the faith is called a *Mujaddid* in Islamic terminology. As he is raised by God, he is in one sense a *mursal* or a messenger, and as he receives Divine inspiration and prophecies of the future are revealed to him, he may metaphorically be called a *prophet*, but in the strict sense, he is neither a prophet nor a messenger, because the Holy Prophet Muhammad, being raised for the whole world and for all generations, is *The Prophet* of the world. The *Mujaddids* are only his servants who are raised to purify Islam of such errors as find their way into the people professing the holy religion on account of the lapse of time. They bring no new books as the prophets brought, nor are they an authority in themselves, the only authority for all time being the Holy Qur-an and the sayings and the practice of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. Such *Mujaddids* have been rising among the Muslims, and the past

three centuries of Hejirah claim three such men in India itself, each of them bearing the same name Ahmad as is borne by the *Mujaddid* of the fourteenth century, Ahmad being the shortened form of his real and full name Mirza Gulam Ahmad. This is in fact a happy coincidence that the *Mujaddids* of the four consecutive centuries rise in the same country and bear the same name, the first of these being Ahmad of Sirhind, the second being Ahmad of Dehli commonly known as Shah Wali Ullah, and the third being Syed Ahmad of Breilly. Now, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian is the only *Mujaddid* of the fourteenth century of Hejirah, no one else having claimed to have been raised to that office anywhere in the world. And as no Muslim can deny the authenticity of a report the truth of which has been borne testimony to by the most eminent and sacred personages of Islam in their practical lives, and as nowhere in the world has there appeared a man besides Mirza Ghulam Ahmad who has claimed to have been raised as a *Mujaddid* for the 14th century of Hejirah, no one who professes faith in the Holy Prophet Muhammad can deny that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is the *Mujaddid* of the fourteenth century.

Now, as I have said already, every *Mujaddid*

is granted light to serve the cause of Islam in such manner as is conducive to the greatest good considering the requirements of his own time. When we consider what was the great need of our times, it becomes clear as daylight that the spread of the Christian religion all over the world, and especially the attacks of that religion on Islam, had created the need for some great inspired champion of the Muslim religion, who should establish the superiority of the religion of Islam over the religion of the Cross. And as the errors which he was required to blot out had a connection with the name of the Messiah, it was necessary that a Messiah should arise to remove them. Hence the *Mujaddid* of this century was called a Messiah. He himself puts this point very tersely in a couplet ;

“As I have been granted a light for the sake of the people of a Messiah,

“The son of Mary is therefore the name which I have been granted.”

That is the whole truth about the advent of a Messiah or a son of Mary among the Muslims and the point has been so lucidly put forth by the Messiah himself that no one who has true respect in his heart for the word of God and the Holy Prophet can deny that the Messiah promised to

the Muslims must necessarily be a *Mujaddid* whose special work should be the correction of the religious errors connected with the name of the Messiah, and that such a *Mujaddid* is the one who has been raised at the commencement of the fourteenth century of Hejirah when the erroneous Christian doctrines were getting the upper hand in the world.

Another point of importance which settles conclusively that the Promised Messiah has been raised in the person of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is met with in the fulfilment of the signs of the advent of the Promised Messiah, and it is for this reason that both the Muslims and the Christians are anxiously waiting for him, and some are even of opinion that the time of his advent has already passed. The great signs of the advent, according to Christians, such as the pestilences and earthquakes are too manifest to need any proof. The earth has been shaken in a manner which is extraordinary. These pestilences and earthquakes are moreover in accordance with the prophecies announced by the Promised Messiah that terrible earthquakes shall work havoc on all sides in the world. The clearest sign of the advent of the Promised Mahdi, according to Islamic prophecies, was the eclipse of the sun and the moon on specified dates in the

month of *Ramazan* which is spoken of in a report. This took place in the year 1894. Among other signs are the appearance of the plague, the prevalence of the religion of the Cross, the appearance of *Zussinnain*, the coming into existence of a new conveyance, which has made conveyance by means of camels fall into disuse, the stoppage of the pilgrimage, the appearance of a great fire in the East which broke out in Java and numerous other signs which cannot be detailed here.

And lastly, the signs shown by the claimant to Promised Messiahship which include the fulfilment of prophecies, the acceptance of prayers, the good effect of the doctrine on the lives of those who follow him, the assistance and protection granted by God, the failure of opponents, the success of the mission, the important practical work which the movement has done and is doing in the spread of Islam, and many other arguments establish the truth of the claim.

It is by the re-animation of faith and the re-awakening of mankind to spiritual life that the Ahmadiyya movement wishes to accomplish the great object of the triumph of the religion of Islam in the world. The current Muslim belief regarding the Promised Messiah also holds the

great object of his advent to be the triumph of Islam, but it is considered that the accomplishment of this object will be brought about by compulsion, i.e., by slaying all those who refuse to accept Islam, which is directly contradicted by the Holy Qur-an in the verse which says that "there should be no compulsion in religion." It is true that the great object of the advent of the Promised Messiah is to establish the supremacy of Islam, but such supremacy can be brought about only by clear arguments of the truth of the principles of Islam, and by extraordinary heavenly signs and wonderful manifestations of Divine power which carry conviction to the hearts of all seekers after truth that Islam is the only true religion. This is what the Holy Qur-an says: "Allah is He who has sent His Messenger with guidance and the true religion that He may make it triumphant over all the religions" (9: 33; 48: 28; 61: 9). This verse is taken by many commentators to relate to the time of the Promised Messiah. There is also a saying of the Holy Prophet which, speaking of the advent of the Messiah, states his great life-work to be that "he shall break the cross." Those who take these words of the *Sahih Bukh'aree* literally make a mistake. The meaning is clear. The Promised

Messiah shall appear when the religion of the Cross shall be in the predominance, and it shall be his work to show that the principles on which it is based are wrong. The erroneous Christian doctrine of the rising up of Jesus to heaven found a great support in the current erroneous belief of the Muslims that Jesus had risen up to heaven and the Promised Messiah has dealt a death-blow to the central doctrine of the Christian faith by showing that Jesus did not rise to heaven but that he died a natural death.

The ten conditions on which disciples are initiated into the Ahmadiyya society were first published on the 12th January 1889. The following is a brief summary of these:—

1. That the disciple shall promise with a sincere heart that he shall not be guilty of any kind of *shirk* so long as he lives.

2. That he shall eschew all evil, such as falsehood, fornication, looking lustfully at others, transgression of Divine commandments, cruelty to any creature of God, rebellion against government, &c., and that he shall not allow himself to be led away by his passions.

3. That he shall be regular in saying the five daily prayers and shall also try to say the night-

prayer (*tahajjud*), and that he shall invoke Divine blessings upon the Holy Prophet, ask forgiveness of his sins from God and seek His protection, and, remembering the numerous Divine blessings upon him, glorify and praise the name of God under all circumstances.

4. That he shall not in any way injure mankind in general and the Muslims in particular by his hand or tongue or otherwise.

5. That he shall remain faithful to God under all circumstances, whether happy or grieved, in affluence or in need, and that he shall submit to the will of God in all cases and be prepared to suffer any hardship or disgrace in His path, and that he shall not under any trial turn his face away from Him, but shall make the tie of union closer.

6. That he shall not follow his sensual desires, and shall submit to the Holy Qur-an and take the words and deeds of the Holy Prophet as the rule of his life.

7. That he shall entirely forsake self-conceit and haughtiness and lead his life in submission, humility and meekness.

8. That he shall consider the interest of his religion and its glory and sympathy with Islam as dearer

than all other interests, viz. his property, the honour in which he is held, his children and everything that is dear to him.

9. That he shall sympathise with all the creatures of God only for His sake, and so far as it lies in his power, benefit mankind with his God-given faculties and blessings.

10. That he shall remain faithful to the brotherly promise which he makes at the time of *bai'at* so long as he lives only for God's sake and that the tie, which unites him to his master into whose hand he has given his hand, shall be more powerful than all worldly relations and kinships and the ordinary relations of master and servant.

The founder of the movement lays great stress upon the attainment of purity and righteousness and upon forbearance under persecutions. It is impossible to quote all such passages from his voluminous works. The best collection of them is contained in the Noah's Ark from which the following passage is taken:—

“Ye people ! who call yourselves my followers, you can not be recognised as my followers upon heaven until your footsteps fall on the path of true righteousness. Say your five daily prayers with your whole heart, humbling

yourselves before God and fearing Him in such a manner as if you actually see Him. Keep your fasts faithfully for the sake of God. Those of you whom the Law requires must give alms in accordance with its directions. If the pilgrimage to Mecca is obligatory upon you and there is no obstacle, you must perform the pilgrimage. Do good so as to love it well and forsake evil so as to hate it bitterly. Know it for certain that no deed rises up to God which is devoid of true righteousness. Righteousness is the root of every goodness; if the root has not dried the deed shall prosper. It is necessary that you should be tried with various afflictions and adversities as the faithful before you were tried. Beware that you stumble. Earth cannot inflict any harm upon you if the tie by which you are bound to heaven is a strong tie.....Again I say to you, do not imagine that your mere outward entrance into my sect will do. An outward act is nothing if unattended with a transformation of the heart. Almighty God sees your hearts and shall deal with you according to their state. Hear, and in saying this I am discharged of the responsibility of delivering my message to you, that sin is a poison and therefore shun it, and that the disobedience of God is an abominable death

and therefore eschew it. Pray God that strength may be given to you. He who is faint-hearted when he prays, and does not consider God as powerful over everything except where He Himself has promised to the contrary, is not of my followers. He who forsakes not lying and deceit is not of my followers. He who is involved in the greedy love of this world and does not even raise his eyes to look to the next is not of my followers. He who does not in practice give a preference to matters of religion over his worldly affairs is not of my followers. He who does not repent of every evil and wickedness, such as drinking wine, gambling, looking to lust, dishonesty, bribery and every other iniquity, is not of my followers. He who is not regular in his five daily prayers is not of my followers. He who is not constantly supplicating before God and praying to him with humbleness of heart is not of my followers. He who forsakes not the company of the wicked who cast their evil influence over him is not of my followers. He who does not revere his parents, or does not obey them in that which is fair and not against the Holy Qur-an, or does not care to serve them to his utmost, is not of my followers. He who is not kind and gentle towards his wife and her relatives is not of

my followers. He who refuses his neighbour the least good in his power is not of my followers. He who forgives not the trespasses of others and harbours revenge is not of my followers. The husband who is false to his wife or the wife that is false to her husband is not of my followers. He who breaks in any way the promise which he makes at the time of *ba'at* is not of my followers. He who does not believe in me as the Promised Messiah and Mahdi is not of my followers. He who is not ready to obey me in all that is fair is not of my followers. He who sits with the wicked and chimes in with those who reject me is not of my followers. Every fornicator, transgressor, drunkard, murderer, thief, gambler, usurper, wrongdoer, liar, forger, every dishonest person, every one given to bribery, every accuser of his brother or sister and every one who sits in such company, is not of my followers. Every one who does not repent of his wicked deeds, and hates not the congregation of evil-doers, is not of my followers."

