

FINDING JESUS
IS
FINDING ISLAM

Reply to Nabeel Qureshi's book: Seeking
Allah, Finding Jesus

Aamir Ibrahim Al-Ash'ari

Table of Contents

Prologue (Seeking Allah)	5
Part 1 (Called to Prayer).....	7
Chapter One (Prayers of my Fathers).....	7
Chapter Four (The Perfect Book)	9
Chapter Five (Stories of the Prophet).....	11
Chapter Six (Righteous through ritual Prayer)	13
Chapter Seven (Diversity in Islam)	14
Chapter Eight (The Path of Shariah).....	16
Chapter Thirteen (Swoons and Substitutions).....	19
Chapter Fourteen (The Father is Greater than Jesus)	22
Chapter Fifteen (Heaven's Gates and Hell's Flames).....	24
Chapter Sixteen (Treasured Traditions).....	27
Chapter Nineteen (The Religion of Peace)	29
Chapter Twenty One (Opening my Eyes).....	31
Chapter Twenty Two (Textual Evolution).....	33
Chapter Twenty Three (Revisiting Reliability)	35
Part 4 (Coming to the Crux)	38
Chapter Twenty Four (Litmus Tests)	38
Chapter Twenty Five (Crucifying the Swoon theory).....	39
Chapter Twenty Six (A Muslim at Church)	40

Chapter Twenty Seven (Debating the Resurrection)	41
Part 5 (Jesus Mortal Messiah, or Divine Son of God).....	44
Chapter Twenty Eight (Genetics and Jesus)	44
Chapter Twenty Nine (Jesus Creates Carpenters)	45
Chapter Thirty (The Divine Son of Man)	63
Chapter Thirty One (Paulemics and the Earliest Jesus).....	70
Chapter Thirty Two (Tension and the Trinity).....	79
Chapter Thirty Three (Resonating with the Trinity).....	81
Chapter Thirty Four (Salvation in the Balance)	83
Chapter Thirty Five (Assessing the Gospel)	84
Part 7 (The Truth About Muhammad)	86
Chapter Thirty Six (Muhammad Revisited).....	86
Chapter Thirty Seven (The Picture Perfect Prophet)	92
Chapter Thirty Eight (Veiling the Violence).....	101
Chapter Thirty Nine (Muhammad Rasul Allah)	115
Part 8 (The Holiness of the Quran)	136
Chapter Forty (The Case for the Quran).....	136
Chapter Forty One (Quran Science and Bucailleism)	139
Chapter Forty two (Hadith and the history of the Qur'an).....	140
Chapter Forty Three (Those Whom Their Right Hands Possess)	145
Part 9 (Faith in Doubt)	151

Chapter Forty Four (Rationality and Revelation)	151
Chapter Forty Five (The Cost of embracing the Cross).....	152
Chapter Forty Six (I am Near, Seek and You Shall Find)	155
Chapter Forty Seven (The field of Crosses)	156
Part 10 (Guided by the Hand of God).....	158
Chapter Forty Eight (Deciphering Dreams).....	158
Chapter Forty Nine (The Narrow Door).....	163
Chapter Fifty (A Stairway out of the Mosque).....	165
Chapter Fifty One (Time to Mourn)	167
Barbarism in Bible	173
Chapter Fifty Two (The Word Speaks).....	180
Chapter Fifty Three (Finding Jesus)	182
Epilogue of Nabeel’s book and my Conclusion.	185
Why are Qadiyanis declared as non-Muslims?	197

Mr. Nabeel Qureshi was an Qadiyani (a heretical cult which is outside the folds of Islam according to Qur'an, Sunnah, and consensus of Muslim scholars) who converted to Christianity. Although Nabeel has passed away due to stomach cancer, however my rebuttal and refutation of his book "Seeking Allah, Finding Jesus" is for all Christian apologists to read especially his mentor David Wood whom he had kept on seeing in his dreams. It is assumed by Christian apologists that Nabeel Qureshi presented a very strong case against Islam and defended Trinitarian version of Christianity very well.

Prologue (Seeking Allah)

Nabeel said: "You are Allah, the God of Islam, aren't You? Or are You . . ." I hesitated, fighting the blasphemy I was about to propose. But what if the blasphemy was the truth? "Or are You Jesus?"

Now such a thought can never arise in mind of a monotheist Muslim or Jew out of the blue, until and unless he/she is misled by polytheistic Trinitarianism, a concept not held by many intellectual Christians themselves such as Unitarian Christians. Sir Isaac Newton, one of the greatest scientists of all times did not believe in trinity and was a monotheist Christian. In Newton's eyes, worshipping Christ as God was idolatry, to him the fundamental sin. [Westfall, Richard S. (1994). The Life of Isaac Newton Cambridge University Press. Page. 124]

Nabeel mentioned his confusion about Islam due to (oft repeated weak, or misunderstood narrations which Islamophobes use such as) Prophet's marriage to child bride, black magic casted on him, he being poisoned, raids on caravan, and tortures being committed. I will present the true Islamic stance on all these issues later in this rebuttal.

Part 1 (Called to Prayer)

Chapter One (Prayers of my Fathers)

Right in the first chapter of his book, Nabeel showed his lack of knowledge in hadith by attributing a lie to Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) by saying: *“It is a **hadith**, a tradition of the prophet Muhammad, that **every Muslim child should** hear the adhan at birth”*

There is no such hadith, and it is a lie because saying adhan in ear of child is not compulsory but it is a Sunnah [See: Jami’ at-Tirmidhi, Vol. 3, Book 17, Hadith 1514. Grade: Weak, whereas some other scholars declared the hadith to be authentic, but the hadiths do not have the wording that every child “SHOULD” hear the adhan at birth]

In this chapter, Nabeel tried to confuse people as if he was from descendants of Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) by saying he was from Qureshi tribe which is tribe of Muhammad. Then he said he was from lineage of Umar bin Khattab (ra) the 2nd caliph according to Sunnis. Nabeel exposed his utter ignorance about Islam by saying that Sunnis consider the caliphs of Islam as "**DIVINELY GUIDED SUCCESSORS OF MUHAMMAD.**" In Sunni theology the caliphs are not deemed "DIVINELY GUIDED." The only people divinely guided according to Sunni Islam are Prophets and none other. This is a major theological blunder

Nabeel Qureshi made and revealed that he was never a true Muslim who knew Islamic theology well.

Nabeel defined word Khalifa as “*...title is used to refer to Muhammad's "FOUR" successors*”

False again, the caliphs were not four but **five** including Imam Hasan bin Ali the **fifth** Caliph of Islam who stayed Caliph for 6 months. Once more Nabeel showed his ignorance in Islamic history as he had only studied Islam partially.

In this chapter Nabeel talked about his grandmother calling her a missionary (a Christian term that Muslims never use) following a "Jamaat (some group)," he also mentioned his mother being influenced by her grandmother who devoted herself to Islam... What he initially hid from readers was that his mother and her grandmother were Qadiyanis not Muslims. Qadiyanis have nothing to do with Islam and are a heretical cult just like mainstream Christians would never accept Mormons to be Christians or even Jehovah's witness.

Chapter Four (The Perfect Book)

Chapter Two and Three have nothing much to rebut, Nabeel just talked about his family.

In fourth chapter, regarding Bismillah being in start of every chapter except Surah at-Taubah (ninth chapter of Qur'an), Nabeel Qureshi attributed something towards his Qadiyani mother that is unexpected from a knowledgeable Muslim to say. It says: *“Allah was very **upset** with people in that Surah beyta so he didn't give us the blessing of the bismillah there” - End Quote.*

Either Nabeel was cooking this up or his mother being a Qadiyani taught him an absurd thing. The actual reason for Bismillah not being written before Surah Taubah is that Surah at-Taubah is part of previous chapter Surah al-Anfal and Bismillah is found in beginning of previous chapter.

In this chapter he attributed towards Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) why 112th Chapter of Qur'an was very important to the Prophet. Nabeel said: *“What was the message that Muhammad considered so important? Essentially this: God is not a father, and He has no son.”*

This is a very loose summary of this glorious chapter by Nabeel. Let us see why this chapter carries great importance in regards to Tawhid (Oneness of God Almighty)

It States: Say: He, Allah is **One**. Allah is He **on Whom all depend**. He **begets not**, nor is He **begotten**. And **none is like Him**. [112:1-4. Shakir]

This chapter of Qur'an is short yet comprehensive. It is also called the chapter of monotheism. It talks about absolute Oneness of God Almighty and nothing being comparable to Him, also all creations (including Jesus) being dependents, and no idol or human to be "BEGOTTEN CHILDREN."

Remember the polytheists of Mecca believed that their supreme idols were daughters of God, and there were also Christians who believed that Jesus was literal begotten son of God. I have shed more light on this in Chapter Twenty Nine.

Chapter Five (Stories of the Prophet)

His mother asked him, *When was Muhammad (Peace be upon him) born and where?* **Nabeel quickly replied: AD, 570 in Mecca.** And his mother abruptly said *Shabash (good job)*... This is funny because Muslims do not answer this question according to Christian calendar. **Muslims according to predominant opinion say that he was born on: 12th Rabi ul Awwal, Aam ul Feel (Year of Elephant) in Makkah.** Nabeel and his mother were reading biography of Prophet from sources like Wikipedia (such as Britannica back then) or orientalist writers and thinkers, who of course depict him in bad light.

After the intellectual Q & A session on Islam between family members of Nabeel, Nabeel's mother the master in Islamic sciences and the one who taught him Islam perfectly calls Prophet Muhammad as "**Rehmatullah** i.e. Mercy of Allah," a term never used for Prophet rather the actual term is "**Rehmat al lil Alameen** meaning Mercy to the worlds (Qur'an 21:107)"

Nabeel's mother talks about Jesus and how Christians are wrong in calling him God. She mentions all Prophets but ignores to mention Mirza Ghulam Ahmed Qadiyani at all. Mirza Ghulam Ahmed Qadiyani categorically claimed to be reincarnation of Jesus and also claimed to be a Prophet. It is a fact that Nabeel's mother is a Qadiyani and so was Nabeel,

hence there was no way she could have hidden teachings of Qadiyani cult. The Jamaat and missionary activity that his grandmother did was of Qadiyani cult not of Islam. Here is proof from Mirza Ghulam Ahmed himself that he claimed to be Jesus.

Mirza said: **I am Messiah of time (Jesus)**, I am the One God Talked to (i.e. Kaleem-e-Khuda which is Moses) **I am Muhammad**, I am Ahmad Mujtaba." (Qadiyani's own book: Tiryaq-ul-Quloob Page # 3 Roohani Khazain Vol # 15 Page: 134)

It is apparent that Nabeel had left already misguided Qadiyani cult for fame, for white privileges, enjoying intimate relations with a white woman whom he had married and other ulterior motives.

Chapter Six (Righteous through ritual Prayer)

Nabeel called Ka'ba a Muslim "**HOLY SHRINE**" in Mecca. Now we know why Christians use such terms for Ka'ba because they believe Muslims worship the Ka'ba. This is the most hilarious accusation on Muslims by Christians. Nabeel Qureshi also used words like **holy and shrine** adjacently with Ka'ba. It is to be noted that there are no idols or dead bodies of saints inside Ka'ba which Muslims worship. Ka'ba is just a symbol of direction for Muslims and it represents unity of Muslims i.e. all black, white, rich, and poor Muslims should face one direction.

Regarding kissing Hajr al Aswad the black stone then that is not worship either but a Sunnah. Worship is only when someone prays to something/someone considering that object or human being (like Jesus) as God or co-sharer in Godhood.

Chapter Seven (Diversity in Islam)

Nabeel finally mentioned his cult Ahmadiyyah in the book, but deceptively called it as a "**sect of Islam**" which of course is false because it is outside the folds of Islam and not considered a sect of Islam. Nabeel had been hiding to mention Qadiyanis all along to fool the readers. The Jamaat (group) he mentioned many times was not some Muslim group but a heretical non-Muslim group of Qadiyanis. His mother, father, grandmother (missionary), and mosques he went to were of Qadiyanis and there was no way they ignored to mention teachings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmed who claimed to be Jesus.

He defended Qadiyaniyyah sect and tried to call them as Muslims. He mentioned story of an outspoken Qadiyani speaker of why Muslims call Qadiyanis as Kafirs (infidels). The speaker accepts down the line that Ahmedis consider Mirza Ghulam Ahmed to be a Prophet and second coming of Jesus which obviously goes against teachings of both Islam and Christianity.

Nabeel and that speaker misquoted some hadiths that anyone who believes in One God and Muhammad (Peace be upon him) to be the Messenger is a Muslim. Now what these hadiths mean is that, one also has to believe in the message conveyed by Allah and his Prophet in order to be a Muslim, and mere belief in them is not enough. For example if

someone says he believes in One God and Muhammad but denies Quran then such as person cannot be Muslim, similarly Qadiyanis are not Muslims as they believe in a Prophet after Muhammad. There are many proofs on this, I have written in detail over it at the end of this book where I have proven from Quran, overwhelming hadiths, scholars, and quotes of Mirza Ghulam Ahmed Qadiyani himself that Qadiyaniyyah is to be considered a non-Muslim cult and cannot be deemed as a sect from Islam.

Chapter Eight (The Path of Shariah)

The Qadiyani speaker talked about Shariah and said that first primary source for Muslims is Quran and "NOTHING CAN SUPERCEDE IT," then he made an utter false statement that Quran is not comprehensive! This confused Nabeel and some people in crowd that Quran is insufficient.

This is why Nabeel and Christian apologists mostly rely on fabricated or weak Seerah stories and hadith narrations to defame Muhammad (Peace be upon him) and Islam. The ruling on killing apostates contradicts Qur'an (see: 4:137), killing homosexuals contradicts Quran as there is no worldly punishment prescribed for homosexuals in Qur'an unlike the Bible, killing all pubescent male Jews of Banu Qurayza also contradicts Quran (see: 2:190) and other authentic hadiths, marrying Aisha (ra) at age of 6 is false which contradicts many Quranic verses such as not inheriting **women** against their will, see 4:19 (a 6 year old cannot give proper consent, hence the hadith is a fabrication, plus Qur'an uses word "WOMEN" so marrying little "GIRLS" becomes forbidden). Drinking camel urine contradicts Qur'an as Qur'an only allows to consume halal (lawful) and Tayyab (pure) things (see: 2:168) and forbids Rijs (filth and Impure, see: 6:145), also the hadith only allows it for medication. Torturing people contradicts Quran, and so on. I will expand on these points in detail with references later in this rebuttal.

The Qadiyani speaker clearly said that any hadith which contradicts Quran is to be rejected. Nabeel ignored this fundamental principle of testing hadiths and seerah stories completely in his quest for truth, this clearly proves that Nabeel's motives were not pure and he had left Qadiyani cult for worldly benefits.

Nabeel Qureshi then made an utter false claim that Sunni schools of jurisprudence have an opinion that Muslim woman cannot have her consent and has to marry as per the wishes of her parents. This is an absolutely absurd claim which is not founded anywhere in Quran and Sunnah, nor in any of the 4 schools of jurisprudence.

Nabeel Qureshi talked about apostasy issue and made a false claim that all 4 schools of jurisprudence prescribe death penalty for it. We will go in details about schools of jurisprudence later but the primary source for Muslims is Quran and Quran prescribes no death penalty for apostates, even for a person who apostasies twice (see Quran 4:137). Now any hadith let alone sayings of scholars which contradict Quran is to be outright rejected.

Coming towards schools of jurisprudence then Nabeel was unaware of Sunni schools of jurisprudence due to his Wikipedia knowledge of Islam. The most dominant school of jurisprudence in Muslim world i.e. Hanafi school prescribes no death penalty for apostates except only for those who

incite Hirabah (war) along with it, but not those who just change religion [See al-Mabsut 10/110 of Hanafi Imam al-Sarkashi. Also Imam Ibn al Hammam al-Hanafi in Sharh Fath al-Qadeer (15/388-9)]. The Hanafi opinion is based on Quran and Hadiths taken in totality hence both these noble sources do not prescribe death penalty for mere apostasy but only those apostates who incite war along with it.

Chapter Nine, Ten, Eleven, and Twelve do not have much to rebut. In ninth chapter Nabeel talked about dreams and how some are from Allah and some from Satan. I have written on this topic later in the rebuttal and how dreams of Nabeel were Satanic. In remaining chapters Nabeel made general discussions about Muslims in west and so on, so let us move on to Chapter thirteen.

Chapter Thirteen (Swoons and Substitutions)

Nabeel said *both Christians and Muslims believe in monotheism and then said orthodox Christians believe Jesus is God incarnate!*

Dear readers, If this is not polytheism then what is? As said before, intellectual Christians such as Unitarian Christians and even those who do not call themselves as Unitarians deny it (such as Jehovah's Witness and scientists like Sir Isaac Newton).

Nabeel talked about Islam ridiculing the blasphemy of Christians i.e. calling Jesus as God and they being destined to hell, but he gave soft image to Christianity by saying that those who deny salvation through Jesus are just false teachers. In reality Quran promises paradise for Jews, Christians, and Sabians who believe in 1 God, hereafter, and do good deeds (see Quran 2:62), provided proper message of Islam has not reached them. Whereas Christianity says you are destined to hell if you do not believe Jesus died for your sins (which is a message of hate for majority of people on earth).

Please note that Qur'an states: Whoever goes right, then he goes right only for the benefit of his ownself. And whoever goes astray, then he goes astray to his own loss. No one laden with burdens can bear another's burden. **And We never**

punish until We have sent a Messenger (to give warning). [17:15]

This “messenger” refers to any messenger of truth and guidance. So if message of Islam has not been conveyed to Christians, Jews, and Non-Muslims due to constant anti-Islamic propaganda then they can be pardoned provided they believed in One God, hereafter, and did good deeds. However this does not include people like David Wood and polytheist Christians as they deny truth after knowing it is the truth and they do not believe in one God nor do good deeds (i.e. by spreading hate speech)

Nabeel accepted to have read book of Mirza Ghulam Ahmed Qadiyani many times which helped him tackle Christians on 2 most important questions i.e. Jesus dying on cross and him being God. Now Mirza was utterly misguided about Jesus, rather he claimed to be Jesus himself. Mirza even claimed to have become Mary who got pregnant allegorically and gave birth to Jesus which he became. Hence Nabeel never understood the Islamic viewpoint on Jesus properly. I have shown many quotes from Mirza at the end of my book but here I will show his absurd quote about becoming Mary himself and impregnating Jesus.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmed Qadiyani said: The Spirit of Jesus was infused in me as it was infused in Mary and allegorically I was rendered pregnant. Not more than ten months had passed and I was made Jesus from Mary. **That**

**is how I became Jesus, son of Mary. (Kashti-e-Nuh
Page # 47)**

Chapter Fourteen (The Father is Greater than Jesus)

Nabeel when he was a Qadiyani, upon being asked about who Jesus was, said: *"Well, I'm Muslim, right? Muslims believe that Jesus was sinless and born of the Virgin Mary. He cleansed the leprous, gave sight to the blind, and raised people from the dead. Jesus is the Messiah, the Word of God." ...*

What Nabeel ignored was that Muslims believe Jesus did all that "Bi izn Allah" i.e. with the grant / power / authority / will of Allah not by himself. This is also proven from Bible that Jesus performed miracles not by himself but through God the Father as Christians call him. Plus Jesus being word "FROM/OF" Allah is often misinterpreted by Christians that Jesus is eternal according to Quran. I will explain that later.

Nabeel got into an argument with a girl called Betsy while he was a Qadiyani. He corners her and puts her in tight spot about where Jesus claimed to be God in any of the Gospels. Nabeel said: *"I'd love for you to, Betsy, but you won't find anything. Jesus never said he was God"*

Dear readers, once you have finished reading this rebuttal you will see that Nabeel, nor David Wood his mentor, or any Christian apologist were able to come up with a single

categorical verse from four Gospels where Jesus himself said:
“I AM GOD, WORSHIP ME.” I know Trinitarians misuse other verses, but as you shall read this rebuttal, those verses will be soundly refuted or interpreted.

Chapter Fifteen (Heaven's Gates and Hell's Flames)

Nabeel boastfully quoted Christians saying loudly in church: *"Accept Jesus as your Lord (God) and you will go to heaven or you are doomed to hell"*

Wow what a message of love and peace! Compare this to Quran 2:62 which promises Salvation to non-Muslim monotheist Jews, Christians, and Sabains who believe in 1 God, hereafter and do good deeds (provided proper message has not reached them).

Nabeel's father taught him the most absurd thing that not even Muhammad (Peace be upon them) will be able to intercede in front of Allah on Day of Judgment. This was an utterly false thing to teach which contradicts Quran and Mutawattir (multiply narrated) hadiths. Nabeel never learnt true Islam and was always misled. The mainstream Sunnis and Shia accept intercession of Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) even in this world let alone on Day of Judgment.

Regarding intercession on Day of Judgment, see Qur'an 17:79 which mentions Maqaam al-Mahmood for Prophet which means station of praise and glory from which Prophet will intercede. Regarding his general intercession being prescribed by Allah see Qur'an 4:64. There are tons of

hadiths on this topic that are not shown due to brevity issue, but read authentic Hadith # 1385 of Sunnan Ibn Majah (online version) as an example. Nabeel tried to confuse people over salvation of monotheist Jews, Christians, and Sabians who believe in hereafter and do good deeds. He brought forward another verse which states: "**And whoever desires a religion other than Islam, it shall not be accepted from him, and in the hereafter he shall be one of the losers**" (Qur'an 3:85)... The word Islam in this verse means "submission to Allah" and this is why Quran calls previous Prophets as Muslims too although Jesus was a Jew by race. Hence this verse simply means Allah will accept only monotheism and truth, therefore 2:62 and this verse do not contradict.

Moreover, it has to be understood that according to Qur'an there is no punishment on non-Muslims to whom proper message has not reached and they are ignorant due to false propaganda against Islam.

Qur'an states: Whoever goes right, then he goes right only for the benefit of his ownself. And whoever goes astray, then he goes astray to his own loss. No one laden with burdens can

bear another's burden. **And We never punish until We have sent a Messenger (to give warning).** [17:15]

This “messenger” refers to any messenger of truth and guidance. So if message of Islam has not been conveyed to Christians, Jews, and Non-Muslims due to constant anti-Islamic propaganda then they can be pardoned provided they believed in One God, hereafter, and did good deeds. However this does not include people like David Wood and polytheist Christians as they deny truth after knowing it is the truth and they do not believe in one God nor do good deeds (i.e. by spreading hate speech)

Chapter Sixteen (Treasured Traditions)

Nabeel's sister answers her mom's tough questions about Sahih Bukhari and how he gathered his book and so on, but when being asked, what is the next most authentic book she becomes dumbstruck and says she does not know? ...This clearly proves that Nabeel had cooked up these stories about his past later on, he deceived people in believing that he grew up in a scholarly family.

Then Nabeel accepted the fact that Muslims pay less attention to Seerah books than Hadith as Seerah books do not record Isnad (chain of narration). The Christian apologists and Nabeel himself heavily relied on Seerah books like Ibn Ishaq, and also third grade Tarikh sources like at-Tabri in his book, which have fabricated reports like "Satanic verses"

Dear readers, you will notice that Islamophobes rely heavily on weak and fabricated reports found in hadith books, also Seerah books such as Ibn Ishaq, and Tarikh books like at-Tabri. The only Divine book for Muslims is Qur'an whereas even hadiths in Bukhari or Muslim could be fabrications and lies let alone clear-cut fables such as "Satanic verses" mentioned in third class books of people like Ibn Ishaq and others.

I did not find anything worthy in Chapter Seventeen and Eighteen to rebut.

Chapter Nineteen (The Religion of Peace)

He talks about September 9/11 incident and said thousands were killed in the name of Islam's God. The intellectual and wise people know for sure now that September 9/11 was an inside job, the buildings especially WTC 7 could not have collapsed due to fire. It is also a fact that America had funded Militias in Afghanistan against Soviet Union that led to creation of Taliban. G.W. Bush was a devout Christian who called his illegal wars as "Crusades" and these wars killed millions of Muslims which led to creation of terrorist groups like ISIS. There were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, nor was there Al-Qaeeda in Iraq back then.

He brushed all eastern Muslims as extremists, which is a blatant lie. He also defined Jihad wrongly and said only western Muslims define Jihad as inner struggle. Remember the word Jihad comes from root word "Jaahada" which means to do struggle. Quran at many places defines Jihad as struggle with our soul (see: 29:6, 69) and to strive through the book Qur'an (see: 25:62). Hadiths explain it as striving against our soul, ending poverty, performing Hajj, and so on. Of course last but not the least Jihad also means to fight against disbelievers to defend the religion and land but if we understand overall context of Quran and Sunnah then it is only in self-defense as many verses of Glorious Quran prove. There are some verses and hadiths misused by Islamopobes that have been countered by great scholars of Islam since a

long time. One should read book of Dr Tahir ul Qadri called “Fatwa on Terrorism and Suicide bombing” for more details.

Chapter Twenty is about Nabeel introducing David Wood to his parents and has nothing important to rebut.

Chapter Twenty One (Opening my Eyes)

Nabeel started his “so called” debate with fanatic Islamophobe David Wood and first proof on corruption of New Testament he gave was very lame i.e. Bible is corrupted due to different translations we have today. When David Wood replied that you should have used 1 John 5:7 as proof, Nabeel had no clue about it. This proves that Nabeel was ignorant of not only Islam but also inter faith studies.

This was clearly a cooked up story to show as If Nabeel was using strongest proofs against Christianity a Muslim could possibly use and David Wood became victorious in no time. A good Muslim apologist who knows Bible well will bring forward many corruptions in New Testament and errors. Bart Ehrman a non-Muslim expert on New Testament has refuted Christianity for good that Gospels are not preserved and accurate. Nabeel does mention Bart in the book but failed to challenge Bart’s sound analysis on reality of NT.

David Wood talked about the manuscripts of gospels all over the world from which Christians can verify the present day gospels. This is a big deception Christians spread, there are no original manuscripts of gospels from first century after Jesus, absolutely none! Even in second century there are fragments so that is also equal to none ...complete manuscripts came very late most probably in 4th century. So gospels were copied from "copies of copies of copies of copies

..." Now remember that back then there were no printing press, people had to copy with their hands and it is impossible that hand copying could not have mistakes, then those mistakes were multiplied when one copy was further copied.

This absolutely destroys the Christian claim that present day gospels are word of God. The language of Jesus was Aramaic and none of the books in NT have Aramaic manuscripts but Greek and Latin manuscripts. Plus there are many books the authorship of which are not known such as Gospel of John (See John 21:24 as a proof that it is not written by disciple John himself), Book of Hebrews, Book of Matthew (See Matthew 9:9, where unknown author mentions Matthew as another person, had the disciple been writing it himself he would not have mentioned the incident in that fashion. Also Christian scholars accept that Gospel of Matthew was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic but there is no manuscript of that Hebrew/Aramaic gospel of Matthew present today), and so on. Luke and Mark were not disciples either. Then you have people like Paul misinterpreting the gospels. NT is thus all messed up.

Chapter Twenty Two (Textual Evolution)

Nabeel made a huge assumption and false claim that Muslims are not much concerned with Old Testament when it comes to refuting Christians and it matches Quran. First of all Christians cannot shy away from Old Testament as they believe Jesus is "Alpha and the Omega" i.e. the eternal God, so all the verses about genocides, burning people to death, wars, stoning, and slavery were sanctioned by Jesus. Christians try to paint Islam as a barbaric religion whereas it is actually the Old Testament that is filled with all these rulings whereas Quran does not endorse them. Christians cannot deem Jesus as prince of peace if they believe him to be God, either they have to deny his divinity or accept that he was the same God who sanctioned all that barbarism. Remember Jesus will come as a "WARRIOR KING" with sword coming out of his mouth in second coming according to book of Revelation. There are many passages even in NT which depict Jesus as hostile. Jesus was actually not able to defeat Jews and Romans due to him being weak and having less followers.

David Wood makes an unfounded claim that Christians have many manuscripts from 2nd century. This is false because there are no "complete" manuscripts of gospels from 2nd century. I challenge David wood to show me those manuscripts with carbon dating.

Then he accepted that only "TWO" full manuscripts are from fourth century. Now we are talking about 400 years after Jesus ...no way manuscripts could have stayed intact and error free by then.

Nabeel said his teachers had not taught him any specifics but just that bible was corrupted. Now who were his teachers? His parents whom I have already exposed not to be experts in Islam. The Qadiyani scholars? Then again Qadiyanis are not Muslims and have a misguided and false understanding of Jesus, so Nabeel never had any proper teachers nor was he well learned.

Chapter Twenty Three (Revisiting Reliability)

David quickly learnt how to eat nihari (a sub-continental dish) without silverware and Nabeel said God was with him all the time ...Wow Hallelujah. No wonder we have wacko Christians going around performing “so called” miracles on sick people and healing them with their electrical powers. I dare any leading Christian to drink most lethal poison in the name of Christ and survive (remember Mark 16:18 says it should not harm you).

Upon being asked if gospels are accurate, David Wood brings up the typical Christian argument that does not Quran say that "INJIL (GOSPEL)" is the word of Allah?...Now the answer to this is that Christians have to rely on Qur'an in order to prove authenticity of their texts. Secondly, the Injil "revealed to Jesus" was accurate not the books compiled by later people who were not even his disciples such as Mark, Luke, Matthew, and John (it has been proven above that none of them were disciples) and also other books such as of Paul and books like Hebrews the authorship of which is unknown.

David Wood uses the biggest deception Christian apologists use to justify their present day gospels from Quran. David says that Qur'an asks the Christians to judge by the Injil (see: 5:47, 68), which means Christians had it during Muhammad's time.

These verses of Quran do not approve the present day gospels from cover to cover, but if we look closely the verse 5:47 talks about judging according to “**GOD’S REVELATION INSIDE GOSPEL.**” Verse 5:68 also talks about turning back to “**GOD’S REVELATION.**” So we do believe that there is truth inside gospels and Old Testament, but that does not mean whole of it is authentic. Secondly, these verses are talking about an incident roughly 1400 years ago and there was a possibility that some Christians had original Gospel back then because Jesus had just passed away 600 years back. But now 2000+ years have passed since Jesus, much time is lost and gospels have been corrupted for sure.

Thirdly, it is not authenticating NT but just asking Christians to judge by the Injeel they had with themselves. The Christians at that time used to ignore even their own scripture on many rulings just like Christians today do too, so asking them to judge by their scripture even if it is corrupted is better than violating the Laws of God.

Fourthly, Quran is only asking to follow Jesus not other men like Paul. Doctrine of trinity and Jesus saying he is God or asking to worship him are not proven from Gospels. Gospel of John came into existence in the end although he is claimed to be disciple of Jesus, even Gospel of John when read properly denies divinity of Jesus.

David Wood says that gospels were written shortly after crucifixion of Jesus and during life of disciples. This is again

false. David had himself accepted above that only two full manuscripts are traced back to 4th century. Hence it cannot be said that Mark, Matthew, Luke, and John were actual writers of the Gospels. In addition, none of these people were witnesses of "so called" crucifixion which is why accounts of crucifixion differ in all 4 gospels.

David mentions Papias as proof who wrote in 100 AD that Mark's Gospel is based on Peter's eyewitness testimony, and also that Matthew and John were disciples. Now for this to be true Christians have to bring forward complete manuscripts of Mark's Gospel from 1st century but there are absolutely no manuscripts of that, not even complete manuscripts in 2nd, not even in 3rd, but in 4th century, so this claim falls to ground. Papias must be talking about original gospel Mark wrote but that is lost. Secondly, present day Matthew's gospel itself mentions Matthew inside it to be a tax collector so clearly Matthew is not its author, plus John the disciple is also not proven to be original author of today's gospel of John as I proved before.

Part 4 (Coming to the Crux)

Chapter Twenty Four (Litmus Tests)

In this chapter, Nabeel was shown as an absolute loser who could not rebut David Wood's "so called" prolific answers. We must have seen many genuine debates. It is never that one debater has all the answers and other guy is plain stupid like Nabeel was shown to be. Nabeel and David had cleverly made up these stories to let down Islam whereas the fact of the matter is that pagan Trinitarians do not stand a chance in front of Islamic monotheism.

David said, the litmus test between Islam and Christianity is whether Jesus died on cross or not? David forgot that this is not a belief issue in Islam, the litmus test is "monotheism and divinity of Jesus." That is where Christians get refuted soundly.

Chapter Twenty Five (Crucifying the Swoon theory)

In this chapter, Nabeel's father debated with Christian experts on issue of crucifixion. Nabeel and his father took the Qadiyani stance which is contrary to Islam, therefore they fail miserably or they were shown to have failed in the book. There are many passages in NT which prove that Jesus was not crucified and accounts on it are contradictory (like did both thieves deny Jesus or just one, did Jesus carry his own cross or someone else, Jesus praying to God to save him and as prayer of Prophets are utterly accepted so Jesus was saved, was Jesus crucified or hung by the tree, and many more, plus none of the disciples were present there but rather had run away, they watched from distance and were not proper eyewitnesses). In a nutshell I would refute the whole crucifixion theory of Christians from this verse of Galatians:

“Christ redeemed us from the **curse** of the law **by becoming a curse for us**—for it is written, “**Cursed is everyone** who is **hanged on a tree**” (Galatians 3:13)

What a messed up message this is! No matter what fancy interpretation Christians give to above verse, it destroys all their concepts such as divinity of Jesus and also crucifixion because God cannot ever be cursed!

Chapter Twenty Six (A Muslim at Church)

In the book Nabeel cleverly started in reverse order to deceive people. Instead of tackling the issue of "divinity of Jesus and trinity" which is the major difference between Muslims/Jews/Unitarians and Trinitarians, Nabeel started in reverse order i.e. crucifixion, resurrection, and such issues first because Paul made resurrection as something on which Christianity hinges.

Chapter Twenty Seven (Debating the Resurrection)

Nabeel mentioned Shabeer Ally, who had defeated Nabeel in debates after he had become a fully blown Trinitarian.

According to Christian debater Mike Licona and Nabeel, Christianity hinges on resurrection of Jesus. Therefore, Nabeel and Christians tacitly accepted that Unitarian Christians who deny divinity of Jesus but believe in resurrection are absolutely fine. Here we have Christians stumbling on their very foundational beliefs.

According to Islam belief in crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus does not make you a polytheist and destined to hell, it is the belief in his divinity which will lead you to hell.

Nabeel summarized the debate between Shabbir Ally and Mike but was totally biased. I have watched the debate and Mike was clearly on back foot and very fearful when Shabbir rebutted him. Nabeel totally ignored Shabbir Ally's interpretation of verse 4:157 which talks about Jesus not being killed or crucified. This verse of Qur'an is not denying that Jesus was tortured or hung from a tree (read Galatian 3:13 where instead of crucifixion the wording "hung from tree" is used, we Muslims can also accept that Jesus was put to the cross but not nailed like it is done in crucifixion).

Jesus survived the torture and was raised alive. Also intellectual Muslims believe that Prophets can come back and meet their loved ones, so Islam does not deny resurrection of Jesus either, minus his death.

It is only Islam which is right on this issue, so the claim that other non-Muslim historians have reached conclusion that Jesus died by crucifixion is of no worth to Muslims. Moreover, Shabbir Ally raised another great point that the incident took place about 2000+ years ago and Jesus is not among us anymore, so naturally the historians came to conclusion that Jesus must have died.

There is no grave of Jesus (except for worthless claims of Qadiyani cult whose book Nabeel had been using, that it is in India), so Jesus was raised alive and was not killed. Also a person can survive on cross for hours as gospels say he was put on cross for hours and not days, also blood and water gushed out from body of Jesus when Romans had put a spear to his body, this also proves his heart was pumping. I know Christians quote all sorts of contradicting medical researches that Jesus was dead, but as Qur'an is an absolute truth and Christians only have conjecture therefore Jesus just went into trauma and kind of a coma. He was actually raised alive which is why tomb was empty, and he later appeared to his loved ones which Christians call as resurrection and we Muslims do not consider resurrection to be contrary to Islamic beliefs.

The biggest proof not only against death of Jesus but also his divinity comes from book of Matthew which states: *And about the ninth hour Jesus cried out with a loud voice, saying, “**ELAHI, ELAHI** lama sabachthani?” that is to say, “My God, My God, **why have you forsaken Me?**”* (Matthew 27:46)

So His God (Jesus uses same word **ALLAH** which is **ALAHA** in Aramaic) heard his prayer and did not forsake him, rather saved him from death.

Finally, Nabeel confronted David Wood on divinity/deity of Jesus. But again he used weak arguments which only a lay Muslim would use, on previous issues Nabeel was ever ready to quote the New Testament but here he started with 112th chapter of Quran which says Allah begets not nor is begotten. Remember this chapter is general and not just refuting Christians, the Pagans of Makkah believed that their idols were daughters of Allah. Any intellectual Muslim would first of all destroy concept of trinity or Jesus's divinity from Bible or from this following verse of Qur'an:

"They do blaspheme who say: Allah is one of three in a Trinity: for there is no god except One Allah. If they desist not from their word (of blasphemy), verily a grievous penalty will befall the blasphemers among them (5:73)"

Part 5 (Jesus Mortal Messiah, or Divine Son of God)

Chapter Twenty Eight (Genetics and Jesus)

David rather than answering in simple terms asked Nabeel to read a whole book on deity of Jesus. Christians do this because polytheism and making a man into god are absurd + complex concepts, whereas belief in One God alone without partners or trinity is a simple concept. God had always kept monotheism easy to understand so that people can easily worship One God alone.

Chapter Twenty Nine (Jesus Creates Carpenters)

David Wood tried to prove from Gospel of John that Jesus is creator of all carpenters and thus is God. Before I explain such verses I will refute Christianity the way intellectual Muslims refute it not how Nabeel wanted to present the case for Islam (but actually he presented the case for Christianity).

First of all, it has to be told to all Christians that Muslims firmly believe in Jesus Christ. We believe in all his proven qualities such as he being born of Virgin Mary, he is the Messiah, the Word from God (will explain later that it does not mean he is eternal), the (created) Spirit of God, one who performed many miracles by the “GRANT” of Allah, like curing the blind, healing the lepers, bringing the dead back to life, blowing into birds and making them alive (Christians deny this. See John 20:30 as proof that if present day gospels do not mention some Quranic miracles of Jesus then it does not mean they are negated), speaking from the cradle (Christians deny this, but it is mentioned in Gospel of Thomas), knowing the matters of unseen, being sinless like all other Prophets, and so on.

Having said that, Jesus was not “Begotten” son of God (Modern Christians will say they also do not believe Jesus to be literal begotten son whereas there are verses in gospels

which call Jesus as begotten son such as John 3:16, 1 John 4:9 and others. Majority of translators translate the greek word “monogenēs as begotten, which also means born.” There were Christians in past who did believe Jesus to be literal son of God which is why Qur’an refutes this concept), he was not God, partner with God, nor co-sharer with God in anyway. He is not part of any Trinity whatsoever.

Christian apologists are well aware of all the verses in Qur’an which praise Jesus and deny his divinity, so due to brevity issue I have not shared them here. However I will refute in this rebuttal the misinterpretation of some verses which Christians use such as Christians accusing Allah of not knowing of trinity and adding Mary into trinity (which is a lie as verses on trinity are separate and verse on Mary worship is separate) or Jesus being called word from/of Allah and as Word of Allah is uncreated/eternal therefore Jesus is eternal too according to Quran.

Now let us come towards passages in New Testament that prove like bright sun that Jesus was not God or part of trinity. **The first question to ask Christians is to show from a single verse of present day Gospels where Jesus himself said: “I am God, Worship me.”** I know Christians use some other verses which somehow indirectly prove Jesus to be God (although they do not) but the question is to prove directly from Jesus where he categorically said “I AM GOD, WORSHIP ME”

I have seen video of David Wood where he tried to tackle this question but yet failed to show that single verse, he went towards misinterpreting other verses as a typical Christian apologist. The point to remember is that, had Jesus been God or asked people to worship him then he would have mentioned that many times let alone once, but there is not a single mention of that in all Gospels, rather when Jesus is asked about first commandment he says:

The first of all the commandments is: ‘Hear, O Israel, **the Lord our God is one Lord.** [Mark 12:29]

Why did not Jesus say: Hear O Israel, the Lord our God **is One in Three Persons**, the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit?

Or Look at Temptation of Christ when Satan asks Jesus to worship him, Jesus says:

.. For it is written: ‘**Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.**’ [Luke 4:8]

Why did not Jesus say: Thou Shall worship the Father, Son, and the holy Spirit, and only them Thou shall serve?

Temptation of Christ itself proves that Jesus was not God. Christians believe Jesus is “Alpha and the Omega” and the Eternal God. So what on earth was Jesus doing hanging out with Satan, on a mythical mountain from where whole world

could be seen, not being able to answer challenges of Satan? What was he doing with him when he was the one who kicked Satan out at first place?

Hence this question by Muslims has always been unanswerable by Christians. The simple reason why Christians cannot answer this question is because Jesus never claimed to be God nor asked to worship him.

Now let us look at other verses which prove that Jesus "HAD" a God and was not God himself, and there is clear rejection of Jesus's divinity.

Proof # 1

Book of Luke states: Jesus went out as usual to the Mount of Olives, and his disciples followed him. On reaching the place, he said to them, "Pray that you will not fall into temptation." **He withdrew about a stone's throw beyond them, knelt down and prayed,** "Father, if you are willing, take this cup from me; **yet not my will, but yours be done.**" **An angel from heaven appeared to him and strengthened him.** And being in anguish, he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat was like drops of blood falling to the ground. When he rose from prayer and went back to the disciples, he found them asleep, exhausted from sorrow. **"Why are you sleeping?" he asked them. "Get up and pray so that you will not fall into temptation."** [Luke 22:39-46]

Clearly, Jesus is praying to His God and cannot be God himself. Plus an Angel strengthened him whereas nothing can strengthen God. Our dear Christians give all sorts of interpretations that Jesus was fully man and fully God, so here he was being humble and subjected himself to God. All these interpretations are false and are not from Jesus himself.

Proof # 2

Book of Luke states: Now it came to pass, as He was praying in a certain place, when He ceased, *that* one of His disciples said to Him, “**Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples.**”**So He said to them, “When you pray, say: Our Father in heaven, Hallowed be your name.** Your kingdom come. Your will be done On earth as it is in heaven. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins, for we also forgive everyone who is indebted to us. And do not lead us into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one.”[Luke 11:1-4]

Again Jesus is clearly teaching how to pray, he says Pray to Father not to Jesus.

Proof # 3

Book of John states: Jesus said unto her, “Touch Me not, for I am not yet ascended to My Father; but go to My brethren and say unto them, ‘**I ascend unto My Father and your Father, and to My God and your God.**’” [John 20:17]

Jesus not only calls Father as his Father but also “HIS GOD” ... Christians cannot give any interpretation to this verse whatsoever. It clearly proves that Jesus has a God and he is not God himself.

Proof # 4

Book of Matthew states: And about the ninth hour Jesus cried out with a loud voice, saying, “Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?” that is to say, “**My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?**” [Matthew 27:46]

Even in last minutes Jesus cried onto His God for help, this verse also proves that Jesus did not die on the tree [See Galatians 3:13 that Jesus was hung on a tree not nailed. We Muslims can accept he was put to cross but not nailed] but actually his prayer was heard by God and he was saved.

Proof # 5

But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; **and the head of Christ is God.** (1Corinthians 11:3)

When head of Christ is God then he cannot be God, simple as that!

Proof # 6

Jesus said: And this is life eternal: **that they might know Thee, the only true God,** and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent. [John 17:3]

Clearly, Jesus is differentiating between himself and God. He is calling God the **only true God** and Jesus being separate whom God has sent.

Christians might say that next verses puts Jesus on par with God, which say: I have glorified Thee on the earth; I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do. And now, O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own Self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was [John 17:4-5]

Then remember Jesus could not have contradicted himself. He is calling God the only true God, so the glory which he is asking for himself is “GRANTED” glory not personal intrinsic glory that only God has. Jesus having glory before the world

was does not mean he was eternal, it means he was always in foreknowledge of God. I will explain this further when I come to John 1:1 and how Christians misuse that passage to make Jesus as eternal.

Proof # 7

For there is one God, and **one mediator between God** and men, the man Christ Jesus (1Timothy2:5)

This verse clearly proves that Jesus cannot be God because mediator could never be God himself. For example if someone asks me to intercede to a King then I am not the King myself.

Proof # 8

And do not call anyone on earth ‘father,’ for you have one Father, and he is in heaven.” (Matthew 23:9)

Some Trinitarian Christians in their exaggerations go to the extent of calling Jesus as “Yahweh” using the verse “Before Abraham was, I am (John 8:58)” whereas that is utter blasphemy even according to wise Christians. There is clear distinction between the Father and Son according to concept of Trinitarians themselves. Jesus is never called the Father or Yahweh in any of the scriptures so he cannot be God.

Understand this concept from Old Testament verse:

Have we not all one father? Hath not one God created us? Why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother, by profaning the covenant of our fathers? (Malachi 2:10 KJV)

Hence ignorant people like David Wood who blaspheme by trying to assert that Jesus is “CREATOR” of us all are plain deniers of Biblical verses. Regarding John 8:58 I will explain it at the end of my rebuttal.

Proof # 9

Jesus said: **I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me. If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true.** (John 5:30)

Jesus denies divinity in most explicit fashion.

Proof # 10

The Father is **“greater than I”** (John 14:28)

Hence if one person of God is greater than other person of Godhood then that makes it polytheistic. Christians believe

that all 3 persons in Godhood are equally powerful, knowledgeable, eternal, and so on.

I know Christians can use verses where Jesus said that **“Father and I are one.”** But that is answered in following three ways

- a) That oneness is in message, will, and spreading Kingdom of God, not in Godhood.
- b) If you take it literally then Gospels contradict.
- c) Jesus included his disciples along with God and himself in unity, so would Christians say that disciples are God too? See John 17:20-21

Due to brevity issue I have only shared 10 passages from NT although there are tons more such as Jesus not having knowledge of hour and so on.

I will refute and explain the passages which Christians use to assert divinity towards Jesus such as forgiving sins, being Alpha and Omega, being “THE TRUTH,” being word which became flesh, when Nabeel mentions them (although he has not mentioned them all, but still I will explain those passages).

Nabeel Qureshi while discussing McDowell’s book called his deductions as weak so there is no need for me to use those

verses and clarify what they mean. But then Nabeel turned towards Gospel of John and thought they “*UNDENIABLY PAINTED JESUS AS DIVINE*”. He started reading John chapter one and then said something which proved the whole Trinitarian Christianity to be a polytheistic religion. I will quote him verbatim, he said about John 1:1 and remaining passage:

*“It is as if John were saying, “As you read the gospel, keep in mind that Jesus is coeternal with the Father, **“HIS PARTNER IN CREATING THE WORLD”**”*

If this is not polytheism then what is? The Christian was himself accepting rather attributing to John that he was saying Jesus is “**PARTNER**” in creating the World. Let us now understand John 1:1 and remaining passage about word becoming flesh. Please note that Nabeel conflated this with Qur’an calling Jesus as “Word from/of Allah”

- a) Firstly, it is not Jesus speaking but unknown author of John, I have decisively proven before that Gospel of John is not proven to be written by disciple John. So Christians fail to prove directly from Jesus that he said this.
- b) Secondly, Gospel of John is the last of all Gospels, whereas Mark, Luke, and Matthew came before Gospel of John. None of the synoptic Gospels start like this, therefore Gospel of John is the only gospel where most

of the verses are found which Trinitarian Christians use to assert divinity towards Jesus. Bart Ehrman a non-Muslim expert on New Testament has proven that John's gospel exaggerates about Jesus too much whereas other Gospels do not.

- c) The language of Jesus was Aramaic whereas Gospel of John is in Greek therefore it cannot be confirmed what words used in John chapter 1 in regards to “logos” are authentically transmitted to us. Regarding “logos (which may and could be translated as: Revelation, commandment, word, and many other things)” See Matthew 15:6 where word logos means revelation of God. See Hebrews 13:7 where again word logos is used but Christians will never believe that it means Jesus Christ there. Word logos is used in many different meanings in Bible, so the translation to “WORD” is first of all inaccurate
- d) The monotheist Unitarian Christians give perfect and correct interpretation to John Chapter one, which can be heard and read over here:
<http://www.biblicalunitarian.com/videos/but-what-about-john-1-1> (accessed on 29/10/2017)
- e) All explanations are given in above non-Muslim Unitarian Christian link. Trinitarians should watch the videos there and also do the reading.

Now let me address the important issue of why Jesus is called “Word from/of Allah in Qur’an (See 3:45, 4:171).

Christians try to misinterpret Islamic interpretation to these verses and use straw-man argument that Quran calls Jesus as eternal. Christians also try to confuse Muslims with a trick question whether Qur’an is uncreated or created? If Muslims say Quran is uncreated then Christians shout, look look Jesus is called word of Allah so he is also uncreated and eternal. If Muslims say created, then Christians shout, you are going against majority of Muslim scholars who said Qur’an is uncreated.

There are many deceptions spread by Trinitarian Christians in this argumentation. Before I come to Ahlus Sunnah wal Jammah (i.e. Sunnis) I want to clarify that Shia school of thought does not consider Qur’an to be uncreated but created. Muta’zila school which emerged from Sunnis also does not consider Qur’an to be uncreated. In Ahlus Sunnah the main schools of theology are Ash’ari and Maturidi, they divide this issue between Kalam an Nafsi and Kalam al Lafzi, the former being uncreated but the latter being created. This is deep theological issue and I do not want to lengthen my reply just on this point. There is no verse in Qur’an nor is there any Mutawattir (multiply narrated) hadith which says Qur’an is uncreated.

Now Jesus being word from/of God is to be understood from another verse of Qur’an which says:

It is He Who gives Life and Death; and when He decides upon an affair, “**HE SAYS TO IT, ‘BE’ AND IT IS**” [40:68]

So Jesus came into existence like how this verse is talking about. Jesus did not have a Father, so Allah said “BE” and he was. Let us look at another verse which Christians never use in relevance to Jesus being a word from/of God.

Qur’an states: Indeed, the example of Jesus to Allah is like that of Adam. He created Him from dust; then **He said to him, “Be,” and he was.** [3:59]

Adam was created without a Father and mother, and Jesus was created without Father. Allah has therefore called Jesus as a word From/of himself not in meaning of Jesus being eternal but as “BE AND HE WAS”

Also Jesus was word of Allah in foreknowledge of Allah, not that he was eternal.

The other verses which Nabeel assumes to be undeniably painting Jesus as divine are also from John i.e. John 5:23 and John 20:28

Let us look at those verses. John 5:23 states: That all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the **Father who hath sent Him.**

As I have already explained the worth of Book of John above, therefore such passages could be interpolations of later people not actual teachings of Jesus. Secondly, I have proven from many verses including from Book of John that Jesus cannot be God. Therefore verses like these should be interpreted in light of those clear verses otherwise there will be clear contradiction. Most importantly this verse by itself is not painting Jesus in divine light, honoring Jesus just like honoring God does not prove his divinity but just showing respect and honor, look closely the verse says he who does not honor the son has dishonored the father. This is proving that Jesus is true representative of God and dishonoring him is equal to dishonoring God. In Islam we have same concept about Muhammad, rather the word Muhammad itself means “The glorified”

Let us look at John 20:28 which states: And Thomas answered and said unto Him, **“My Lord and my God!”**

God knows what original manuscript had said, it could have said: My Lord, My Messiah, but later Christians changed it to God. I have explained in detail that there were no “COMPLETE” manuscripts of gospels in first century after Jesus, not even in second, not even in third and only two full manuscripts in fourth. Till then they had come from “copies of copies of copies of copies...” and there is no way errors could not have been made while copying.

Plus according to Bible the word God is not always used for God the Almighty, many times it is used for people with authority too. Here are some examples:

Book of Exodus says: And the LORD said unto Moses, “**See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh**, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet. [Exodus 7:1 KJV]

Hence it stands proven that word God was used in Bible for Prophets and it did not mean in sense of a deity. This verse also destroys the trick of Trinitarians who say word “ELOHIM” somehow proves trinity as it asserts multiplicity in Godhood, here word Elohim is used for Moses but he was a single person.

Psalms says: I said, “You are gods, sons of the Most High, all of you [Psalms 82:6]

Also Thomas made that statement in utter shock and surprise so he was excused.

Nabeel in order to let down Qur’an says: *There was no need for any commentary to understand the gospels. “ANYONE CAN UNDERSTAND THE BIBLE”*

In the Gospels Jesus has talked in complex parables at many occasions that cannot be understood by a person reading them directly. A person needs a commentary or guidance from an expert. Nabeel then mentioned “BIBLE” as a whole

and said anyone can understand the Bible, which is obviously false. Here let me show some verses which even biggest Christian scholars failed to explain properly let alone ordinary readers would understand them.

Paul said: **For the foolishness of God** is wiser than men, and the **weakness of God** is stronger than men. [1 Corinthians 1:25]

This is a blasphemy. An ordinary person reading bible will have no option but to look for a commentary or ask an expert. Still this cannot ever be explained by any Christian. There is no such thing as “Foolishness of God” nor “Weakness of God”

Book of Galatians says: Christ redeemed us from the curse of the **law by becoming a curse for us**—for it is written, “**Cursed is everyone who is hanged on a tree** [Galatians 3:13]

Yet another blasphemy. This verse not only destroys the Christian dogma of Jesus’s divinity but is also un-defendable. Christian God became a curse? God cannot ever be cursed! No matter what fancy interpretation Christians give, this is un-defendable. The ordinary Bible reader has to turn towards commentary or ask an expert but believe you me none can provide an accurate answer except Islam which portrays Jesus in good light unlike Christianity.

There are many more verses in NT and OT for which one requires a commentary or an expert opinion. Hence proven that Nabeel was just being biased against Islam.

Chapter Thirty (The Divine Son of Man)

David Wood contradicts himself and accepts that he does not know who wrote John's gospel by saying: "*John's gospel was written by a disciple* ***“OR AT LEAST IN THE LIFETIME OF DISCIPLES”***"

Now this is the state of David Wood the leading apologist of Christians who makes many videos against Islam to defend Christianity. But it is not his fault, none of the Christian scholars can prove for sure that Gospel of John was actually written by John the disciple of Jesus nor can they prove it was written in lifetime of disciples. All they have is conjecture.

David again tells Nabeel to read another book rather than answering simply about deity of Jesus. Christians have to confuse people on this concept because it is complex and absurd. They cannot justify it from Old Testament and NT due to overwhelming verses which disapprove divinity of Jesus, so they ask others to read books written by Christian apologists who use hook and crook methods to make Jesus divine.

Nabeel then started reading McDowell's another book and in it Mark's verse is quoted which Christians use to assert divinity towards Jesus. Let us look at that verse in context:

“But he remained silent and made no answer. Again the high priest asked him, “Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?” And Jesus said, “I am, and you will see the Son of Man seated at the **right hand of Power**, and coming with the clouds of heaven.” And the high priest tore his garments and said, “What further witnesses do we need? [Mark 14:61-63]

Christians conclude from this verse that Jesus committed some sort of blasphemy in light of Jewish High Priest which is why he tore his garments. However nowhere in this passage is Jesus claiming to be God. Christians use Danial 7 and Psalm 110 in relevance to this, but they also do not prove Jesus to be God. Jesus having dominion and authority through grant of God does not make him God. What Christians are not realizing is that they are making up another demigod along with God Almighty because they have no option but to accept that all authority and dominion was given to Jesus by God Almighty as these passages clearly prove. The God Almighty on the other hand has independent, self-owned, and intrinsic authority and dominion, nobody granted Him these powers.

- a) This passage asserts anthropomorphism towards God i.e. He is some entity sitting on throne. God is pure of time and space, He does not occupy any space or place.
- b) Biblical Jesus never claimed to be God in this passage, rather he distinguishes between himself and God

categorically by saying he will “SIT ON RIGHT HAND OF POWER (GOD)” which clearly proves that Jesus and God are separate beings.

c) The Jewish Rabbis were looking for excuses to accuse Jesus no matter what, they considered it blasphemy not because they thought Jesus claimed to be God but because they did not believe Jesus was the Messiah who will rule over them. Plus there are many passages where Jews accuse Jesus of blasphemy due to not understanding him, like for example Jesus forgiving sins and Jews call it blasphemy (that will be explained later how Jesus forgave sins not by himself but through grant of God and also passed on this authority to his disciples)

d) Jews knew the Old Testament very well, Jesus could not have contradicted the Law and never claimed divinity. There is absolutely no mention of Jesus by name being God in Old testament, nor is there any concept of triune Godhood in OT (except if you are a delusional Christian who misinterprets “Elohim” to be multiplicity in Godhood although I have explained from Exodus 7:1 that word Elohim is to be understood according to context and when referred to God Almighty it refers to Singular God. Also other misinterpretations such as Spirit of God hovering over water as mentioned in Genesis 1 means spirit being separate from God, although Genesis clearly calls it spirit of God himself not

a separate Spirit, and many such absurd Christian interpretations which Jewish scholars of Tanakh/Old Testament easily refute)

e) Christians have to prove the same powers for holy spirit too and show such categorical verses for holy spirit as well, otherwise Christians stand proven as worshipers of Christ along with God which of course is polytheism and a heresy even according to concept of trinity explained by Christian scholars themselves.

Nabeel claimed that Danial 7 said: *There indeed just as Blomberg had said was a prophetic vision of one like a Son of Man “WHO WAS **WORSHIPED** FOR ALL ETERNITY BY MEN OF EVERY LANGUAGE” This son of man “**WAS GIVEN**” authority and sovereign power over an everlasting kingdom.*

This statement is filled with contradictions, and also something Danial 7 never says.

I have read Danial 7 multiple times, Jews deny it to be regarding Jesus altogether and they have a strong case from Danial 7 itself. Christians hide the verse 22 which is interpretation of previous verses i.e. it is not talking about a single man but saints. Let us look at verse 22 of same Danial 7. It states:

Until the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given
“**FOR THE SAINTS**” of the Most High, and the time came
when the “**SAINTS POSSESSED THE KINGDOM**”
[Danial 7:22]

Danial himself did not know meaning of 7:13-14 so Angel explained to him that it refers to saints or to a whole nation of people which Jews say refer to nation of Israel.

Secondly, nowhere does Danial 7:13-14 say that Jesus will be **worshipped**, it uses word “**SERVE**” which Nabeel cleverly changed into worship, although that has nothing to do with worship. Majority of the translators even King James version translate it as serve and not worship, hence it proves that this servitude is like Kings or rulers are served who have authority, it does not refer to worship.

Thirdly and this is most important, Nabeel himself said:
*“This son of man “**WAS GIVEN**” authority and sovereign power...*

Again, nowhere does Danial 7 uses word “sovereign power” either, but anyways I ask David wood as Nabeel is dead, who gave this authority to Jesus? Was it Jesus himself or God Almighty? If you say God Almighty then Jesus ceases to be eternal God, if you say Jesus gave it to himself then you are contradicting the clear passages in Mark.

Now let us come towards Psalm 110:1 that Christians mistranslate and misuse.

King James Version and majority of Christian translators translate it as:

The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.

They mistranslate the second word לַאדֹנָי; (pronounced: *ladonee*) as **Lord** over here but same KJV in Genesis 24:54 translates same word as “to my master,” or in Genesis 32:4 as “to my lord,”

Common English Bible rightly translates this verse as
What the **LORD** says to my master: “Sit right beside me until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet!” [CEB PS 110:1]

Rabbi Tovia Singer has refuted Christianity on this issue for good, he says: The Psalm begins with the opening Hebrew words מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד (*Mizmor l'David*).” The word “*Mizmor*” means “a song,” and thus the opening phrase of this Psalm is, “A Song of David.” In fact, the word Psalms comes from the Greek word ψαλμός (*psalmos*), which means “a song.”

He also says: The Hebrew word adonee never refers to God anywhere in the Bible. It is used only to address a person, never God. That is to say, God, the Creator of the universe, is

never called adonee in the Bible. There are many words reserved for God in the Bible; adonee, however, is not one of them.

Then he says: ...The central purpose of the composition of this sacred work for the Levites to sing them in the Temple. The Levites would stand on a platform and joyfully chant these spiritually exhilarating Psalms to an inspired audience. Accordingly, the Levites would sing allowed, The Lord [God] said to my master [King David] “Sit thou at my right hand...” (Psalm 110:1)

[Read Tovia Singer’s whole article here:

<https://outreachjudaism.org/psalm110/> (accessed on 29/10/2017)]

So the verse is not about Jesus but David (Peace be upon him). Remember the Jewish Rabbis and scholars know their scripture better than Christians.

Chapter Thirty One (Paulemics and the Earliest Jesus)

David says there are writings before gospels which prove that Christians saw Jesus as God i.e. letters of Paul. Christian apologists have to move outside of gospels quickly because gospels clearly deny divinity of Jesus and Christians cannot prove divinity for holy spirit either with verses like holy spirit will sit on right hand side of power, holy spirit was called God by Thomas and so on. The holy spirit does not pass the litmus test the same way Jesus does, therefore trinity falls flat to the ground and is proven as polytheism. The passages which somehow prove Jesus as god need pseudo interpretations and Christians have to turn towards texts outside gospels.

Nabeel touches the point that Muslims accuse Paul of corrupting teachings of Jesus. The writings of Paul coming before gospels is a clear indication that even gospels were corrupted according to writings of Paul, or that writings of Paul were distorted too. I will prove that writings of Paul contradict at many places and prove Jesus not to be divine.

David uses Philippians 2:6-7 as proof to assert divinity towards Jesus from Paul. The Christian translators are confused in translating these verses which proves they never understood them properly. I will explain this passage later and explain that even these verses do not assert divinity towards Jesus, but first let us understand that Paul at many

places denies divinity of Jesus so either there is distortion in Paul's text or Paul was confused himself. Let us look at proofs where Paul denied divinity of Jesus.

Proof # 1

The Son is the **image** of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation. [Colossians 1:15]

Also see 2 Corinthians 4:4 which calls Christ an Image of God.

Although some translators have tried to mistranslate this verse such as Contemporary English Version lies and says "**Christ is exactly like God**" but majority of translators have correctly translated it as: The Son is the **image of** the invisible God. Now remember image is never God itself. According to both Islam and Christianity God created humans in his Image, but that does not mean humans are God. Plus the verse says firstborn whereas God is not born in any sense. Paul is not an authority in Islam so we do not accept his concept of firstborn but this verse is shown just to refute Christians.

Proof # 2

Before Christians shout loudly why I have not shown next verses then in next verses it says things like everything were created by him and so on. Christians show this passage in

isolation whereas what Paul meant is understood from another passage which proves that Jesus was an agent not actual creator himself.

1 Corinthians 8:6 states: **Yet to us there is but one God, the Father, from whom are all things, and we in Him, and one Lord Jesus Christ** by whom are all things, and we by Him.

Clearly Paul distinguishes between God the Father and Jesus the Lord. He proves God to be the creator and Jesus as an agent. We Muslims do not agree to this concept of Paul, but I am showing this just as proof that Paul either did not consider Jesus to be God or was confused himself.

Proof # 3

Paul says: When all things are subjected to him, then the **Son himself will also be subjected to him** who put all things in subjection under him, that God may be all in all. [**1 Corinthians 15:28**]

Clearly Paul proves that Jesus will be subjected to God. Now what kind of God subjects himself to another God?

Proof # 4

Paul says: But I want you to know that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of the woman, **and God is the head of Christ.** [1 Corinthians 11:3]

If Jesus is God then he ceases to be head of every man according to this verse as head of Jesus is God!

Proof # 5

Paul said: For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. [Ephesians 3:14]

Now let us come towards Philippians 2:6-7 which Christians often use and misinterpret. Let us first look at contradictory translations from leading Christian translations.

King James Version translate them as: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.

Please see the bold parts. Now let us see Contemporary English Version:

Christ was truly God. But he did not try to remain equal with God. Instead he gave up everything and became a slave, when he became like one of us.

English Standard Version states:

Who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped but emptied himself, by taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men.

Common English Bible says:

Though he was in the form of God, he did not consider being equal with God something to exploit. But he emptied himself by taking the form of a slave and by becoming like human beings. When he found himself in the form of a human

Now it is clear that translators tried to distort the actual meaning. If we read next verses then it says to the extent that “at the name of Jesus every knee should bow” and yet again many Christian translators translate the last 11th verse wrongly whereas some such as Easy to Read Version translate rightly as: They will all confess, “Jesus Christ is Lord, and this will bring glory to God the Father.

Before explaining further, we as Muslims do not agree with Paul. He was not disciple of Jesus, he had some hallucination where he “claimed” to have met Jesus but according to his own writing the Satan can deceive acting like an Angel, here is what he wrote:

And no wonder! Even Satan disguises himself as an angel of light. [2 Corinthians 11:14]

That is exactly what Paul must have experienced. Having made this clear let us dismantle the passage.

a) Paul is clearly differentiating between Jesus and God in passage of Philippians 2:6-11. Had Jesus been God, he would have categorically said he is God rather than using difficult words which Christian translators till today have not understood properly. He calls him “form of God” which even if we take at face value does not make Jesus “EXACTLY” as God.

b) If Jesus were God, then it would make no sense at all to say that he did not “grasp” at equality with God because no one grasps at equality with himself. It only makes sense to compliment someone for not seeking equality when he is not equal. Some Trinitarians say, “Well, he was not grasping for equality with the Father.” That is not what the verse says. It says Christ did not grasp at equality with *God*, which makes the verse nonsense if he were God. [Quoted from: www.biblicalunitarian.com/verses/philippians-2-6-8 (accessed on 29/10/2017)]

c) Paul says he emptied himself (according to many translations). Now this creates further problems for

Trinitarians because they believe Jesus was fully God and fully man, but if they use this verse they have to believe Jesus emptied himself of divinity completely.

d) Regarding every knee bowing to Jesus, then according to Islam Prophets were bowed to before Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) forbade it as that could lead to idolatry. But it does not mean bowing to Prophets was considered as worship. In Qur'an Angels bowed to Adam and also brothers of Joseph bowed to him. Let us look at some biblical passages in this regard.

It states in Genesis: Joseph was the ruler of the land. He was the one who sold grain to all the people of the land. **And Joseph's brothers came and bowed to the ground in front of him.** [Genesis 42:6]

It states about Prophet Lot: And there came two angels to Sodom at evening, and Lot sat in the gate of Sodom. And Lot, seeing them, rose up to meet them, **and he bowed himself with his face toward the ground** [Genesis 19:1]

There are many more passages. So kneeling before Jesus does not mean he is to be worshipped. I have proven above that Paul himself says that he kneels to the Father.

Then David wood uses 1 Corinthians 8:6 which has already been shown above. It actually proves contrary to Christian claims.

Then David defends Paul by making sweeping statements like: *Why would Paul make Jesus into a deity being a devout Jew?* I have already explained above through many of Paul's writings that he did not. At maximum it could be said that Paul's writings were distorted too or that he was confused himself. Plus who says Jews cannot commit blasphemy? There is a cult called Messianic Jews who believe just like Christians. There is also a possibility that Paul was a Jewish stooge setup to adulterate teachings of Jesus and to prove Judaism as right. I know Christians will call my last statement an assumption, but that is exactly why I used the word "possibility"

David Wood makes yet another huge blunder in order to defend Paul by saying: *Nabeel, after Jesus I see Paul as the "GODLIEST MAN OF ALL TIME" I am not about to just sit here and listen to you insult him...*

David Wood exposes himself and Christianity completely with this statement. Fanatical Christians like David throw the 11 disciples of Jesus in the bin who had actually seen him, lived in hard times with him, and followed him. Christians do this to defend Paul because in Paul's writings they somehow see hope to their pagan beliefs, although I have proven above that Paul denied divinity of Jesus too or at least his writings contradict.

Paul is the guy who tried to outlaw the Law of Moses completely contrary to Jesus in Matthew 5:17-20, see Paul's writings in Galatians 4:21-31, Colossians 2:13-14, Romans 10:4 and others (opposite writings of Paul also exist, but my point is that Paul is a dubious character in Christianity), he outlawed circumcision although Jesus was circumcised himself (see: Luke 2:21), wrote emphatically against women (1 Timothy 2: 9-15, 1 Corinthians 14:33-35, Ephesians 5:22-24, and others), introduced concept of using lies to spread the message (see: Romans 3:7).

Plus Nabeel was not insulting Paul anywhere but just presenting some refutations which he knew. Of course Nabeel being ignorant of Islam and Bible made a poor case which later led to his conversation to Trinitarian polytheism.

Also this statement by David Wood by itself proves that Jesus was not God but a "GODLY" person, a Godly person is not God himself.

Chapter Thirty Two (Tension and the Trinity)

Finally Nabeel came towards Trinity towards the end as trinity is most hard to explain by Christians, rather many Christians consider it a mystery. He used the typical Christian misunderstanding that Qur'an considers trinity as worship of "God, Son, and Holy Mary" He quotes verse 5:116 as proof.

Let us look at verse 5:116. It states:

And behold! Allah will say: "O Jesus the son of Mary! Didst thou say unto men, **worship me and my mother as gods in derogation of Allah'?**" He will say: "Glory to Thee! never could I say what I had no right (to say). Had I said such a thing, thou wouldst indeed have known it. Thou knowest what is in my heart, Thou I know not what is in Thine. For Thou knowest in full all that is hidden. [5:116, Yusuf Ali]

This verse is not talking about trinity but actually there was a sect of Christians who worshipped Mary, to read more about such early Christians, study on **Collyridianism**. Till today it is prevalent among many Roman Catholics to make idols of Holy Mary and to worship her by praying to her. The verse on trinity is the following. Qur'an states:

They do blaspheme who say: **Allah is one of three in a Trinity:** for there is no god except One Allah. If they desist not from their word (of blasphemy), verily a grievous penalty will befall the blasphemers among them. [5:73, Yusuf Ali]

Yes some scholars of past did confuse this concept as they did not bother to study the Bible. However big authorities in Tafsir such as al-Qurtubi say under 5:73 that Trinity refers to “The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit” Tafsir Ibn Abbas i.e. Tanwir al Miqbas min Tafsir Ibn Abbas also says the same.

Chapter Thirty Three (Resonating with the Trinity)

Nabeel started with the typical Christian logic of linking everything to trinity, he talked about concept of resonance and said: *“Some molecules, like water have no resonance while others have three resonance structures **or more**, like the nitrate...”*

He concluded by saying: *“If there are things in the world that can be three in one, even incomprehensibly so, then why cannot be God?”*

Nabeel was clearly comparing nature of God to created things which is a blasphemy not only according to Qur’an but also Bible. Plus he had accepted himself that everything is not triune in nature.

Unlike on previous topics, Nabeel accepted trinity to be correct on basis of logic, whereas previously he had been asking for proofs from Gospels and rebutting them with his Qadiyani knowledge. Nabeel did this so that he could fool people in believing that Christianity is right on its biggest dogma i.e. trinity. It is actually trinity which requires all sorts of proofs from Gospels.

Now let me refute the concept of trinity.

- a) Nowhere is the word trinity found in the whole New Testament. Had trinity been core doctrine taught by Jesus then he would have used the word at least once. “Tawhid” on the other hand is categorically mentioned by name in authentic Hadiths [Sunnan Ibn Majah, Hadith # 3122, Jami at-Tirmidhi, Hadith # 2597]
- b) Christians are confused about nature of Holy Spirit i.e. what it is exactly, they mostly explain it to be dove like something.
- c) Christians have to show categorical verses directly from Jesus where he said: God is three persons in one being. This dogma has been a thorn in eyes of Christians since a long time that they had to forge in 1 John 5:7 to add concept of trinity in New Testament. This fabrication is still present in King James version of Bible which is most relied upon translation according to Christians.

Chapter Thirty Four (Salvation in the Balance)

Nabeel started talking about Jesus dying for our sins, and how he became friends with a Buddhist who agreed with his logic that Jesus could not have died for sins of billions of people. David interjected and said to Nabeel: *“You know fully well that Christian doctrine teaches Jesus is God yet you took that out of equation when you critiqued the theology. God is not forcing ‘some random person’ to suffer for our sins. He is paying for our sins himself”*

It has been proven above from many verses that Jesus denied divinity and cannot be God. Plus Nabeel had tacitly accepted by now in the book that Jesus was God, so of course on this basis he would accept all other absurd concepts of Christians too.

David in order to justify the absurd Christian concept said: *“If heaven is going to be a perfect place, by definition there can be no sinners in it. None at all”*

This is why Islam gives the perfect answer that in heaven we will be sent as young, clean, and sinless people, all our sins will be wiped out and we will be pure.

Chapter Thirty Five (Assessing the Gospel)

Nabeel rated divinity of Jesus, his dying on cross, and resurrection at 80-85 on a scale from 0-100. Zero being unfounded and hundred being best explanation. No sane Muslim would do what Nabeel did. Divinity of Jesus gets a Zero without a shadow of doubt as I proved from many verses, crucifixion gets a Zero too because of contradicting reports in NT, whereas Islam does not deny Jesus being tortured or hung from a tree or tied to a cross without being nailed, and then raised alive. Resurrection can get high score close to 85 because there are proofs in Islamic sources that Prophets can come back and meet their loved ones. So it stands established that Nabeel was always a confused Qadiyani who did not study Islam nor comparative religions properly.

Nabeel said: *“Anyone who objectively approaches the Quran will be astounded by its **scientific** truths and beautiful teachings”*...then accepted himself that he had not studied Islam with scrutiny as he had studied Christianity which is proven as a lie as he was unaware of even 1 John 5:7 and many other things which Muslim apologists know ...

Nabeel again presented a weak case for Islam. Although Quran indeed has scientific wonders mentioned in it, but Quran is not a book of science but a book of guidance for humanity. The New Testament is filled with things like Jesus driving out demons from bodies of people, bringing dead

back to life (Quran also mentions that), putting demons in pigs and drowning them, walking on water, standing on a mythical mountain from which whole world could be seen and many things which modern science would mock at, rather New testament concentrates on guidance of people too and not science, whereas Old testament talks about science indirectly at many places. The atheist/agnostic scientists point to many scientific mistakes in Old Testament.

Nabeel said: *“Let’s start with Muhammad next time and I will discuss Quran after that”*

Again Nabeel started in reverse order like he did in case of Christianity where he came towards trinity in the end. Muhammad (Peace be upon him) is to be known from Qur’an first and not hadiths and other books like Seerah and history books.

Part 7 (The Truth About Muhammad)

Chapter Thirty Six (Muhammad Revisited)

Nabeel started with a general sweeping statement by saying: *“Muslims who question Allah are usually tolerated by other Muslims, but questioning Muhammad is grounds of excommunication, or worse”*

First of all that is not true, secondly It is Christians who have forgotten God Almighty the Father and concentrate the most on Son Jesus, they have given all attributes of God the Father to Jesus and forgotten God although scripture calls true believers those who do contrary to that, let us see the verses:

Book of John states: Yet a time is coming and has now come **when the true worshipers will worship the Father in the Spirit and in truth, for they are the kind of worshipers the Father seeks.** God is spirit, and his worshipers must worship in the Spirit and in truth.”[John 4:23-24]

This passage does not only prove that worship should be directed to Father alone but also the fact that God has a spirit which is his own, not a separate person.

Nabeel concocted belief of all Muslims by saying: *“Even though **“EVERY”** Muslim would quickly admit*

Muhammad is human, in theory fallible like any other man, they often revere him as flawless”

This is false and a contradictory statement. According to Islamic theology of both mainstream Sunni and Shia Islam, all Prophets especially Sayyiduna Muhammad (Peace be upon him) are infallible (sinless). The verses and hadiths which talk about sins of Prophets are talking about “Relative sinning” i.e. Sin in eyes of Allah as Allah sets high standards for Prophets, but according to definition of sin in our terms, they are not sins. Qur’an proves that even Adam did not sin but made an innocent mistake (See Qur’an 20:115, Sahih Bukhari 6.60.260 for example). The Prophets asking for forgiveness refers to their humbleness in front of God Almighty not that they were sinners. Had Prophets been sinners then their followers would get an excuse to sin.

He again talked about September 9/11, whereas all sane people in the world know for sure now that 9/11 was an inside job in order to wage illegal wars on Muslim countries by United States of America. Iraq did not have Weapons of Mass destruction, nor was Al-Qaeeda there in Iraq at that time. Plus how could WTC 7 collapse when no plane had hit it? The twin towers could not have collapsed either due to fire of jet fuel, the footage of “so called” plane hitting pentagon clearly shows some kind of missile hitting it but not a huge plane, the passports being found in rubble and all such crap was crafted later on to wage illegal wars to kill millions of Muslims.

Nabeel then said: *“Islam comes from root word peace”*

This again proves that he had not studied Islam properly. The word “Salam” means peace, and Islam becomes peace because Prophet has told to spread Salam, whereas Islam the word itself means submission. Of course Nabeel was bound to be refuted and become Christian when he did not even know basics.

Then he talked about scientific things, I have already shed light on it that a good Muslim apologist would never use such a strategy because Quran is a book of guidance not science, same is the case with New Testament.

Then he talked about Deuteronomy 18:18 and John 16:12-13 to be predicting about Muhammad. I know Muslim apologists use such verses especially Zakir Naik who is a Wahabi and Wahabism has nothing to do with Islam, but I believe Muslims should not use Bible about predicting Muhammad (Peace be upon him) because Bible has been corrupted. Quran and authentic hadiths are more than enough for us. By the way Christians say Deut 18:18 is about Jesus but Jews soundly refute them and say it is not about Jesus, also passages in John talks about a “comforter to come after Jesus” whereas holy spirit was already there, hence even Christians do not understand those passages properly. Regarding that comforter staying forever then intellectual Muslims do believe that Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon

him) is “Hadhira Nadhir (present and witnessing)” still I would not use corrupted Bible.

Mike then asked a question: *“I have heard it is said that Islam was spread by the sword, but you’re saying that Muhammad engaged only in defensive battles. Can you tell me why your position is more accurate? Nabeel responded: “The Qur’an teaches la-iqraha fi-deen (there is no compulsion in religion) (2:256)” In response to this Mike misquotes a verse out of context, partially, and also mistranslates it i.e. “Slay the **infidels** wherever you find them (9:5)” Nabeel rather than exposing Mike that he has misquoted the verse out of context from Qur’an itself, runs towards hadiths.*

Let us look at 9:5 along with context. It has to be read from 9:1 to 9:13

Verse 9:1 states: [This is a declaration of] disassociation, from Allah and His Messenger, **to those with whom you had made a treaty** among the polytheists.

Verse 9:4 states: **Excepted are those with whom you made a treaty** among the polytheists and then they have not been deficient toward you in anything or supported anyone against you; so complete for them their treaty until their term [has ended]. Indeed, Allah loves the righteous [who fear Him].

And then 9:5 states: And when the sacred months have passed, then kill the polytheists wherever you find them and capture them and besiege them and sit in wait for them at every place of ambush. But if they should repent, establish prayer, and give zakah, let them [go] on their way. Indeed, Allah is Forgiving and Merciful.

Verse 9:6 states: **And if any one of the polytheists seeks your protection, then grant him protection** so that he may hear the words of Allah . Then deliver him to his place of safety. That is because they are a people who do not know.

Verse 9:10 States: They do not observe toward a believer any pact of kinship or covenant of protection. And it is they who are the transgressors.

Verse 9:12 states: **And if they break their oaths** after their treaty and defame your religion, **then fight** the leaders of disbelief, for indeed, there are no oaths [sacred] to them; [fight them that] they might cease.

Verse 9:13 (This is most important to understand) states: **Would you not fight a people who broke their oaths and determined to expel the Messenger, and they had begun [the attack upon] you the first time?** Do you fear them? But Allah has more right that you should fear Him, if you are [truly] believers.

Hence it stands proven from context of Qur'an itself that it is not asking to kill "all **infidels**" as wrongly translated by

Nabeel or by Mike” but 9:5 is talking about “**polytheists only**” who broke the treaty and “INITIATED THE FIGHT FIRST”

After this Nabeel, Mike, and David got into a long discussion about authenticity of hadiths. Mike and David accept that hadith cannot be trusted at all as they were compiled over 200 or 250 years after Prophet Muhammad (which was also Nabeel’s ignorance as hadiths were compiled way earlier, one example is Muwatta Imam Malik).

Now these same Christian fanatics use hadiths against Muhammad (Peace be upon him) and even fabricated reports from third class Seerah and history sources which are lower in rank than hadiths, but when it comes to defending their own stances they quickly reject hadiths altogether. **My dear readers, you should keep it in mind now that whenever David Wood or any Christian apologist presents any hadith against Prophet Muhammad or Islam then you can show book of Nabeel as proof that they do not accept hadiths to be authentic academically.** The intellectual Muslims also do not accept hadiths which contradict Qur’an, logic, and Usool ul hadith (principles of checking hadiths).

Chapter Thirty Seven (The Picture Perfect Prophet)

Nabeel started with a deception yet again by saying: *“ALMOST EVERYTHING MUSLIMS know about Muhammad comes to them orally, rarely from primary sources. Unlike Christians learning about Jesus from the Bible, the Quran has very little to say about Muhammad”*

These are sweeping statements, plus Qur’an has a lot to say about Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him). It has many verses on his praise, on how he lived, in his defense from attacks from disbelievers, and so on. Nabeel was clearly trying to misguide the gullible Christian audience.

Then Nabeel moved towards a Seerah (Biography) book rather than Hadith and assumed that Ibn Hisham removing “fabricated and weak” reports from Seerat Ibn Ishaq somehow proves that biography of Prophet has been altered. Nabeel was ignorant of the fact that there have been and still are people who attribute lies to noble personalities in history. The historians had a certain bias due to culture, past religion they followed, prevalent rulers whom they followed, and simply because some were liars like Ibn Ishaq was.

Ibn Ishaq was himself severely criticized by many giants such as Imam Malik after whom one of the four schools of jurisprudence is named i.e. Maliki School. Imam Malik the

great called Ibn Ishaq a Dajjal (grand liar), many other hadith specialists called Muhammad Ibn Ishaq a “LIAR” too. [See Tahdhib ut Tahdhib of Ibn Hajr al-Asqalani, Volume 9, under narrators starting with letter M (meem)]

Nabeel says: *“What young Muslims learn about Muhammad is an airbrushed portrait — this blemish removed and that feature emphasized — that makes him fit a desired image. Through selective quotation, Muhammad becomes the picture-perfect prophet”*

No, We check the sources in light of Qur’an which calls Muhammad (Peace be upon him) as “Mercy to the worlds (21:107)” and standing on an “Exalted standard of character (68:4)” Therefore any hadith, let alone some third class seerah or history narration, which contradicts Qur’an is to be outright rejected according to primary principle of Usool ul Hadith.

Nabeel said: *“If a Western Muslim wants to paint a peaceful portrait of Muhammad, all they have to do is quote peaceful hadith and verses of the Quran, to the exclusion of the violent ones. If an Islamic extremist wants to mobilize his followers to acts of terrorism, he will quote the violent references, to the exclusion of the peaceful ones”*

Bible can be easily misinterpreted too. When Christians believe Jesus to be eternal God then all verses in Old Testament about stoning, burning people to death,

genocides, killing disobedient children, and warfare become sanctioned by Jesus. Also many passages in New Testament can be misinterpreted such as Jesus coming to make family members turn against one another, or Jesus coming back in 2nd coming as a warrior king with sword coming out of his mouth. Qur'an on the other hand does not prescribe "genocides" nor "burning people to death" nor "killing disobedient children" nor "preemptive wars" nor "killing apostates" nor "stoning"

Nabeel said: *"For example, the Quranic verse that I have seen quoted more often than any other to defend a peaceful view of Islam is 5:32. I have seen it cited on CNN, MSNBC, ABC, and innumerable dawah materials to show that the Quran discourages murder. What each of these references omitted was the first line of the verse, which makes it explicit that the prohibition of murder was directed specifically to the Jews; it was not a teaching sent to Muslims. It is the next verse that directly relates to Islam and Muslims: "the penalty for those who wage war against Allah and His Messenger and strive upon earth [to cause] corruption is none but that they be killed or crucified or that their hands and feet be cut off from opposite sides or that they be exiled from the land." Unfortunately, that verse is also ignored in the process of selective quotation"*

Let us first of all understand 5:32 in light of Islamic sources whether it applies to Muslims or is just for Jews.

Imam al-Baghawi the classical commentator of Qur'an explains this verse: Suliman bin Ali said: I asked Hasan al-Basri, Does this apply to us as it applied to the Children of Israel?' He replied, 'Yes [Ma`alim at-Tanzeel under 5:32]

Hasan al-Basri was from the successors and one of the greatest scholars. The great mystic (Sufi) ways in Islam have Hasan Basri in chain.

But It is not only Hasan al-Basri, rather companions of Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) considered the verse to be general.

Ali bin Abi Talhah reported that Ibn `Abbas said, "It is as Allah has stated, (if anyone killed a person not in retaliation of murder, or (and) to spread mischief in the land – it would be as if he killed all mankind, and if anyone saved a life, it would be as if he saved the life of all mankind.) SAVING LIFE IN THIS CASE OCCURS BY NOT KILLING A SOUL THAT ALLAH HAS FORBIDDEN. So this is the meaning of saving the life of all mankind, for whoever forbids killing a soul without justification, "THE LIVES OF ALL PEOPLE WILL BE SAVED FROM HIM" [Tafsir Ibn Kathir under 5:32]

Ibn Kathir also explains: Al-A`mash and others said that Abu Salih said that Abu Hurayrah said, "I entered on `Uthman when he was under siege in his house and said, `I came to give you my support. Now, it is good to fight (defending you) O Leader of the Faithful!' He said, `O Abu Hurayrah! Does it

please you that you kill all people, including me' I said, 'No.'
"HE SAID, IF YOU KILL ONE MAN, IT IS AS IF YOU
KILLED ALL PEOPLE" Therefore, go back with my
permission for you to leave. May you receive your reward and
be saved from burden.' So I went back and did not fight."
[Tafsir Ibn Kathir under 5:32]

Hence this verse is general according to Islamic
jurisprudence. Now regarding next verse, then the verse is
clear itself that it is talking about those who waged war on
Prophet, and those who cause "corruption" on land. This
corruption on land is akin to committing genocides,
destroying infrastructure. The classical commentators have
applied this verse on "Khawarij" and Khawarij of today are
groups like ISIS and they deserve such a punishment because
of their brutality, suicide bombings, raping women, and
other atrocities.

Sayyed Nasr Hussain explains "corruption" as: Armed
crimes falling under the legal category of Hirabah, which
comprises armed robbery, assault (including rape), and
murder, particularly of innocent travelers on the road.[The
Study Quran: A New Translation and Commentary.
Commentary to 5:33]

There are tons of verses in Qur'an which talk about dealing
kindly with non-Muslims. Yes there are verses which talk
about not taking Jews and Christians as our allies, and also to
fight them until they pay Jizyah (tax), but such verses have

to be understood with complete context of Qur'anic message and hadith.

Nabeel then admitted to have gotten hold of Bukhari for first time in his life. So he had been confronting Christian experts all the time without having read Bukhari and knowing Islam properly? This proves that Nabeel had ulterior motives and was never a knowledgeable Muslim who knew Islam well, nor did he know Christianity well like Muslim apologists know. David, Mike, and company teamed up against the ignorant man seeing a vulnerable and gullible person, or Nabeel left the already misguided Qadiyani cult for ulterior motives as I have mentioned before.

Nabeel finds problem in the third hadith of Bukhari about revelation coming to Prophet Muhammad and there was a cross reference to another hadith i.e. 9.111 which added more to the hadith that Prophet Muhammad thought of committing suicide (Naudhobillah). Now Nabeel forgot something here which he had already discussed in the book i.e. Isnad (chain of narration), and also the fact that Mike and David denied hadiths altogether as they had come after 200 years later. Both the shorter and longer version (which mentions Prophet trying to commit suicide) come from a narrator called "Ibn Shihab al-Zuhri" who was renowned for making "interpolations" in hadiths. Many classical hadith experts had criticized Zuhri for not clarifying which were words of actual hadith and which were his own words. So a narration from a fabricator who makes interpolations is

guaranteed to be rejected in light of Usool ul hadith (Principles of hadith). Secondly this hadith comes from Aisha the wife of Prophet. She was not present at the time when early revelations started to come on Prophet, nor is this hadith traced to be Marfu (elevated to Prophet i.e. Prophet narrating the hadith himself), so that is second technical flaw in hadith.

Here are proofs from hadith specialists that Zuhri made interpolations:

Imam al-Sakhawi said: Ibn Shihab al-Zuhri used to (himself) explain many hadiths, many times he would not mention the particle [of speech] from which would be known if the words were from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) or from Zuhri himself. Hence some (scholars) of his time would always ask him to separate his words from those of the Prophet (Peace be upon him). [Sakhawi, Fath-al-Mughees, 1/267-8)]

Zuhri tried to show as if there was rift between Companions and family of Prophet through his interpolations too. Imam al-Bayhaqi exposes Zuhri on one such important issue by saying:

وقول الزهري في قعود علي عن بيعة أبي بكر رضي الله
عنه حتى توفيت فاطمة رضي الله عنها منقطع

Translation: This part that Ali abstained from giving pledge to Abu Bakr till Fatima died, is saying of al-Zuhri and it is broken (munqata) [Sunnan Bayhaqi al-Kubra 6/300, Hadith # 12512]

So Zuhri was dubious and used to insert many things from himself. Hence the hadiths Nabeel showed and also Islamophobes rely upon are to be rejected. Remember no book other than Qur'an is divine, Bukhari has many weak and even fabricated reports in it. It is the Wahabis and extremists who try to assert that Bukhari and Muslim have everything authentic in it, but intellectual Muslims and scholars have long ago declared that Bukhari/Muslim have weak and fabricated reports in them too.

If Christians are stubborn and still do not accept these narrations to be interpolations of Zuhri, then let us look at Temptation of Biblical Jesus when he was hanging out with Satan on a mythical mountain from which whole world could be seen. It states:

Book of Luke: Then the devil took him to the holy city and had him stand on the highest point of the temple. If you are the Son of God," he said, "**throw yourself down. For it is written: "He will command his angels concerning you, and they will lift you up** in their hands, so that you will not strike your foot against a stone. Jesus answered him, "**It is also written:** 'Do not put the Lord your God to the test. [Luke 4:5-7]

Look closely, Jesus does not rebut Satan on the point that Angels will lift you if you throw yourself down, meaning Jesus knew it was written in scripture that if Prophets tried to do such a thing then Angels would save them. Plus what on earth was Jesus doing hanging out with Satan when according to Christians he was the one who expelled Satan out being God? Why did Satan ask Jesus to worship him, when Satan already knew that God would never do that? This passage from Luke also destroys concept of divinity of Jesus.

Chapter Thirty Eight (Veiling the Violence)

Nabeel reads beautiful hadiths that Muslims should not harm others, feed the poor, greet strangers kindly, and so on. But then he stumbles upon hadith 1.24 in Bukhari which states (actual reference is 1.25 though): I have been ordered by Allah to fight against people until they testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that Muhammad is Allah's Apostle, and offer the prayers perfectly and give the obligatory charity . . . then they will save their lives and property from me."

As I have mentioned before that every hadith has to be checked according to Usool ul Hadith (principles of hadith) and the primary principle is that any hadith that contradicts Qur'an is to be outright rejected. Secondly, you have seen yourself that David, Mike, and team of Christian specialists denied hadiths altogether as they were compiled over 200 years after Prophet, so why didn't Nabeel apply the same rule on this hadith?

Qur'an categorically says to Prophet Muhammad contrary to this hadith: If it had been your Lord's will, they would all have believed, all who are on earth! **Will you then compel mankind, against their will, to believe!** (10:99)

Hence it is not the will of Allah that all should believe. Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was a perfect

Muslim and Islam is all about submitting to “WILL OF ALLAH” so how can he go against Allah’s will? Therefore, this hadith contradicts Qur’an and is to be rejected. There are many more verses that could be cited but this is most relevant to debunking the hadith.

Nabeel said: *I simply could not believe it, and so I hurriedly moved on to the next hadith. But 1.25 said that the greatest thing a Muslim can do after having faith is to engage in jihad. As if to clarify what kind of jihad, **Sahih Bukhari clarifies, “religious fighting.”***

No, that is not Sahih Bukhari clarifying but the Wahabi translator Muhsin Khan adding his own brackets. Clearly, Nabeel was reading in a hurry just to find faults and was not honest. The Prophet just mentioned Jihad generally and Jihad according to Islam has to be understood from overall message of Qur’an and authentic hadiths.

Let us first look at definition of Jihad. We do not need to consult Arabic dictionaries because definition of Jihad is established directly from Qur’an itself.

Qur’an states:

And whosoever **STRIVES (JAAHADA), STRIVES (YUJAAHIDU)** only for himself (29:6).

As for those who **STRIVE (JAHADU)** in Us (the cause of Allah), We surely guide them to Our paths, and lo! Allah is

with the good doers. (29:69)

These verses clearly use the word “JIHAD” and they refer to Jihad an Nafs (striving against the lowly traits of our soul).

Hence it stands proven from Qur’an that word Jihad originates from root word “Jaahada” which refers to striving. This striving could be in many forms such as striving against lowly traits of our soul, striving to serve our parents, saying word of truth in front of a tyrant ruler, performing hajj, striving to end poverty, and last but not the least fighting (Qitaal) against the “OPPRESSIVE” disbelievers who “INITIATE” war upon Muslims.

Contrary to this, Merriam Webster the famous English dictionary falsely defines jihad only as: a war fought by Muslims to defend or spread their beliefs. (In simple definition)

1. In full definition it states: 1. **a holy war** waged on behalf of Islam as a **religious duty**; *also* : a personal struggle in devotion to Islam especially involving spiritual discipline
2. **a crusade** for a principle or belief

Dictionary.com also falsely defines it as:

1. **a holy war** undertaken as a **sacred duty** by Muslims.
2. any **vigorous, emotional crusade** for an idea or principle.

Collins English dictionary defines it as: a **holy war against infidels** undertaken by Muslims in defence of the Islamic faith

Due to such false definitions, the word Jihad is misused by western media/thinkers and anti-Islamic propagandists, they define it as “HOLY WAR” whereas actual wording for the holy war is “al-Harb-u-Muqaddasah” a term never used in Qur’an. There is not a single verse in Qur’an that calls jihad a “holy war”

The verses about warfare/fighting use the word “Qitaal” and that is only applicable in situation of war (that too initiated by disbelievers and not from Muslims)

Having described Jihad, we should know that Islam is indeed not a pacifist religion and we should not be shy to accept this fact. Every great ideology cannot be pacifist in approach due to existence of crimes and violence in this world that could only be tackled with an iron fist. One cannot shower flowers on a gunman entering a school for instance and killing children.

There are many hadiths which explain concept of Jihad too.

Let me share some:

Hadith # 1 (Jihad is to strive against lowly traits of our soul)
Read this following hadith in relevance to Qur'anic verse which states: ..."By the soul and the proportion and order given to it, and its inspiration as to its wrong and its right; **Truly he succeeds who purifies it, and he fails that corrupts it**" (Holy Qur'an, 91: 7-10)

The Prophet (Peace be upon him) said:

وَسَمِعْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَقُولُ " الْمُجَاهِدُ مَنْ جَاهَدَ نَفْسَهُ

The Mujahid (one who does Jihad) is one who strives against his own soul." [Sunnan Tirmidhi, Hadith # 1621]

Imam at-Tirmidhi declared this hadith as "Good and Authentic"

It also states in another hadith:

الْمُجَاهِدُ مَنْ جَاهَدَ نَفْسَهُ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ

The Mujahid (one who does Jihad) is he who makes Jihad against his nafs (ego) for the sake of Allah.[Sahih Ibn Hibban (#1624, 2519): Authenticated by; Shu`ayb al-Arna'ut (Commentary on Ibn Hibban): authentic; al-Hakim said:

Sahih; `Iraqi confirms him]

Hadith # 2 (Jihad by serving our parents)

Narrated `Abdullah bin `Amr: A man came to the Prophet (ﷺ) asking his permission to take part in Jihad. The Prophet (ﷺ) asked him, "**Are your parents alive?**" **He replied in the affirmative. The Prophet (ﷺ) said to him, "Then exert yourself in their service."**

Another hadith states:

Yazid b. Abu Habib reported that Na'im, the freed slave of Umm Salama, reported to him that 'Abdullah b. 'Amr b. 'As said: There came to Allah's Apostle (ﷺ) a person and said: I owe allegiance to you for migration and Jihad seeking reward only from Allah. He (the Holy Prophet) said: Is one from amongst your parents living? He said: Yes, of course, both are living. He further asked: Do you want to seek reward from Allah? He said: Yes. Thereupon Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) said: **Go back to your parents and accord them benevolent treatment.** [Sahih Muslim, Hadith # 6186]

Yet another hadith states:

It was narrated from Mu'awiyah bin Jahimah As-Sulami, that Jahimah came to the Prophet (ﷺ) and said: "O Messenger of Allah! I want to go out and fight (in Jihad) and I have come to ask your advice." He said: "Do you have a mother?" He said: "Yes." He said: "Then stay with her, **for**

Paradise is beneath her feet." [Sunnan Nasai'i, Hadith # 3104. The Hadith is Authentic]

Hadith # 3 (Jihad is to say word of truth in front of a tyrant ruler)

إِنَّ مِنْ أَعْظَمِ الْجِهَادِ كَلِمَةً عَدْلٍ عِنْدَ سُلْطَانٍ جَائِرٍ

Abu Sa'eed Al-Khudri narrated that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said: "**Indeed, among the greatest types of Jihad is a just statement before a tyrannical ruler.**" [Sunnan Tirmidhi, Hadith # 2174, Grade of Hadith is :Good]

Another hadith states:

Abu Umamah reports that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said:

أَحَبُّ الْجِهَادِ إِلَى اللَّهِ كَلِمَةٌ حَقٌّ تُقَالُ لِإِمَامٍ جَائِرٍ

The most beloved Jihad in sight of Allah is a word of truth in front of a tyrant leader [Mu'jam Al-Kabir # 8002, Hadith is "GOOD"]

Hadith # 4 (Jihad to perform hajj)

The Mother of the Believers, 'Aishah, narrates: "I said: 'O Messenger of Allah, shall we not go out and fight in jihad with you, for I do not think there is any deed in the Qur'an that is

better than jihad.' **He said: 'No. the best and most beautiful (type) of jihad is Hajj to the House;** Hajj Al-Mabrur. "[Sunnan Nasai'i, Hadith # 2628. It is Authentic]

Similar hadiths are also in Bukhari (# 1520, 2684)

Hadith # 5 (Jihad to end poverty)

Narrated Abu Huraira: The Prophet (ﷺ) said, "The one who looks after a widow **or a poor person is like one who strives in the cause of Allah**, or like him who performs prayers all the night and fasts all the day." [Sahih Bukhari, Hadith # 5353]

There are many more hadiths, which prove that Jihad does not refer to military campaign only. Islam allows self-defense and fighting too but forbids to cross limits as Quran says in 2:190. Mufasireen explain that transgressing limits in this verse refers to not killing women, children, non-combatants, religious people, not to destroy infrastructure, burn trees, and so on. In my reading of Nabeel's book I did not come across him mentioning other verses which Islamophobes use such as not taking Jews and Christians as allies, or fighting those who do not believe in Allah and people of the book until they pay Jizya (tax), so I will just shortly explain those verses.

Those verses also have a specific context, verse about not taking Jews and Christians as allies refers to not taking them as allies in faith only, but they can be taken as friends in

worldly matters. Verse about fighting those who do not believe in Allah and people of the book has a specific context about Byzantine Roman empire who had mobilized troops against Muslims.

Nabeel then starts reading Martin Lings book on Biography and assumes that he omits to mention the hadith of suicide because he was ignorant of it, or he did not want to show that picture of Muhammad (Peace be upon him). But I have already explained above that the hadith is rejected due to Zuhri's interpolations.

Nabeel then talks about attack on Pagan Meccan caravans. I have already proven from Qur'an above i.e. 9:1-13 that Meccan Pagans were the ones who persecuted Muhammad (Peace be upon him) and his companions, forced them to migrate from their own homeland i.e. Mecca, attacked Muslims first and killed some companions (as authentic reports prove that Summayyah bint Khayyat was martyred by Meccans. See Kitab Tabaqat al Kabir by Ibn Sa'd Volume 8, Page 185-186, Translated by Aisha Bewley), also they went to assassinate the Prophet and Abu Bakr in cave Hira while they were migrating, but they were saved by Allah, see Qur'an 9:40 and Bukhari 6.185, hence it is decisively proven that pagan Meccans were the aggressors. The pagan Meccans after expelling Muslims took over properties of Muslims, and only after this constant persecution did the event of "Nakhla" happen, and even that was not sanctioned by Muhammad (Peace be upon him) at all.

Nabeel who was holding Bukhari for first time, how did he come to know of the report of caravan narrated in third grade Tarikh books and others? Either Nabeel was never a true Muslim (which of course he wasn't as he was a Qadiyani) and always wanted to find faults in Islam, or he was influenced by Islamophobes too much prior to learning Islam properly. We do not have to turn towards even hadiths let alone historical reports to know for sure that Pagan Meccans were the aggressors and not Muhammad (Peace be upon him)

Qur'an states: **Would you not fight a people who broke their oaths and determined to expel the Messenger, and they had begun [the attack upon] you the first time?** Do you fear them? But Allah has more right that you should fear Him, if you are [truly] believers. [9:13]

Also another verse in relevance is this: **Permission [to fight] has been given to those who are being fought, because they were wronged.** And indeed, Allah is competent to give them victory. [22:39]

Although Nabeel does not mention this in the book but David Wood and Sam Shamoun often misinterpret 2:217 in regards to raid on Caravans. When we read the verse properly and also the report about Nakhla incident then it is clear that Muhammad (Peace be upon him) "DID NOT SANCTION" to raid the caravan or to kill anyone, he had just sent Abdullah bin Jahsh to gather information, but Ibn Jahsh acted

contrary to Prophet's order and attacked the caravan. Then the verse 2:217 was revealed which still proves Muhammad (Peace be upon him) as innocent and no blame can be put on him.

It states: They ask thee concerning fighting in the Prohibited Month. Say: "**Fighting therein is a grave (offence);** but graver is it in the sight of Allah to prevent access to the path of Allah, to deny Him, **to prevent access to the Sacred Mosque, and drive out its members.**" Tumult and oppression are worse than slaughter. Nor will they cease fighting you until they turn you back from your faith if they can. And if any of you Turn back from their faith and die in unbelief, their works will bear no fruit in this life and in the Hereafter; they will be companions of the Fire and will abide therein. [2:217]

This verse clearly proves that Muhammad (Peace be upon him) did not sanction Nakhla raids rather Abdullah bin Jahsh disobeyed the Prophet and Qur'an calls his action a "GRAVE OFFENCE (SIN)" However what Meccan Pagans had done and were doing was far more offensive. They had already declared war by expelling Prophet and companions out, not letting them back to Mosque of Makkah, looted their properties, broken the treaties, killed companions (like Summayyah), and initiated the war first as 9:13 and 22:39 proves.

Again Nabeel quotes from Ibn Ishaq's Seerah and Tabaqat Ibn Sa'd and not authentic hadiths that Muhammad (Peace

be upon him) ordered to assassinate Asma bint Marwan a mother of five. Nabeel did not show any chain of narration for this report because he knew he would be exposed. It contains Muhammad bin Hajjaj, regarding him Imam al-Bukhari said: His hadith is **rejected**. Yahya bin Ma'een said: He is an **evil liar**. Imam Daraqutni said: He is a **liar**, and at another place he said: He is **not trustworthy**. [al-Dhahabi in Meezan ul A'itidal, 3/509]

Then Nabeel used another report but ignored the Sahih hadith in Bukhari. Nabeel said: *For example, in the aftermath of the Battle of the Trench, Muhammad captured and beheaded over five hundred men and teenage boys from the Jewish tribe of Qurayza. After the Muslims killed the men, they sold the women and children into slavery and distributed their goods among themselves*

This incident of Banu Qurayza is also highly disputed. The only authentic narration is present in Bukhari and that contradicts with other reports. Let us look at hadith in Bukhari first.

Narrated Abu Sa`id Al-Khudri: When the tribe of Bani Quraiza was ready to accept **Sa`d's judgment**, Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) sent for Sa`d who was near to him. Sa`d came, riding a donkey and when he came near, Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) said (to the Ansar), "Stand up for your leader." Then Sa`d came and sat beside Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) who said to him. "These people are ready to accept your judgment." Sa`d said, "**I give the judgment that their**

warriors should be killed and their children and women should be taken as prisoners." The Prophet (ﷺ) then remarked, "O Sa`d! You have judged amongst them with (or similar to) the judgment of the King Allah." [Sahih Bukhari Vol. 4, Book 52, Hadith 280]

The reports which say that all boys who reached puberty were killed contradict this hadith of Bukhari which says that **"ONLY WARRIORS WERE KILLED"**

Points to note from this hadith are the following.

- a) Jews themselves accepted Sa`d to judge over them.
- b) It was Sa`d who gave judgment not Muhammad (Peace be upon him)
- c) Only the warriors were killed, not others. The remaining were taken as captives according to Law of Old Testament which was binding on Jews. Sa`d was well versed in Jewish law, so he passed verdict according to Deuteronomy which states: "If they refuse to make peace and they engage you in battle, lay siege to that city. When the Lord your God delivers it into your hand, **"PUT TO THE SWORD ALL THE MEN IN IT"** As for the women, the children, the livestock and everything else in the city, you may take these as plunder for yourselves. And you may use the

plunder the Lord your God gives you from your enemies"[Deuteronomy 20:12-14]

d) As Christians consider Jesus to be God, then that ruling in Deuteronomy was sanctioned by Jesus. So Sa'd ruled according to Law of Old testament not Islam.

Still, there are many verses and hadiths which forbid to kill non-combatants, so those passages supersede these reports and this incident is fictional and never happened.

Chapter Thirty Nine (Muhammad Rasul Allah)

Nabeel meets David again and David has prepared a binder against Prophet Muhammad. Nabeel who is clearly proven to be ignorant of Islam and is gullible keeps on hanging out with David and other Christian apologists, researching on internet, asking his Abba who himself is no scholar, misguided Qadiyanis, but never consults intellectual true Muslims and scholars. David raises the issue that Quran allows Muslims to marry 4 women but Muhammad had more wives at a time. Nabeel uses verse 33:50 in defense of our Noble Prophet.

The reason why Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was allowed to marry more women is because many tribes accepted Islam and gave their daughters to Prophet, people wanted their daughters to be associated with Prophet, and last but not the least it was divine revelation. Majority of his wives were widows and elderly women so he married them to give shelter and protection to women. Also remember that polygamy has been practiced by previous Prophets too like Abraham, David, and Solomon (last two holy men had many wives and concubines and according to Judeo-Christian faiths they have to be considered as righteous Kings at least according to scriptures), plus Old Testament and even New Testament does not prohibit Polygamy at all. It is a Christian lie that they link polygamy to Islam only. Please note that

Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was allowed to have many wives through revelation and the above reason I provided, but general people should marry only 1 woman, or maximum 4 according to Qur'an but under very strict conditions of dealing justly and fairly with all which is very difficult, thus Qur'an recommends to marry only 1 woman.

David then touches the favorite topic of Islamophobes i.e. Marriage with Aisha (ra). The Islam haters use this as their biggest weapon to distract people from Islam. They call Muhammad (Peace be upon him) as a pedophile who married a 6 year old girl and consummated the marriage at 9. Even if we consider these hadiths to be correct, then nobody before 1900 century objected on Prophet (Peace be upon him) due to this issue. Plus during the life of Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) none of the polytheists, Jews, or even Christians objected on it, although they were always looking to defame our Prophet. This proves that it was not considered wrong or even taboo at that time in past. Anyways these hadiths are to be checked according to Qur'an and Usool ul hadith (principles of hadith).

Qur'an states: O you who believe! **You are forbidden to inherit women against their will**, and you should not treat them with harshness... (4:19)

This verse clearly proves that **women** cannot come into wedlock against their will. It is a fact that 6 or 9 year old girl cannot give proper consent. Plus Qur'an uses the word "WOMEN" so question of marrying "GIRLS" is clearly out of question according to Qur'an.

Qur'an states: And test the orphans [in their abilities] **until they reach marriageable age**. Then if you perceive in them sound judgment, release their property to them... (4:6)

The great commentary on Qur'an called Tafsir al-Jalalyn states: ... until they reach the age of marrying, that is, until they have become eligible for it through puberty or [legal] age, which, according to al-Shāfi'ī, is the **completion of fifteen years**... [Tafsir al-Jalalyn under 4:6]

Qur'an clearly links marriageable age to when orphans can make sound judgment. It is a fact that 6 year old cannot give sound judgment, so the hadiths about Prophet marrying Aisha at age of 6 contradict Qur'an. Some intellectual Sunni scholars and Shia both reject these reports.

Here the author would like to share an article written by a knowledgeable Sunni friend:

Aishah's Age of Marriage [عائشة أم المؤمنين رضي الله عنها]

There is nothing in our religion that is shameful: we don't apologise to anyone and we are proud of our religion.

Now getting to the topic:

First question:

Did Aishah claim that the Prophet married her at 6 and consummated the marriage at 9?

Yes , it is authentically established that she said this:

Imam Bukhari narrates:

عَنْ عَائِشَةَ - رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا - أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ تَزَوَّجَهَا وَهِيَ بِنْتُ سِتِّ سِنِينَ، وَأَدْخَلَتْ عَلَيْهِ وَهِيَ بِنْتُ تِسْعِ

Aishah narrated that the Prophet (ﷺ) married her when she was six years old and he consummated his marriage when she was nine years old.

['Sahih Bukhari', 5133].

These are her words... any attempt to weaken the chains of these Ahadith is futile.

About 8 different students of Aisha reported her words - so its a solid report - mass-transmitted.

Second question:

Could Aishah be mistaken about her age?

Yes , this is also possible:

1- The Prophet (ﷺ) said:

إِنَّا أُمَّةٌ أُمِّيَّةٌ، لَا نَكْتُبُ وَلَا نَحْسِبُ

"We are an illiterate nation;

we neither write,

nor know accounts."

[‘Sahih Bukhari’, 1913].

إِنَّا أُمَّةٌ أُمِّيَّةٌ لَا نَكْتُبُ وَلَا نَحْسِبُ

"We are an unlettered Ummah, we do not use astronomical counting (to calculate dates/time) or computation."

(‘Sunan an-Nasa’i’, 2140 - Sahih).

2- The Qur'an states:

هُوَ الَّذِي بَعَثَ فِي الْأُمِّيِّينَ رَسُولًا

'He is the One Who raised among the illiterates a messenger.' [62:2].

3- The Qur'an states:

وَقُلْ لِلَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ وَالْأُمِّيِّينَ أَسْلَمْتُمْ

'Say to those who were given the Scripture and the illiterates: "Do you submit yourselves (to God)?" [3:20].

In those times, dates were guess work from memory....

The Arabs remembered dates by linking them to big events, like "the year of the elephant" or "the year of the famine".

These things were not always written down.

She had one of the greatest minds no doubt, but she was not infallible, so it is possible that she was mistaken.

It is also possible that she may have narrated this in her old age, and we know that even the sharpest memories deteriorate with old age.

Third question:

Is there any historic evidence that suggests that Aishah may have been mistaken?

Yes - The Syrian Hadith specialist, Salahudin al-Idlibi has provided 10 historical evidences which indicate that Aishah must have been 14 at the age of marriage and 17 at the age of consummation.

Read the English translation of his research here:

<https://hawramani.com/aisha-age-of-marriage-to-prophet.../>

What indicates that Aishah was guessing as well is that she sometimes said her marriage was at 6 and sometimes 7, and that the consummation was sometimes 9 and sometimes 10 - so she herself wasn't sure.

These are all authentic narrations.

Even today in some lands, many people don't know how old their are...they just use guesses.

Fourth question:

Did scholars rely on History to cross-check narrations?

Yes, they did:

Imam al-Sakhawi dedicated an entire book to this topic - its called:

الإعلان بالتوبيخ

لمن ذم أهل التورخ

It's a 400 page book in which he argues the importance of history and criticises those who downplay its importance.

History was not some external tool - it had become an integral part of the process in Hadith sciences.

He brings many examples from the Salaf, relying heavily on History, such as:

1- Sufyan al-Thawri said (p. 38):

لَمَّا اسْتَعْمَلَ الرُّوَاهُ الكَذِبَ اسْتَعْمَلْنَا لَهُمُ التَّارِيخَ

"When the narrators started using lies, we started using history against them."

2- Hassan Bin Zayd said (p. 39):

لَمْ نَسْتَعِنْ عَلَى الكَذَّابِينَ بِمِثْلِ التَّارِيخِ

"We did not rely on anything against the liars more than on history."

3- A man was narrating from Khalid bin Ma'dan (p. 39).

Ismail bin Ayyash asked him: "In which year did you write narrations from Khalid bin Ma'dan?" He replied: "In the year 113."

Ismail said:

أنت تزعم أنك سمعت من خالد بن معدان بعد موته بسبع سنين ؟

"So you claim to have heard from him 7 years after his death?"

4- [Al-Mu'allā] said (p. 41): 'Abū Wā'il narrated to us, he said: 'Ibn Mas'ūd attacked us on the day of Siffīn'.

So Abū Nu'aym said:

أَنزَاهُ بُعِثَ بَعْدَ الْمَوْتِ

'Do you think he was raised after death?'

[Ibn Mas'ūd passed away in 32 or 33H, several years before the day in question]

5-Hafs Bin Ghyath said:

ورويانا عن حفص بن غياث أنه قال : " إذا اتهمتم الشيخ ، فحاسبوه بالسنين " ، يعني احسبوا سنه وسن من كتب عنه .

6- A man narrated something from Ibn Humaid and they asked him about his age. When he told them his age, he was born 13 years after Ibn Humaid had died.

They said:

سمع هذا الشيخ من عبد بن حميد بعد موته بثلاث عشرة سنة

'This Shaykh claims to have heard Ibn Humaid speak thirteen years after he had died.'

7-Al-Zarkhashi :

معرفة التاريخ المتعلق بالمتون

8- Muhadith Al-Mu'allimi Al-Yamani says 'Al-Fawaid al-Majmua' (353):

النظر في متن الخير ، كل من تأمل منطوق الخبر ، ثم عرضه على الواقع ، عرف حقيقة الحال

"... Then present [the content of the narration] to reality and you will know the truth of the matter."

9- It is reported in 'Mizan al-'itidal', [3/225]:

يحيى الوحاظي، حدثنا عفير بن معدان، قال: قدم علينا عمر [بن موسى] (1) حمص، فاجتمعنا إليه، فجعل يقول: حدثنا شيخكم الصالح

فقلنا: من هذا؟ فقال: خالد بن معدان

قلت له: في أي سنة لقيتته؟ قال: في سنة ثمان ومائة في غزاة أرمينية [قلت: اتق الله] (1). يا شيخ، لا تكذب

مات خالد في سنة أربع ومائة، وأزيدك أنه لم يغز أرمينية قط

A man reported that Khalid bin Mi'dan narrated something to him in a certain year, at the battle of Armenia.

The scholars who knew history rebuked him and said: 'Fear Allah', saying that he had already died in that year and that he didn't even take part in the battle of Armenia!

So they used historical evidences against him... if they didn't know history, they would have believed him.

10- It has been reported:

كان في عهد الخطيب البغدادي قد أظهر بعض اليهود كتاباً وادعى أنه كتاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم بإسقاط الجزية عن أهل خيبر وفيه شهادات الصحابة وأن خط علي بن أبي طالب فيه فعرضه رئيس الرؤساء ابن المسلمة على أبي بكر الخطيب فقال: هذا مزور. قيل: من أين لك؟ قال: في الكتاب شهادة معاوية بن أبي سفيان ومعاوية أسلم يوم الفتح وخيبر كانت في سنة سبع، وفيه شهادة سعد بن معاذ وكان قد مات يوم الخندق فاستحسن ذلك منه.

ينظر هذه القصة في: المنتظم في تاريخ الملوك والأمم لابن الجوزي: 265/8، وسير أعلام النبلاء للذهبي: 280/18، والطبقات الكبرى للسبكي: 35/4، وغيرها.

In the time of Khatib al-Baghdadi, the Jews produced a document to the Muslim ruler, in which the Prophet apparently removed the Jiziyah tax from the Jews on the day of Khaybar.

Khatib al-Baghdadi said: 'This is a forgery'.

They asked why?

He explained that one of the witnesses to this document mentioned are Mu'awiyah, and he became Muslim on the day of the conquest, and Khaybar was before this!

And secondly, another witness mentioned in this list is Sa'd bin Mu'adh, and he had already died on the day of Khandaq, which was before Khaybar.

So, he used history to proof this document was fake.

So, what scholars did in terms of gathering these historic evidences to show Aisha was older is not a deviation, but perfectly in line with the methodology of Hadith scholars.

This is why Imam Bukhari wrote: 'Tarikh al-Kabir' [التاريخ الكبير] [The Great History], in which he listed the bioographies of about 40,000 narrators, when they were born, when they died, who they met, where they lived, etc.

History has always been important to scholars of Hadith.

And history is not only used to catch liars - but also genuine mistakes of truthful people, who may have mistakenly mixed up some events.

What also puts big question marks around this narration is the following authentic narration:

خَطَبَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ وَعُمَرُ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا فَاطِمَةَ فَقَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ " إِنَّهَا صَغِيرَةٌ " . فَخَطَبَهَا عَلِيٌّ فزَوَّجَهَا مِنْهُ

Abu Bakr and 'Umar, may Allah be pleased with them, proposed marriage to Fatimah but the Messenger of Allah said: '**She is a saghirah (small).**'

Then 'Ali proposed marriage to her (later on) and he married her to him.

(‘Sunan an-Nasa’i’, 3221 - Sahih).

<https://sunnah.com/nasai:3221>

Is it conceivable that the Prophet would oppose a marriage because the girl is small, and then marry a 6 year old child himself?

Conclusion:

We could easily turn the tables on them, but we also don't have to fight every battle and defend every accusation

people make ... especially when the evidences are not conclusive.

If someone accuses our Prophet of these things, then simply say:

Yes, it is confirmed that Aishah made that claim, but we also have multiple historic evidences which indicate that she may have been mistaken about her age.

That's it.

And if they then reject history and insist that she cannot be wrong, we can then put 100s of Ahadith in front of them in which these same Sahaba & Sahabiyat witnessed miracles of the Prophet with their own eyes.

They should then accept those as well and embrace Islam if they're truthful.

Authored by the brother in Islam: [Mohmand Afghan](#)

David then presented hadith of Prophet being poisoned From Bukhari 3.47.786. Now this does not prove that he was a false Prophet. Many Prophets were killed by Jews according to testimony of Biblical Jesus himself.

Strange biblical Jesus after sending many woes not on ordinary Jews but their scholars, calling them Snakes, brood of vipers, hypocrites, and blind fools which is Anti-Semite to the core, although he was a Jew by race himself, and another verse says that anyone who says you fool is in danger of hell fire; Matt 5:22, anyways he says:

“Jerusalem, Jerusalem, **“YOU KILL THE PROPHETS”** and stone those sent to you, how often I have longed to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, and you were not willing” [Matthew 23:37]

Qur’an also states that Jews killed many Prophets prior to Muhammad (Peace be upon him). Qur’an states: ... That was because they [repeatedly] disbelieved in the signs of Allah and **killed the prophets without right**. That was because they disobeyed and were [habitually] transgressing. [2:61]

Regarding the reports that a Jewess wanted to test if Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was a true Prophet or not, if he was he would have survived, then those reports are not authentic first of all. It is just proven that Prophet was poisoned but extra wordings are not accurate and are contradictory to each other. Plus Prophet survived the poisoning for many years whereas another companion who ate it died instantly. Those reports contradict in wordings, some say the Prophet (Peace be upon him) forgave that Jewess (as Hadith of Bukhari proves which David wood mentioned) while others say she was killed in retaliation,

some say the meat told the Prophet it was poisoned, while some do not mention that, therefore the extra wordings are all fabrications. Only this bit is true that Prophet was poisoned and he died after few years due to that poison. A Prophet being poisoned or killed has no effect on his Prophethood as many Prophets were killed in past too, a Prophet can indeed die by Poison because Prophets are human in nature.

David then used hadith that Prophet had black magic casted on him. He used Bukhari 4.54.490. Again this hadith contradicts Qur'an and is to be rejected. Islamophobes and unfortunately some Muslims who are influenced by Wahabis try to assert that everything in Bukhari and Muslim is absolutely Sahih.

Qur'an states: We are most knowing of how they listen to it when they listen to you and [of] when they are in private conversation, **when the wrongdoers say, "You follow not but a man affected by magic."** [17:47]

Just like Jesus was accused of casting out devils through Beelzebub the prince of devils (see: Matthew 12:24), similarly Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was falsely accused of many things and one of them was being affected by magic. The Prophet was neither mad, nor affected by magic at all.

Plus the hadiths on this topic do not reach real level of “MUTAWATTIR (MULTIPLY NARRATED)” but are only Ahaad (singular in chain), and as this is an issue related to belief i.e. integrity of Qur’an depends on this issue, therefore only a Qur’anic verse will work in this regard which should categorically say that Magic was casted on Prophet and he was affected by it, but no such verse exists, rather Quran calls such people as wrong doers who accuse Prophet of being affected by magic.

David Wood, then uses the oft-repeated Satanic verses used by Islamophobes and Anti-Islamic propagandists. He goes towards same Ibn Ishaq the grand liar who was criticized by Imam Malik the giant and many hadith masters. Seerah and Tarikh books are third grade sources in Islamic sources. All the reports about Satanic verses are fabrications. The actual incident is to be understood from the verse of Qur’an which states:

Never sent We a messenger or a prophet before thee but when He recited (the message) Satan proposed (opposition) in respect of that which he recited thereof. But Allah abolisheth that which Satan proposeth. Then Allah establisheth His revelations. Allah is Knower, Wise [22:52, Pickthal]

Nowhere does this verse prove that Prophet (Peace be upon him) recited the Satanic verses himself as said in fabricated

reports. It was actually Satan who made that voice up and people thought it was Prophet.

From companions of Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) this report is only spuriously narrated by Ibn Abbas (ra) with fabricated and broken chains. Remember the incident of Surah Najm (53rd chapter) took place before Migration and age of Ibn Abbas (ra) at the time of migration was only 3 years. Those people who concocted this lie forgot while attributing to Ibn Abbas (ra) that he could not have witnessed such an incident as an adult properly and narrated it. Also had this incident been true then many other companions would have narrated it but this report is only a singular narration from Ibn Abbas and not from other companions.

Secondly the above verse i.e. 22:52 is in a Madani Surah (i.e. revealed in Madina) and there is gap of many many years between both Surahs and incidents, so had incident of Gabriel coming to Prophet and saying to him that you have recited verse from Satan been true then Allah would not have revealed 22:52 after many years to condole the Prophet.

Qadhi Iyaadh the great scholar of Islam summarizes the opinion on Satanic Verses as: This report is not narrated by any of the six compilers of hadith, **nor is it “NARRATED WITH AUTHENTIC AND CONTINEOUS CHAIN.” This narration is reported by some of those commentators and historians who “GATHER” all**

kinds of “STRANGE AND RARE” things [Ash-Shifa, Arabic: Volume # 2, Page # 106-110]

Imam al-Karmani wrote: The story of cranes (satanic verses) is **“Batil (false)” and it is not “LOGICALLY NOR TEXTUALLY CORRECT”** [Sharh al-Karmani (6/153)]

Even a commentator of Qur’an who used to explain through logic i.e. Imam Fakhr ud din al-Razi said: This report is **“FALSE ACCORDING TO QUR’AN, SUNNAH, AND PROOFS OF LOGIC”** ...then he presented 7 verses of Qur’an in proof of it being false. He also quoted hadith experts who called this report as false. [Tafsir al Kabeer (8/237-238)]

Imam al-Qurtubi yet another top commentator of Qur’an after rejecting this narration said: We Ask Allah’s refuge from this narration, there is no need to interpret it [Tafsir al-Qurtubi (12/75-76)]

Many other Commentators of Qur’an rejected it such as Abu Hayyan al Andalusī, Allama Alusi and others. Hence people like David Wood and bandwagon only rely on fabricated reports to malign our noble Prophet (Peace be upon him) David Wood again mentions that Prophet tortured people for money and gives reference of same third grade book of liar Ibn Ishaq. Qur’an and multiply narrated authentic hadiths clearly forbid torture.

Sahih hadith states: Narrated `Abdullah bin Yazid Al-Ansari: The Prophet (ﷺ) forbade robbery (taking away what belongs to others without their permission), **“AND ALSO FORBADE MUTILATION (OR MAIMING) OF BODIES”** [Sahih Bukhari 3.654]

When mutilation of bodies is forbidden then how can torture be allowed in Islam?

Qur'an ordains forgiveness and kindness by saying: Keep to forgiveness (O Muhammad), **and enjoin kindness**, and turn away from the ignorant. [7:199]

Qur'an orders to deal with all disbelievers kindly (except for those who wage war): Allah forbids you not, with regard to those who fight you not for (your) Faith nor drive you out of your homes, **from dealing kindly** and justly with them: for Allah loves those who are just. (60:8)

So such reports are to be outright rejected. I know David wood also uses a report from Bukhari about Camel urine which towards the end talks about torturing the people who had killed the herder. That hadith is also rejected because Quran forbids to consume impure things and only consume Tayyabat i.e. pure (see 5:4) and also forbids torture as I proved above from verses.

David Wood then mentions about attack on unarmed Jews at Khaybar. The war of Khaybar has a historical background.

The Jewish tribes of Khaybar were involved in supporting Pagan Meccans against Muslims, planning to wage war on Muslims, also were involved in killing innocent Muslims and so on. This is why Prophet (Peace be upon him) finally decided to attack them. It was not a preemptive war as Islamophobes try to assert. It were the Jews who were the culprits and aggressors. Qur'an only orders to fight against aggressors and in self-defense and war of Khaybar falls in that category too.

David Wood then says: “...*he caused his adopted son to divorce so he could marry his daughter-in-law Zainab*”

In reference he mentions Quran 33:37, Sahih Muslim 8.3330, and Tabri Vol. 8, pp.2-3

Let us look at verse 33:37:

And [remember, O Muhammad], when you said to the one on whom Allah bestowed favor and you bestowed favor, **"Keep your wife and fear Allah," while you concealed within yourself that which Allah is to disclose. And you feared the people, while Allah has more right that you fear Him.** So when Zayd had no longer any need for her, We married her to you in order that there not be upon the believers any discomfort concerning the wives of their adopted sons when they no longer have need of them. And ever is the command of Allah accomplished. [Qur'an 33:37]

It was an Arab culture that “ADOPTED SONS” were considered as biological sons, however Islam abolished that illogical custom through the above verse. One can marry the divorced wife of adopted son because adopted son is not your biological son and therefore marriage with his divorced wife is not immoral by any standards (except for illogical standards which Islamophobes or western societies set).

Plus Zaynab (ra) and Zayd (ra) were not in good terms with each other as many reports prove. The orientalist and Islamophobes only present the discarded version of the story i.e. Prophet was attracted to Zaynab when he saw her in attractive clothes which led to his marriage to her, however there are actual authentic versions which do not talk about such an incident and that are the only authentic ones as narrated in Bukhari.

Narrated Anas: Zaid bin Haritha came to the Prophet (ﷺ) complaining about his wife. The Prophet (ﷺ) kept on saying (to him), "Be afraid of Allah and keep your wife." Aisha said, "If Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) were to conceal anything (of the Qur'an he would have concealed this Verse." Zainab used to boast before the wives of the Prophet (ﷺ) and used to say, "You were given in marriage by your families, while I was married (to the Prophet) by Allah from over seven Heavens." And Thabit recited, "The Verse:-- 'But (O Muhammad) you did hide in your heart that which Allah was about to make

manifest, you did fear the people,' (33.37) was revealed in connection with Zainab and Zaid bin Haritha." [Sahih Bukhari 9.516]

This hadith clearly destroys the story of Prophet getting attracted towards Zaynab, actually Zayd and Zaynab were not in good terms and Zayd wanted divorce (which contradicts the story Islamophobes present i.e. Zayd thought of divorce when he found out that Prophet liked Zaynab) but Prophet told him to fear Allah and stay with her. The Prophet knew that according to divine will he will get married to Zaynab eventually but he “CONCEALED THAT” from people, and this is the concealment which Qur’an talks about, not that he was attracted to Zaynab.

Then David wood mentions the hadith about Camel urine which has already been refuted above.

Nabeel then said: “In my frustration, I began studying books on hadith methodology by acclaimed scholars, listening to scholastic lectures, and reading commentary after commentary, trying to determine how to discredit the traditions that maligned Muhammad’s character and defend the hadith that portrayed the prophet I loved. But there was just no razor I could use to dissect the two. None except the idea, “Muhammad must be a prophet, and therefore these stories must be false.” But there were just too many stories, even from reputable sources of hadith”

Nabeel Qureshi did not know Arabic, and majority of classical Islamic literature on science of hadith, commentaries on Qur'an, and Hadith are not translated, so Nabeel was just making this up. Secondly I have already clarified the golden principle that any hadith or historical report which contradicts Qur'an is to be rejected because Qur'an calls Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) as "Mercy to the worlds (21:107)" and Standing on "Exalted standard of character (68:4)"

Part 8 (The Holiness of the Quran)

Chapter Forty (The Case for the Quran)

Nabeel said: *“For Muslims, the Quran is the closest thing to an incarnation of Allah, and it is the very proof they provide to demonstrate the truth of Islam. The best parallel in Christianity is Jesus himself, the Word made flesh, and his resurrection. That is how central the Quran is to Islamic theology”*

There is no such thing as incarnation of Allah in anything for Muslims. No Muslim “WORSHIPS” the Qur’an nor considers it as partner of God. Nabeel deliberately misinterprets the Islamic theology to confuse people about Jesus being word in flesh concept which Christians have. That has already been refuted above.

Nabeel said: *“Imagine my incredulity when I discovered an answer to the Quran’s challenge, Al-Furqan al-Haqq. Translated “the true measure of discernment,” it is a book that responds to the challenge of the Quran by writing Christian teachings in Quranic style. This book apparently reproduced the Quranic style so effectively that some who recited it aloud in public areas were thanked by Arab Muslims for having recited the Quran itself.”*

Al-Furqan al-Haqq is such a foolish attempt by Christians that Muslims can only laugh at it. Instead of Bismillah they

write “In the name of Father, the Word, The Holy Spirit” Any Muslim who knows Arabic well will instantly consider it idiotic and funny. Plus, even the apostles themselves did not baptize people in the name of three persons (see Acts 2:38, Acts 8:16, Acts 10:48, Acts 19:5), and the verse in Matthew (28:19) which Christians use is disputed to be accurate. So did the apostles contradict a clear injunction given by Jesus?

On top of that, Qur’an has beautiful rhythmic, melodic style **along with a message conveyed which has a history behind it**, whereas Al-furqan has none of it, therefore the challenge of Qur’an stays intact. Al-Furqan would have met the challenge if the person writing it defeated pagan Meccans with only 313 men having limited armory against over 1000 men having great armory. Had verses about actual migration of Prophet which took place, and so on. So the Qur’anic challenge is to produce the verses like it with all the truth conveyed in it with the incidents “ACTUALLY” taking place.

Nabeel then said that Muslim apologists appeal to four arguments that Quran talks about future prophecies, mathematical patterns, scientific truths and textual preservation.

My answer is that we will not look at what apologists say but what Qur’an says itself. I have personally not heard good Muslim apologists talking about mathematical patterns, rather a misguided person called Rashad Khalifa ended up denying verses of Quran just to prove his “so called”

mathematical patterns. I have clarified before that Qur'an is not a book of science but a book of guidance, New Testament does not have scientific discussions in it either whereas Old Testament touches on this subject and Atheists/agnostics point towards many scientific blunders in Bible. Regarding future prophecies then again this is not a theme of Qur'an except for few cases such as "Romans being defeated which is mentioned in Qur'an and that prophecy did come true. Gog and Maggog being mentioned who are yet to appear according to both Christianity and Islam, and some other issues" Regarding preservation of Qur'an then yes that is clearly mentioned in Qur'an in Chapter 15, Verse 9.

Chapter Forty One (Quran Science and Bucailleism)

Nabeel talked about a French man of science Maurice Bucaille who wrote a book on Quran and Bible but proved that Bible is filled with scientific errors whereas Qur'an is flawless and has scientific proofs. Remember Maurice never became a Muslim so this is a strong neutral testimony. Nabeel then tries to refute the great scientist by quoting him in bits and pieces.

I am not a scientist nor biologist so I will not write much on this topic, but all I would say is that science is subservient to Faith. Atheist and Agnostic scientists bring forward many verses from Bible and call them unscientific blunders. Qur'an in our sight is above science and it is our understanding which is limited and we do not understand the depth of some verses, not that those verses are unscientific.

In my life I have heard doctors and scientists contradicting themselves on many issues and changing viewpoints, science keeps on evolving, theories keep on changing.

Chapter Forty two (Hadith and the history of the Qur'an)

In this chapter Nabeel talked about preservation of Qur'an and brought forward some hadiths in order to confuse people. According to consensus of Muslim scholars when Qur'an itself says Allah is guardian of it then Qur'an is completely preserved and we do not have to turn towards hadiths. Let us first look at the glorious verse:

Qur'an states: Indeed, it is We who sent down the Qur'an and indeed, **We will be its guardian.** [15:9]

All the hadiths which Nabeel brought, none of them talks about this chapter of Qur'an, therefore they become irrelevant and Qur'an is proven as fully preserved. Now let us come towards hadiths which Nabeel misused.

Nabeel accepted the fact that Prophet (Peace be upon him) orally taught his companions the Qur'an and his companions memorized the Qur'an. He also tacitly accepted that Qur'an was dictated to companions which was written by them and this is proven from many hadiths. Nabeel then touched the issue of "DIFFERENT RECITATIONS" and Muhammad (Peace be upon him) calling different recitations between companions as right while he was alive. Remember different recitations have absolutely no effect on compilation and writing of Qur'an.

Nabeel then talked about tenure of Abu Bakr the first caliph of Islam i.e. when Prophet had passed away. Abu Bakr took part in battle against people who denied Zakaah and many memorizers of Qur'an died then, so Abu Bakr planned to compile Qur'an under supervision of Zaid bin Thabit who compiled Quran by checking every verse with 2 witnesses except for one verse i.e. last verse of Surah at-Taubah which was brought by Khuzayma whose testimony was considered equal to two according to Sahih Hadith.

Then Nabeel talked about Uthman bin Affan's tenure i.e. third caliph of Islam. Here Nabeel had a misunderstanding that Uthman "EDITED" the Qur'an whereas that is a lie. What Uthman did was that he made one master copy and made copies out of it and distributed them to different parts of Muslim world. Uthman burns all other copies so that there are no copyist errors.

After this Nabeel came towards a "LONE" narration of Abu Musa al-Ash'ari in Muslim claiming that a Surah similar to size of Surah Baraat was revealed and he recited a verse from it which is not present in Qur'an today. Now we should remember that this hadith is "AHAD (SINGULAR)" and not "MUTAWATIR (MULTIPLY NARRATED)" and singular narrations are never taken as proof on belief issues. Plus thousands of other Sahaba had memorized the Qur'an but none of them mention a Surah similar to the size of Surah Baraat, thirdly had there been such a long surah then there would have been many other Sahaba talking about it in

different hadiths but we do not have other Sahaba saying that.

Then Nabeel mentioned the hadith about a goat coming and eating a paper on which a verses were written. The hadith is a fabrication as it comes from same Muhammad bin Ishaq who is called a Dajjal (grand liar) by Imam Malik and many great hadith specialists, plus he is Muddalis (cheater) too and he narrated this hadith with “UN” and in Usool ul hadith a Mudalis when he narrates with “UN” then his hadith is not accepted [See Tahdhib ut Tahdhib of Ibn Hajr al-Asqalani, Volume 9, under narrators starting with letter M (meem)]. Remember the Wahabi authentications found online at www.sunnah.com or Dar us Salam publications are not correct at many occasions. Wahabis make huge blunders in authenticating and weakening hadiths.

Regarding verse of stoning the 2nd Caliph of Islam talks in detail about it in hadith of Muslim where he says it was revealed and we memorized it but later people will not find it in Qur’an [See: Muslim 4194] This clearly proves that some verses were revealed but “NOT ORDERED BY ALLAH AND PROPHET TO BE MADE PART OF QUR’AN”

Hence all these hadiths which Islamophobes use have no effect on integrity and preservation of Qur’an. All they prove is that some verses were revealed but they were not made part of Qur’an. According to Islam the Prophet did not speak

except what Allah revealed to him, but that did not mean everything was made part of Qur'an.

Qur'an states: Nor does he speak from [his own] inclination. It is not but a revelation revealed [53:3-4]

Nabeel then partially quoted from as-Suyuti's al-Itiqan by hiding what he said about such reports, Nabeel said: *In addition to the previously quoted hadith in which he refused to stop reciting certain verses, Ubay is known to have had 116 chapters in his Quran, two more than Zaid's edition. Ibn Mas'ud had only 111 chapters in his Quran, insisting that the additional chapters in Zaid's Quran and Ubay's Quran were just prayers, not Quranic recitation. - End Quote.*

But what Nabeel hid is that the Same as-Suyuti said:

هذا كذب على ابن مسعود وموضوع، وإنما صح عنه قراءة
عاصم عن زر عنه، وفيها المعوذتان والفاتحة

It is a lie attributed to Ibn Mas'ud and a fabrication.

It is authentically proven from him the Qiraat (recitation) of Asim from Zirr, and in it are Muawizatain (last 2 chapters) and al-Fatiha". [As-Suyuti in al-Itqaan fi Ulumil Qur'an, where he quotes ibn Hazm's opinion]

It is also not proven that Ubay ibn Ka'b believed Qur'an had 116 chapters.

Chapter Forty Three (Those Whom Their Right Hands Possess)

This is where Nabeel claimed to be totally broken in regards to Islam. He is misled by David Wood's interpretation of three Qur'anic verses and some hadiths. The three Qur'anic verses are: 4:24, 23:6, and, 70:30. Nabeel then clearly misreads the hadiths due to David's misinterpretation that Companions of Prophet had sexual relations with war captives without their consent (although those hadiths do not say that anywhere, rather hadith h in Abu Dawud 11.2150 which Nabeel mentioned clearly says: "This is to say that they are lawful for them **when they complete their waiting period**" which clearly proves they had accepted Islam because this ruling only applies on Muslim women, hence it was not forced sex but consensual relationship after they had accepted Islam as I will prove).

Let us first understand verse 4:24

First of all Imam at-Tabri the classical commentator on Qur'an explains 4:24 from many companions that previous marriage of the captive is annulled after she has been captured. Now keeping that in mind the verse does not tell to rape married slaves rather it is to be understood from another verse of Qur'an which states:

And “MARRY THE UNMARRIED” among you and the “RIGHTEOUS AMONG YOUR MALE AND FEMALE SLAVES... [24:32]

Hence according to Qur’an only consensual sex after marriage or with female captives who willingly accepted Islam was allowed. When they had accepted Islam then their previous marriages automatically became invalid. Qur’an makes it clear in 2:256 that there is no compulsion in religion, so those captives could not have been forced into religion.

Imam an-Nawawi explains 4:24 as:

لا يحل وطؤها بملك اليمين حتى تسلم فما دامت على دينها
فهي محرمة

Translation: “Sexual intercourse cannot be done with those your right hands possess “UNLESS THEY ACCEPT ISLAM” but if they are following their (past) religion they are forbidden (to approach) [Sharh Sahih Muslim, under Hadith # 2643]

Now it becomes absolutely certain due to irrefutable proofs that according to Qur’an sex is allowed only after marriage and with those captives who willingly accepted Islam and gave consent.

Also 4:24 itself forbids “unlawful sexual intercourse” which will include not having sex with slaves without their consent and also if they do not accept Islam.

The next verse to 4:24 states:

And whoever among you cannot [find] the means to marry free, believing women, **then [he may marry] from those whom your right hands possess...** [4:25]

Qur’an in context is telling to marry the slaves. Had Islam allowed rape of slave women then 4:25 would not have told to marry them. Why go through the procedure of marriage (which according to Islam is allowed only with mutual consent) if Islam allowed rape?

Islam forbids rape of any woman whether free or slave.

Imam Malik (rah) states:

What is done in our community about the man who rapes a woman, virgin or non-virgin, if she is free, is that he must pay the bride-price of the like of her. “IF SHE IS A SLAVE” he must pay what he has diminished of her worth. “THE HADD-PUNISHMENT IN SUCH CASES IS APPLIED TO THE RAPIST” and there is no punishment applied to the raped woman. (Book 36, Hadith 1418 Muwatta Imam Malik)

Imam ash-Shafi’I (rah) said:

"IF A MAN ACQUIRES BY FORCE A SLAVE-GIRL, THEN HAS SEXUAL INTERCOURSE WITH HER" after he acquires her by force, and if he is not excused by ignorance, then the slave-girl will be taken from him, he is required to pay the fine, "AND HE WILL RECEIVE THE PUNISHMENT FOR ILLEGAL SEXUAL INTERCOURSE" (Ash-Shaafi'i, al-Umm, Volume 3, page 253)

Had sex without consent been allowed in Islam then these mighty scholars would not have called it rape and applied legal punishment on the rapist.

Nabeel presented hadiths from Sahih Muslim and others, although none of them prove that captives were forced into sex.

Now let us look at Biblical verses in this regard. Remember Old Testament is binding upon all Christians as they consider Jesus to be an eternal God and all this was sanctioned by Jesus, also Jesus did not come to abolish the law but to fulfill and authenticate it fully (read Matthew 5:17-20). Even if Christians say OT laws are outlawed then still they have to accept that God ordered these things in past on humans, so was God barbaric in past?

Book of Deuteronomy states: If they refuse to make peace and they engage you in battle, lay siege to that city. When the Lord your God delivers it into your hand, **"PUT**

TO THE SWORD ALL THE MEN IN IT, AS FOR THE WOMEN" the children, the livestock and everything else in the city, you may take these as **"PLUNDER"** for yourselves. **"AND YOU MAY USE THE PLUNDER"** the Lord your God gives you from your enemies"[Deuteronomy 20:12-14]

Use the plunder, God of Bible says!!!

Things do not just stop here, Book of Numbers after talking about a bloody war talks about Moses himself saying: *Now kill all the boys and all the women who have slept with a man. **Only the young girls who are virgins may live; you may keep them for yourselves.*** [Numbers 31:17-18]

Wait there is a lot more, Bible even tells the rapist to marry the woman raped and to never divorce her!

It states: *If a man is **caught in the act of raping a young woman** who is not engaged, he must pay fifty pieces of silver to her father. **Then he must marry the young woman** because he violated her, **and he will never be allowed to divorce her.*** [Deuteronomy 22:28-29]

One last one, although there are tons more. This one clearly endorses forced marriage with war captives!

It states: ***When you go out to war*** against your enemies and the LORD, your God, delivers them into your hand, ***so that you take captives, if you see a comely woman among the captives and become so enamored of her that you wish to have her as wife, you may take her home to your house.*** But before she may live there, she must shave her head and pare her nails and lay aside her ***captives' garb.*** ***After she has mourned her father and mother for a full month, you may have relations with her, and you shall be her husband and she shall be your wife.*** However, if later on you lose your liking for her, you shall give her her freedom, if she wishes it; but you shall not sell her or enslave her, ***since she was married to you under compulsion.***" [Deuteronomy 21:10-14 - NAB]

Do the answering Mr. David Wood and other fanatical Christian apologists as Nabeel is dead. Remember all this was sanctioned by Biblical Jesus your Eternal God!

Part 9 (Faith in Doubt)

Chapter Forty Four (Rationality and Revelation)

David talked about dreams and God having directed Nabeel to some so called supernatural signs in the sky ...huh! Nabeel then realized that he had not been asking the triune God all the time, so he should turn to the triune God rather than singular one God of Islam and Judaism. This chapter is very short and has nothing much to say, so let us move on.

Chapter Forty Five (The Cost of embracing the Cross)

Nabeel said: *“THE COST FOR A MUSLIM to accept the gospel can be tremendous.”*

Muslims already accept the Gospel, but yes we accept the Gospel revealed to Jesus not the books having unknown authors which Christians have today.

Nabeel said: *“Of course, following Jesus meant that I would immediately be ostracized from my community. For all devout Muslims, it means sacrificing the friendships and social connections that they have built from childhood. It could mean being rejected by one’s parents, siblings, spouse, and children”*

I followed Nabeel closely online and saw him getting defeated in debates from Shabbir Ally, the parents of Nabeel are Qadiyani and Qadiyanis are not Muslims, rather they are enemies of Muslims who mostly take asylum in western countries by presenting bad image of Muslim countries. Qadiyanis are in good terms with even haters of Islam, so Nabeel did not face any such sacrifice. A true Muslim would disown a son who leaves monotheism for polytheism of Trinitarians, yes had someone become a Unitarian Christian then that would have been acceptable according to Qur’an 2:62. Nabeel even on his death bed talked about support

from his parents which proved that his parents and Qadiyani community did not isolate him as such.

I have seen Christians cussing at ex-Christians who chose Islam, parents and family members disowning their children who chose Islam, but Nabeel did not face such things.

Nabeel said: *“It is this kind of familial dishonor that drives many in the Middle East to commit honor killings. Although there is no command in the Quran or hadith to carry out “honor killings,” there are commands in the Quran to kill mischief makers, as well as plenty of commands in the hadith to kill apostates”*

Nabeel tacitly accepted the fact that Christian apologists and Islamophobes lie all the time that honour killing is sanctioned in Quran and hadith. Regarding mischief makers then it refers to those who incite corruption on land i.e. war and such. Regarding apostates then Nabeel cleverly ignored Qur’an and ran towards hadith but claimed there are “PLENTY OF COMMANDS” although that is also not true because even in hadith killing apostates comes from a narrator “IKRIMA” who was a person who hated Prophetic family and concocted hadiths against Ali the beloved cousin of Prophet (Peace be upon him). Also the other hadiths about death to apostates are linked to killing those apostates who incite war along with apostasy.

Nabeel quoted a verse from Mark which itself puts integrity of present day gospels at stakes. He said: *“There is a reason **Jesus said**, “Whoever wants to be my disciple must deny themselves and take up their cross and follow me. For whoever wants to save their life will lose it, but whoever loses their life for me and **for the gospel** will save it” (Mark 8:34 – 35).”*

Jesus talks about a singular Gospel over here. Jesus also talks about a singular Gospel in his own possession in Mark which states: Now after John was delivered up, Jesus came into Galilee, **preaching the gospel of God**, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe in the gospel. [Mark 1:14-15 ASV]

So clearly there was a singular Gospel revealed to Jesus not 4 gospels according to Mark, Luke, Matthew, and John whom I have proven not to be disciples before.

Chapter Forty Six (I am Near, Seek and You Shall Find)

Nabeel cried out to God Almighty and he made it clear that he was calling out to One God of Islam alone to guide him. He was asking God to show him dreams or visions, but later he said whether this God was Allah or Jesus? Look how he forgot Yahweh the Father, he even forgot Holy Spirit the third person. Christianity is all about Jesus worship, they ignore the Father God mostly and also Holy Spirit.

Chapter Forty Seven (The field of Crosses)

Nabeel before going to sleep, begs God to show him a dream in Orlando. He was begging to Allah as he clarified later that he is yet to accept Christianity but as we know Nabeel was confused about Godhood already so he was begging to a mixed kind of God. So when he was confused about Godhood then of course the dream would be a misguided dream from Satan as I will explain.

Then suddenly he hallucinated a vision, which I will quote in his words:

“At that instant, the room went pitch dark. I looked out into the blackness before me. Where there had been a wall just a few feet from my bed, the wall was no longer. What I saw instead was a field with hundreds of crosses. They were glowing, in bright contrast to the darkness around them.

The tears ceased. My body was paralyzed, and time stood still. I panned over the crosses, but they were beyond number. And just as quickly as it had come, the vision was gone. I was back in the hotel room, at the edge of my bed. In stunned silence, I considered what I had just seen. After a few moments, I looked up toward the heavens and said, “God, that doesn’t count!” – End Quote

This would not bring tears in eyes of any honest reader but a burst of laughter! Did you just read Nabeel saying: God that doesn't count! HUH!

Then Nabeel came back to his senses and said:

“One side of my mind was asking, “Did God just reveal Himself to me? Did He finally answer my prayers? I saw a field of crosses. That must mean He wants me to accept the gospel.”

But the other side played devil's advocate, arguing, “Nabeel, if you're wrong about this, Allah will send you to hell forever. This could be Satan trying to confuse you because you have been flirting with shirk, the polytheism of Christianity.”

And, somewhere in my mind, the more rationalist side of me thought, “Maybe you're just jet lagged and seeing things. Do you really want to make the biggest decision of your life based on one sleepy, emotional moment? Are you ready to give up everything for this?”

Then Nabeel again said it doesn't count and this vision had to be backed up by a dream in order for him to accept Christianity! Now the same Nabeel who had said above that vision could be from Satan, then why cannot the dream be from Satan too? Finally Nabeel saw the dream on same night!

Part 10 (Guided by the Hand of God)

Chapter Forty Eight (Deciphering Dreams)

Nabeel had a clear evil dream from Satan and not from God. He interpreted it in favor of Christianity and his Islamophobic friend David Wood. Let us look at his dream and symbols in it. Later he called his mom who checked from an Islamic book of interpretations to verify what all symbols meant. Magically the dream of Nabeel was perfectly interpreted against Islam from an Islamic book of interpreting dreams written by a classical scholar called Ibn Sirin. Clearly, Nabeel distorted his dream to match the book of Ibn Sireen to depict Islam in bad light, remember Satan is very knowledgeable and It can even disguise itself as an Angel (which even Paul said) let alone it not knowing interpretation of dreams and symbols, so Satan can deceive people in most clever ways like Nabeel was. Anyways I will quote his whole dream here:

*“In the beginning of the dream there was **a poisonous snake** with red and black bands going around it, separated by thin **white stripes**. All it did was hiss at people when they stepped into the garden. The people in the garden couldn’t see it — it was far away and watching from a perch on a stone pillar. This pillar was across a chasm. The perch then became my vantage point for the first half of my dream.*”

*In a garden-like area with hills and lush green grass and trees, there was a huge **iguana, like a dragon**. It would lie still and hide by becoming like a hill — no one who walked on it knew it was an iguana. If they had known, they would be scared, but the iguana liked the fact that no one knew. **Then a giant boy came**, and this giant boy knew that the iguana was an iguana, and he stepped on it, accusing it of being an iguana. The iguana got angry, so he reared back to bite the giant boy, who had stepped on its tail.*

*As the iguana was about to bite the boy, the boy had a **huge cricket** that challenged the iguana to a fight. My vantage point changes now, and I am directly beneath the iguana, looking up at its head. The iguana nodded and accepted the challenge, and as the **cricket flew away** to go to a fighting place, the iguana turned to me and tried to lunge at me and kill me. The cricket saw that the iguana was lunging at me, so he came back and **bit its head off, decapitating it**. – End Quote.*

Clearly this dream was evil in nature and was from Satan not God. Nabeel interpreted it as:

1. The snake on the stone pillar is evil.
2. The garden is the world.

3. Nabeel had some hidden evil inside him from the beginning of his world which he interprets as Christian concept of original sin. Or it was Islam which was in Nabeel since beginning and Islam is evil (This is a lie as Nabeel was a Qadiyani not Muslim. Secondly Christians have an absurd belief that all Children are born with Sin and are not innocent)
4. Iguana was evil Islam
5. Giant boy was David Wood (I started laughing at this)
6. The Cricket was Christianity which challenged Islam (Wow what great symbolism i.e. Christianity is an insect. Remember Nabeel and Christians should not be accepting Ibn Sirin a Muslim scholar's interpretation of symbols)

He went on and said that Cricket provided salvation by defeating Islam the iguana and so on. Satan was clearly depicting Islam as all evil and David wood as all great and Christianity to be a warrior.

As we have been reading the rebuttal, Nabeel had been seriously influenced by David Wood's false interpretations to Islam and also false teachings of Christianity, his knowledge of Islam was fragile, he was a Qadiyani and never a Muslim, he hallucinated visions, and so on. Keeping all this in mind

then it is a fact that a person dreams about events happening close to oneself. So it was either a dream from Satan as authentic hadiths prove, or this dream came to him due to Nabeel being surrounded by people like David Wood, Mike, and others. Remember Nabeel was best friends with David and hung out with him frequently.

Then Nabeel called his mom who interpreted the dream from Classical Islamic scholar Ibn Sirin's book called Kitab ar Roya (Book of Dreams). Now remember Nabeel had begged Allah for guidance so had this dream been from Allah and interpretation been according to Ibn Sirin's book then would Allah say Islam is iguana the evil and David Wood is a giant boy who guided Nabeel against Islam, and Cricket is the warrior Christianity? Clearly Satan deceived Nabeel or he distorted this dream in accordance to Ibn Sirin's book of dreams in order to prove Christianity as right.

Let us look at an authentic hadith and Paul's wording how Satan misguides people in dreams.

Narrated Abu Qatada: The Prophet (ﷺ) said, "A true good dream is from Allah, and a bad dream is from Satan." [Sahih Bukhari 9.113]

Satan can deceive in different ways through dreams. Nabeel's dream is perfect example of Satan misguiding him away from perfect monotheism of Islam towards polytheism of Trinitarian Christianity. Satan has great knowledge of the

scripture as Christians also know from the incident of “Temptation of Christ” so why wouldn’t Satan know how to misguide people through symbols in dreams? He can easily play with symbols and our mind.

Paul said: And no wonder! Even Satan disguises himself as an angel of light.[2 Corinthians 11:14]

Chapter Forty Nine (The Narrow Door)

Nabeel in order lengthen his book said that he was still not certain about the dream. He shared his dream with David Wood, who with his tongue out said: *“There was no doubt that the dream pointed him to Christianity”*

Nabeel again turned to Allah for dreams about converting to Christianity. That is like saying I am a vegetarian but I eat meat. Nabeel said: *“Three,” I said to myself. “Allah likes odd numbers, and the Christian God is triune. Why not ask for three dreams?” So I returned to Allah in prayer with a very specific request.*

Nabeel then had a second dream and yet again the same old Mr. David Wood is in the Dream. Man was this guy Nabeel making this Wood guy into an Apostle or what? This time David Wood was already in heaven and Nabeel had to pass through a Narrow door. He saw David wood just because he was deeply influenced by him and was best friends with him.

Nabeel talked about Luke 13:22-26 and New International version translation rather than King James Version because KJV does not translate it the way he wanted it to be.

Let us look at another verse from present day gospels which literally makes it impossible for any “rich” person to enter paradise.

Biblical Jesus said: And again I say unto you, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God.” [Matthew 19:24]

Although in next verses Biblical Jesus does say that with God everything is possible but then again that verse proves Jesus to be separate from God and destroys concept of Jesus’s divinity.

Chapter Fifty (A Stairway out of the Mosque)

God then started to work on fingertips of Nabeel and showed him the third dream. Remember he had asked Allah, so this is Allah misguiding Nabeel away from Islam...HUH!

Finally he saw a dream without David Wood. Satan was wise enough to realize that if he showed David Wood the third time then all the people reading Nabeel's book would become skeptical of the drama!

The third dream is related to a stairway leading outside a mosque, then an Imam (one who leads prayer in mosque, that's what Imam is when we speak of a mosque, but Nabeel did not clarify which Imam he was talking about) comes and sits behind Nabeel on a carpet and then dream continues...

Nabeel made himself into a future great scholar and wise teacher in interpretation of this dream. He literally praised himself in interpretation of this dream. This yet again exposed Nabeel completely and revealed that he was a self-boasting, man of too much pride. This dream is about leaving Islam i.e. stairway leading outside mosque and all Muslims even Imam were inferior to Nabeel which is why the Imam sat on the floor below and behind him.

Nabeel was talking about three dreams due to triune nature of God in Christianity but had forgotten that he had a

hallucination too. So he rightly considered these as 4 signs. Now was the God of Christians a quaternity (four in persons) according to Nabeel?

Nabeel accepted Christianity in a weird way assuming the Christian God does not know his intentions, he said: *I acknowledged the truth to myself but not to anyone else, **not even God.***

Chapter Fifty One (Time to Mourn)

Nabeel in order to lengthen his book still begged Allah to guide him even though he had categorically said before that if he saw three dreams in favor of Christian dogma he would accept Christianity. He talked about visiting many mosques with his Qadiyani father and meeting many Imams. Now being a Muslim I would assure you that a Qadiyani father would never roam around in Muslim mosques asking Muslim scholars, rather he will take his son to non-Muslim Qadiyani wannabe scholars.

Nabeel got exposed completely that he was making up a case against Islam without having read whole of Qur'an properly. He said about Qur'an: *"There was nothing there for me. It depicted a god of conditional concern, one who would not love me if I did not perform to my utmost in pleasing him, one who seemed to take joy in sending his enemies into the hellfire. It did not speak to the broken nature of man, let alone directly to the broken man in need of God's love. It was a book of laws, written for the seventh century."*

Clearly Nabeel had not read the Qur'an properly or he had innate hatred for it due to company of evil people like David Wood.

Christian missionaries mostly spread a misconception that Allah is not loving. Christians do not even know the 99 names

of Allah properly. Qur'an clearly mentions Allah to be "AL-WADOOD" I.E. "ALL-LOVING"

Qur'an states: And He is the Oft-Forgiving, **Full of Loving-Kindness** [85:14. Yusuf Ali]

113 Chapters out of 114 start with: In the name of Allah, Most Gracious, **Most Merciful.**

Regarding "conditional concern" then according to Christianity you are doomed to hell if you do not believe Jesus died for your sins. I ask Christians if it is ok to believe in Jesus without him dying for our sins? Is it ok to deny his divinity and still be forgiven? Islam on the other hand is the only religion which promises salvation even for Jews, Christians, and Sabians but the condition is logical i.e. Belief in 1 God, hereafter, and good deeds (i.e. not to commit murder, rape, stealing, lying, giving charity and so on), see Qur'an 2:62. Please note that this applies to those non-Muslims to whom proper message of Islam has not been conveyed.

Regarding God not loving us until we do our utmost to please him. Then Qur'an does tell to abstain from major sins such as shirk and to believe in articles of faith, if we do that then Allah will pardon our minor mistakes. It is actually Bible which calls "GOD A JEALOUS GOD [Exodus 34:14, He is even called a **consuming fire** and jealous God in Deuteronomy 5:9]"

Regarding Allah taking joy in sending his enemies in hell fire, then nowhere does Qur'an says that Allah takes joy in it. Rather Qur'an talks about Jesus's conversation with Allah on Day of Judgment regarding polytheist Christians, Jesus says: If You should punish them - indeed they are Your servants; **but if You forgive them** - indeed it is You who is the Exalted in Might, the Wise. [5:118]

Qur'an even says to an extent: **What can Allah gain by your punishment**, if ye are grateful and ye believe? Nay, it is Allah that recogniseth (all good), and knoweth all things. [4:147. Yusuf Ali, or Sahih International translates as: What would Allah do...]

I have also explained before that Allah will not punish people until he has send a proper Messenger to the nations, see Qur'an 17:15.

So there is no concept of Allah having joy in punishing the wrong doers. However concept of punishment is strongly stressed in Christianity too. Both Muslims and Christians believe in heaven and hell.

Qur'an is a book of guidance for all times, yes some verses like for example verses about warfare are for specific period only with a certain context and historical background.

Nabeel then said: *"I had never read the Bible for personal guidance before. I did not even know where to start. I*

figured the New Testament would be a good place, so I opened to the beginning of Matthew. Within minutes, I found these words: “Blessed are those who mourn, for they shall be comforted.”

Why not start from Old Testament? Is Old Testament not from same God? Were you afraid to see the genocides, stoning to death, burning people to death, killing disobedient children, raping female slaves, warfare, and what not being sanctioned by biblical Jesus (i.e. the Alpha and the Omega as you believe)?

Anyways even if you start from New Testament’s first book then Christianity is in deep trouble, this is why Nabeel conveniently ignored the very first chapter of Matthew the first gospel which talks about concocted “INCESTUOUS” lineage of Biblical Jesus.

According to Islam Jesus is pure and he has no paternal lineage but was born miraculously through Virgin Mary, hence no need to cook up forged and unwanted genealogies for him

The very first book of New Testament i.e. Book of Matthew and that too right in the first chapter describes the Lineage of Jesus as:

1. The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.

2. **ABRAHAM BEGAT ISAAC**; and Isaac begat Jacob; and Jacob begat Judas and his brethren; [Matthew 1:1-2]

Wait Wait! Let's just stop here before moving further and proving contradicting lineages of Jesus in Luke and Matthew. Let's first see how Biblical Jesus has this following lineage according to book of Genesis in Old Testament.

So how did Isaac come? Let the bible do the talking:

Genesis 20 states: And Abraham said of Sarah his wife, "**SHE IS MY SISTER**" and Abimelech king of Gerar sent, "**AND TOOK SARAH**" [Genesis 20:2]

Assuming that biblical Abraham said an innocent statement to save himself, but look what he says ahead when he is at peace with King Abimelech

Genesis 20:12 states: "**BESIDES**" "**SHE REALLY IS MY SISTER, THE DAUGHTER OF MY FATHER**" though not of my mother; and she became my wife.

No comments required.

Things do not just stop here, it gets vulgar even further. **Judah commits incest with his "Daughter in Law"**

and the illegitimate child PAREZ born becomes grandfather of "biblical Jesus"

Read the long story in Genesis 38:15-30. The important point is of illegitimate child named "PAREZ" which is called ditto by name as grandfather of Jesus having same ancestry in forged lineage according to Book of Matthew's first chapter

Matthew 1:3 states: ***Judah the "FATHER OF PAREZ"*** and Zerah, ***"WHOSE MOTHER WAS TAMAR (DAUGHTER IN LAW OF JUDAH)*** Perez the father of Hezron, Hezron the father of Ram.

Shame on the people who cooked up such stories although according to Islam Jesus was simply born miraculously of Virgin Mary without any need of making Joseph as father of Jesus. There is absolutely no need to cook up fake contradicting genealogies of him.

But Let us see why Nabeel and Christians ignore Old Testament conveniently, it is because it proves their eternal God Jesus as a war monger, barbaric, and Cruel God.

Barbarism in Bible

Let us first authenticate the Old Testament from Jesus and NT itself

Jesus said: **Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them.** I tell you the truth, until heaven and earth disappear, **not the smallest letter, not the least stroke of a pen, will by any means disappear from the Law until everything is accomplished.** **Anyone who breaks one of the least of these commandments and teaches others to do the same will be called least in the kingdom of heaven, but whoever practices and teaches these commands will be called great in the kingdom of heaven.** For I tell you that unless your righteousness surpasses that of the Pharisees and the teachers of the law, you will certainly not enter the kingdom of heaven. [Matthew 5:17-20]

It states in Book of Timothy: All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, [2 Timothy 3:16]

Hence all scripture is profitable for “DOCTRINE, REPROOF, AND INSTRUCTION” Now let us see why Nabeel cleverly ignored Old Testament just to spew venom against Qur’an.

Bible quote # 1

Qur'an prescribes no death penalty for someone who blasphemes the name of God Almighty, nor is there any verse to kill apostates in Qur'an. Even hadiths of killing apostates are weak due to a narrator called "IKRIMA" who hated Prophetic family and concocted hadiths against Ali the beloved cousin of Prophet. Plus other hadiths only ask to kill those apostates who incite war along with apostasy.

Whereas Bible asks to stone the blasphemers. It states in book of Leviticus:

"Anyone who blasphemes the name of the LORD is to be put to death. The entire assembly must stone them. Whether foreigner or native-born, when they blaspheme the Name they are to be put to death. [Leviticus 24:16]"

Bible quote # 2

Islam prescribes no punishment for a "stubborn and rebellious" child, but look what the Bible says:

If a man has a stubborn and rebellious son who will not obey the voice of his father or the voice of his mother, and who, when they have chastened him, will not heed them, then his father and his mother shall take hold of him and bring him out to the elders of his city, to the gate of his city. And they shall say to the elders of his city, "This son of ours is stubborn

and rebellious; he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton and a drunkard.” Then all the men of his city shall stone him to death with stones; so you shall put away the evil from among you, and all Israel shall hear and fear. [Deuteronomy 21:18-21]”

This is absolute Barbarism and cruelty which is not justified. Islam does not prescribe any such barbarism.

Bible quote # 3

Islam prescribes no punishment if a child curses his parents, but look what Bible says:

'If anyone curses his father or mother, he must be put to death. He has cursed his father or his mother, and his blood will be on his own head (Leviticus 20:9)

Bible quote # 4

Islam prescribes no death penalty for kidnaping someone. The person is to be imprisoned according to Islamic jurisprudence. But look what Bible says:

"Anyone who kidnaps another and either sells him or still has him when he is caught **must be put to death.** (Exodus 21:16)

Bible quote # 5

God is shown as a hasty God and was about to kill even the mighty Prophet Moses (God forbid) over a minor thing of circumcision. Whereas there is no such absurd story in Islam. Bible states:

At a lodging place on the way, **the LORD met {Moses} and was about to kill him.** But Zipporah took a flint knife, cut off her son's foreskin and touched {Moses'} feet with it... (Exodus 4:24-25)

Bible quote # 6

Killing is fun according to Bible whereas Islam enforces strict conditions even in battlefield (i.e. not to kill unarmed, not to attack one who turns his back, not to kill women and children, not to cut down trees etc...)

Book of Exodus states: Then he said to them, "This is what the LORD, the God of Israel, says: 'Each man strap a sword to his side. **Go back and forth through the camp from one end to the other, each killing his brother and friend and neighbor.**' "The Levites did as **Moses commanded**, and that day about three thousand of the people died (Exodus 32:27-28)

Bible quote # 7

Bible allows burning people whereas Islam forbids to burn anyone no matter what big crime the person did

'If a man marries both a woman and her mother, it is wicked. **Both he and they must be burned in the fire**, so that no wickedness will be among you. (Leviticus 20:14)

Why should they be burned along? This is barbarism to the extreme!

Bible quote # 8

Jesus came not to bring peace but division. Whereas Qur'an teaches bring family ties together.

Biblical Jesus says: **I have come to bring fire on the earth, and how I wish it were already kindled!** But I have a baptism to undergo, and what constraint I am under until it is completed! **Do you think I came to bring peace on earth? No, I tell you, but division.** From now on there will be five in one family divided against each other, three against two and two against three. They will be divided, **father against son and son against father, mother against daughter and daughter against mother, mother-in-law against daughter-in-law and daughter-in-law against mother-in-law.**" [Luke12:49-53]

Bible quote # 9

In another passage Biblical Jesus uses word “SWORD”

Do not suppose that I have come to bring peace to the earth. **I did not come to bring peace, but a sword. For I have come to turn "a man against his father, a daughter against her mother,** a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law - a man's enemies will be the members of his own household (Matthew 10:34-36)

Christians will say that Jesus is talking about loving him more than family members, and Islam also teaches to love Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) more than family and everything else. Then yes we accept the Christian interpretation, but people like David Wood and fanatical Christian apologists misinterpret Islam without looking at context too, so I am giving them a dose of their own medicine.

Bible quote # 10

Islam says that both Adam and eve were deceived, whereas NT says Eve is to be blamed and Woman is subservient to man!

Book of Timothy states: In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with broided hair, or gold, or pearls, or

costly array. **Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man,** but to be in silence For Adam was first formed, then Eve. **And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.** (1Timothy 2:9-14)

There are many more passages which can be shown, but I have shown only 10 due to brevity issue. Clearly Nabeel had not read Qur'an properly but was biased. He was misled by David Wood or he left Qadiyani cult for ulterior motives (He was never a Muslim anyway).

Chapter Fifty Two (The Word Speaks)

Nabeel claimed to have found the new true God. He said: *“Just after midnight one evening, still captivated by this newfound glory, I found these words in Matthew 10:32 – 33: “Whoever acknowledges me before others, I will also acknowledge **before my Father in heaven**. But whoever disowns me before others, I will **disown before my Father in heaven**.”*

Even this passage in Matthew proves that Jesus is not God but a separate entity from God.

Nabeel said: *“I submit. I submit that Jesus Christ is Lord of heaven and earth. He came to this world to die for my sins, proving His lordship by rising from the dead.”*

Who is Yahweh then? Who is Holy Spirit then? Christians in their polytheism ignore the Father entity and holy spirit and concentrate mostly on Jesus. I know they misquote some verses about Jesus having authority but I will prove that even disciples were given authority to judge from their thrones, so would they become gods too? Remember all the passages Christians use about Jesus having authority prove that God Almighty gave Jesus that authority, so Jesus never had “PERSONAL” “INDIPENDANT” and “INTRINSIC” authority, hence he cannot ever be called a God, because God

has intrinsic authority and dominion not that someone else granted Him all that.

Regarding Jesus dying for our sins, then nobody dies for the sins of other people, you have to pay for your own sins/crimes (see: Deuteronomy 24:16, Ezekiel 18:20, Matthew 7:1-2). God Almighty is not unjust that he would **curse** (see: Galatians 3:13) his son for sins of other people. Biblical passages prove that Jesus asked to save him, I have already shed light on this that even at last moment Jesus cried onto “HIS” God to save him, plus this concept of Jesus dying for sins of all people is illogical because Jesus could not have died for Christians like G.W.Bush who committed genocides. It also incites people to commit sins because people believe Jesus has already died for their sins.

Chapter Fifty Three (Finding Jesus)

Nabeel talked about betrayal to his family. It should be remembered that Qadiyanis hate Muslims and are closer to those who despise Muslims. The founder of Qadiyani cult Mirza Ghulam Ahmed Qadiyani used vulgar language against all Muslims and called us all as sons of prostitutes and infidels. Qadiyanis enjoy asylum in many western countries at times cooking up false stories of persecution in Muslim lands. I do not deny that some Qadiyanis do get persecuted. I live very near to a Qadiyani mosque in Lahore, Pakistan and they freely pray and live happily. Had family of Nabeel been true Muslims they would have disowned him. He painted his mother to be some sort of a scholar but still she did not disown Nabeel.

Nabeel talked about crucifixion and gave exaggerated details as: *“Did he know that God entered into this world for him, to suffer in his stead? Received with slaps and fists by the very people He came to save, He was scourged until His skin fell off in ribbons, only to be pierced through both arms and feet, nailed naked on wood for all to ridicule. He scraped His skinless back on splintered wood with each rasping breath, His last breath finishing the task of rescuing us, of securing our eternity with Him.”*

A God nailed naked and tortured? A God who died in flesh? This is worst definition of God one could give! Remember

Christians believe Jesus was God in flesh, then they believe death came to his flesh, so they are literally saying God died in Flesh!

The Gospels contradict on the accounts of crucifixion.

Did Jesus pray to The Father to prevent the crucifixion? (1) Yes. (Matthew 26:39; Mark 14:36; Luke 22:42). (2) No. (John 12:27).

Did Jesus bear his own cross? (1) Yes (John 19:17). (2) No, Simon was made to carry it (Matthew 27:31-32).

The gospels say that two thieves were crucified along with Jesus. Did both thieves mock Jesus? (1) Yes (Mark 15:32). (2) No. One of them mocked Jesus, the other defended Jesus (Luke 23:42-43).

Did Jesus ascend to Paradise the same day of the crucifixion? (1) Yes. He said to the thief who defended him, "Today you will be with me in Paradise" (Luke 23:43). (2) No. He said to Mary Magdalene two days later, "I have not yet ascended to the Father" (John 20:17).

According to Mark 15:23: And they gave Him to drink wine mingled with myrrh, but He received it not.

But according to John 19:29-30 Jesus is given vinegar, and he drinks it.

All the disciples had run away and were not proper eye witnesses. Book of Matthew states: But all this was done that the Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled.” **Then all the disciples forsook Him and fled.** [Matthew 26:56] Luke 23:49 proves that they watched it from far so that does not count as proper eye witness account either. It is quoted from gospels that Mary the mother of Jesus and Mary Magdalene were eye witnesses, but all other people who witnessed were not disciples. Above all, I have already established that present day gospels are not authentically proven to be written by any of the disciples nor it is confirmed that the proclaimed authors wrote them.

Did God hear the prayer of Jesus and saved him, the answer is clearly Yes!. Jesus said: “**Alaha, Alaha,** lama sabachthani?” that is to say, “**My God, My God, why have you forsaken Me?**” (Matthew 27:46)

So Allah did not forsake him rather saved him from death! Regarding resurrection I have shed light on it before that Islam has deep concept that Prophets can come back and meet their loved ones, so Islam does not deny resurrection of Jesus.

Epilogue of Nabeel's book and my Conclusion.

Nabeel talked about how few other people accepting Christianity including the Buddhist Zach, and some atheists. He talked about his missionary activities with the fanatical Christian apologist David Wood.

In conclusion I would like to conclude with Islamic message of truth according to my understanding of Qur'an, authentic hadiths, study of Bible, and knowledge acquired from scholars.

There is only 1 singular God without multiplicity in nature and personhood who is worthy of worship. He has no partners, no co-sharers. He grants authority and power to his beloved Prophets like Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and Muhammad (Peace be upon them all). These authorities, powers, and miracles are not their personal and independent qualities but "GRANTED" ones which distinguishes them from God. This is the message conveyed in Qur'an and even present day Old Testament and New Testament. Jesus never said he is God, nor asked to worship him. Had trinity or divinity of Jesus been core beliefs for Jesus he would have categorically called himself as God and asked people to worship him in categorical terms. He taught to pray to God Almighty, he called Father "HIS GOD" till his last moments on earth.

All the verses which Christians use to assert divinity towards Jesus are to be understood in light of other verses which deny divinity of Jesus, the Unitarian Christian interpretation and Islamic interpretation are the only correct interpretations on those verses.

The Jews went to one extreme of considering Jesus as someone who drove out devils through help of Beelzebub the prince of demons, and they called him false Messiah, whereas Christians went to the other extreme reading about his miracles they started calling him God incarnate. Islam provides the middle way of truth i.e. Jesus was a human, a mighty Prophet, a Messiah, who performed wonderful miracles even some miracles which Christians deny, he was raised alive, and shall descend again.

In the End I would like to show some verses which people like David Wood and Christian apologists show in order to assert divinity towards Jesus. When they totally fail to show a single verse where Jesus said :I am God, worship me, they run towards verses like these:

Passage # 1 & Refutation

Book of Mark states: When Jesus saw their faith, He said unto the one sick with the palsy, “**Son, thy sins are forgiven thee.**” But there were certain of the scribes sitting there and reasoning in their hearts, “**Why doth this man**

thus speak blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God only?” [Mark 2:5-7]

From such passages in present day gospels the Trinitarian Christian apologists shout out loud that Jesus was God as only God can forgive sins, although next verses clearly prove that Jesus had “AUTHORITY ON EARTH” to forgive sins i.e. It was granted to him and not his intrinsic power which only God has. Although being Muslims we do not accept these verses, there must be something missing in the verse which said that actually it was God who forgave sins through Jesus, but let us put these verses under scrutiny from other verses.

Book of John states: Again Jesus said, “Peace be with you! As the Father has sent me, I am sending you.” And with that he breathed on them and said, “Receive the Holy Spirit. **If you forgive anyone’s sins, their sins are forgiven; if you do not forgive them, they are not forgiven.**” [John 20:21-23]

So are disciples also gods now as they got power to forgive sins? Hence having granted quality of forgiving sins does not make anyone God.

Passage # 2 & Refutation

Christians say Jesus will judge all people and thus he is God as only God is Judge. They quote the following passage:

Book of Matthew states: When the Son of Man shall come in His glory and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory. **And before Him shall be gathered all nations, and He shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats.** [Matthew 25:31-32]

Although the passage does not categorically say that Jesus will judge them, but just says he will separate them like shepherd separates sheep from goats. Christians also quote verse about “Son of Man sitting on right hand of power” which I have already explained before, but that itself distinguishes between God and Jesus so Jesus cannot be God. Now let us look at another passage about disciples:

It states: Jesus said to them, “Truly I tell you, at the renewal of all things, when the Son of Man sits on his glorious throne, you who have followed me **will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.** [Matthew 19:28]

So are the disciples all 12 gods now? Wait a minute Jesus says 12 thrones, so does he include Judas too?

Passage # 3 and Refutation.

Christian apologists bring up passage from Book of Revelation which is not a book of gospels but is a book of dreams. It is also not proven which John wrote it. They bring forward the verse about Jesus being the “ALPHA AND THE OMEGA” but they ignore the 11th verse from Chapter 1 which is considered to be forged. When initial verse is considered a forgery then why not the later verse mentioning Jesus as Alpha and Omega not be a forgery too?

They quote this passage:

And when I saw Him, I fell at His feet as dead. And He laid His right hand upon me, saying unto me, “**Fear not; I am the First and the Last.** I am He that liveth, and was dead; and behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen, and have the keys of hell and of death. [Revelation 1:17-18]

Christians ignore Revelation 1:11 which has forgery about same Alpha and Omega thing.

King James version starts the verse as: Saying, “I am Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last..

Whereas Majority of other translators exclude it such as New International Version: which says: “Write on a scroll what you see...

Remember King James Version also includes the forgery of trinity in 1 John 5:7. King James Version is the most relied upon translation according to Christians. So Majority of Christians have been and still are reading forged verses in Bible.

According to Islam even Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) is called as “FIRST AND LAST” in authentic hadith, so does that mean Muslims believe he is God (Nuadhobillah)? This just proves that Spirits of Prophets are created prior to bodily creation. This concept cannot be explained by our limited human understanding as we cannot fully understand what a spirit is. The Spirit exists eternally but this eternal existence of spirit cannot be put on par with the eternal existence of God. So we can say that Spirit has “RELATIVE ETERNAL EXISTANCE” which of course cannot be compared to God’s eternal existence.

So Jesus is called first as in he is first in foreknowledge of Allah, and he is called last as he will be sent in the end of times too. Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) is called the First and the Last because of “Haqiqat al Muhammadiyah (Muhammadan reality)” a deep concept which not even many Muslims understand properly let alone Christians will. The authentic hadith which calls Prophet Muhammad as “First and Last” is found in Dalail an Nabuwwah by Imam al-Bayhaqi: Volume 5, Page No. 483. Prophet Muhammad is called first as his spirit was created from light first and last because he was the last Prophet sent in Arabia.

Passage # 4 & Refutation

Christian apologists say that Jesus called himself “THE TRUTH” which means he is God. They quote this verse:

Jesus answered, I am the way and “**THE TRUTH**” and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me. [John 14:6]

Christians say that one of Allah’s name is “al-Haqq (The truth)” so according to Islamic teachings Jesus claimed to be God. The same verse is denying divinity of Jesus because it is saying “NO ONE COMES TO THE FATHER EXCEPT THROUGH ME” hence Jesus being an intermediary cannot be God. An intermediary is never God himself. I have explained before that If I am an intermediary to reach the king then I am not King himself.

Above all present day Bible is subservient to Qur’an and we take whatever goes in accordance to Qur’an.

Secondly what Christians are forgetting is that Allah has both Dhaati (personal) and attributive (Sifaati) names. Allah does not share his personal names with anyone but his attributive names can be shared with others. For example nobody can call himself “ALLAH” and Jesus never claimed to be “ALAHA OR GOD OR YHWH” whereas people can name themselves as “Raheem, Sami, Baseer, Kaleem and so on” The name

Haqq is not Dhaati name of Allah. Many Muslims keep names such as “Haqq Nabi” or call Prophet’s cousin Ali as “Haqq Ali” and this will not be shirk.

Passage # 5 & Refutation

Some Fanatical Christians go to the extent of calling Jesus as “Yahweh” which is utter blasphemy even according to wise Christians and belief that Father and Son are distinct from one another. They use the following verse:

Jesus said unto them, “Verily, verily I say unto you, **before Abraham was, I am!** [John 8:58]

If assuming that Jesus called himself as “Yahweh” here and “Ego eimi” means “Yahweh” then verse should read: “Before Abraham was, Yahweh!” ...Now that phrase does not make sense at all, how could it say: Before Abraham was, Yahweh? That is not even a proper statement and sentence!

If Christians say that Jesus was calling himself eternal here and thus he was God. Then again they are wrong. Why did Jesus talk about only Abraham? Had he been eternal he would have said before Adam was, I am. Remember Adam was first created being. Or he would have said, before everything was, I am. Hence Jesus is clearly talking about “FOREKNOWLEDGE OF GOD” not himself being eternal. He was just refuting Jews of his time and telling about himself in foreknowledge of God even before Abraham so that Jews accept him.

Christians will say that Jews picked up stones to stone Jesus after he made that statement, which means they considered it blasphemy and thus Jesus claimed to be God. I have explained before that Jews misunderstood Jesus many times and were looking for ways to accuse him. For more explanation see the Unitarian Christian explanation regarding “Ego eimi” here:

<http://www.biblicalunitarian.com/videos/john-8-58b>

(accessed on 29/10/2017)

Read these verses again, though I had shown them before:

“And do not call anyone on earth ‘father,’ for you have one Father, and he is in heaven.” (Matthew 23:9)

Understand this verse from Old Testament verse:

Have we not all one father? Hath not one God created us? Why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother, by profaning the covenant of our fathers? (Malachi 2:10 KJV)

Passage # 6 & Refutation

Christians try to prove God’s incarnation in Jesus through this following passage:

Book of John says: Philip said, “Lord, show us the Father and that will be enough for us.” Jesus answered: “Don’t you know me, Philip, even after I have been among you such a long time? **Anyone who has seen me has seen the Father.** How can you say, ‘Show us the Father’? **Don’t you believe that I am in the Father, and that the Father is in me?** The words I say to you **I do not speak on my own authority. Rather, it is the Father, living in me, who is doing his work.** Believe me when **I say that I am in the Father and the Father is in me; or at least believe on the evidence of the works themselves.** [John 14:8-11]

Out of all gospels, it is book of John which came into existence in the end, which Trinitarian Christians assume to be painting Jesus in divine light most emphatically. But if we read John thoroughly and deeply then even John denies divinity of Jesus in categorical terms as I have proven before through many passages from John. Seeing Jesus being akin to seeing God is like Qur’an calling Muhammad (Peace be upon him) a “BURHAN” i.e. conclusive proof (4:174)...this is why Biblical Jesus further says in John 14: **“or at least believe on the evidence of the works themselves”**

Jesus being one in God is to be understood from another passage of John where even believers in Christ are called as one with God:

Biblical Jesus said: Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe in Me through their word, **that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us**, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. [John 17:20-21]

So are the disciples and believers also gods now? Hence Jesus was not talking about unity in Godhood but unity in message, establishing the Kingdom of God.

The overwhelming verses which I have shown before which strongly disapprove divinity of Jesus from all 4 gospels and other books of NT are to be taken apparently, whereas the verses which Trinitarians use to somehow assert divinity towards Jesus have been debunked by Unitarian Christians and Muslim apologists. Having said that, I present a Challenge to all Trinitarian Christians by using this verse of Mark:

“But about that day or hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father. [Mark 13:32]”

Trinitarians believe that Son and Holy Spirit are co-eternally and equally God in knowledge too, so I challenge all Trinitarians to prove where Jesus said he knows of the hour!

With this I conclude my rebuttal. May Allah guide all Trinitarian Christians to truth of Islam or at least to Unitarian Christianity/Monotheism.

Peace!

Aamir Ibrahim Khan

Email: aamir_ibraheem@hotmail.com

Why are Qadiyanis declared as non-Muslims?

Qadiyanis follow a person with the name of Mirza Ghulam Ahmed Qadiyani (1835-1908) who initially claimed to be a reviver (Mujaddad), later Mahdi, and finally went to extremes of calling himself an incarnation of Jesus, rather all prophets. I shall cite all these proofs from his books, but first let us look at proofs from Qur'an, overwhelming hadiths, and classical Islamic scholars that anyone who claims to be Prophet after Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) is a grand liar and Kafir, also people who follow such a person are also Kafirs.

Finality of Prophethood

The unanimous Belief of Muslim world is that Prophet Muhammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is the Last and Final Messenger/Prophet of Allah. In other words Prophethood has ended with Prophet Muhammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and those who do not believe in it are ventured out of the bounds of Islam.

This article is divided into different sections for better and clear understanding.

- A) Lexicographical definitions**
- B) Proof from Quran in light of classical Mufasireen**
- C) Proof from overwhelming Sahih Ahadith**
- D) Consensus of Muslim scholars and Ummah**

E) The Constitution Law of Pakistan (and declaration of Muslim world that Qadiyanis are Apostates/Kufaar)

F) The False Prophet i.e Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiyani al-Kaddhab and his false claims

Lexicographical definitions

Imam Ibn Munzur [Born: 630 AH] and Allama Ismail bin Hammad al Juhri [Born: 332 AH], the reason why we have mentioned the birth dates of both these Imams is to make it clear that these Lexicographers wrote their works long before the Fitnah of Qadiyanism had even emerged. So It is clear that Muslim Ummah was and is still unanimous on the viewpoint that Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) is the last Prophet and any claim of Prophethood after him is falsehood and trait of Dajjal/Kadhaab

Imam Ibn Munzur (rah) writes in Lisan ul Arab:

محمد، صلى الله عليه وسلم، خاتِمُ الأنبياء، عليه وعليهم الصلاة والسلام. التهذيب:
والخاتِمِ والخاتَمِ من أسماء النبي، صلى الله عليه وسلم. وفي التنزيل العزيز: ما كان
محمد أباً أحد من رجالكم ولكن رسول الله وخاتِمَ النبيين؛ أي آخرهم

Translation: Muhammad (Peace be upon him) is the Last of Prophets (Salat and Salam on all), both the words Khatim and Khatam are names of Prophet, as is revealed in Al Aziz (i.e. Quran):” Muhammad is not the father of any man among you, but he is the messenger of Allah and the Seal/Last of the Prophets; and Allah is ever Aware of all things” (33:40) **THIS REFERS TO LAST/END (أي (آخرهم** [Lisan ul Arab, Under the letter “خ”]

Imam Ibn Munzur also said:

ومن أسمائه العاقب أيضاً ومعناه آخر الأنبياء

Translation: And amongst the names (of Prophet) is Al-Aqib which means “**The Akhir al Anbiya**” I.e. **The Last to come of Prophets** [Ibid]

Allama Ismail bin Hammad al Juhri (rah) writes:

Arabic-English-Translation: (ختم الله له بخير) May Allah bring the End on Khair, (وختمت القرآن: بلغت آخره) I finished the Quran: (read) till it's "End" (واختتمت الشيء: نقيض افتتاحه) The Last of something is opposite to beginning (of it) (والخاتم والخاتم،) بكسر التاء وفتحها. والخيتام والخاتام كله بمعنى، والجمع الخواتيم. وإذا لبسته. (وخاتمة الشيء: آخره) Khatam, Khatim, Khitam, the Plural Khawatim, the meaning of all these are same and the end of something is Khatim ash Shay. (ومحمد صلى الله عليه وسلم خاتم) **And Muhammad (Peace be upon him) is the Last of Prophets (Salat and Salam on all)** [As-Sahah Taj ul Lughat, Volume No. 6, Page No. 186]

Definition In Light of great successor (Tabi'i)
Qatada (rah)

وأخرج عبد الرزاق وعبد بن حميد وابن المنذر وابن أبي حاتم عن قتادة رضي الله عنه في قوله {ولكن رسول الله وخاتم النبيين} قال: آخر نبي

Translation: Imam Abdur Razzaq, Abd bin Humaid, Ibn Mundhir and Ibn Abi Hatim narrate from Qatada who said about (He is the Messenger of Allah and Khatam an Nabiyeen) that **It means: He is the “LAST NABI”** [Imam Jalal ud din Suyuti in Tafsir Dur ul Munthur, Under 33:40]

In Light of leading Tabi'i Imam Hassan al-Basri (rah)

وأخرج عبد بن حميد عن الحسن في قوله { وخاتم النبيين } قال: ختم الله النبيين بمحمد صلى الله عليه وسلم، وكان آخر من بعث

Translation: Imam Abd bin Humaid narrates from Hassan Basri (rah) who said regarding “Khatam an Nabiyeen” : **Allah has brought end to Prophets through Muhammad (Peace be upon him) and “HE IS THE LAST TO BE SENT”**[Tafsir Dur ul Munthur Under 33:40]

Proof from Quran in light of classical Mufasireen

Quran states: Muhammad is not the father of [any] one of your men, **but [he is] the Messenger of Allāh and seal [i.e., last] of the prophets.** And ever is Allāh, of all things, Knowing. (33:40. Sahih International translation)

Imam Ibn Kathir (rah) the widely renowned Mufasir/Muhadith/historian of Islam, he writes in his magnificent Tafsir al Quran al Azeem (i.e. Tafsir Ibn Kathir)

فهذه الآية نص في أنه لا نبي بعده، وإذا كان لانبي بعده، فلا رسول بعده بالطريق الأولى والأخرى؛ لأن مقام الرسالة أخص من مقام النبوة، فإن كل رسول نبي، ولا ينعكس، وبذلك وردت الأحاديث المتواترة

Translation: This Verse is a “**DEFINITE PROOF**” over this matter i.e. **There will be no Prophet after him, when there cannot be any Nabi after him** then how

could there be even a Rusul because the Risalat is linked to Nubuwah, every Rusul is Nabi but every Nabi is not Rusul. This is also established from “**MUTAWATTIR AHADITH**” (UNDENIABLE DUE TO THE FACT THAT THEY HAVE COME FROM MULTIPLE CHAINS) [Tafsir al Quran al Azim by Ibn Kathir, Page No. 1488, Published by Dar ul Kutb al Arabi, Beirut, Lebanon]

Imam Ibn Kathir (rah) then mentions overwhelming ahadith which we shall mention in the hadith section of this post, but let's look at another great proof which Imam Ibn Kathir cites, he says and we quote:

فمن رحمة الله تعالى بالعباد إرسال محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم إليهم، ثم من تشريفه لهم ختم الأنبياء والمرسلين به، وإكمال الدين الحنيف له، وقد أخبر الله تبارك وتعالى في كتابه، ورسوله صلى الله عليه وسلم في السنة المتواترة عنه: أنه لا نبي بعده؛ ليعلموا أن كل من ادعى هذا المقام بعده، فهو كذاب وأفك دجال ضال مضل، لو تحرق وشعبذ، وأتى بأنواع السحر والطلاسم والنيرجيات، فكلها محال وضلال عند أولي الألباب؛ كما أجرى الله سبحانه وتعالى على يد الأسود العنسي باليمن، ومسيلمة الكذاب باليمامة من الأحوال الفاسدة والأقوال الباردة ما علم كل ذي لب وفهم وحجى أنهما كاذبان ضالان، لعنهما الله، وكذلك كل مدع لذلك إلى يوم القيامة، حتى يختموا بالمسيح الدجال

فكل واحد من هؤلاء الكذابين يخلق الله تعالى معه من الأمور ما يشهد العلماء والمؤمنون بكذب من جاء بها، وهذا من تمام لطف الله تعالى بخلقه، فإنهم بضرورة الواقع لا يأمرؤن بمعروف، ولا ينهاون عن منكر، إلا على سبيل الاتفاق، أو لما لهم فيه من المقاصد إلى غيره، ويكون في غاية الإفك والفجور في أقوالهم وأفعالهم

Translation: Allah has told us in His Book, and His Messenger has told us in the Mutawatir Sunnah, that there will be no Prophet after him, so that it may be known that everyone who claims this status after him is a liar and fabricator who is misguided and is misleading others. Even if he twists meanings, comes up with false claims and uses tricks and vagaries, all of this is false and is misguidance as will be clear to those who have understanding. This is what

Allah caused to happen in the case of Al-Aswad Al-`Ansi in the Yemen and Musaylimah the Liar in Al-Yamamah, whose false miracles and nonsensical words showed everyone who was possessed of understanding that they were liars who were leading people astray; may the curse of Allah be upon them both. **This is the case with every false prophet until the Day of Resurrection, until they end with Al-Masih Ad-Dajjal (the Antichrist). Each of these liars is given by Allah signs which show the people of knowledge and the believers that his message is false** -- which is part of the perfect kindness of Allah towards His creation. These liars do not enjoin what is good, nor forbid what is evil, unless they do so by coincidence or because it serves an ulterior purpose. They are the utmost in falsehood and immorality, in all that they say and do [Imam Ibn Kathir in Tafsir al Quran al Azeem, Page No. 1389, Translation taken with care from English version by Dar us Salaam]

Imam Abu Hayyan al Andalusī [D. 445 AH] after **decisively** proving Finality of Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) from Quran and Sunnah writes in his Tafsir Al Bahr al Muheet:

ومن ذهب إلى أن النبوة مكتسبة لا تنقطع، أو إلى أن الولي أفضل من النبي، فهو زنديق يجب قتله. وقد ادعى النبوة ناس، فقتلهم المسلمون على ذلك

Translation: A Person who has a viewpoint that Prophethood is not closed, or one who thinks that a Wali is superior than Nabi then such a person is **“ZINDEEQ” and “Wajib ul Qatl”** Those who had claimed Prophethood amongst people then Muslims have killed them. [Tafsir Bahr al Muheet, Under 33:40]

Qadhi Thana Ullah PaniPatti (rah) writes in his Tafsir al Mazhari: Khatam has been mentioned (in this ayah) in the meaning of “Akhir/Last” and someone who came to bring an “END TO SOMETHING” as “Last Nabi after whom no Prophet will come [Tafsir al Mazhari, Volume No. 9, Page No. 266]

Qur'an states:

وَمَنْ أَظْلَمُ مِمَّنِ افْتَرَىٰ عَلَى اللَّهِ كَذِبًا أَوْ قَالَ أُوحِيَ إِلَيَّ وَلَمْ يُوحَ إِلَيْهِ شَيْءٌ وَمَنْ قَالَ سَأُنزِلُ مِثْلَ مَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ وَلَوْ تَرَىٰ إِذِ الظَّالِمُونَ فِي غَمَرَاتِ الْمَوْتِ وَالْمَلَائِكَةُ بَاسِطُوا أَيْدِيهِمْ أَخْرَجُوا أَنْفُسَكُمْ الْيَوْمَ تُجْزَوْنَ عَذَابَ الْهُونِ بِمَا كُنْتُمْ تَقُولُونَ عَلَى اللَّهِ غَيْرَ الْحَقِّ وَكُنْتُمْ عَنْ آيَاتِنَا تَسْتَكْبِرُونَ

Translation: And who is more unjust than **one who invents a lie about Allāh or says, "It has been inspired to me," while nothing has been inspired to him, and one who says, "I will reveal [something] like what Allāh revealed."** And if you could but see when the wrongdoers are in the overwhelming pangs of death while the angels extend their hands, [saying], "Discharge your souls! Today you will be awarded the punishment of [extreme] humiliation for what you used to say against Allāh other than the truth and [that] you were, toward His verses, being arrogant." (6:93. Sahih International translation)

It states in Tafsir al Jalalyn under this verse:

And who that is none does greater evil than he who invents lies against God by claiming prophethood when he has not been called to it or who

says ‘It is revealed to me’ when nothing has been revealed to him — this was revealed regarding the false prophet Musaylama al-Kadhhdhāb — or he who says ‘I will reveal the like of what God has revealed’? — these were the mockers who would say If we wish we can speak the like of this Q. 831; If you could only see O Muhammad (s) when the mentioned evildoers are in the agonies the throes of death and the angels extend their hands against them beating and torturing them saying to them in stern censure ‘Give up your souls! to us that we may seize them. Today you shall be requited with the chastisement of humiliation because you used to say about God other than the truth of claiming prophethood and inspiration falsely and that you used to scorn His signs’ disdaining to believe in them. The response to the conditional statement beginning with law ‘if you could only see’ is ‘you would be seeing a terrifying thing’. (Tafsir al Jalalyn under 6:93)

This will apply to all claimants of Prophethood after Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) whether Zilli or Buroozi or whatever. Whosoever claims so becomes an Apostate/Zindeeq/Grand Liar.

Proofs from overwhelming ahadith

Here we are going to mention 20 Ahadith (although the number reaches in hundreds) which decisively prove that door to Prophethood has been closed and anyone who claims to be Prophet after Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) is a Liar/Dajjal/Cheat/Fabricator

Hadith # 1

Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 56, Number 735: - Book of Merits - Chapter on Khatam an Nabiyeen) –

المناقب - خاتم النبيين صلى الله عليه وسلم

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, "My similitude in comparison with the other prophets before me, is that of a man who has built a house nicely and beautifully, except for a place of **"ONE"** brick in a corner. The people go about it and wonder at its beauty, but say: 'Would that this brick be put in its place!' **So I am that brick, and I am the last of the Prophets.**"

This Hadith is also narrated in Sahih Muslim Hadith # 5675 under the chapter of "THE FINALITY OF ALLAH'S APOSTLE (MAY PEACE BE UPON HIM)" It is also narrated in Musnad Ahmed bin Hanbal Hadith # 7479, Also narrated in Sunnan al-Bayhaqi al-Kubra, Hadith # 11422]

Hadith # 2

حدثنا أنس بن مالك قال
قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إن الرسالة والنبوة قد انقطعت فلا رسول بعدي ولا نبي

Translation: Anas bin Malik narrates from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) who said: **The Messengership and Prophethood have ended and there will be no Messenger and Prophet after me** [Sunnan Tirimdhi, Hadith # 2274, where Imam Tirimdhi declared it "HASSAN SAHIH", Also narrated by Musnad Ahmed bin Hanbal, Volume No.3, Page No. 467, Mustadrak ala Sahihayn al Hakim, Volume No. 4, Page No. 391]

Imam at-Tirimdhi (rah) said after this hadith:

هَذَا حَدِيثٌ حَسَنٌ صَحِيحٌ

This hadith is "FAIR AND AUTHENTIC" [ibid]

Hadith # 3

Abu Huraira reported that the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) said: I have been given superiority over the other prophets in six respects: I have been given words which are concise but comprehensive in meaning; I have been helped by terror (in the hearts of enemies): spoils have been made lawful to me: the earth has been made for me clean and a place of worship; **“I HAVE BEEN SENT TO ALL MANKIND AND THE LINE OF PROPHETS IS CLOSED WITH ME”** [Book 004, Number 1062: (Sahih Muslim)]

Hadith # 4

Abu Huraira reported Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as saying: The Last Hour would not come **“UNTIL THERE WOULD ARISE ABOUT THIRTY IMPOSTERS, LIARS, AND EACH ONE OF THEM WOULD CLAIM THAT HE IS A MESSENGER OF ALLAH”** [Book 041, Number 6988: (Sahih Muslim), Sahih Bukhari, Volume 9, Book 88, Number 237]

Hadith # 5

وإن الله لم يبعث نبيا إلا حذر أمته الدجال وأنا آخر الأنبياء وأنتم آخر الأمم وهو خارج فيكم لا محالة

Translation: The Prophet (Peace be upon him) said: Allah has not sent any Prophet who did not warn his nation about

Dajjal, but Now **“I AM THE LAST OF PROPHETS (آخر الأنبياء)”** and you are the last Ummah (آخر الأمم), he will for sure arise from amongst you [Sunnan Ibn Majah, Hadith # 4067]

Hadith # 6

وإنه سيكون في أمتي ثلاثون كذابون كلهم يزعم أنه نبي وأنا خاتم النبيين لا نبي بعدي

Translation: The Prophet (Peace be upon him) said: There will arise 30 (grand) Liars (ثلاثون كذابون) from my Ummah, each of them will claim that he is the Prophet whereas **“I AM KHATAM AN NABIYEEN AND THERE IS NO PROPHET AFTER ME (لا نبي بعدي)”** [Sunnan Tirimdhi , Hadith # 2202]

Imam Tirimdhi Said after this hadith:

هذا حديث حسن صحيح

Translation: This Hadith is “HASSAN SAHIH”

The Hadith is also narrated in Sunnan ABU Dawud, Hadith # 4252

Hadith # 7

Narrated S'ad: Allah's Apostle set out for Tabuk. appointing 'Ali as his deputy (in Medina). 'Ali said, "Do you want to leave me with the children and women?" The Prophet said, "Will you not be pleased that you will be to me like Aaron to Moses? **“BUT THERE WILL BE NO PROPHET**

AFTER ME” [Volume 5, Book 59, Number 700: (Sahih Bukhari)]

Hadith # 8

Narrated Abu Huraira: The Prophet said, "The Israelis used to be ruled and guided by prophets: Whenever a prophet died, another would take over his place. **”THERE WILL BE NO PROPHET AFTER ME, BUT THERE WILL BE CALIPHS WHO WILL INCREASE IN NUMBER** ”The people asked, "O Allah's Apostle! What do you order us (to do)?" He said, "Obey the one who will be given the pledge of allegiance first. Fulfil their (i.e. the Caliphs) rights, for Allah will ask them about (any shortcoming) in ruling those Allah has put under their guardianship." [Volume 4, Book 56, Number 661: (Sahih Bukhari)]

Hadith # 9

The Prophet of (Peace be upon him) said: I am the Slave of Allah and I was a Last Prophet (saw) in (sight) of Allah when Adam’s Khameer was being created [Imam al Baihaqi in Shu'ab ul Imaan Volume 2 Page No. 134, Imam Hakim in his Mustadrak declared Its chain to be Sahih]

Hence Prophethood was finished at Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) even when Adam (a.s) was not yet created!

Hadith # 10

On the day of ressuruction people will run to all Prophets

asking for help and intercession, the hadith states[It's long one, so part of it is stated below]:

They will come to me and say, 'O Muhammad ! You are Allah's Apostle and **“THE LAST OF THE PROPHETS”** and Allah forgave your early and late sins. (Please) intercede for us with your Lord. Don't you see in what state we are?[Sahih Bukhari, Volume 6, Book 60, Number 236]

The whole hadith proves that People shall run to different Prophets but **“FINALLY”** come to Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) who shall intercede for them, this hadith clearly proves the Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) shall be the Last towards whom they will run

Hadith # 11

Hadrat Jabir bin Abdullah (ra) narrates that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said: I am the leader of all Prophets and there is no boast, I am the Last of all Prophets and there is no boast [Sunnan al Darimi, Hadith # 50]

Hadith # 12

Once the Prophet (Peace be upon him) came to us in a way as If he is leaving us, then he said thrice: I am Muhammad the Ummi Prophet (Salallahu alaihi wasalam) and there is no Prophet after me [Musnad Ahmed bin Hanbal, Volume No. 2, Page No. 172, Sheikh Ahmed Shakir in Takhrij of it: The chain of this Hadith is “Hassan”]

Hadith # 13

The Propht (Peace be upon him) said: **There is no Prophet after me, and there is no Ummah after you**, so you should worship your Lord and say your 5 daily prayers, and fast in your month (Ramadan), obey your leaders and thus enter the Blessed garden of your Lord [Imam Tabarani in Muj'am al Kabir, Volume No. 8, Hadith # 7217]

Hadith # 14

Hadrat Abu Dhar (ra) narrates that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) told him: The first Prophet is Adam and the last one is Muhammad (salallaho alaihi wasalam) [Kanz ul amaal, Hadith # 32269]

Hadith # 15

Hadrat Uqba bin Aamir (ra) narrates that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said: Had there been a Prophet after me then It would have been Umar [Sunnan Tirimdhi, Hadith # 3272]

Hadith # 16

Narrated Jubair bin Mutim: Allah's Apostle said, "I have five names: I am Muhammad and Ahmad; I am Al-Mahi through whom Allah will eliminate infidelity; I am Al-Hashir who will be the first to be resurrected, the people being resurrected there after; **“AND I AM ALSO AL-AQIB(I.E. THERE WILL BE NO PROPHET AFTER ME)”** [Volume 4, Book 56, Number 732: (Bukhari)]

Hadith # 17

Narrated Isma'il: I asked Abi Aufa, "Did you see Ibrahim, the son of the Prophet?" He said, "Yes, but he died in his early childhood. Had there been a Prophet after Muhammad then his son would have lived, **“BUT THERE IS NO PROPEHT AFTER HIM”** [Volume 8, Book 73, Number 214: (Bukhari)]

Hadith # 18

عن ابن عباس عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال أنا أحمد ومحمد والحاشر والمقفي والخاتم

Translation:Hadrat Ibn Abbas (ra) narrates that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said: I am Ahmed, Muhammad, Hashir, Maqfi (One who is sent in the last) and I am “KHATIM” [Imam Tabarani in Muj'am as Saghir, Hadith # 152]

Hadith # 19

Qatada narrates that when the Prophet (Peace be upon him) recited the Ayah { And when We exacted a covenant from the prophets, and from thee (O Muhammad) and from Noah... 33:7} he said: The goodness was started through me and I am the last amongst all Prophets to be sent [Muassanaf Ibn Abi Shaybah, Hadith # 31753]

Hadith # 20

The Prophet (Peace be upon him) said: Abu Bakr (ra) is the best amongst all people (after me) **“BUT HE IS NOT A PROPHET”** [Al Kamil by Ibn Adi, Volume No. 6, Page No. 484]

This hadith is shown as a proof that had there been any Prophet after Prophet (Peace be upon him) then Sahaba deserved the best of it, but even Sayyidna Abu Bakr (ra) was not a Prophet as is clearly and explicitly mentioned in this hadith.

Qadiyanis use a weak narration from Musannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah which states:

حدثنا حسين بن محمد، قال: حدثنا جرير بن حازم، عن عائشة، قالت: قولوا: خاتم النبيين، ولا تقولوا: لا نبي بعده

Aisha (ra) said: Say Khatam an Nabiyeen but do not say, there is no Prophet after him (Musannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah # 26653)

This is a Munqati (disconnected/broken) weak narration because Jarir bin Hazem (rah) was born in 85 or 88 AH whereas Sayyida Aisha (ra) died in 58 AH

Plus Mirza Qadiyani said: Other books of Hadith will only be in this case capable of being accepted that they are not against Quran and agreed upon hadiths of Bukhari and Muslim (Ruhani Khazain 10/60. See footnote)

Now the wording La Nabi Baadi is used in agreed upon Bukhari and Muslim hadiths. See Sahih Bukhari # 3455. And Sahih Muslim # 1842 a

Also In Sahih Muslim this wording is used, See # 2404 a. And also in Sahih Bukhari # 6194

Similar hadith is also there having wording from Mughira bin Shu'ba (ra) in Musannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah # 26654 that saying Khatam al Anbiya is enough. It also has wording about Jesus (a.s) coming before and after Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him). It is weak too because of narrator Mujalid bin Saeed upon whom majority have done Jarh.

It states in Tafsir of Yahya bin Salam 2/723 that Aisha (ra) said: Do not say La Nabi Baada Muhammad but say Khatam an Nabiyeen. Indeed Isa ibn Maryum (a.s) will descend as a Just ruler and a Just leader. He will kill the Dajjal, break the cross, kill the swine (s), abolish the Jiziyah and war will end.

This narration is weak as well because Rabi' bin Subayh (rah) has Jarh on him which is summarised by Imam Ibn Hajr al Asqalani (rah) in his Taqrib at Tahdheeb # 1895 that he was truthful but سيء الحفظ....

This is a Mufasar Jarh. Many scholars criticized him too whereas others praised. The Jarh will supercede. We will still explain actual meaning of such narrations ahead.

Secondly these Mawquf narrations go against Marfu hadiths of Sahihayn (Bukhari and Muslim) and also other authentic

Marfu hadiths which emphatically prove saying La Nabi Baadi. We have quoted Mirza Qadiyani himself that hadiths in OTHER BOOKS which contradict Qur'an and agreed upon hadiths of Bukhari and Muslim cannot be taken. Also Mirza Qadiyani has used hadith of La Nabi Baadi in his statements, which we will present later.

Thirdly they are talking about Isa ibn Maryum (a.s) coming again by himself without new Shariah but will follow Shariah of Muhammad (Peace be upon him) and do things which Mirza Qadiyani bin Charagh bibi never did. So Isa a.s will come and that will not affect the finality of Prophethood. For example Prophets prayed behind our last Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) during his journey of Isra wal Mi'raj. When that did not affect finality of Prophethood at that time then similarly it will not affect when Jesus (a.s) who was actually a previous prophet and not later, will descend again. We have discussed the issue of Hayat (life) of Isa a.s and he descending again in detail later in this article.

Consensus of Muslim scholars and Ummah

Imam al Qadhi Iyaadh (rah) the author of magnificent Seerah work i.e. Ash-Shifa, he writes:

We declare that person as Kafir who considers someone along with you or after you as a Prophet, just like this we also declare him Kafir who claims that “Revelation (Wahi)” is sent to him even if he does not claim propethood, **Thus all such people are “DISBELIEVERS”** because they do Takdhib of Prophet (i.e. call him liar – Naudhobillah). The Prophet (Peace Be Upon hIm) has informed us that he is “KHATAM AN NABIYEEN” and “NO PROPHET WILL

COME AFTER HIM” and that “HE HAS BEEN SENT TO ALL PEOPLE” The ummah is unanimous that this Kalaam is to be taken on its apparent and there is no room for any Tawil, or Takhsis **and the Kufr of such people is Qat’i (i.e. Definite) Ijmai (i.e. unanimously agreed)** [Ash Shifa, Page No. 237-238]

The great Hanafi Imams, Allama Khafaji (rah) and Mullah Ali Qari (rah) have also endorsed this strongly in Naseem ur Riyaz, Volume No. 6, Page No. 355-256, Sharh ash-Shifa Volume No. 2, Page No. 515-516]

Imam Ghazzali (Rahimuhullah), The Hujjat ul Islam (i.e. Proof of Islam), he said:

We have known through “Consensus” that La Nabi B’adi (There is no Prophet after me) proves that the door to Prophethood has been permanently closed after Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) and the word “Khatam an Nabiyeen” also includes “MUTLAQ ANBIYA (all anbiya)” We (Muslims and their scholars) are thus certain that there is no room for any kind of Tawil (interpolation/interpretation) or Takhsis (to make specific such as nabi could come in this form or that form – Naudhobillah) . Whosoever does Tawil in this hadith then he is Munkir of Consensus [Al Itisaad fil Itiqaad, Page No. 163]

Imam Ibn Qudama al Maqdisi the great Hanbali Imam, said:

Whosoever claims Prophethood **or one who accepts his claim then (both) become “APOSTATES”** because

when Musaylma Kaddhab claimed to be Prophet and his people testified to it then all of them became apostates along with him [Al Mugni, Volume No. 9, Page No. 33, Published Dr al Fikr, Beirut, Lebanon]

The Constitution Law of Pakistan states

298-B

Misuse of epithets, descriptions and titles etc., reserved for certain holy personages or places.

...Any person of the Qadiani group or Lahori group (who call themselves “Ahmadis” or by any other name) who by words, either spoken or written, or by visible representation, refers to the mode or form of call to prayers followed by his faith as “Azan”, or recites Azan as used by the Muslims, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to three years, and shall also be liable to fine.

298-C

Person of Qadiani group, etc., calling himself a Muslim or preaching or propagating his faith.

Any person of the Qadiani group or the Lahori group (who call themselves “Ahmadis” or by any other name), who, directly or indirectly, poses himself as a Muslim, or calls, or refers to, his faith as Islam, or preaches or propagates his faith, or invites others to accept his faith, by words, either spoken or written, or by visible representations, or in any manner whatsoever outrages the religious feelings of Muslims, shall be punished with imprisonment of either

description for a term which may extend to three years and shall also be liable to fine.

The False Prophet

A person by the name of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiyani declared himself to be a Mahdi and started misleading the Muslim by his false claims. Later on he went few steps ahead, and declared himself as a Prophet and as well as Isa ibn Maryam, rather claimed that he was all Prophets (Naudhobillah). Now let us see the reality of this Dajjal and his falsehood. Note: Some parts shall be emphasized.

Mirza claiming Prophethood

1. Mirza said: ...One person was presented by his opponent an objection that the person you have pledged to (i.e. Mirza) claims to be a Prophet and Messenger (Rasul), the answer to which was mere rejection, **"ALTHOUGH SUCH AN ANSWER IS NOT CORRECT" The truth is that God's that pure revelation (Wahi) which descends on me, it contains such words like Rasul or Mursal, or Nabi, not once but many times.** Then how could this answer be correct that such words are not there... One of them is revelation (Wahi) of Allah that It is He who sent His Messenger with guidance and the religion of truth to manifest it over all religion. (Qur'an 48:28), see page 498 in Barahin Ahmadiyya, **in this the humble me has been clearly called Rasul.** Then after this there is revelation of God in my regard i.e. Messenger of God in outfit of Prophets, see Barahin Ahmadiyya page 504. Then in this same book near to this dialogue **there is revelation (Wahi) of God that Muḥammad is the Messenger of**

Allāh; and those with him are forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves.(Qur'an 48:29). In this revelation of God I have been named Muhammad and also a Messenger. Then this is revelation of God which is stated on page 557 of Barahin Ahmadiyya that A warner came in the world, the second qiraat of it is that Nabi has come in the world. In this manner this humble one is remembered at many places as Messenger (Rasul) (Roohani Khazain 18/206-207. Translation of verses are from Sahih International translation. Brackets added by author of this article)

Then Mirza makes long discussion that how could he be Prophet after Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) being Khatam an Nabiyeen (i.e. Seal/Last of Prophets)- The summary of what he said is that Muslims have false belief about Jesus coming again as a Nabi whether new or old no Prophet can come. This proves the aqida to be perfect testimony of being a clear lie due to verse of Khatam an Nabiyeen and hadith La Nabi Baadi (i.e. There cannot be a Prophet after Prophet Muhammad Peace be upon him), Then he says he perfectly and truthfully believes in the verse of Khatam an Nabiyeen. He further says all windows of Prophethood have closed except one window of Seerat Sadiqi i.e. becoming annihilated in Prophet and one who comes to Allah from the way of this window, then he wears cloak as a Zill (literally meaning shadow) of Prophet and wears cloak of Prophet Muhammad's Prophethood..The prophethood of Muhammad comes to him in form of Burooz (re-emergence)...Hence my Prophethood and Messengership is due to being Muhammad and Ahmad and this name was given to me due to being annihilated in Rasul...he also says that meaning of word Nabi in dictionary is one who receives information from God and gives news of unseen, so where these meanings become truly applied then

word of Nabi will also be truly applied. It is a condition of Nabi to be a Rasul, If he is not Rasul then he cannot receive news of unseen...then he says the difference is that after our Prophet (Muhammad Peace be upon him) there would not come any Prophet upon whom new Shariat would descend...then he talks about proving himself as zilli and second coming of Muhammad (Peace be upon him)...

Let us see how Qadiyanis understand the word Burooz. Mirza's son Bashir Ahmad said:

It means that the Promised Messiah (i.e. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani) is not something separate to Nabi Kareem (Muhammad) Peace be upon him. He is the same who will appear in Burooz shade again in world..... In this way is there any doubt left that God descended Muhammad Peace be upon him again to Qadian (i.e Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiyani) (Kalimatul Fasl, Page: 104-105. Brackets added)

Note by author Aamir Ibrahim: Remember the issue of life or death of Isa ibn Maryum (a.s) and him descending again by himself is the favourite topic which Qadiyanis distort and put forward to deceive ordinary Muslims. However we should first talk about false claims, lies, and character of Mirza with Qadiyanis- We will talk about Isa ibn Maryum (a.s) being raised alive and shall by himself descend again under Mirza's claim that he received so called special divine inspiration that Maseeh Ibn Maryum has died.

2. Mirza said: "I am Maseeh-e-Zamaan (Messiah of time), I am the Kaleem-e-Khuda (Moses) I am Muhammad Peace be upon him, I am Ahmad Peace be upon him ,Mujtaba." (Qadiyani's own book: Tiryaq-ul-Quloob P.3 Roohani

Khazain Vol.15 P.134. Brackets added but are in relevance to what Mirza said)

AstaghfirUllah, the editor of this article (Aamir Ibrahim) wants to clarify that such disgusting statements are only shown in refutation of Qadiyani filth, otherwise we consider such statements to be disrespectful to mention without such a cause.

Mirza Declares himself as "ALL" Prophets whether in zill or burooz, it is clear kufr which makes Mirza Qadiyani an apostate

1. "No Prophet has passed in the world whose name has not been given to me. Thus as God has said in Braheen-e-Ahmadiyya I am Adam, I am Noah, I am Abraham, I am Isaac, I am Jacob, I am Ishmael, I am Moses, I am David, I am Jesus son of Mary, I am Muhammad Peace be upon him, that is as burooz. As God has attributed all these names to me, and said regarding me جری اللہ فی حل الانبیاء that is Prophet of God in the outfit of Prophets. Thus it was necessary that the eminence of each Prophet is present in me and one attribute of each Prophet is revealed through me." (Tatumma Haqeeqatul Wahi P.84, 85 Roohani Khazain Vol.22 P.521)

2. "In this revelation of God, God has kept my name Rusul because as it is written in Barahin-e-Ahmadiyya, God the Exalted has designated me as a manifestation of all prophets upon them be peace, and has ascribed the names of all prophets to me. I am Adam, I am Seth, I am Noah, I am Abraham, I am Isaac, I am Ishmael, I am Jacob, I am Joseph, I am Moses, I am David, I am Jesus and I am the perfect manifestation of the name of Holy Prophet Peace be

upon him, that is as zill I am Muhammad Peace be upon him and Ahmad Peace be upon him" (Footnote, Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi P.72 Roohani Khazain Vol.22 P.76)

3. "I am sometimes Adam, sometimes Moses, sometimes Jacob. Moreover I am Abraham, my generations are countless." (Braheen-e-Ahmadiyya, Part 5, Durre-Sameen P.100 Roohani Vol.21 P.133)

4. Mirza said: In this era God wanted that all those Pious and Truthful, Holy Prophets who have passed, should appear in the models of the being of one man, so that is me." (Braheen-e-Ahmadiyya part 5 P.90 Roohani Khazain Vol.21 P.117-118)

Mirza in his ignorance declares himself as "KAFIR"

Mirza Qadiyani said

1. I consider the claimant of Nabuwat and Risalat as liar and Kafir after Sayyidna wa Mawlana Hazrat Muhammad Mustafa salallahu alaihi wasalam Khatam al Mursaleen. I am certain that revelation of Risalat started from Adam the chosen one and **"ENDED"** at Janab Rasul Ullah Muhammad Mustafa salallahu alaihi wasalam [Majmua Ishtiharat, Volume No. 1, Page No. 230-231)

2. In Quran Shareef there is no mention of Maseeh Ibn Maryam coming again anywhere, however Khatam e Nabuwat is perfectly mentioned, to differentiate between old and new Prophets is a naughtiness, this differentiation is not found in either Hadith nor Quran, the hadith "La

Nabi Badi” is also “GENERAL REJECTION” therefore how daring and courageous and disrespectful it would be to follow lowly thoughts and intentionally leave aside the “DEFINITE PROOFS” in Quran and to believe that after Khatam al Anbiya a Nabi can come, also to re-start the sisilsila of Wahi of Prophethood after it had been stopped because whosoever has quality of Nabuwat then his Wahi is without any doubt a Wahi of Nabuwat [Mirza Qadiyani in Ruhani Khazain, Volume No. 14, Pages 392-393]

3. It is not the quality of Allah that He sends a Nabi after “Khatam an Nabiyeen” nor is it His quality to start the new chain of Propethood again "AFTER IT BEING ENDED" and to abrogate some Ahkaam of Qur'an and add something to it, and go against His promise [Ruhani Khazain, Volume No. 5, Page No. 377]

4. Mirza said: I believe that our Nabi Muhammad (Peace be upon him) is Khatam al Anbiya, and our book Quran Kareem is the means to guidance... And I believe that our Rasul is leader of children of Adam and leader of Messengers, AND ALLAH HAS BROUGHT END TO PROPHETS THROUGH YOU [Ruhani Khazain, Volume No. 5, Page No. 21]

Note by Aamir Ibrahim: Whether someone considers himself Zilli or Buroozi Nabi or any form of Nabi, claims to receive Wahi, is Munkar of Finality of Prophethood and becomes Kafir/Murtad.

Mirza claiming to be Promised Messiah

1. "I proclaim that I am the Promised Messiah about whom every God's pure book has prophesied that he will appear in

the Last Era"(Tohfa-e-Golravia, Roohani Khazain vol. 17 p.295)

2. "I swear upon that God, who has sent me and fabricating on Him is the work of accursed ones, He has sent me as Promised Messiah." (Majmoo'a-e-Ishtiharaat vol. 3 p.435)

Mirza going through Menses and having a child inside him which is like Child of Allah (One of his most absurd and vulgar imaginations through which he tried to claim himself as Isa Ibn Maryam)

3. Mirza said : Babu Ilahi Bukhsh wants to see "YOUR MENSTRUATION" or get information on some "FILTH AND IMPURITY" but God will show you his rewards, which will be continuous, and in you there is no menstruation but "THAT CHILD HAS DEVELOPED", such a child who is like the "CHILDREN OF ALLAH" (Tatumma Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi, Roohani Khazain vol. 22 p.581)

4. The insults go on: In Kastih-e-Nuh it states summary of which is: The spirit of Jesus was infused in me like it was infused in Mary and allegorically I was rendered pregnant. Not more than ten months had passed when I was made Jesus from Mary. That is how I became Jesus, son of Mary.(Kashti-Nooh pg 47- Ruhani Khazain. Vol. 19, Page 50)

Dajjal receiving so called divine Inspiratons, and also saying absurd things.

1. "This is why God sent me and has made apparent to me in his special divine inspiration that Maseeh Ibne Maryam

has died." (Tauzeeh-e-Maram, Roohani Khazain vol. 3 p.402)

Note by author Aamir Ibrahim: The opinion of Ahlus Sunnah i.e. Ahlus Sunnah Barelwi, Deobandi, and Ahlul Hadith, even Shia (i.e. Twelvers) is that Isa ibn Maryum (a.s) was raised alive and shall descend again before end times.

According to Ahlus Sunnah he will rule as just judge, break the cross, kill swine (s) , kill dajjal, and all people of the book shall believe in him in totality. He will go to Madina and address Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) at his grave and shall be buried next to Muhammad (Peace be upon him). None of which Mirza Qadiyani (LA) did as Mirza was first of all not Isa Ibn Maryum but rather Mirza Ghulam Ahmad bin Charagh Bibi.

Also Jews and Christians did not accept him as Messiah in totality [rather not even very few especially Jews. Also Jews and Christians of western world and elsewhere hardly recognized Mirza Qadiyani, let alone accepted him in great numbers as Promised Messiah. A former Qadiyani Nabeel Qureshi who is now dead, had converted to Christianity, some other people have converted to Christianity too. Mirza Qadiyani himself accepted which is paraphrased: "Some Muslims (who were Qadiyanis but due to Mirza's debate had become Christians and Mirza said he had expelled them from Jamaat already) after this divine inspiration became Christians, to consider this proof over truthfulness of Christians is wickedness--then he makes boastful claim that many Christians accepted Islam i.e. Qadiyanism See Ruhani Khazain, 9/28, footnote. Qadiyanis have accepted that hundreds of Muslim scholars in time of Mirza left Islam and

became priests. Also remember Abdullah Atham the arch Christian opponent of Mirza was a former Muslim too who converted to Christianity, and he never came back to Islam] nor did Mirza become a just judge all over the world, nor did he break the cross i.e. Christianity of wrong form did not become completely false in his time nor they all accepted Islam, nor did he kill pigs i.e. Christians did not stop eating pigs, which has not happened till today. All this will happen after Haqiqi Nazul of Isa ibn Maryum (a.s).

However if some people like Javed Ahmad Ghamdi and some others even if in past differed with this then that does not affect the dominant opinion. Even for argument's sake it is assumed that Jesus (a.s) died (although he for sure did not) then we should discuss core issues with Qadiyanis like we mentioned before i.e. issues like his false claims, lies, and his character. Also remember Jesus (a.s) will come as a follower of Muhammad (Peace be upon him). He was a previous Prophet not later to Muhammad (Peace be upon him), so him coming again does not affect the finality of Prophethood. For example Prophets prayed behind Muhammad (Peace be upon him) during his journey of Isra wal Mi'raj. So just like it did not affect finality of our Prophet then, then similarly it will not do so when Jesus (a.s) comes again. We have written elsewhere about meanings of words Mutawafeeka or Tawafaytani used about Jesus (a.s) in Qur'an due to which Qadiyanis try to deceive Muslims that Jesus (a.s) has died. Mutawafeeka or Tawafaytani also mean making something complete (without death) or death in form of sleep but not real death. Also they mean to take. **Regarding Jesus being alive and coming again read Qur'anic verses 4:157-159. Also see 43:61. Also 3:55 where word Mutawafeeka is translated by almost all translators**

not as death. Due to brevity issue the author shall use just one Tafsir of this verse:

Tafsir al-Jalalyn explains as: And mention when God said ‘O Jesus I am gathering you seizing you **and raising you to Me away from the world without death...** [Tafsir al-Jalalyn under 3:55]

Also verse 5:117 where almost all translate word Tawafaytani not to be death.

Many Tafaseer could be shown.

Under 43:61, Imam Ibn Kathir (rah) said:

Mujahid said: (And he shall be a sign for (the coming of) the Hour.) means, sign and "One of the signs of the Hour will be the appearance of `Isa son of Maryam before the Day of Resurrection. " Something similar was also narrated from Abu Hurayrah, Ibn `Abbas, `Abu Al-`Aliyah, Abu Malik, `Ikrimah, Al-Hasan, Qatadah, Ad-Dahhak and others. **Many Mutawatir Hadiths report that the Messenger of Allah said that `Isa will descend before the Day of Resurrection as a just ruler and fair judge.** (See Tafsir Ibn Kathir, Online English version under 43:61)

Under 4:159. Let us share detailed extract from Tafsir Ibn Kathir:

Allah said,

وَإِنْ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ إِلَّا لِيُؤْمِنَنَّ بِهِ قَبْلَ مَوْتِهِ وَيَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ يَكُونُ عَلَيْهِمْ شَهِيداً

(And there is none of the People of the Scripture, but must believe in him, before his death. And on the Day of Resurrection, he will be a witness against them.) Ibn Jarir recorded that Ibn `Abbas commented, (And there is none of the People of the Scripture, but must believe in him, before his death.) **before the death of `Isa, son of Maryam, peace be upon him. Al-`Awfi reported similar from Ibn `Abbas. Abu Malik commented; (but must believe in him, before his death.) "This occurs after `Isa returns and before he dies, as then, all of the People of the Scriptures will believe in him."**

The Hadiths Regarding the Descent of `Isa Just Before the Day of Judgement, and his Mission

In the chapter about the Prophets in his Sahih, under, "The Descent of `Isa, Son of Maryam," Al-Bukhari recorded that Abu Hurayrah said that the Messenger of Allah said (By Him in Whose Hands my soul is, the **son of Maryam (`Isa) will shortly descend among you as a just ruler, and will break the cross, kill the pig and abolish the Jizyah. Then there will be an abundance of wealth and nobody will accept charitable gifts any more. At that time, one prostration will be better for them than this life and all that is in it.)** Abu Hurayrah then said, "Read if you will, (And there is none of the People of the Scripture, but must believe in him, before his death. And on the Day of Resurrection, he will be a witness against them.)" Muslim recorded this Hadith. So, Allah's

statement (before his death) **refers to the death of `Isa, son of Maryam.** Another Hadith by Abu Hurayrah Imam Ahmad recorded that Abu Hurayrah said that the Messenger of Allah said (`Isa will say Ihlal from the mountain highway of Ar-Rawha' for Hajj, `Umrah or both.) Muslim also recorded it. Ahmad recorded that Abu Hurayrah said that the Prophet said (**`Isa, son of Maryam, will descend and will kill the pig, break the cross,** lead the prayer in congregation and give away wealth until it is no longer accepted by anyone. He will also abolish the Jizyah and go to Ar-Rawha' from where he will go to perform Hajj, `Umrah or both.) Abu Hurayrah then recited (And there is none of the People of the Scripture, but must believe in him, before his death.) Hanzalah said, "Abu Hurayrah added, `Will believe in `Isa before `Isa dies,' but I do not know if this was a part of the Prophet's Hadith or if it was something that Abu Hurayrah said on his own. " Ibn Abi Hatim also recorded this Hadith.

Another Hadith

Al-Bukhari recorded that Abu Hurayrah said that the Messenger of Allah said (How will you be when Al-Masih, son of Maryam (`Isa) descends among you while your Imam is from among yourselves) Imam Ahmad and Muslim also recorded this Hadith.

Another Hadith

Imam Ahmad recorded that Abu Hurayrah said that the Prophet said (The Prophets are paternal brothers; their mothers are different, but their religion is one. I, more than any of mankind, have more right to `Isa, son of Maryam, for there was no Prophet between him and I. He will descend,

and if you see him, know him. He is a well-built man, (the color of his skin) between red and white. He will descend while wearing two long, light yellow garments. His head appears to be dripping water, even though no moisture touched it. He will break the cross, kill the pig, and banish the Jizyah and will call the people to Islam. During his time, **Allah will destroy all religions except Islam and Allah will destroy Al-Masih Ad-Dajjal (the False Messiah). Safety will then fill the earth,** so much so that the lions will mingle with camels, tigers with cattle and wolves with sheep. Children will play with snakes, and they will not harm them. **`Isa will remain for forty years and then will die, and Muslims will offer the funeral prayer for him.)** Abu Dawud also recorded it. End-quote (See: Online English version of Tafsir Ibn Kathir under 4:159. Rather also previous verses)

As we are honest so let us show Tafsir al Jalalyn of which one part can go against us. However the second part is the more relied upon opinion.

It states in Tafsir al Jalalyn under 4:159:

And there is not one of the People of the Scripture but will assuredly believe in him, in Jesus, before his death, that is, [before the death] of one belonging to the People of the Scripture upon seeing the angels of death with his very eyes, at which point his faith will not profit him; **or [it means] before the death of Jesus, after he descends at the approach of the Hour, as is stated in hadith; and on the Day of Resurrection he, Jesus, will be a witness against them, of what they did when he was sent to them.**

End-quote.

Note: Even Tafsir al Jalalyn elsewhere clearly proves that Isa a.s was raised alive without death as we showed before. Hence Qadiyanis should understand as a whole and not be like Jews taking some part and hiding other.

Now let us see hadiths with exact references. In one authentic hadith it says: Hudhaifa b. Usaid al-Ghifari reported:

Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) came to us all of a sudden as we were (busy in a discussion). He said: What do you discuss about? They (the Companions) said. We are discussing about the Last Hour. Thereupon he said: It will not come until you see ten signs before and (in this connection) he made a mention of the smoke, Dajjal, the beast, the rising of the sun from the west, "THE DESCENT OF JESUS SON OF MARY (ALLAH BE PLEASED WITH HIM)," the Gog and Magog, and land-slides in three places, one in the east, one in the west and one in Arabia at the end of which fire would burn forth from the Yemen, and would drive people to the place of their assembly. [Sahih Muslim # 2901 a or see # 6931 in online version)

There is chapter title in Sahih Muslim in Kitab ul Imaan Chapter 71:

The descent of 'Eisa bin Mariam to judge according to the Shari'ah of our Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him).

Note: Imam Bukhari also made a similar chapter as:

باب نُزُولِ عِيسَى ابْنِ مَرْيَمَ عَلَيْهِمَا السَّلَام

(See Book of Prophets, Chapter 49. Online version)

Then under chapter of Sahih Muslim are couple of hadiths narrated from which we will share some. (Note: Chapter titles of Sahih Muslim are made by Imam Nawawi according to a sound opinion)

It is narrated on the authority of Abu Huraira that the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) observed:

I swear by Allah that the son of Mary will certainly descend as a just judge and he would definitely break the cross, and kill swine and abolish Jizya and would leave the young she-camel and no one would endeavour to (collect Zakat on it). Spite, mutual hatred and jealousy against one another will certainly disappear and when he summons people to accept wealth, not even one would do so. (Sahih Muslim 155 c)

Another hadith from another Sahabi states:

Jabir b. 'Abdullah reported:

I heard the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) say: A section of my people will not cease fighting for the Truth and will prevail till the Day of Resurrection. He said: Jesus son of Mary would then descend and their (Muslims') commander would invite him to come and lead them in prayer, but he

would say: No, some amongst you are commanders over some (amongst you). This is the honour from Allah for this Ummah. (Sahih Muslim # 156)

Let us see a hadith from Sahih Bukhari too:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) said, "By Him in Whose Hands my soul is, **surely (Jesus,) the son of Mary will soon descend amongst you and will judge mankind justly (as a Just Ruler); he will break the Cross and kill the pigs and there will be no Jizya (i.e. taxation taken from non Muslims). Money will be in abundance so that nobody will accept it, and a single prostration to Allah (in prayer) will be better than the whole world and whatever is in it.**" Abu Huraira added **"If you wish, you can recite (this verse of the Holy Book): -- 'And there is none Of the people of the Scriptures (Jews and Christians) But must believe in him (i.e Jesus as an Apostle of Allah and a human being) BEFORE HIS DEATH.** And on the Day of Judgment He will be a witness Against them." (4.159) (See Fath-ul-Bari, Page 302 Vol 7) (Sahih Bukhari # 3448. See especially the wording: Before his death)

There are many other proofs too which have not been shown due to brevity issue. So it is established in Marfu form from Prophet (Peace be upon him) not just from Abu Hurraira (ra) but also other Sahaba as well that Jesus son of Mary (Peace be upon him) not Mirza Ghulam Ahmad bin Charagh bibi, will for sure descend and do the things as mentioned above.

Qadiyanis misuse this verse to say Isa (a.s) has died. It states in Qur'an

Muhammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is no more than a Messenger, **and indeed (many) Messengers have passed away before him.** If he dies or is killed, will you then turn back on your heels (as disbelievers)? And he who turns back on his heels, not the least harm will he do to Allâh; and Allâh will give reward to those who are grateful. (3:144. Muhsin/Hilali translation)

a) It does not say or use word "ALL" in most translations. Some translators translate it as: Many were the messenger that passed away before him. (Abdullah Yusuf Ali). Like many messengers that have passed before him. (Free Minds)...

Very few translated with word "ALL"

Even if we assume it means all, then Jesus (a.s) is excluded. Let us understand this from a verse of Qur'an about all those who are worshipped other than Allah will be fuel of Hell fire.

Qur'an states: Certainly you 'disbelievers' and whatever you worship instead of Allah will be the fuel of Hell. You are 'all' bound to enter it. (21:98. Dr. Mustafa Khattab translation).

Mushrikeen of Makkah worshipped Jinns who later turned Muslims but Mushrikeen of Makkah did not know even afterwards that they had become Muslims and kept on worshipping them. (See: Sahih Muslim 3030 b, c, also see

3030 d).So those pious Jinns will be fuel of hell fire too Naudhobillah?

Mushrikeen of Malkah considered angels as daughters of Allah.

Qur'an states: And they assign unto Allah daughters - Be He Glorified! - and unto themselves what they desire;When if one of them receiveth tidings of the birth of a female, his face remaineth darkened, and he is wroth inwardly.

(Qur'an 16:57-58. Translation of M.Pickthall)

So would they angels also be fuel of hell fire Naudhobillah? Plus scholars said: (Prophets like) Uzayr, Isa, and Angels Peace be upon them are not included in this verse. (See Tafsir al Qurtubi towards end under this verse)

Let us also understand from a hadith- It states in a Hadith of Prophet (Peace be upon him): ... Every (Kullu) newly-invented thing is an innovation and every innovation is going astray, and every going astray is in the Fire.(See: Sunnan Nasai'i #1578. Hadith is Sahih and very famous. Brackets added).

However Genuine Ahlus Sunnah believe due to other verses and narrations that those innovations are good or could be good which do not oppose Islamic sources, and have a basis in Shariah. Like for example celebrating Mawlid of Prophet (Peace be upon him). Plus scholars innovated new things like Ilm ur Rijaal, putting I'raab on Qur'an etc... Many scholars have said, Innovations are of two types i.e. Praiseworthy and blameworthy.

Qadiyanis misuse verses of Qur'an which we will show in context, about Allah asking Jesus (a.s) if he told his people to worship him and Mary...about Jesus (a.s) being witness over them till he was alive (Note: Verse does not use word alive but being with them or dwelt among them), but after his death (whereas verse says after you took me up, as we explained word Tawafaytani above in regards to this verse) only Allah knows what they did. From these, Qadiyanis by going against other verses and hadiths which we showed above, say, If Jesus was alive and in real sense had to come himself again then why would he say to Allah I was witness over them while I was alive (actually dwelt among them) i.e. when Jews and Christians will believe in him before his actual death then how could Jesus (a.s) reply in such a manner?

Let us first see the verses:

And [beware the Day] when Allāh will say, "O Jesus, Son of Mary, did you say to the people, "Take me and my mother as deities besides Allāh?" He will say, "Exalted are You! It was not for me to say that to which I have no right. If I had said it, You would have known it. You know what is within myself, and I do not know what is within Yourself. Indeed, it is You who is Knower of the unseen.

I said not to them except what You commanded me - to worship Allāh, my Lord and your Lord. **And I was a witness over them as long as I was among them; but when You took me up, You were the Observer over them, and You are, over all things, Witness.**

[Qur'an 5:116-117. Saheeh International translation. In footnote of Dr. Mustafa Khattab's translation, it says: **This refers to the ascension of Jesus Christ. See footnote for 3:54 End-quote. Actually 3:55. Note: This exchange of words in Qur'an is about when Jesus son of Mary (a.s) was ascended to heaven and what People did behind him after that.** However when he comes again Jews and Christians will believe in him in totality like we proved above from Qur'an, Hadith, and Tafsir]

There are couple of more answers to this.

a) Qur'an, and established Sunnah coming from multiple sources cannot contradict each other. Qadiyanis in order to prove their Dajjal Mirza as truthful try to confuse Muslims and imply that Quran and multiple authentic hadiths contradict each other (Naudhobillah).

b) Scholars from past till today have believed in majority that Jesus son of Mary (a.s) was raised alive and shall descend again as actual Isa ibn Maryum, not in form of Ghulam Ahmad Qadiyani bin Charagh bibi. Now did these luminaries not understand Arabic and Qur'an? We have already said that some people like Ghamdi or even some from past, differing on this issue does not have affect.

c) it states in Tafaseer from which we will show one from Tafsir al Jalalyn. Although this verse was shown before too. It states in Tafsir al Jalalyn

I only said to them that which You commanded me to say and that is “Worship God my Lord and your Lord.” And I was a witness a watcher over them preventing them from

saying what they used to say "**WHILST I WAS AMONGST THEM; BUT WHEN YOU TOOK ME TO YOU WHEN YOU RAISED ME UP TO THE HEAVEN.** You were Yourself the Watcher over them the Observer of their deeds and You Yourself are Witness over all things Aware and knowing them including what I said to them and what they said after me and whatever else.
End-quote.

Qadiyanis use an athar from Ibn Abbas (ra) in Sahih Bukhari which says that Ibn Abbas (ra) interpreted word Mutawafeeka regarding Isa (a.s) as Mumituka (i.e. cause you to die). See Sahih Bukhari. Kitab of Tafseer in Chapter 13 after Hadith # 4622. Note: It is narrated in Chapter title of Bukhari without chain. But its chain is mentioned in other books. Ahlus Sunnah in majority do not consider all narrations of Sahih Bukhari in chapter titles to be authentic. Even if some scholars claimed so then they were and are wrong. Plus even if Imam Bukhari (rah) may have considered them authentic but they are not necessarily authentic to others and rightly so.

Salafi scholar Zubayr Ali Zai and some others have declared it weak (Munqati) saying Ali bin Abi Talha did not meet Ibn Abbas (ra), this is right though [See: Taqrib ut Tahdhib of Imam Ibn Hajr Asqalani which states that he used to do Irsal upon Ibn Abbas (i.e. did not meet Ibn Abbas RA nor hear from him). Imam Ibn Hajr also said He is truthful BUT MAKES MISTAKES. See Narrator Ali bin Abi Talha # 4754. Also see Meezan al A'itdal of Imam Dhahabi narrator Ali bin Abi Talha # 5870- In Tahdhib ut Tahdhib of Imam Ibn Hajr Asqalani, there is criticism on Ali bin Abi Talha too like for example: Imam Ahmad said, his things are Munkaraat, Abu Dawood said, InshaAllah he is mustaqeem al hadith BUT HIS OPINION IS BAD. Imam Duhaim said He did not hear

Tafsir from Ibn Abbas (ra). Yaqub bin Sufyan said: He is Daeef in hadith, Munkar, his madhab is not praiseworthy...he is not Matrook, (but) and not Hujjah]

However we know that some scholars have accepted Tafseeri narrations of Ali bin Abi Talha from Ibn Abbas (ra) in spite him not meeting or hearing from Ibn Abbas (ra). But It should be remembered that principles cannot be changed and those scholars be accepted. Also there is criticism on Ali bin Abi Talha, hence especially in an important issue like this one the qawl cannot be accepted or be interpreted like we will do ahead, but on other issues relating to general matters his Tafseeri narration from Ibn Abbas (ra) may be accepted. Anyways we will discuss it further for the sake of argument.

Here are couple of answers to this.

a) Ibn Kathir (rah) makes detailed discussion and said which is paraphrased: Mufasireen differed over the verse {Indeed I will take you and raise you to Myself. 3:55. Dr.Mustafa Khattab translation}. Qatada and others said: This refers to Taqdeem and Takheer (Urdu words used for Arabic words to explain i.e.Raising is first and then cause you to die is later) “I will raise you towards Myself and then cause you to die,” meaning after that. Ibn Abbas (RA) said Mutawafeeka means Mumituka i.e cause you to die. Wahb bin Munaba (rah) said: While God was raising you, He made you die for three hours in the start of day. Ibn Ishaq said: Nasara (Christians) presumed that Allah made you die for seven hours and then made you alive. Wahb said: After death for three days Allah made you alive and took you up. Matr al Waraq said: Meaning I will complete you in

world, It does not mean death here. Just like this Ibn Jarir (rah) said Tawafi here means Rafa (raising).

Many (Mufasireen) said that death here means sleep as at another place Qur'an states: He is the One Who calls back your souls (Yatawafakum) by night.. (Qur'an 6:60. Dr. Mustafa Khattab translation. Brackets added). (Meaning Allah makes you die at night i.e. makes you asleep). There is a verse (elsewhere) which states: 'It is' Allah 'Who' calls back the souls (Yatawafa) 'of people' upon their death as well as 'the souls' of the living during their sleep. Then He keeps those for whom He has ordained death, and releases the others until 'their' appointed time. Surely in this are signs for people who reflect. (Qur'an 39:42. Dr. Mustafa Khattab translation. We showed full verse. Brackets added)...

There is Hadith that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) after waking up from sleep used to say: All the thanks are due to Allah Who brought us back to life after He had caused us to die (sleep)...Then Ibn Kathir continues, and quotes verses: For their denial and outrageous accusation against Mary, and for boasting, "We killed the Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, the messenger of Allah." But they neither killed nor crucified him—it was only made to appear so. Even those who argue for this 'crucifixion' are in doubt. They have no knowledge whatsoever—only making assumptions. They certainly did not kill him. Rather, Allah raised him up to Himself. And Allah is Almighty, All-Wise. Every one of the People of the Book will definitely believe in him before his death. And on the Day of Judgment Jesus will be a witness against them. (Qur'an 4:156-159. Dr. Mustafa Khattab translation)

The dhamir of Qabla Mawtihi i.e. before his death (in 4:159) is returning to Isa (a.s) i.e. All people of the book will believe in Isa (a.s) when he will descend on earth before Qiyamah...HENCE ALL PEOPLE OF THE BOOK WILL BELIEVE IN HIM, he will not take Jiziya nor accept anything other than Islam... Ibn Ibn Abi Hatim has narration from Hadrat Hasan regarding verse Inni Mutawafeeka that it means, Sleep was put upon him (Jesus) and he was raised by Allah in the state of sleep. Hadrat Hasan said, Prophet (Peace be upon him) said to Jews: Isa (a.s) did not die and he will return towards you before Qiyamah. And God Almighty says: {And purify [i.e., free] you from those who disbelieve. 3:55. Dr Mustafa Khattab translation} meaning by raising you to heaven {And make those who follow you [in submission to Allāh alone] superior to those who disbelieve until the Day of Resurrection. 3:55, Dr.Mustafa Khattab translation} and thus it occurred, when Maseeh (Peace be upon him) was raised to God to heaven. Then Ibn Kathir talks about different groups of Christians which came into existence, one of which remained steadfast and believed Jesus was only a servant of Allah, and Messenger, not god....
End-quote.

Even from Ibn Abbas (ra) it is proven regarding Quranic verse 4:159 i.e. And there is none from the People of the Scripture but that he will surely believe in him [i.e., Jesus] before his death.¹ And on the Day of Resurrection he will be against them a witness.

(Sahih International translation. The insertion of word Jesus in brackets in this translation is accurate and perfect as we proved above that Dhamir is returning to Jesus. In Islam 360 version It is there even without brackets. Some other translators added word Jesus in brackets too like M.A.S Abdel Haleem. In Urdu translation of Maulana

Muhammad Junagarhi he even used word Isa without brackets. Mufti Taqi Usmani also mentioned word Isa without brackets. Irfan ul Qur'an translation of Dr. Tahir ul Qadri in Urdu and English also uses word Jesus outside brackets. And so on.

Ibn Abbas said regarding it: Before death of Isa ibn Maryum (a.s) (See Tafsir al-Tabari under this verse. There are many other quotes in Tafsir al-Tabari too which prove that all people of scripture i.e. All Jews and Christians will believe in Jesus before Jesus's death. Yes he mentioned other quotes too that it refers to they not dying before believing in Jesus i.e. when these people are about to die they will witness truth but that will not benefit them. We being honest have already shown this from Tafsir al-Jalalyn. However the opinion that all Jews and Christians will believe in Jesus before Jesus's death supercedes).

It is also narrated in Tafsir Sufyan ath-Thawri that, Ibn Abbas (ra) said regarding verse: And there is none from the People of the Scripture but that he will surely believe in him [i.e., Jesus] before his death. 4:159 (Sahih International translation). Before death of Isa Peace be upon him. (Tafsir Sufyan ath-Thawri # 229)

In Tafsir Ibn Abi Hatim it says: Ibn Abbas (ra) said regarding "And there is none from the People of the Scripture but that he will surely believe in him [i.e., Jesus] before his death (4:159, Sahih International translation). (Ibn Abbas said it means) That before death of Isa Ibn Maryum (a.s) (Tafsir Ibn Abi Hatim 4/1114, # 6254)

In Tafsir al-Qurtubi. Right after narrating Ibn Abbas(ra)'s qawl of Mumituka it says: Rabi' bin Anas (rah) said it means

death of sleep as Qur'an says: He is the One Who calls back your souls by night... (6:60, Dr Mustafa Khattab Translation)...later Imam Qurtubi (rah) says to an extent that: It is correct that Allah rose you up without death and sleep, as Hasan and Ibn Zaid said, and this is what Tabari chose. This is Sahih from Ibn Abbas (ra) and Dhahak (rah) also said so... (See Tafsir al Qurtubi under 3:55)

Mustadrak ala Sahihayn of Imam al-Hakim has hadith: From Saeed bin Jubayr from Ibn Abbas May Allah's mercy be upon them, who said (about verse): {And there is none from the People of the Scripture but that he will surely believe in him [i.e., Jesus] before his death. 4:159. Sahih International translation}. (It refers to) Appearance of Isa Ibn Maryum, Allah's Peace and blessings be upon him.

Imam al-Hakim said: It is Authentic (Sahih) on the criteria of Shaykhayn (i.e. Imam al-Bukhari and Imam Muslim), but they did not narrate it.

Imam adh-Dhahabi said in Talkhees: (It is Sahih) on criteria of al-Bukhari and Muslim

(Mustadrak ala Sahihayn by Imam al- Hakim # 3207, with Talkhees of Imam adh-Dhahabi)

The Muhaqiq to book:

وكيحي بن الجراح أقواله ومروياته في التفسير من أول سورة الفاتحة إلى نهاية سورة الكهف

المؤلف: محمد أحمد السيد القرشي
محقق: وصي الله بن محمد عباس

Volume 1, Page, 651

Said regarding this narration of Ibn Abbas (ra), in footnote, which is paraphrased: It is narrated in Tafsir al-Tabari (9/380) number (10795), The chain is weak due to Ibn Waki' who is weak, but due to next narration it elevates and becomes Hasan li Ghayrihi. It is also narrated in Tafsir Sufyan ath-Thawri (Page 98), number (229). Then he mentions other references like Tafsir al-Tabari # 10794 who narrated from Muhammad bin Bashaar. Ibn Abi Hatim who narrated from Ahmad bin Sinan. Then he says: All of them coming from Muhammad bin Bashaar or Ahmad bin Sinan from Abdur Rahman bin Mahdi from Sufyan. THE CHAINS ARE AUTHENTIC. Then he mentions reference of Mustadrak al-Hakim which we have already mentioned above...

Note: All these proofs from Ibn Abbas (RA) put together become impeccable whereas the statement attributed to Ibn Abbas RA that Mutawafeeka means Mumituka has problem due to Ali bin Abi Talha

b) This is enough to destroy Qadiyanis. Those statements which go against Qadiyanis are mentioned with Jazm by especially Ibn Kathir (rah). But we will say that even if we assume the narration of Ibn Abbas (ra) to be correct, then first of all it should be interpreted according to detailed extract from Tafsir Ibn Kathir and references from Tafsir al-Tabari from Ibn Abbas (ra) himself. Also what we quoted from Tafsir of Sufyan ath-Thawri, from Ibn Abi Hatim,

Qurutbi, and Mustadrak ala Sahihayn of Imam Hakim. Secondly if Qadiyanis deny these authentic narrations and valid interpretations (which is impossible for them to do so) then the athar of Ibn Abbas (ra) they present is contrary to Quranic verses, overwhelming hadiths, Tafaseer (including that of Ibn Abbas ra himself), and opinions of majority of scholars, so it cannot be taken. One narration is mentioned in Tafsir Dur al Munthoor of Imam Suyuti (rah) which has wording that Ibn Abbas (ra) said: I will raise you and then cause you to die in end times (Tafsir Dur al Munthoor under verse 3:55. Shown as corroborating reference)

2. Mirza said. It is paraphrased as: This is proven from categorical proof that "Jesus migrated towards Kashmir he died and his grave is in Srinagar till today" (Kashmir). (Roohani Khazain vol. 18 p.361)

3. "I am just like Quran and soon it will be exhibited on my hand, what has been exhibited by Quran." (AlBushra Vol.2 P.119)

4. Regarding verse of Qur'an "Wa maa arsalnaaka illa Rehmat al lil Alameen" **meaning:** We have sent you as a Mercy for all the worlds. Mirza applied it on himself (See: Roohani Khazain Vol.11 P.78)

Note by Aamir Ibrahim: Deobandi big authority Rasheed Ahmed Gangohi has also falsely said in his Fatawa Rashidiah that Rehmat al lil Aalmeen is not exclusive trait of Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) .. AstaghfirUllah. So Beware O Muslims from deobandi cult as well and only turn towards Ahlus Sunnah wa'l Jamm'ah.

5. " 'Daiyan ila Allahe' and 'Sirajum Muneer' two names and two titles were especially given to Holy Prophet Peace be

upon him in Holy Quran and then the same two titles were given to me in divine inspiration." (Arba'een No.2 P.5, Roohani Khazain Vol.17 P.350-351)

6. "In this place the word Soor has meaning of Promised Messiah." (Chashma-e-Maarifat P.76, Roohani Khazain Vol.23 P.85)

7. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiyani (LA) said:

...God has appointed me the **Promised Messiah** for the Muslims and Christians, so am I the **Avatār** for the Hindus. For the past twenty years or so, I have been proclaiming that just as I have appeared in the spirit of the Messiah son of Mary alaihis salam **for the purpose of removing sins** which have filled the earth, **so have I come as Raja Krishna one of the greatest Avatārs of the Hindu faith**. In other words, I am the same person by virtue of spiritual reality. This is no fancy or speculation on my part. **The God of heaven and earth has revealed to me, not once but a number of times, that for the Hindus I am Krishna and for the Muslims and Christians I am the Promised Messiah...**(Lecture Sialkot, English. Page Number 39...)

Then he tried to defend himself which we shall paraphrase i.e. Ignorant Muslims will immediately say due to assuming name of a Kafir he (Mirza) has openly accepted disbelief. He said this revelation is from God and he has no choice but to proclaim it. Then he tried to prove Raja Krishna to be a truly great man the like of whom cannot be found in Rishis and Avatars of Hindus. He also claimed that Krishna was an Avatar i.e. Prophet on whom the Holy Spirit would descend from God...also in later days God will send an Avatar in the image of Krishna and that is Mirza. And he goes on.

Note: Even if we assume Krishna might have been a Prophet. Still Mirza cannot be considered right as his claims were absolutely bogus and he claimed to be many people and zill of all Prophets not just Krishna.

8. "Hay Krishan Ji Roodur Gopal." (AlBushra Vol.1 P.56)

9. "It is not good to confront the Brahmin Autar (i.e. Mirza)." (AlBushra Vol.2 P.116. Brackets added by author of this article)

10. "King of Aryans has come." (AlBushra Vol.1 P.56)

11. "Amin ul Mulk Jai Singh Bahadur." (AlBushra Vol.2 P.118)

12. "That God be praised who took away my sorrow and gave me that thing which He had not given to any people in this era ." (Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi P.107, Roohani Khazain Vol.22 P.110)

13. Mirza describes his divine inspiration:

God praises you from His throne, God is praising you and is coming towards you." (Anjam-e-Atham P.55, Roohani Khazain Vol.11 P.55)

14. Mirza said: (Enemies) intended to disgrace me... Desired for my death and predicted about it. So our God gave me the good news that "I SHALL HAVE AGE OF EIGHTY (80) YEARS RATHER MAYBE MORE" (Roohani Khazain, Vol. 19, P. 239, Mawahib-ur-Rahman, P. 21. Brackets added) [But Mirza died in 1908. Died at age of 68-73 as we will prove below]

Note by editor Aamir Ibrahim: The satan who inspired to Mirza was himself confused about exact age of Mirza at death (whereas God cannot be), which is why Mirza according to good news of his god said, his age will be 80 "RATHER MAYBE MORE"

At another place Mirza said: We shall bestow upon you a pleasant and comfortable life, eighty years or thereabouts - meaning, a few years less or a few years more... (Tadhkirah, English version, Page Number 529. Also see: Ruhani Khazain 17/66).

Also said, God will make your life long, eighty years or five, four years more or five, four years less (Ruhani Khazain 22/100).

He also said: ..."GOD HAD INFORMED ME" in "CLEAR TERMS" that I would live to the age of eighty, or that five to six years more or five to six years less....Nor is there a promise of God that my age will necessarily exceed eighty years. Rather, the hope implied in the words in the revelation of God is that, If God so desires, my age could even somewhat exceed eighty years. The actual words of the Revelation that pertain to this promise, however, fix the age between 74 and 86....(Barahin-e-Ahmadiyya, Part 5, Page. 347. English version. Also in Ruhani Khazain 21/258-259)

Qadiyanis have no answer to this so they try to create doubt on birth date of Mirza. However they fail so miserably that some of them including Mirza Qadiyani himself (See footnote in Ruhani Khazain 13/177 or see Kitab al Barriya, translated into English by name: A brief sketch of my life, Page 10) said he was born in 1839 or 1840. This makes their life even more miserable because if we follow these

dates then Mirza died in 1908, hence his age at death was even less than 73 i.e. It was 68 or 69

According to Qadiyani website Ahmadipedia, and Wikipedia Mirza was born on 13 February 1835 and died on 26 May 1908, which implies that his age at death was 73. (Note: We took these references today and have taken screenshots. If someone changes them later to deceive people then they will be caught red-handed)

15. In your (i.e. Mirza's) divine inspirations your opponents are called Kafir (Qadiyani Akhbar Al-Fazl, 15 January 1935. Brackets added)

16. Mirza's son Bashir Ahmad said: Now the matter is clear, if the denial of the Nabi Kareem (Muhammad Peace be upon him) is disbelief, then the denial of the Promised Messiah (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiyani) must also be disbelief, because the Promised Messiah is not something different from Nabi Kareem (Muhammad Peace be upon him), but He is the same. If the denier of the Promised Messiah is not a disbeliever, then Naudhobillah the denier of the Holy Prophet is also not a disbeliever. Because how is it possible that denial of Prophet Muhammad in his first coming is disbelief, but in the second coming (i.e. of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiyani) **according to the Promised Messiah, your spirituality is more strong, perfect and most vehement, so your denial how can not be disbelief.** (Mirza's son Bashir Ahmad In Kalamatul Fasl. Pages: 146-147. Brackets added)

17. It is written in Qadiyani newspaper al Fazl which we shall paraphrase as: Therefore, in these meanings, denying that the Promised Messiah (who is the means of the appearance of the Second Coming of the Holy Prophet)...It is like denying the Second Coming of the Holy Prophet and you being Ahmad and Nabi Allah. **It makes the denier to exit folds of Islam, and makes him confirm Kafir** (Akhbar al Fazl, June 29, 1913, see page 7)

Note by Editor Aamir Ibrahim: Qadiyanis often try to deceive Muslims by saying that they consider us to be Muslims. So Beware!!

Lahori group strongly prove that majority of Qadiyanis, Mirza's son and many other Qadiyanis consider all Muslims to be Kafirs. Regarding Lahori group being Kafirs although they do not consider Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiyani to be a Prophet but rather Mujadid and Mahdi and Promised Messiah. But still they are Kafirs because Mirza Ghulam Ahmad did claim Prophethood (whether Zilli of Buroozi) and to be Promised Messiah and considered enemies to be Hell bound, so Lahori group is Kafir too.

18. Look, from the order of God, "EVERY DAY IN A MOMENT (OR HOUR) CRORES OF HUMAN BEINGS DIE ON EARTH AND CRORES TAKE BIRTH" with His intention" [Kashti-e-Nooh Page 37 Roohani Khazain Volume No. 19 Page 41. Brackets added]

Note by Editor Aamir Ibrahim: It was and still is logically impossible for "CRORES TO DIE EVERYDAY, LET ALONE IN HOUR OF DAY" and "CRORES TO TAKE BIRTH" So this lunatic Mirza was just firing arrows in the air.

19. "Antaa minnee bi manzilata waladee - You are from me like my son" (Haqeeqat-ul-Wahi P.86, Roohani Khazain Vol.22 P.89. Although in footnote it says that he said it metaphorically. But still we as Muslims cannot accept such things allowed to be said even metaphorically. Plus we will show proofs that Mirza claimed to have become God in his visions. Remember visions of true Prophets are true but Mirza was a false one and liar)

20. "Anta minnee bi manzilati awlaadee - **you are from me like my sons.**" (AlBushra Vol.2 P.65)

Note by Editor Aamir Ibrahim:Mirza did Shirk over here and also some of the statements of him shall be shown later where he claimed to have become God. In Islam we cannot say such things even metaphorically. So it is confirmed that he was a Christian and British agent who tried to distort the Islamic teachings.

Disrespect in the court of Imam Hussain(R.A)

1. Mirza writes with great pride:"O Shia nation! Don't insist that Hussain is your savior because I tell you truthfully truthfully that today there is one among you who is greater than Hussain." (Dafe alBala P.13, Roohani Khazain Vol.18 P.233- Before this he even claimed to be greater than Maseeh ibn Maryum and said this to Christian missionaries. Also see Ruhani Khazain 18/240 where Mirza said meaning of which is that God will give birth to second Isa Ibn Maryum and he will be better than previous one and that is Mirza Qadiyani)

2. Mirza writes in his book, Aijaz-e-Ahmadi: "And there is great difference between me and your Hussain, Because I am getting every moment support and help from God But Hussain? Just recall the plains of Karbala -Till now you are crying, so just ponder!" (Aijaz-e-Ahmadi, Roohani Khazain Vol.19 P.181)

Note by Editor Aamir Ibrahim: The Prophet (Peace be upon him) said in an authentic hadith: Hussain is from me and I am from Hussain.. [Sunnan Tirmidhi, Hadith # 4144] So these will be counted as direct disrespect of Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) not only of Imam Hussain (RA).

Mirza Kadhaab even claimed to be Hajr-e-Aswad (the Black Stone of Ka'ba) and Bayt Ullah (House of Allah)

1. Mirza writes: "One man kissed my foot, and I said to him that I am Hajr-e-Aswad (the Black Stone of Ka'ba)." (Tadhkirah Majmuah Ilhamaat, Kushoof o Roya, Page. 33, UK, 2023 edition. Brackets added)

2. God in His divine inspirations **kept my name Bayt Ullah (House of God) too** (Footnote in Roohani Khazain. Vol. 17, Pages 444-445. Brackets added)

3. He writes:"Zameen-e-Qadian ab Mohtram hay. Hujoom-e-Khalq say Arz-e-Haram hay

Translation: The land of Qadiyan is now honoured, with flocking of **people it has become the Land of Haram (Makkah)**" (Durre Sameen, Urdu P.56. Brackets added)

The False Dreams and Claiming to be a god

1. Mirza Qadiyani (Lanat Ullah) said, which is paraphrased: I (Mirza Qadiyani) saw in my Kashf (divine inspiration) that **I myself am God and I believed in this that I am Him (God)**.---He then made long discussion also said: "God entered in my being ... and in this condition I was saying like this that WE WANT A NEW SYSTEM AND NEW HEAVEN AND NEW EARTH. Thus initially I created Heaven and Earth in Ijmali (i.e. brief) form...After making long discussion he tries to defend himself that he did not claim to be god (Note from author of this article: Although he did so) then said to Christians in boast that they should compare ilhamaat on Mirza with Ilhamaat on Jesus and they should decide that Mirza's ilhamaat are superior to that of Jesus from which Christians claim Jesus's divinity. If someone's godhood can be derived from such ilhamaat then Naudhobillah my (i.e. Mirza's) Ilhamaat by fortiori (a stronger reason) proves my divinity more than Jesus.... (Ruhani Khazain V. 13, P. 103-106. Brackets added. Although Mirza has used word Naudhobillah but still his complete discussion proves that he was claiming to be god. Also see V.5, P.564-565 which shall be mentioned separately ahead)

2 -The Summary of what Mirza said and It is paraphrased: I saw in my dream that I am exactly God and I believed that I am Him, neither my intention remained nor any danger in this capacity (when I was God) I said: We want a new

system, new heavens, new earth. Thus I initially created heaven and earth in an Ijmali (brief) form in which there was neither any differentiation nor any arrangement. Then I separated them and arranged them ... and at that moment I found myself capable of doing that. Then I created the first sky and said: We have adorned the lowest heaven with Lamps (Qur'an 67:5). Then I said: We will create human with a portion of clay. Thus I made Adam and I created Adam on the best shape and in this manner I became KHALIQ - Creator." (Aina-e-Kamalaat-e-Islam P.564-565; Roohani Khazain Vol.5 P. 564-565)

3. "I had been given the quality of annihilating and giving life. And this quality is given to me by God (Khutba-e-Ilhamiyah P.23; Roohani Khazain Vol.16 P.55-56)

4 -At another place, he mentions his divine inspiration: "(O Mirza!) Verily, It is your order. When you intend for something, you say: (Be), and it happens." (AlBushra Vol.2 P.94. Brackets added)

5. "I saw in my dream that I am in the Court of God the Exalted, I am waiting that there is my case, then got the answer: O Mirza! Be patient, We will soon be free... Then once I saw that I went into the court, **God the Exalted is sitting on the chair in the form of a Ruler and on one side there is a clerk who is presenting him with some documents which are in his hand.** Ruler picked up the document and said: Mirza is present. **Then I saw closely and it appeared that beside Him there is a vacant chair and He asked me to sit on it and He**

has the documents in his hand .Then I woke up."
(Mukashifaat P.28-29)

Mirza had promised to write 50 parts i.e. volumes of book, but when he failed to write fifty and was able to write only 5, he practised this following deceit to fool people

He claims that there is No Difference between 50 and 5 except for a dot (zero)

1. Mirza said: "First I had intended to write "FIFTY PARTS (VOLUMES)" and I was satisfied in (writing) fifty than five, **as in numbers of fifty and five there is difference of "JUST A DOT (ZERO)"** So I have fulfilled my promise by writing five (instead of 50) "(Baraheen-e-Ahmadia V.5. P. 7, Roohani Khazain V.21 P.9. Brackets added)

2. Mirza raised funds on the commitment that he would write a huge book in 50 volumes. However, he stopped the work when only 5 small volumes had been written. When asked about the discrepancy, he reasoned that **"There is a difference of only a dot between 5 and 50!"**

Mirza calling himself Absurd

Mirza said: **"This is an absolutely irrational and absurd (Behuda) matter that the "ORIGINAL**

LANGUAGE OF A PERSON IS DIFFERENT AND THE DIVINE INSPIRATION IS SENT IN DIFFERENT LANGUAGE" which he cannot even understand, because in this there is unbearable burden- And what is the use of such a divine inspiration which is beyond human understanding" (Chashma-e-Ma'arif p.209, Roohani Khazain vol.23 p.218. Brackets added)

Let us now see the languages in which Mirza received divine inspirations, quite an opposite statement.

Mirza said: "However it is more surprising than this that certain divine inspirations come to me also in those languages **ABOUT WHICH I HAVE NO FAMILIARITY AT ALL**" like English or Sanskrit or Hebrew etc." (Nuzool-e-Maseeh p.57, Roohani Khazain vol.18 p.435)

Towards end we will show grammatically incorrect English in so called divine inspirations sent to Mirza.

Death of Kadhaab

Qadiyanis claim that, Mirza Ghulam Qadiyani recited Kalima during his dying moment. Let us understand this from the people who were beside his bed, before his death

Mir Nasir Nawab, father-in-law of Mirza Ghulam was at his bedside. Mir Nasir in his biography, Hayat-e-Nasir, wrote:

1. "When I reached Hazrat Saheb and saw his condition, then he addressed me and said: **MIR SAHEB. I HAVE DEVELOPED EPIDEMIC CHOLERA'**. I think After that He

(MIRZA) did not say anything clear till he died next day at 10 am." (Hayat-e-Nasir, p.14. Brackets added)

2. "Huzoor could not talk two hours before death. Dr Mirza Yaqoob Baig Sahib marhoom and Dr Syed Mohammad Hussain Shah were the treating physicians. Huzoor asked for paper, pen and ink and wrote: I have too much dryness. I cannot talk." and there were some other words like this which could not be read." (Statement of 'SAHABI' of Mirza in Akhbar al Fazl, dated 24th November 1937)

It is clear from the above statements that, Mirza didn't repent from his fabrications/lies and disbelief and also didn't utter Kalima.

Miscellaneous Statements

1. Mirza lied about Sahih Bukhari and gave false reference. It is our challenge to all Qadiyanis to show just one hadith from Sahih Bukhari which states: Voice will come from sky that "This is Caliph of Allah, the Mahdi" The author shall give heavy amount of money to one who does so.

Mirza said: ...For example **those hadiths of Sahih Bukhari** in which news has been given regarding some caliphs of **last era. Especially that Caliph regarding whom it is written in Bukhari that VOICE WILL COME FROM SKY REGARDING HIM THAT THIS IS CALIPH OF ALLAH THE MAHDI.** Now think this hadith is of what rank and status which is stated in such a

book which is most authentic after Book of Allah. (Ruhani Khazain. Vol. 6, Page. 337)

2. The basis for my this claim is not Hadith but Quran and that Wahi which came to me. Yes, in support we also present those Hadiths which are according to Quran Shareef and **DO NOT CONTRADICT MY WAHI**. Rest of the Hadiths, **WE THHROW THEM AWAY LIKE A WASTE PAPER.**"(Roohani Khazain vol.19 p.140)

Again read Qur'an Chapter 6, Verse 93.

3. *Mirza's God the meaning of which is that:* He prays, fasts, awakens, and sleeps (Al-Bushra 2/79)

Regarding Allah fasting Mirza tried to defend himself by saying:

It is obvious that God does not observe fast or break it. These words are not literally applicable to Him, they are used metaphorically and mean: I shall sometimes send down My chastisement and at other times I shall grant respite.... Divine books are full of such metaphors. For instance it is said in a hadith that on the Day of Judgment God will say: I was ill, I was hungry, **'I WAS NAKED'** etc. [Haqiqatul-Wahi, p. 104 footnote, Ruhani Khaza'in, vol. 22, p. 107, footnote]

Reference: Qadiyani book, Tadhkirah, English version, Page: 570.

First of all Mirza lied that Allah was naked (God forbid) as such a hadith is baseless. Secondly we can

only use those metaphors which are used in Qur'an and authentic hadiths. The hadith about Allah being ill, asking for food, and drink is present in Sunni books like Sahih Muslim but not in Qur'an whereas Mirza claimed such metaphors to be mentioned in Divine Books. We are sure of only Qur'an to be a perfectly Divine book, whereas others such as Old and New testaments are severely corrupted. Qur'an categorically negates Allah sleeping or awakening in Ayat al Kursi. Also Allah praying or fasting is not mentioned in Qur'an. Sahih Muslim and hadith books are not Divine books either in spite of having authentic narrations. Anyways we cannot add things like Allah "Praying" "Sleeping" "Awakening" As far as we know Mirza has only defended himself on Allah fasting issue but not on praying, sleeping, awakening statements of his.

Plus the addition of word "NAKED" for Allah as done by Mirza is a baseless claim.

Note: There is a fabricated hadith that Prophet (Peace be upon him) said:... The first one to pray (funeral prayer) for me is Allah from above His throne. [Narrated in Mu'jam al Kabeer of Imam Tabrani # 2676. Imam Nur ud din Haythami said after narrating it, It contains Abd al-Mun'im bin Idrees who is a Kadhaab (liar) and one who fabricates (hadiths). Majma uz Zawaid 9/31 # 14253. Imam Ibn Jawzi also mentioned it in his book over fabricated hadiths i.e. Mawdhoo'at. Imam Suyuti also mentioned it in his book over Fabricated hadiths]

4. Mirza Ghulam Ahmed wrote the meaning of which is that once he put some matter in writing and placed it before the Almighty for His signature. God signed it with blackness in red ink... and on the tip of the pen where there was excess

(black) ink...Almighty shook His pen and drops of ink fell on Mirza's clothes... (Tiryaaq-ul-Qulub pg 33)

5. On 5 March 1905 I dreamed of a person who appeared to be an angel... When I asked his name, he said I have no name, I said you must have some name. He said my name is Tichi -Tichi- In Punjabi language it is called prescribed time, meaning one coming at the exact time of need, then I woke up (Roohani Khazain Vol. 22. Page 346)

Note by Editor Aamir Ibrahim: We should all laugh at the name "Tichi" I think Disney should get some ideas from Mirza Qadiyani.

6. Paraphrased: One of Mirza's Angel came in his dream in the form of a man called **Mithan Lal** who used to be Extra assistant commissioner (Tadhkirah Majmua Ilhaamat, Kushoof o Roya. Page No. 525. UK, 2023 edition)

7. Ñyal came to me and chose me and rotated his fingers and signified that the promise of Allah had arrived. In footnote it says: Here Allah the Almighty has named Gabriel as Ñyal, because he returns often (Author) (Haqiqatul Wahi, English. Page Number: 124)

8. (Due to my teachings) which had a result that, lacs of people have given up the false ideas of Jihad. Which were in hearts of people due to Mullahs with less intelligence. (Sitara-e-Qaisariya pg 3. Brackets added but that is what Mirza is implying)

Note by Editor Aamir Ibrahim: Again a glaring proof that Mirza was a British agent-

9. Let us look at some grammatically incorrect English in so called divine inspirations sent to Mirza the accursed one.

(a) I can what I will do.

(b) We can what we will do. (Reference of both these is Tadhkirah Majmuah Ilhamaat, Kushoof o Roya. Page Number: 56. UK, 2023 edition)

(c) You have to go Amritsar. (Tadhkirah Majmuah Ilhamaat, Kushoof o Roya. Page Number: 102. UK, 2023 edition)

(d) Words of God cannot exchange. (Tadhkirah Majmuah Ilhamaat, Kushoof o Roya. Page Number: 87. UK, 2023 edition)

(e) Words of God not can exchange. (Tadhkirah Majmuah Ilhamaat, Kushoof o Roya. Page Number: 101. UK, 2023 edition. Regarding this it is written in footnote that (Note by Syed Abdul Hayee) This "SEEMS TO" be scribe's error. This divine inspiration is also written at page 87 where there are words of cannot. End-quote. This is a futile attempt to defend Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiyani. However in Urdu statement of Mirza and also English translation below, it is written like we have mentioned)

(f) He halts in the Zilla Peshawar. (Tadhkirah Majmuah Ilhamaat, Kushoof o Roya. Page Number 102. UK, 2023 edition. We can let this one through. However Mirza said before it: Then there is a sentence the meaning of which I do not know and that is this. End-quote. So it is laughable.

If it is meant, he lives or resides in Zilla Peshawar then the statement of Mirza is not accurate, plus instead of word Zilla the word district would have been better. But as mentioned before we can let this one through)

The satan who sent these to Mirza (LA) was poor in English as well.

10. Doctor Mir Muhammad Ismaeel told me that he has heard many times from the Promised Messiah alaihis salam (actually accursed) that he has Hysteria. And sometimes he used to call it Miraq (Mental derangement, Melancholy, depression) as well.

(Son of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiyani i.e. Mirza Bashir Ahmad in his book Seerat ul Mahdi, Vol 2, Page No. 340. Brackets added. Although Mirza Bashir has tried to defend Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiyani on this issue but failed miserably)

Abusive language of Mirza Qadiyani.

Mirza said: **Our enemies have become PIGS OF WILDERNESS AND THEIR WOMEN HAVE BECOME WORSE THAN B*TCHEs** (In Roman Urdu: Dushman hamaray Bayabaano kay Khanzeer ho gayay aur Un ki aurtain Kutiyoon say barh gayi hain)

دشمن ہمارے بیابانوں کے خنزیر ہو گئے اور اُن کی عورتیں کتوں سے بڑھ گئی
ی ہیں۔

(Ruhani Khazain 14/53. Book Najm ul Huda. Brackets added)

In English translation of Mirza's book Najm ul Huda it is translated as:

My foes have been turned into the swine of the wilderness, And their women have been converted into worse than curs. [Najm ul Huda (The Star that Guides), English version, Page 22. Both translations we showed can be taken]

Mirza while trying to refute Abdullah Atham (Christian) called even Muslims and their scholars who do Takdhib of Mirza as, It is paraphrased: Not being born in halal way (i.e. B*stard) and not of good breed. (Ruhani Khazain 9/31. Book Anwar ul Islam. Brackets added. Translation of words "Naik Zaat nahi" is primarily "Not of good breed" See Rekhta dictionary for meaning of نیک ذات And it also means same due to Mirza's statement in context)

Plus ahead Mirza said: He who indulges in nonsense against this clear decision and out of wickedness goes on repeating that the Christians have achieved victory and continues immodest and shameless and without replying justly to our decision will not refrain from denial and the use of loose language and will not admit our victory will make it clear that **"HE IS EAGER TO BE CONSIDERED A**

BASTARD AND IS NOT LEGITIMATE (ibid. This part is taken from Qadiyani website)

We cannot even call Christians as b*stards let alone Muslims and their scholars. Mirza was such a big liar and cheat that Muslims took the side of a Christian and considered Mirza defeated in his debate with Abdullah Atham (a Christian). Mirza had claimed Abdullah Atham would die in 15 months, which he did not. Qadiyanis try to defend Mirza in his false prophecy though, we have discussed Mirza's contradicting claims of divine inspirations regarding his age of death before. **Remember leading Qadiyani Munazir Razi Nauman has accepted and said: Sadly some Maulvis joined Atham.**

We know Qadiyanis try to defend Mirza by saying that Qur'an has said that some Jews were turned into apes and pigs (See: Qur'an 5:60, Also 7:166). Compared one who disbelieves to a dog lolling out his tongue (See: 7:176). Worst of creatures (98:6). Also worst of creation (8:22) (some translators use word beasts too in translation of 8:22) and such. The answer to this is the following.

(a) Muslims let alone their scholars cannot be compared to disbelievers like Jews and others. Qadiyanis try to convince Muslims to accept their cult by being soft spoken and say things like Love for all, Hatred for none. They hypocritically and deceivingly say, they consider us to be Muslims. They should from now onwards say that Muslims and their scholars are pigs and their women are b*tches. This is how they should start their missionary activity.

(b) Allah can say/do whatever He likes as Qur'an says: He cannot be questioned for His acts, but they will be questioned (for theirs). (21:23. Translation by Abdullah Yusuf Ali)

(c) Mirza the apostate has called all his enemies as such. This cannot be justified in any way.

They also use hadith that Ulama of later days are condemned as apes and swine (Hakeem Tirmidhi not to be confused with Jami' Tirmidhi of Kutb-e-Sitta, Tadhkirah fi ahwal al Mawta wa umur al Akhirah of Imam Shams ud din Qurtubi, Kanz ul Umaal and some other books of low level).

Qadiyanis apply this hadith to Ulama during the time of Mirza. First of all this hadith is weak and has many problems in it. The chain of this is mentioned in Tadhkira of Imam Shams ud din Qurtubi Page 1256 as:

حدثنا هشام بن خالد الدمشقي، عن إسماعيل بن عياش، :حدثنا عمر بن أبي عمر قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه : عن ليث، عن ابن سابط عن أبي أمامة قال

i.e. UMAR BIN ABI UMAR from Hishaam bin Khalid ad-Damishqi from Ismaeel bin Ayyash from LAYTH from Ibn Sabit FROM Abi Umama who said that Prophet Peace be upon him said:...

In the Salafi book

حمود بن :كتاب إتحاف الجماعة بما جاء في الفتن والملاحم وأشرط الساعة، المؤلف
عبد الله التويجري 2/250

It is declared weak.

It is weak because Abdur Rahman bin sabit did not have Sama (hearing) from Abu Umamah. Laith bin Abi Salim whom many scholars of Hadith declared weak. Narrator Umar bin Abi Umar being Majhool (unknown),

Also Secondly the answer to this is that those scholars of misguidance were not the ones during the time of Mirza who opposed him. Plus Muslim scholars were right in refuting Mirza not vice versa. We have proven Mirza to be a Dajjal (grand liar), Kafir, Murtad (apostate), and cheat on our website.

Qadiyanis also use another hadith the first of which we will show from Mishkaat which gives reference of Shu'ab al Iman of Imam Bayhaqi. Hadith states:

Ali reported God's messenger as saying, " A time is soon coming to mankind when nothing of Islam but its name will remain and only the written form of the Qur'an will remain. Their mosques will be in fine condition but will be devoid of guidance, their learned men will be the worst people under heaven, corruption coming forth from them and returning among them." Baihaqi transmitted it in Shu'ab al-iman. (Mishkaat # 276)

First of all it does not call scholars as worse than animals rather calls them worst people under heaven. In both English and urdu translations of Mishkaat present online (see: www.sunnah.com for English and Islam 360 app for urdu) It is translated as worst people under heaven. **Even if we accept that it means they will be worst than all creation then, again this hadith is weak too. Salafi scholar Albani declared it weak. Also Salafi scholar Zubayr Ali Zai declared it weak. Muhaqiq of Mujalisa wa Jawahir al Ilm (Author of the book is Abu Bakr Ahmad bin Marwan al Daynawari al Maliki) i.e. Mashoor bin Hasan Aal Salman has graded this narration as “Extremely weak”. See Mujalisa wa Jawahir al ilm 2/359**

Abdullah bin Dukain is weak, also Ali bin Hussain (rah) did not meet or hear from Ali bin Abi Talib (RA). There are other hadiths like this but some are fabricated and others weak, Regarding one Imam Bayhaqi (rah) said:

It is Mawquf (narrated by a Sahabi, not Prophet). **The chain of it up to Sharik is unknown, and the first one (i.e. one from Abdullah bin dukain) is munqati (i.e. interrupted/broken).** And Allah knows the best. (Hence they are all weak) [See Shu'ab al Imaan of Imam Bayhaqi # 1765]

Plus one of them has no wording which could be translated as scholars being worst of creation. The remaining answer has already been given above in regards to hadith about scholars in later days being like apes and swine.

Regarding Mirza calling his opponents (i.e. Muslims, scholars of Islam and even Christians) as b*stards. Then Qadiyanis try to defend him by saying that Qur'an has used such wording for a disbeliever Walid bin Mughira.

Note: Author has seen Qadiyani and Lahori Ahmadi replies on this issue. They are confused. They try to assert that Mirza actually called his opponents B*stards and illegitimate as I showed their own translation above, but at the same time try to say, he said it metaphorically (which is a lie of course). They have the audacity to bring verses about Noah (a.s)'s son who rejected the teachings and became Kafir. (They use verses 11:46-47). Noah's son was Naudhobillah not a bastard child (this would be a big disrespect of Noah a.s) but only called not son of Noah due to his Kufr and becoming Kafir. Even metaphorically he was not a bastard child. Remember Noah (a.s) addressed his son gently before he became Kafir as: "O my son" (See: 11:42). Nowhere in Qur'an is stated that Noah (a.s) called his son bastard whether really or metaphorically, whether before he became Kafir or later.

Qadiyanis misuse 68:13 to literally assert that Muslims, scholars of Islam, and even Christians were literally bastards. So their trick that it means metaphorically is clear deception. Even if we assume (speculate) it to be metaphorical still it remains abusive.

Qur'an says in 68:13: **coarse, and on top of all that, an imposter.** (M.A.S Abdel Haleem translation. **Intrusive** as translated by M. Pickthall. **Notorious** by T.Usmani. Free

minds translates it as: **greedy**. Qaribullah as: **low character**. Asad as: **utterly useless [to his fellow-men]**. Safi Kaskas translates as: one who is **despicable**. Sarwar translated it as: **morally corrupt**. QXP translates it as **worthless to the society**. On internetmosque.net website literal translation of zaneem is given as: a known mean low or evil person. Even Lahori Ahmadi group translation in English of Muhammad Ali It is translated as: **Ignoble, besides all that, notoriously mischievous. His actual Urdu translation is which we shall write in Roman: Sakht Jhagralo, Is kay Ilawa Shararat main Mashoor (hai)**. Page 2651. In commentary he does accept meanings to be: One who is not from nation but is attributed to them...also means child of fornicator. Also narrated from Saeed bin Jubayr that it means one who is famous in mischief End-quote. **So the narration of Saeed bin Jubayr will supersede**. Note: Lahori group also know about abusive language of Mirza and try to defend him. In Qadiyani translation of Mirza Tahir Ahmad their Quran has wrong references in stead of 68:13 their Quran has this verse at 68:14, this is how it is at many or most places, verses are one ahead of original reference (Contrary to Quranic references Muslims follow). Anyways he has translated it as: “illegitimate child”. Without saying it was a metaphor.

In urdu as "**Badnam (In English it means notorious)**" by Mahmud ul Hasan in Tafsir-e-Usmani. In Tafsir of it, it says, that according to some Salaf it also means one born out of fornication and b*stard. Regarding the Ka fir these verses were revealed "**HE WAS JUST LIKE THAT**"

Now the answer to this is that a lot of translators did not translate the word Zaneem as an illegitimate child (b*stard). Even if we accept the translation to be illegitimate child (b*stard) then Walid bin Mughira was actually and really an illegitimate child as proven from Islamic sources.

It says in Tafsir al Jalalyn: moreover ignoble an adopted son of Quraysh — namely al-Walīd b. al-Mughīra **whose father claimed him after eighteen years; Ibn ‘Abbās said ‘We know of no one whom God has described in the derogatory way in which He describes him** blighting him with ignominy that will never leave him the adverbial qualifier ba‘da dhālika ‘moreover’ is semantically connected to zanīm ‘ignoble’ —

Imam Fakhr ud din Raazi (rah) said, which is paraphrased as: (There are many sayings in regards to Zaneem). Fara said: Who attributes himself towards some nation but is not from it. It also means born due to fornication who attributes himself to some nation but is actually not from that nation....His father claimed him after eighteen years that he was his son. It is said his mother fornicated but it was not famous, until this verse was revealed. "SHA'BI SAID ZANEEM MEANS ONE WHO IS SO FAMOUS OF BEING EVIL AND CENSURED LIKE A FEMALE GOAT IS KNOWN FROM ITS HANGING EAR -IBN ABBAS SAID, THAT PERSON IS CALLED ZANEEM WHO BECAME FAMOUS DUE TO EXCESSIVE MEAT IN HIS NECK. MAQATIL SAID ZANEEM IS THAT PERSON WHOSE ROOT OF EAR HAS EXCESSIVE MEAT.

Hence meanings given by many Salaf will supersede.

Salafi scholar Abdus Sattar Hammad said:...Just like one having an excess piece in neck or ear which has no purpose, similarly that man in his nation also has no importance. That Kafir regarding whom these verses were revealed, then "HE HAD ACTUALLY THESE ATTRIBUTES" (Hadayat ul Qari, Sharh Sahih al Bukhari, Urdu, under hadith 4917)

In Irfan ul Qur'an translation of Dr. Tahir ul Qadri it is said: These Verses were sent down about Walid b. Mughira. The venerable 'Abd Allah b. 'Abbas states: 'For no one else have so many humiliating titles been used to date in the Holy Book as Allah has given to this evil soul.' Because Walid b. Mughira blasphemed against the glory of the Holy Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him), Allah replied, describing ten of Walid b. Mughira's evils, and He also revealed his illegitimacy in the end. Later his mother validated this fact. See: Tafsir al-Qurtubi, al-Razi, al-Nasafi, etc.

Also according to Qur'an no one else has been attributed with such bad traits especially that of Zaneem. Hence how dare Mirza the apostate call his enemies (i.e. Muslims, our scholars and even Christians) as b*stards? How did he know they were all b*stards?

Note: Qadiyanis have tried to defend Mirza in using word B*stard, so they applied the literal meaning in defence of Mirza.

Qadiyanis try to defend Mirza from his statements that the abusive words he used were not abuses but rather truths and facts. They quote Mirza saying:

I say "**TRULY, ABSOLUTELY TRULY**", that I have not, "**TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE**" used even one word which can be called abusive. A misconception arises because most people fail to differentiate between hurling abuse and narrating the truth...(Ruhani Khazain 3/109. Book Izala e Auham, Part 1. Translation taken from Qadiyani website)

First of all Mirza claimed and said: I truly and absolutely truly say...then he said "To the best of my knowledge", **what a confusing statement. Plus Izala e Auham from which this quote is given was published in 1891, whereas Najm ul Huda was published in 1898 where he called enemies as Pigs and their women as b*tches. Also Anwar ul Islam was published in 1894 where he called his enemies as b*stards. (These dates are taken from Qadiyani website)**

Anyways it is still a futile attempt to defend Mirza because in our article we have proven Mirza to be false claimant of Prophet (s) (whether Zilli or Buroozi), a liar, deceiver, Murtad (apostate) and cheat. This is the unanimous opinion of Ahlus Sunnah and even Twelver Shia.

Qadiyanis also try to defend Mirza by using Old testament and Gospels, and such, which were for sure not preserved

even long long before Mirza's birth rather not even during Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him)'s time, rather even before that they were corrupted (Listen to Bart Ehrman). They even try to claim through Mirza's own writings which states:

“When Jesus calls the respectable religious lawyers and Pharisees of the Jews **as swine and dogs**, and their most honourable leader Herod **a fox, and compares their respectable priests and jurists to whores**, and as regards the revered leaders, who were accorded the highest respect by the Roman rulers and made to sit with honour in the Roman courts, he speaks of them **in these offensive, very hurtful and uncivil words, calling them illegitimate, adulterous, evil, dishonourable, faithless, fools, hypocrites, satanic, doomed to hell, serpents and brood of vipers — are not these words very serious, filthy abuse in the opinion of the critic?** From this it becomes evident that the objection of the critic does not only apply to me and my books **"BUT IN REALITY HE HAS ATTACKED ALL THE DIVINE SCRIPTURES AND PROPHETS WITH A BURNING HEART"**(pages 14–15; Ruhani Khaza'in, v. 3, p. 109–110 -Translation taken from Lahori Ahmadi website. Emphasized by me)

Whereas we Muslims believe those scriptures have been severely corrupted, so such obscenities cannot be attributed to previous Prophets let alone Jesus (a.s). Even Qadiyanis accept that previous scriptures including four gospels have been corrupted, so how dare Mirza use them and these forgeries to defend his abusive language. Rather we refute

Christianity by saying that at one place your Biblical Jesus said:

But I tell you, don't be angry with anyone. If you are angry with others, you will be judged. **And if you insult someone, you will be judged by the high court. And if you call someone a fool, you will be in danger of the fire of hell.** (Matthew, 5:22. Easy to read Version. ERV)

In Arabic version it says:

أَمَّا أَنَا فَأَقُولُ لَكُمْ إِنَّ مَنْ يَغْضَبُ مِنْ شَخْصٍ آخَرَ فَإِنَّهُ يَسْتَحِقُّ
الْمُحَاكَمَةَ، وَمَنْ يَشْتِمُ شَخْصًا آخَرَ يَتَّبِعِي أَنْ يَقِفَ أَمَامَ مَجْلِسِ
الْقَضَاءِ. وَكُلُّ مَنْ يَقُولُ لِشَخْصٍ آخَرَ: «أَيْهَا الْغَيْبِيُّ» يَسْتَحِقُّ الْجَحِيمَ

Translation: But I say to you all , any person who becomes angry with another Person then he is deserving of being judged. And one who abuses another then he should stand in front of Judicial council. **And everyone who says about another person <You fool> then he is deserving of hell** (Arabic Bible, Easy to Read version)

In Urdu version it says:

لیکن میں تم سے جو کہتا ہوں کہ تم کسی پر غصہ نہ کرو ہر ایک تمہارا بھائی ہے اگر تم دوسروں پر غصہ کرو گے تو تمہارا فیصلہ ہوگا اور اگر تم کسی کو برا کہو گے تو تم سے یہودیوں کی عدالت میں چارا جوئی ہوگی۔ اگر تم کسی کو نادان یا اُجڈ کے نام سے پکارو گے تو دوزخ کی آگ کے مستحق ہو گے

English translation: But what I say to you that you should not be angry towards anyone (as) **EVERYONE IS YOUR BROTHER**. If you get angry on others then decision will be made about you. **And If you call someone bad, then in the court of Jews you will be tried. If you call someone with name of fool or (call him) ill mannered, then you will be deserving of Fire of Hell.** (Urdu, Easy to read version. Brackets added).

But elsewhere your Biblical Jesus said: **You are blind fools!** Can't you see that the Temple is greater than the gold on it? It's the Temple that makes the gold holy! (Matthew 23:17. Easy to read Version. ERV)

We know Christians try to defend themselves on this issue, but are wrong. Remember when Biblical Jesus of Christians told not to insult nor even call someone fool then the abuses attributed to Jesus (a.s) that he said them, are proven as forgeries. Now the question to Qadiyanis is that even though you accept previous scriptures are corrupted and we also accept so, but still we hypothetically ask: Were all the Muslims, their women, and scholars like Jewish Pharisees and Jewish scholars? As said before Qadiyanis try to convince Muslims to accept their cult by being soft spoken and say things like Love for all, Hatred for none. They hypocritically and deceptively say, they consider us to be Muslims.

Above all Quran states: And (remember) when We made a covenant with the Children of Israel, (saying): Worship none save Allah (only), and be good to parents and to

kindred and to orphans and the needy, **and speak kindly to mankind**; and establish worship and pay the poor-due. Then, after that, ye slid back, save a few of you, being averse. (Quran 2:83. M.Pickthall translation)

When this was enjoined upon Bani Israel then Jesus (a.s) by fortiori (a stronger reason) cannot use abusive/foul language.

They also try to defend Mirza through his writings that he resorted to foul language just in retaliation. The answer to this is that, did genuine Sunni scholars, and their women or even other women call Mirza b*stard? Also Swine and ape? Qadiyanis should show proof where they "**ALL**" did so. Note at: Qadiyanis should show proof where they "**ALL**" did so.

Still it is not justified according to Islam to use abusive language in retaliation. Qur'an teaches us:

The 'true' servants of the Most Compassionate are those **who walk on the earth humbly, and when the foolish address them 'improperly', they only respond with peace.**(25:63. Dr. Mustafa Khattab translation).

Qur'an states: Invite 'all' to the Way of your Lord **with wisdom and kind advice**, and only debate with them in the best manner. Surely your Lord 'alone' knows best who has strayed from His Way and who is 'rightly' guided. (16:125. Translation of Dr. Mustafa Khattab. One may check

other translations too. Word beautiful preaching or fair preaching is also used)

Qur'an tells us not to revile even false idols because Mushrikeen in retaliation revile the true One God.

Qur'an states: **Revile not those unto whom they pray beside Allah lest they wrongfully revile Allah through ignorance.** Thus unto every nation have We made their deed seem fair. Then unto their Lord is their return, and He will tell them what they used to do. (6:108. M.Pickthall translation)

Qur'an said to Moses (a.s) and Aaron (a.s):

Go, both of you, to Pharaoh, for he has truly transgressed 'all bounds'. **Speak to him GENTLY**, so perhaps he may be mindful 'of Me' or fearful 'of My punishment'." (20:43-44. Translation of Dr. Mustafa Khattab. Emphasized by me)

Qur'an states: ...**And do not insult one another and do not call each other by [offensive] nicknames.** Wretched is the name [i.e., mention] of disobedience after [one's] faith. And whoever does not repent - then it is those who are the wrongdoers. (49:11. Sahih International translation)

Qadiyanis also misuse verse of Qur'an i.e. 4:148, which states: Allah does not like negative thoughts to be voiced—except by those who have been wronged. Allah is All-

Hearing, All-Knowing. (Translation by Dr. Mustafa Khattab. Some have translated it as evil words, harsh, or bad words)

The word **بِالسُّوَاءِ** does not necessarily refer to using abusive words, especially in retaliation. Even if we take it to mean sending Lanah (curse) as mentioned in Tafaseer (Note: Qadiyani at ahmadianswers website has said: **Firstly, the word “lanat” is not a swear word. It refers to losing the Blessings of God. Also said: ‘Lanat” is not a curse word, rather a prayer. When Allah Sends His curse on a person, it means Allah Removed them from His Nearness and Love.** End-quote)

So it does not justify saying abusive words or lying in retaliation.

It states in Tafsir Ibn Kathir under this verse:

Sayyidna Ibn Abbas (RA) said in Tafsir of this verse: It is not allowed for a Muslim to invoke (curse) upon another Muslim. However one who is oppressed can invoke (curse) on the oppressor and he said regarding {Except those who have been wronged} **IF HE STAYS PATIENT THEN IT IS SUPERIOR"** In Abu Dawood there is hadith Narrated by Aisha (RA): Something of her was stolen, and she began to curse him (i.e. the thief). The Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) said to her: Do not lessen his sin. Imam Hasan Basri (rah) said: He should not be invoked upon (i.e. cursed), rather this supplication should be made: O Allah help me in regards to this thief and make him return (what was) my right. Another narration is narrated by him that although it is permitted for oppressed to invoke upon (i.e. curse) the

oppressor, but it should be remembered that he does not cross limits. Abdul Kareem bin Malik Jazri (rah) said in explanation of this verse: One who swears can be swore back, however one who lies (regarding you) then in return you cannot lie back. And It is in another verse: There is no blame on those who enforce justice after being wronged. (42:41. Dr. Mustafa Khattab translation). It is in Abu Dawud: Abu Hurairah (RAA) narrated that the Messenger of Allah (P.B.U.H.) said: "When two men insult one another, what they say is mainly the fault of the one who began it, so long as the one who is oppressed does not transgress...(Translation taken from English version of Bulugh al Maram but hadith is similar), then Imam Ibn Kathir mentions hadith: It was narrated that Uqbah bin Amir said:

"We said to the Messenger of Allah(ﷺ): ' You send us and we stay with people who do not show us any hospitality. What do you think of that?' The Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) said: 'If you stay with people and they give you what a guest deserves, then accept it. If they do not do that , then take from them what they should have offered, which a guest is entitled to.'"

Then Imam Ibn Kathir showed a hadith from Musnad Bazaar. Similar to it is narrated in Adab ul Mufrad of Imam Bukhari which we will mention here along with addition present in Abu Dawud:

Abu Hurayra said, "A man said, 'Messenger of Allah, I have a neighbour who does me harm. He said, (In a version of Abu Dawud it says, go and have patience. He again came to

him twice or thrice). (Prophet said): Go and take your things out into the road.' He took his things out into the road. People gathered around him and asked, 'What's the matter?' He replied, 'A neighbour of mine injures me and I mentioned it to the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace. He told me, "Take your things out into the road."' They began to say, 'O Allah, curse him! O Allah, disgrace him!' When the man heard that, he came out to him and said, 'Go back to your home. By Allah, I will not harm you.'"

End-quote.

Let us see quote from Tafsir al Khazin:

Maqatil said: This verse was revealed regarding Abu Bakr (RA). One person in presence of Prophet (Peace be upon him) disrespected Abu Bakr (RA), Abu Bakr (RA) kept quiet but still that person kept on (insulting him), then once Abu Bakr (RA) responded. After that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) stood up. **Abu Bakr (RA) said: O Prophet! I have been abused and you have not responded anything to it. Until when I responded (to the person) then Prophet stood up and said: An angel was answering from your side, but when you responded the Angel left and Satan arrived. Regarding this the verse was revealed.** (Tafsir al Khazin)

Similar narration is in Abu Dawood which states: **Narrated Sa'id ibn al-Musayyab:**

While the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) was sitting with some of his companions, **a man reviled AbuBakr and insulted him. But AbuBakr remained silent. He insulted him twice, but AbuBakr controlled himself. He insulted him thrice and AbuBakr took revenge on him.** Then the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) got up when AbuBakr took revenge. AbuBakr said: Were you angry with me, Messenger of Allah? The Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) replied: **An angel came down from Heaven and he was rejecting what he had said to you. When you took revenge, a devil came down. I was not going to sit when the devil came down.**

Next one says:

The tradition mentioned above has also been transmitted by Abu Hurairah through a different chain of narrators. This version has:

A man was reviling Abu Bakr. He then mentioned the rest of the tradition in a similar manner.

Abu Dawud said: Similarly, it has been transmitted by Safwan b. 'Isa, from Ibn 'Affan, as Sufyan said. (Sunnan Abu Dawood, # 4896-4897. Previous one declared Hasan li Ghayrihi by Albani but next one which corroborate it as Hasan. Zubayr Ali Zai said: Hasan due to next coming hadith which is witness over it)

In Musnad Ahmad a hadith states: Sayyiduna Abu Hurayrah رضى الله عنه narrated that a man reviled (Sayyiduna) Abu Bakr رضى الله عنه while the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم was sitting (along with some of his sahabah) رضى الله عنهم and wondering and smiling. When the man went too far (in reviling), **Abu Bakr رضى الله عنه retorted to some of what he said. The**

Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم become angry and got up. Abu Bakr رضى الله عنه came to him and said, O Messenger of Allah, he was reviling me and you were sitting, but when I gave some reply to him, you became angry and got up. He (i.e. The Prophet) said, "An angel was there with you replying to the man. When you spoke to him, the Satan appeared in between and I cannot sit with Satan." Then, he said, "Abu Bakr, there are three things that are all true.

(i) No one who is wronged ignores that for the sake of Allah, Mighty and Glorious, but Allah grants him great help for it.

ii) No one goes on bestowing with the intention of joining ties of relationship but Allah grants him much more against it. And,

(iii) No one begs with intention to pile up abundance (of wealth) but Allah causes him to become poorer because of it."

(Musnad Ahmad bin Hanbal # 9590, Dar al Hadith, Cairo edition. Muhaqqiq said the Chain is Sahih i.e. sound. Translation taken from English translation of Mishkaat by Shaykh Nawab Qutbuddin Khan Dehlavi. Corrected and some amendments are made by author Aamir Ibrahim according to wording used in Musnad Ahmad)

Imam Nur ud din Haythami (rah) said about this narration in Majma uz Zawaid: It is narrated by Ahmad and Tabrani in his al-Awsat... The men of Ahmad are those of Sahih. # 13698.

Salafi scholar Albani declared it Jayyid (strong), and Musnad Ahmad's version as Sahih on criteria of Sahih Muslim (Silsilah al-Ahadeeth as-Sahihah # 2231)

Also Salafi scholar Zubayr Ali Zai declared it Hasan in Tahkim over Mishkaat # 5102

So according to these narrations one should not Abuse even in retaliation.

Qur'an states: You 'believers' will surely be tested in your wealth and yourselves, **and you will certainly hear many hurtful words from those who were given the Scripture before you and 'from' the polytheists. But if you are patient and mindful 'of Allah'—surely this is a resolve to aspire to.** (3:186. Dr.Mustafa Khattab translation)

Qur'an states: So be patient 'O Prophet' with what they say. And glorify the praises of your Lord before sunrise and before sunset.(50:39.Dr.Mustafa Khattab translation)

Qur'an states: Be patient 'O Prophet' with what they say, and depart from them courteously.(73:10. Dr. Mustafa Khattab translation)

This detailed explanation and proofs we presented are going against Qadiyanis. Except one part which they may misuse i.e. Abdul Kareem bin Malik Jazri (rah) said in explanation of this verse: One who swears can be swearsed back, **however one who lies (regarding you) then in return you cannot lie back.** End-quote

Here are couple of answers:

a) Abdul Kareem bin Malik Jazri (rah) was not a Sahabi but a Tabi'i. He is not a Sharih (law giver). When it is proven from Qur'an and overwhelming hadiths (many of which we will also show ahead) that Muslims should not be abusive in any case, then qawl of Abdul Kareem cannot work. Even if some other people also said so then many verses, hadiths and explanations in Tafaseer will supersede.

b) Plus even he said you cannot lie in return. Whereas Mirza Qadiyani did so by calling "ALL" his opponents as Pigs, their women as b*tches, and opponents as B*stards which were clear lies and false accusations. Note: We say again they should prove from "ALL" Muslim scholars, Muslims, and their women that they abused Mirza in such emphatic terms.

c) We believe Mirza Qadiyani was not a Muslim at first place but an apostate, so there is no chance of accepting Mirza's foul language.

d) Mirza Qadiyani was not Mazloom but Zalim himself as he transgressed limits, denied Islamic teachings and became a Murtad/Zindeeq.

If they misuse hadith that two persons who insult each other then blame is on one who started it. But then hadith says "so long as the one who is oppressed does not transgress" **Even that cannot be misused by Qadiyanis because Mirza indeed transgressed.** Plus

word sabb does not always mean abuse (We know other translators of Abu Dawood and hadith present elsewhere translated wording in this hadith as abuse too)

Although we are from Ahlus Sunnah and do not represent Ahl-e-Hadith. However we all Muslims, also Twelver Shias are united against Qadiyanis and consider Mirza Qadiyani to be an apostate, liar, Dajjal, cheat and so on. Someone like Javed Ahmad Ghamdi (a pseudo scholar) do not matter. He said in regards to a question about Ahmadis that, he does not consider anyone Kafir who claims to be Muslim. This is an utterly batil (false) opinion. However he said at another place that he considers it Sareeh (clear) Kufr to believe about even possibility of a Prophet coming , whether Tashreehi, ghayr Tashreehi, Zilli, Buroozi, spiritual or so on... Anyways Ghamdi is not Hujjat upon us at first place.

Lahori Ahmadi group quoted from Isha'at al Sunna where Ahl-e-Hadith scholar Muhammad Hussain Batalvi said regarding Mirza Qadiyani:

"Hidden enemy of Islam"; "The second Musailima"; "Dajjal"; "a liar"; "a cheat"; "accursed one"; "he should have his face blackened, and a rope should be tied round his neck and a necklace of shoes put over him, and in this condition he should be carried through the towns of India"; "a satan, a evil-doer"; "Zindeeq"; "most shameless"; "worse than Dajjal"; "has the manners of ruffians and scavengers, nay those of beasts and savages"; "progeny of Halaku Khan and Changez Khan, the unbelieving Turks, this shows that you are really a . . .(Taken from Lahori Ahmadi website. They have not given exact reference)

Here are couple of answers:

- a) Mirza Qadiyani has called all his opponents as Pigs, their women b*tches. And also who do Takdhib of him to be B*stards (This one whether regarding Muslims or Christians is utterly despicable). He did not say it regarding Muhammad Hussain Batalvi only. Plus Qadiyanis should show proof where wife of Allama Batalvi called Mirza as such.
- b) What Muhammad Hussain Batalvi said was truth because we have proven Mirza to be an apostate, Dajjal (Grand liar), cheat and such who deserved what Batalvi Sahib said.
- c) Still in retaliation Mirza had no right to abuse back and to cross limits. Remember when it is superior for general Muslims not to retaliate, then Mirza being a (false) claimant of Prophethood (whether Zilli or Buroozi), Promised Messiah/Mahdi cannot do so at all .
- d) Plus according to Qadiyani website Allama Batalvi had repented from calling Mirza Qadiyani and his group to be Kafirs. It states in Qadiyani website, that Mirza Qadiyani said:

” I saw that this man [Maulavi Muhammad Husain] will acknowledge my being a believer before his death and I saw that he had given up calling me Kafir [disbeliever] and had repented of this position. I saw all this in a dream and I am hoping that my Lord will

make it come true” (Hujjatul-Islam, Ruhani Khazain, Volume 6, Page 59)

Qadiyanis quote their own newspaper which according to them asserts that Allama Batalvi said: ” All these sects believe the Holy Qur’an to be the Word of God. Like the Qur’an, all these sects also believe in hadith. A new sect, Ahmadi, started a short time ago ever since Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian made his claim to be the Massiah and Mahdi. This sect also believes equally in the Qur’an and hadith.... My sect certainly does not consider any of the above mentioned sects to be kafir [disbelievers].” (For Details see al-Fadl, Volume 1, No. 35, February 11, 1914, Page 3)"

End-quote.

As usual prophesy of Mirza was wrong. We cannot rely on Qadiyani’s own newspaper as they are liars. However we have shown them to prove that Mirza was not using foul language about Batalvi Sahib or his wife but also other Muslim scholars, Muslims and their women.

Note: The book Hujjat ul Islam was published in 1893 before Najm ul huda which was published in 1898. In the latter he called Muslims and their scholars as pigs and their women b*tches. Also Anwar ul islam was published in 1894 where Mirza called his Muslim and Christian opponents as B*stards.

Hence the abusive language of Mirza cannot be upon Batalvi Sahib, but rather on other scholars, Muslims and their women [even woman (s) related to Batalvi Sahib did not use abusive language, until Qadiyanis prove otherwise that they “ALL” did so]

Qadiyanis may misuse hadith which states:

Abu Huraira reported Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) as saying:

O Allah, I am a human being and for any person amongst Muslims upon whom I hurl malediction or invoke curse or give him whipping **make it a source of purity and mercy.** (Sahih Muslim # 2601 a)

Here word "Sabb" cannot be translated as Abuse or cuss. Plus let us understand it from another hadith

...I am a human being and I am pleased just as a human being is pleased and I lose temper just as a human being loses temper, so for any person from amongst my Ummah whom I curse "**AND HE IN NO WAY DESERVES IT**" let that, O Lord, be made a source of purification and purity and nearness to (Allah) on the Day of Resurrection. (Sahih Muslim # 2603)

Mirza Qadiyani used abusive language and considered his opponents deserving of it. And did not mean it to be a source of purity and mercy. We have already explained above from Qadiyani website itself that Lanat is not a swear or curse word.

It states in Sahih Bukhari:

Narrated Anas bin Malik:

The Prophet (ﷺ) was not one who would abuse (others) or say obscene words, or curse (others), and if he wanted to admonish anyone of us, he used to say: "What is wrong with him, his forehead be dusted!" (Sahih Bukhari # 6031)

Narrated Masruq: Abdullah bin 'Amr mentioned Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) saying that he was neither a Fahish nor a Mutafahish. Abdullah bin 'Amr added, Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) said, **'The best among you are those who have the best manners and character.'** (Sahih Bukhari # 6029)

Narrated 'Aisha: A man asked permission to enter upon the Prophet. When the Prophet (ﷺ) saw him, **he said, "What an evil brother of his tribe! And what an evil son of his tribe!"** When that man sat down, **the Prophet (ﷺ) behaved with him in a nice and polite manner and was completely at ease with him.** When that person had left, 'Aisha said (to the Prophet). "O Allah's Apostle! When you saw that man, you said so-and-so about him, then you showed him a kind and polite behavior, and you enjoyed his company?" Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) said, **"O 'Aisha! Have you ever seen me speaking a bad and dirty language?** (Remember that) the worst people in Allah's sight on the Day of Resurrection will be those whom

the people leave (undisturbed) to be away from their evil (deeds)." (Sahih Bukhari # 6032)

Abdullah bin 'Amr said; The Messenger of Allah said:

The best of you are those best in conduct.' And the Prophet was not one who was obscene, nor one who uttered obscenities. (Sunnan Tirmidhi # 1975. It is Sahih)

Abdullah narrated that the Messenger of Allah said:

"The believer does not insult the honor of others, nor curse, **nor commit Fahishah, nor is he foul.**" (Sunnan Tirmidhi # 1977. Hadith is Hasan)

Narrated `Abdullah bin Mulaika:

`Aisha said that the Jews came to the Prophet (ﷺ) and said, "As-Samu 'Alaikum" (death be on you). `Aisha said (to them), "(Death) be on you, and may Allah curse you and shower His wrath upon you!" **The Prophet (ﷺ) said, "Be calm, O `Aisha ! You should be kind and lenient, and beware of harshness and Fuhsh (i.e. bad words).**" She said (to the Prophet), "Haven't you heard what they (Jews) have said?" He said, "Haven't you heard what I have said (to them)? I said the same to them, and my invocation against them will be accepted while theirs against me will be rejected (by Allah). " (Sahih Bukhari # 6030)

Note: Saying Wa alaykum in response to Jews saying death be upon you is not abusive. Plus If we read the full hadith, Prophet (Peace be upon him) told Aisha (RA): Be calm, O `Aisha ! You should be kind and lenient, and beware of harshness and Fuhsh (i.e. bad words)...Plus Mirza's abuses to Muslims and their scholars will be returned back to him and rejected by Allah to be applicable on Muslims.

It is stated in Sahih Muslim:

It is narrated on the authority of 'Abdullah b. Amr b. al-'As that the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) observed: Abusing one's parents is one of the major sins. They (the hearers) said: Messenger of Allah, does a man abuse his parents too? He (the Holy Prophet) replied: Yes, one abuses the father of another man, who in turn abuses his father. One abuses his mother and he in turn abuses his (the former's) mother. (Sahih Muslim # 90 a)

So Mirza in retaliation abused parents of his enemies and that could never be justified.

Ibn Mas'ud (RAA) narrated that the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) said:

insulting a Muslim is disobedience to Allah, and fighting with him is Kufr (disbelief).” Agreed upon.

(Bulugh al Maram by Imam Ibn Hajr Asqalani. English version from Sunnah.com reference is, Book 16, Hadith 51. English translation, Book 16, Hadith 1530. It is translated as defaming elsewhere such as Sunnan Nasai'i, some

translated as reviling and abusing too. So when defaming and insulting another Muslim is a big sin then abusing him is even bigger)

It is narrated on the authority of Jabir that he heard the (Holy Prophet) say: A Muslim is he from whose hand and tongue the Muslims are safe. (Sahih Muslim # 41)

One hadith says to an extant:

It was narrated from Abu Hurairah that: The Messenger of Allah [SAW] said: "**The Muslim is the one from whose tongue and hand the people are safe,** and the believer is the one from whom the people's lives and wealth are safe." (Sunnan Nasai'i # 4998. Hadith is Sahih)

Due to these hadiths the hadith in Sahih Muslim which Qadiyanis may misuse can only be interpreted that it does not mean using foul language and not even Lanah as many hadiths forbid from even sending Lanah on other Muslims. Plus especially those who do not deserve it. We know there are hadiths where some people are cursed like men imitating women and vice versa, etc...Such people really deserve it, plus Qadiyani website has accepted that Lanah is not a swear or curse word so they are fully refuted.

Qadiyanis may misuse words used by Sayyidna Abu Bakr (RA) regarding goddess of Mushrikeen al-Lat. It is a long narration, which has the following wording

امصص ببظر الالات، أنحن نفر عنه وندعه؟

Sahih Bukhari # 2731. Ustadha Aisha Bewley translated it as: **Suck al-Lat's nipples! Would we flee from him and desert him. Alfred Guillaumi in English version of Seerah Ibn Ishaq, translated as: Suck al-Lat's nipples! Should we desert him?** However it may be translated as: ***Suck the clitoris of al-Lat, would we flee from him and desert him?* Muhsin Khan only used word Abused.**

Here are following answers in regards to this.

- a) If Qadiyanis are so stubbornly persistent to defend their abusive Mirza Ghulam Ahmad then they may use such abusive word for idols of Mushrikeen (idolaters), that too if Mushrikeen start ridiculing first. They cannot use them for Muslims or even Ahlul Kitab as Jews claim to follow Moses (a.s) and previous Prophets, and Christians claim to follow Jesus (a.s) and previous Prophets, and majority worship Jesus (a.s) too. It is a challenge to Qadiyanis where such wordings are used for Prophets even though Jews and Christians tampered the true teachings, and many Christians worshipped and still worship Jesus (a.s). We have proven above that Mirza Qadiyani disrespected Jesus (a.s) relying on fabricated previous scriptures, and attributed to Jesus (a.s) that he Naudhobillah used foul language. Qadiyanis own those statements to defend abusive language of Mirza. Whereas at the same time believe previous scriptures have been corrupted.

- b)** We have shown Quanic verse not to revile even idols of Mushrikeen. However Abu Bakr (ra) responded in retaliation. Look at point a above again.
- c)** Mushrikeen of Makkah when worshipped their idols then the nipples or even if we take translation of clitoris, then they considered it holy.
- d)** Hindus till today revere vagina of their goddess kamakhya in the kamakhya temple. In Bhutan some people make pictures or drawings of male genital organ and believe that they bring good luck and expel evil spirits. Also shiva lingam represents phallic symbol. It is worshipped by Hindus till today .
- e)** It was a proverb like Arabs say which is paraphrased: The poets are of three types: 1. A good one. 2. An ordinary one and, 3. The one who bites the nipples/clitoris of his mother. (Abu Ali al-Hasan bin Rashiq al-Qairawani in his book: Al Umda fi Mahasin ash-Shi'r al adabih 1/116). Which means that third category of poets are worthless. As Urwa worshipped al-Lat hence it was superior to him than his mother.
- f)** It is a Khabr e Wahid. Imam Khattib Baghdadi (rah) said which is paraphrased: A Khabr al Wahid report cannot be accepted if it goes against (sound) intellect, the order of Holy Qur'an, and the known Sunnah (which is certain) [Al Kifayah fee Ilm ir Riwayah, Page. 432]. Imam Nawawi (rah) said: Most of the (scholars) and Researchers said that the Hadiths of Bukhari and Muslim which are not Mutawattir, they imply conjecture (zann) since they are from Ahaad, and the

Ahaad imply nothing but conjecture (Zann). This is based on what was already known and agreed upon. This rule applies without distinguishing between Bukhari, Muslim or others. [Sharh Sahih Muslim, Volume # 1, Page # 20]

- g)** It contains a narrator Ibn Shihab al Zuhri. It has come in lone narrations having Zuhri which can depict Shaykhayn (Abu Bakr ra, and Umar ra) in bad light, especially Abu Bakr (ra). For example the narration in Bukhari, Muslim and elsewhere saying that Sayyidah Fatima (ra) DIED ANGRY WITH ABU BAKR (RA) AND SAYYIDNA ALI (RA) DELAYED BAYAH TO ABU BAKR (RA) TO 6 MONTHS. (See Sahih Bukhari # 4240, 4241) However other narrations prove that Sayyidah Fatima (ra) was well pleased with Abu Bakr (ra). See Tirmidhi # 1609 which states:

Narrated Abu Hurairah: That Fatimah came to Abu Bakr and 'Umar may Allah be pleased with them both, to ask them about her inheritance from the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ). They said: "We heard the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) say: 'I am not inherited from.'" So she said: 'By Allah! I will never talk to you two again.' So she died having not talked to them."

'Ali bin 'Eisa said: **"The meaning of not speaking to you two is: 'Never again regarding this inheritance, because you two are truthful."**[Jami' at-Tirmidhi Vol. 3, Book 19, Hadith 1609 Declared Hasan]

Also see Sunnan al-Kubra of Imam Bayhaqi (Narration # 12735). This next one is declared by Imam Bayhaqi (rah) himself as good and Mursal, having authentic chain. End-quote. Hence due to other corroborations it becomes absolutely authentic.

And also that Sayyidna Ali (ra) gave Bayah way earlier than six months as proven from Al Mustadrak ala Sahihayn of Imam Hakim (# 4457) and al Sunan al Kubra of Imam Bayhaqi (# 16538). The narrations are authentic. They prove that Ali (ra) gave bayah very early.

Plus Imam Bayhaqi (rah) said about Ali (ra) delaying Bayah to 6 Months:

This part that Ali abstained from giving pledge to Abu Bakr (ra) till Fatima (ra) died, is saying of al-Zuhri and it is broken (munqati) [Sunnan al-Kubra of Bayhaqi Hadith # 12732]

It has also come from Zuhri that Umar (ra) said to Ali (ra) that you considered Abu Bakr (ra) as liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest. Also considered me (i.e. Umar ra) as liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest. (See Sahih Muslim # 1757 c)

Now this above wording is not proven except through Zuhri being in chain. Shia use these narrations to disrespect Abu Bakr (ra) and Umar (ra).

Also Zuhri inserted in narration that Prophet (Peace be upon him) tried to commit suicide many times, Naudhobillah. The wording of Bukhari is:

The Prophet became so sad AS WE HAVE HEARD that he intended several times to throw himself from the tops of high mountains... (Sahih Bukhari # 6982)

Imam Ibn Hajr Asqalani (rah) said about above one:

Hence the one who stated “As it has reached us” was al-Zuhri, the meaning of his saying is: In this sentence is that which has reached us regarding the Prophet (Peace be upon him) in regards to this story. It is an addition that has reached al-Zuhri which is “NOT CONNECTED BACK TO THE ORIGINAL NARRATION” and al-Kirmani said: This is evident [Fath ul Bari, Sharh Sahih ul Bukhari 12/359]

So Zuhri who can make such severe interpolations then it is possible that the narration of Zuhri about Abu Bakr (ra)'s language can be disputed too.

h) Qadiyani website itself says: The Holy Qur’an is the 100% authentic word of Allah. There is no doubt about it, but we can’t say the same concerning the Ahadith. The Ahadith can be unreliable, misunderstood or even made up. Our understanding concerning the Ahadith is not whether they are *Sahih* or *Daeef*, but whether they support the Holy Qur’an or not! Please try to understand this point, Sahih Bukhari and Sahih Muslim, made very good checks to see which hadith can be termed *Sahih* or *Daeef*. If the chain was sound and they were happy with it, then with Sahih Bukhari he used to then pray two raka’ats and finally put it in his

Ahadith book. Thousands of Ahadith he rejected because they were not sound enough for him. That is why he is looked upon as the most authentic out of all the Ahadith books, **but just because he recorded it, does not make it correct. That is why no one says that Sahih Bukhari is 100% authentic, they only say that about the Holy Qur'an.**

Qadiyanis may misuse the following hadith:

Utayy ibn Damura said, "I saw with Ubay a man who was attributing himself (in lineage) with an attribution of Jahiliyyah, so Ubay told him to bite his father's male organ and did not speak figuratively (i.e. was explicit). So his companions looked at him. He said, 'It appears that you disapprove of it.' Then he said, 'I will never show apprehension to anyone with regards to this. Verily, I heard the Prophet, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, say, "Whomever attributes himself (in lineage) with an attribution of Jahiliyyah, then tell him to bite his father's male organ and do not speak figuratively (i.e. be explicit). (Adab ul Mufrad of Imam Bukhari # 963 Online version)

Here are couple of answers.

- a) Salafi scholar Zubayr Ali Zai declared it's chain weak in Tahkeem over Mishkaat # 4902. Whereas Salafi scholar Albani declared it Sahih. Even if it is authentic in chain but that does not mean matn (content especially the part about private part) is authentic too. First of all Qur'an says about Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him):

And indeed, you are of a great moral character.(Qur'an 68:4. Sahih International translation)

Also it states regarding Prophet (Peace be upon him)

Narrated Abu Sa`id Al-Khudri:

The Prophet (ﷺ) was shier than a veiled virgin girl. (Bukhari # 3562))

b) It should be understood from another hadith:

It was narrated that Abū Hurairah said: "The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said: 'Allāh has taken away your pride of *Jāhiliyyah* and your boasting about your forefathers. One is only a righteous believer or a doomed evildoer. You are the sons of Ādam and Ādam was created from dust. Men should stop boasting about their forefathers, who are no more than the coal of Hell, or they will certainly be more insignificant before Allāh than the beetle that rolls dung with its nose.'" (Sunnan Abu Dawood, Volume, 5, Page, 419, Hadith # 5116. Arabic-English Dar us Salam version. Hadith is Hasan).

This hadith does not use the wording which was present in previous hadith, and this latter one will supersede.

c) During the time of Mirza, did all the Muslims, their scholars, and their women boastfully attributed their lineage with an attribution of Jahiliyyah?

d) Plus there is discrepancy in wording of the hadith too.

There can be many more proofs shown.

We would like to conclude with this beautiful verse of Qur'an:

And We have not sent you, [O Muḥammad], except as a mercy to the worlds. (21:107. Sahih International translation)

And we would say that a claimant of Prophethood (whether Zilli of Buroozi) /Mahdi/Promised Messiah (although Mirza cannot be any but was rather a liar, apostate, and Zindeeq) cannot use abusive language in any case. Even if we ask a young person, he will say, he cannot do so. I even asked my daughter and she said he cannot do so in any case.

Mirza Qadiyani claiming to be Mahdi and Isa by using fabricated and weak narrations.

Mirza used an athar that too a fabricated one. Distorted its translation and applied it on himself to claim to be Mahdi. Let us first look at the athar (Note: It is not hadith of Prophet Peace be upon him, nor any Sahabi). It states:

Muhammad bin Ali said: Indeed there are two signs for our Mahdi, since creation of heavens and earth, they have never appeared. Moon shall be eclipsed on "THE FIRST NIGHT OF RAMADAN" and Sun shall eclipse in the "MIDDLE OF IT". This has never happened since Allah created the heavens and the earth. (Sunnan Daraqutni # 1795)

Now let us look at deceiving and false translation of Mirza Qadiyani. Mirza Qadiyani translated, which is paraphrased: First night of Ramadan for lunar eclipse as 13th night, and Middle of Ramadan for solar eclipse as 28th. (See: Ruhani Khazain 11/330)

Above all this narration is fabricated. It contains Jaabir al Ju'fi and Amr bin Shamr. Both have been declared as Liars by many scholars. Amr bin Shamr was also a Rafidhi Shia who used to abuse Sahaba. Plus such eclipses have happened in Ramadan many times before Mirza and after his death too. David L. McNaughton has written an article which is available in pdf, proving that they happened many times before Mirza and also after his death. So even if assuming it refers to 13th night for Lunar eclipse, and 28th for Solar eclipse then It is further proven as fabricated because the wording in narration cannot ever refer to those dates.

Mirza tried to defend himself that the narration uses word Qamar not Hilal which means it cannot be first night of Ramadan. What a cheat Mirza was. According to Qur'an Qamar can refer to first night of moon too. In Qur'an word Qamar is used for Moon overall irrespective of it being of first night or later.

Qur'an states:

وَ الْقَمَرَ قَدَّرْنَاهُ مَنَازِلَ حَتَّىٰ عَادَ كَالْعُرْجُونِ الْقَدِيمِ

Translation done by almost all is moon (See Qur'an 36:39)
(also see 36:40, 55:5, 35:13, 21:33)

Also Mirza said Sun will be eclipsed on 28th. How can this be right according to narration? Plus Mirza said that first night of Ramadan refers to 4th night onward, then word Awal used for Moon eclipse should refer to 5th night not 13th. Because 5th night is closest to Awal.

Even if we assume lunar eclipse refers to 13th night and Solar eclipse to 28th then the hadith is not only Fabricated due to chain but also due to content (matn)

Qadiyanis misuse verse 75:7-9 which state: But when sight is confounded. And the moon is eclipsed. And sun and moon are united. (M.Pickthall translation)

If we read in context from verse 6 then it refers to Day of resurrection, not about Mirza's time.

In Tafsir al Jalalyn it states: and the sun and the moon are brought together, "SO THAT BOTH OF THEM WILL RISE FROM THE WEST"; or [it means when] the light of both of them disappears — 'AND THIS WILL BE ON THE DAY OF RESURRECTION"

Tafsir Ibn Katheer also applied it on Day of resurrection. So this verse can never be regarding Mirza. Plus the verse does not mention it happening in Ramadan.

Qadiyanis yet again use Gospel (s) to defend Mirza. As said before previous scriptures have been corrupted and are not Hujjah upon us, and Qadiyanis also accept they have been corrupted. Above all even Matthew 24:29 does not refer to Mirza but about second coming of Jesus (a.s) which can never be applied to Mirza because Qadiyanis believe Jesus (a.s) has died and shall not descend by himself again as Isa Ibn Maryum whereas Mirza was Ghulam Ahmad Qadiyani bin Charagh bibi.

Now we will make detailed discussion on the issue of Imam Mahdi (ra). Mirza the accursed one used fabricated and weak hadiths and applied them on himself but rejected or falsely interpreted the Authentic ones. Another weak hadith Qadiyanis and Mirza himself misused is the hadith which states:

It was narrated from Anas bin Malik that the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) said:

“Adhering to religion will only become harder and worldly affairs will only become more difficult, and people will only become more stingy, and the Hour will only come upon the worst of people, and the only Mahdi (after Muhammad (ﷺ)) is ‘Eisa bin Maryam.”

Ibn Majah # 4039

This is declared weak by the following scholars.

1. Mullah Ali Qari (rah) said: It is weak according to consensus of Muhaditheen (Mirqaat al Mafatih, Sharh Mishkaat al Masabih. See Sharh after Hadith # 5462. Dar al Fikr Beirut, Lebanon, 2002 edition)

2. Imam Dhahabi (rah) said: It is Munkar (denounced) (See under narrator Muhammad bin Khalid, # 7479)

3. Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah declared it weak (Manhaaj as Sunnah 8/256)

4. Ash-Shawkani said: Imam San'ani said It is fabricated (Fawa'id al Majmooa, Narration # 127)

4. Salafi scholar Albani declared it Munkar in Silsilah Ahadith al Da'efa #77 -Also extremely weak except the sentence about hour which is Sahih. (See his Tahkim over Ibn Majah)

5. Salafi scholar Zubayr Ali Zai declared it weak too in his Tahkim over Ibn Majah. He said which is paraphrased: Hasan Basri is narrating with An (and he is mudalis). Aljanda (Muhammad bin Khalid) it is not proven that Ibn Maeen did Tawtheeq of him. (Muhammad bin Khalid is declared Majhool, Matrook, His hadiths cannot be followed, Daeef). There is dispute in chain. Abban did not hear from Hasan (Brackets are added by author)

Five scholars are enough to be quoted. Plus the wording of this weak hadith should only be interpreted as Isa (a.s) is perfectly guided (and sinless) Mahdi not that he is same as Imam Mahdi (ra). Let us understand that word Mahdi is

used for one who is guided as well. It is stated regarding Khulafa Rashideen al Mahdiyeen (first 5 Caliphs)

It was narrated from 'Abdur-Rahman bin 'Amr As-Sulami that:

He heard Al-'Irbad bin Sariyah say: "The Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) delivered a moving speech to us which made our eyes flow with tears and made our hearts melt. We said: 'O Messenger of Allah. This is a speech of farewell. What did you enjoin upon us?' He said: 'I am leaving you upon a (path of) brightness whose night is like its day. No one will deviate from it after I am gone but one who is doomed. Whoever among you lives will see great conflict. I urge you to adhere to what you know of my Sunnah and the path of the Rightly-Guided Caliphs, (مِنْ سُنَّتِي وَسُنَّةِ الْخُلَفَاءِ الرَّاشِدِينَ الْمَهْدِيِّينَ) and cling stubbornly to it. And you must obey, even if (your leader is) an Abyssinian leader. For the true believer is like a camel with a ring in its nose; wherever it is driven, it complies."

[Sunnan Ibn Majah # 4. Hadith is Sahih and has other chains too. One version was called as Hasan Sahih by Imam Tirmidhi (rah) himself. Arabic inserted by author]

This refers to first four Caliphs i.e. Sayyidna Abu Bakr (ra), Sayyidna Umar (ra), Sayyidna Uthman (ra), Sayyidna Ali (ra) [and if we include Sayyidna Hasan (ra) then five, however his tenure of being Caliph was very short]. None of them claimed to be separate entity of Imam Mahdi (ra)

Regarding Sahabi Ameer Mu'awiyah. It states in Jami' Tirmidhi

Narrated 'Abdur-Rahman bin Abu 'Umairah - and he was one of the Companions of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ):from the Prophet (ﷺ), that he said to Mu'awiyah: "O Allah, give him guidance, (make him) guided one, and guide (others) by him."

Tirmidhi # 3842. English Dar us Salam version. Hadith is Sahih. Translation corrected according to context. See Urdu translation too.

Here word مَهْدِيًّا has been used.

Such wording is also used by Prophet (Peace be upon him) for Sayyidna Jarir (ra) (See Sahih Bukhari # 6089, 6090)

Qadiyanis may misuse hadith that Caliphate (on the Manhaj) of Nubuawah shall stay for thirty years. So hadith of 12 Caliphs contradict that. Then remember the first four (or five) rightly guided caliphs who came in power are considered Khulafa ar Rashideen whose path is to be followed as we presented hadith. Whereas next ones are not included in this.

Scholars have differed over the hadith of twelve caliphs and the meaning of such hadiths is ambiguous, however Imam Abu Dawood narrated it in Book of al-Mahdi, which can refer that it includes Imam Mahdi (ra) to be last one. Imam

Suyuti (rah) has also said so due to title made Imam Abu Dawood (rah). See: Al Haawi lil Fatawi 2/102

Imam Ibn Kathir (rah) said: The meaning of this Hadith is a glad tiding of 12 righteous caliphs (after the Prophet) who will establish truth and treat people with justice. It does not necessarily mean that they will come one after another. Four of them have come one after another i.e. four caliphs Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, and Ali. Among them is undoubtedly Umar bin Abdul Aziz (rah), and some from Bani Abbas. The Day of Resurrection will not come until the 12 caliphs rule. And apparently Imam Mahdi whose glad tiding has been mentioned in many narrations is one of them [Tafsir Ibn Kathir (3/65)]

Some scholars counted all 12 Caliphs and claimed they have gone by and even included tyrants like Yazid bin Mu'awiya, which is obviously not correct. However the correct list seems to be the following as said by Imam Ahmad Ridha Khan (rah):

1. Sayyidna Abu Bakr (ra)
 2. Sayyidna Umar bin Khatab (ra)
 3. Sayidna Uthman bin Affan (ra)
 4. Sayyidna Ali bin Abi Talib (ra)
 5. Sayyidna Hasan bin Ali (ra)
 6. Sayyidna Ameer Muawiyah (ra)
 7. Sayyidna Abdullah bin Zubayr (ra).
 8. Hadhrat Umar bin Abdul Aziz (ra)
- And finally 12th being Imam Mahdi (ra)

Three who are remaining, it is not sure who they are.

Amongst remaining three Mirza can never be one, because all of them especially last one will also be from Quraish whereas Mirza was not. Plus Imam Mahdi (ra) who is a separate entity from Jesus (a.s) is mentioned in List. He will come in end of times and have attributes, and do things which Mirza never did.

Plus list according to twelver Shias who are a majority in Shia, is:

1. Sayyidna Ali bin Abi Talib (ra)
2. Sayyidna Hasan bin Ali (ra)
3. Sayyidna Hussain bin Ali (ra)
4. Sayyidna Ali bin Hussain (Zayn ul Abideen) (ra)
5. Sayyidna Muhhamad al Baqir (ra)
6. Sayyidna Jafar al Sadiq (ra)
7. Sayyidna Musa al Kadhim (ra)
8. Sayyidna Ali al Rida (ra)
9. Sayyidna Muhammad al Taqi (ra)
10. Sayyidna Ali al Hadi (ra)
11. Sayyidna Hasan al Askari (ra)
12. Sayyidna Imam Mahdi (ra) who is in ghaybat (in absence) and is not Jesus (a.s).

So even according to twelver Shia, Imam Mahdi (ra) is other than Isa ibn Maryum (a.s), but is in ghaybat. He according

to Shia is son of Imam Hasan al Askari (rah), whereas Mirza Dajjal was not.

Now let us look at deception of Qadiyanis. They in order to make two different people i.e. Imam Mahdi (ra) and Jesus (a.s) as one, even distorted translations.

Proof # 1 (Qadiyanis gave reference of famous Mushin Khan translation but being cheats, changed the translation)

They quoted it as: Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) said "How will you be when the son of Mary descends amongst you and is your imam among you." (Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 4, Book 55, Hadith 658)

Note this way of mentioning references refers to Muhsin Khan translation.

Now let us see actual wording:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) said "How will you be when the son of Mary (i.e. Jesus) descends amongst you and your imam is among you."

End-quote.

At another website of Qadiyanis they have different translation to the one I showed first

It states: How would it be with you when the son of Mary will descend among you and you will have a leader raised from among you?"

What big cheats Qadiyanis are, however second translation of Qadiyanis we showed is closer to be right. Let us look at translation of Sahih Muslim in regards to this hadith.

Proof # 2

It is narrated on the authority of Abu Huraira that the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) observed:

What will be your state when the son of Mary descends amongst you and there will be an Imam amongst you? (Sahih Muslim # 155 d. Even here Qadiyanis have given reference same as present online but cleverly changed translation)

Let us understand this from another hadith

It is narrated on the authority of Abu Huraira that the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) observed:

What would you do when the son of Mary would descend amongst you and would lead you as one amongst you? Ibn Abi Dhi'b on the authority of Abu Huraira narrated: Your leader amongst you. Ibn Abi Dhi'b said: Do you know what the words: " He would lead as one amongst you" mean? I said: Explain these to me. He said: He would lead you

according to the Book of your: Lord (hallowed be He and most exalted) and the Sunnah of your Apostle (ﷺ).

(Sahih Muslim # 155 d)

Hence here it does not prove that Isa (a.s) is same entity as Imam Mahdi (ra), rather it means he will lead Muslims according to Qur'an and Sunnah of Prophet (Peace be upon him)

Also that Isa (a.s) will pray behind Imam Mahdi (ra) is also proven as we will mention hadith ahead.

Qadiyanis misuse a hadith of Musnad Ahmad which states:

حدثنا محمد بن جعفر، قال: حدثنا هشام، عن محمد، عن أبي هريرة، عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال: يوشك من عاش منكم أن يلقي عيسى ابن مريم إماما مهديا وحكما عدلا، فيكسر الصليب، ويقتل الخنزير، وتوضع الجزية، وتضع الحرب أوزارها

Qadiyanis wrongly and partially translated it because It is going against them in totality (However elsewhere they do mention next things, which by the way go against Mirza and Qadiyanis). Here is their translation:

“It is near that one who lives from amongst you shall meet ‘Eisa bin Maryam. He will be the Imam Mahdi, a leader and a just ruler..”(Musnad Ahmad #9294)

Actual translation should be: It is near that those of you who shall live, shall meet Isa the son of Maryam, a guided

leader and just judge. He will break the cross, kill the swine, abolish the Jizyah, and the war will be stopped.

Dar us Salam version has this translation: It was narrated from Abu Hurayrah that the Prophet (ﷺ) said: "Soon those among you who live will meet 'Eesa ibn Maryam, a fair leader and just judge. He will break the cross, kill the pigs and abolish the jizyah, and war will lay down its burdens." (Musnad Ahmad bin Hanbal, Volume 6, Page, 591-592, Hadith number # 9323. Arabic-English, Dar us Salam version)

So Qadiyani deceptive translation as "the Imam Mahdi" is not justified. It should be translated as guided leader or fair leader.

The whole hadith refutes Qadiyanis.

a) It is talking about Isa Ibn Maryum (a.s) descending not Mirza Ghulam Ahmad bin Charagh bibi who never descended but was born in Qadiyan and lived there already. We know Qadiyanis deceive people that Mirza became Isa in metaphorical sense. Remember no hadith says metaphorical Isa Ibn Maryum (a.s) shall descend. Word used is descent not being already present in world. Jesus (a.s) will be a just judge whereas Mirza the accursed one did not become Judge of world. Break the cross i.e. if taken metaphorically means false Christianity will be abolished completely which never happened in time of Mirza. Also kill the swine which if taken metaphorically means Christians will stop eating pigs, which also did not happen till today. Abolish the Jizya which will happen all over the world. And

war will stop. All this has not happened and till today is happening, plus wars have been going on after Mirza.

b) The Wasf (attribute/trait) of Jesus is mentioned i.e. He will be a guided leader not that he will be the same person as Imam Mahdi, who will be first of all from Quraish, which Jesus never was (rather Jesus was from Bani Israel) nor was Mirza. He will be from Ahlul Bayt especially from biological lineage of Sayyidah Fatima (ra), which Jesus (a.s) cannot be, nor was Mirza as such.

Then qadiyanis misuse hadiths where wasf (attribute/trait) of being Mahdi is used i.e. guided one. We have already shown hadith about Khulafa ar Rashideen and Ameer Muawiya (ra) above. So were they, Ameer Muawiyah (ra) and other people whose this wasf has been told were really Imam Mahdis who will come before end times?

Then Qadiyanis use hadith that Isa (a.s) will be a Khalifa, so if Imam Mahdi (a.s) is separate Khalifa than Jesus (a.s) then hadith tells to kill other claimant of caliphate. They use a weak hadith of Tabarani which calls Isa (a.s) as Khalifa. It has come with Mu'an'an of Qatada and Qatada is a Mudalis of third category, the Mu'an'an of whom cannot be accepted. (See his name in Tabaqat al Mudaliseen of Imam Ibn Hajr Asqalani # 92. In third category of Mudaliseen). Also Imam Nur ud din Haythami (rah) said Muhammad bin Uqba as Sadoosi is called Thiqa by Ibn Hibban but weak by Abu Hatim. (Majma uz Zawaid # 13788). So the Jarh will supersede.

Let us take their own translation:

Narrated Abu Hurairahra: The Holy Prophet Muhammadsaw said: “Hearken! There is no Prophet and Messenger between me and the Forthcoming Jesus. He is the Khalifa in my Ummah after me. Verily, He will kill the Dajjal, and break the cross, and abolish war. Anyone from among you who sees him, should convey my Salam to him” (Tabarani, Hadith #5040)

First of all they do not know how to give reference. Just saying Tabarani does not clarify which book of Imam Tabarani is it present in. Anyways it is in Mu'jam al Awsat and Sagheer of Imam Tabarani AND IT IS WEAK. Secondly it refutes Qadiyanis themselves because it is saying according to Qadiyani translation itself : There is no Prophet and Messenger between me and the Forthcoming Jesus. He is the Khalifa in my Ummah after me. Verily, He will kill the Dajjal, and break the cross, and abolish war. Anyone from among you who sees him, should convey my Salam to him” End-quote

Qadiyanis do not believe in Jesus (a.s) descending himself whereas this hadith is saying There is no Prophet or Messenger between me and FORTHCOMING JESUS. Which proves Jesus coming again will not affect the finality of Prophethood which is contrary to belief of Mirza and Qadiyanis themselves. Plus he will do things like killing Dajjal, break cross etc... which we have already explained Mirza did not do. None of the Muslims conveyed Salam to Mirza believing him to be a Mahdi let alone Promised Messiah.

Even if assuming the hadith is Sahih then it does not apply on caliphate during time of Jesus (a.s) and Imam Mahdi (ra). Only those caliphs are to be killed who make caliphate in opposition of already existing caliphate. Whereas that will not be the case with Imam Mahdi (ra) and Jesus (a.s) who will join hands. Plus Jesus (a.s) will pray behind Imam Mahdi (a.s) as this following hadith proves:

Jabir b. 'Abdullah reported:

I heard the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) say: A section of my people will not cease fighting for the Truth and will prevail till the Day of Resurrection. He said: Jesus son of Mary would then descend and their (Muslims') commander would invite him to come and lead them in prayer, but he would say: No, some amongst you are commanders over some (amongst you). This is the honour from Allah for this Ummah. (Sahih Muslim # 156).

Qadiyanis try to create doubt that wording used in this hadith is Ameer not Khalifa. They say it does not prove Mahdi to be different from Isa (a.s) as Isa (a.s) will pray behind leader not Imam Mahdi (ra). Let us understand this from a famous hadith of 12 Caliphs. In one version it states:

It has been narrated on the authority of Jabir b. Samura who said:

I heard the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) say: Islam will continue to be triumphant until there have been TWELVE CALIPHS. Then the Prophet (ﷺ) said something which I could not

understand. I asked my father: What did he say? He said: He has said that ALL OF THEM (TWELVE CALIPHS) WILL BE FROM THE QURAISH. (Sahih Muslim 1821 d and others).

However one version says:

Narrated Jabir bin Samura:

I heard the Prophet (ﷺ) saying, "There will be TWELVE MUSLIM RULERS (who will rule all the Islamic world)." He then said a sentence which I did not hear. My father said, "ALL OF THEM (THOSE RULERS) WILL BE FROM QURAISH" (Sahih Bukhari # 7222, 7223)

In above hadith word Ameer has been used whereas in previous one Khalifa was used. Hence proven Khalifa and Ameer can be used interchangeably. So that hadith of Imam Mahdi (ra) leading Jesus (a.s) in prayer means that they are two different persons. Plus these hadiths prove that all of them will be from Quraish so they can never fit on Mirza as he was not from Quraish.

Qadiyani website says: There are only two alternatives left for a seeker after truth, both of them absurd and dangerous. Either we admit that the Tradition which describes the Messiah and the Mahdi as one and the same person is not a true Tradition, or we admit that the Messiah and the Mahdi are two different persons and that the intention of the Tradition is to point to a difference of spiritual significance in the two....However, both interpretations are dangerous. One requires us, without good reasons, to treat as spurious

a Tradition which is a well authenticated one, true according to all sound criteria

End-quote.

We have proven the narration of Ibn Majah inauthentic and proven that Imam Mahdi (ra) and Isa Ibn Maryum (a.s) are different entities. Hence Qadiyani boastful claim is clearly proven false.

Mirza Qadiyani Dajjal applied fabricated and weak hadiths on himself and denied the authentic ones which clearly go against him. Let us see Mirza's detailed discussion on issue of Imam Mahdi (ra) and then we will show authentic hadiths which prove Mirza wrong. Mirza said:

“Mine and my Jama’at belief about the Mahdi and Promised Messiah is that all the hadith are not reliable and trustworthy. To me, they are under three kinds of criticism, or you can say that they are only of three kinds. Firstly, those ahadith that are fabricated and wrong and their narrators are blamed of lies and dishonesty, thus no righteous Muslim can trust them. Secondly, the ahadith that are weak and broken and because of mutual contradictions and disagreements cannot be trusted. Renowned Imams of Ahadith have not either mentioned them altogether or with criticism and doubt. They have not testified these traditions by not confirming the truth and dishonesty of their narrator. The third category of such ahadith are those are though correct and authenticated by many ways but they have either been fulfilled in the past and no waiting period remains for them, or no outwardly khilafat and battles are mentioned in them. Only Mahdi, i.e a guided person is

heralded in them. It is not only hinted but also explicitly stated that his kingdom and khilafat should not be outwardly and that, he would neither fight nor shed blood. He shall have no army but establish faith with the power of spiritual concentration as stated in a hadith “There is no Mahdi except Isa” in the book of Ibn-e-Majah known with the same name in Hakim’s Mustadrik narrated by Anas bin Malik who narrated from the Holy Prophetsaw. The meaning of this hadith is that there shall be no Mahdi except who shall come in the disposition and teaching-style of Jesus. He shall neither fight battles but spread guidance through examples and heavenly signs. The hadith by Imam Bukhari supports this hadith which states:

الحرب يضع

Yadha-ul-Harb means that the Mahdi whose other name is the Promised Messiah shall abolish religious battles altogether. He shall teach not to fight for religion, but spread religion through illuminations of truth, miracles of morality and signs of nearness of God. Therefore, I truly say that one who fights for religion at this time or supports such fighter or advises him apparently or secretly, or have such desires in his heart, is disobedient of Allah and His Messenger and has stepped out of the limits of their wills and obligations” (Haqiqat-ul-Mahdi Pages 3-6, Ruhani Khazain Volume 14 Pages 429-432. Translation taken from Qadiyani website)

Now let us see authentic hadiths which cannot ever fit on Mirza.

Hadith # 1

It is narrated in Mustadrak al Hakim:

Abu Sa'id al-Khudri reported: The Messenger of Allah, peace and blessings be upon him, said, "The Mahdi will appear in the latter part of my nation. Allah will grant him rain to bring produce from the earth. He will give out wealth appropriately, cattle will be plentiful, and the nation will become great. He will live as ruler for seven or eight years." (Mustadrak ala Sahihayn by Imam Hakim # 8673. Translation is of brother AbuAminaElias).

After narrating it Imam al-Hakim said: This hadith has sahih chain but Bukhari and Muslim have not narrated it. Imam Dhahabi (rah) also declared it Sahih in his Talkhees of Hakim. Salafi scholar Albani also declared it Sahih in Silsilah ahadith as Saheeha # 711

Especially note the part: He will live as ruler for seven or eight years. This did not happen in time of Mirza and he was not a ruler for 7 or 8 years. Plus previous part of hadith is also against Mirza.

Hadith # 2

Abu Nadra reported:

"We were in the company of Jabir b. 'Abdullah that he said it may happen that the people of Iraq may not send their qafiz and dirhams (their measures of food stuff and their money). We said: Who would be responsible for it? He said:

The non-Arabs would prevent them. He again said: There is the possibility that the people of Syria may not send their dinars and mudds. We said: Who would be responsible for it? He said this prevention would be made by the Romans. He (Jabir b. Abdullah) kept quiet for a while and then reported Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) having said there would be a caliph in the last (period) of my Ummah who would freely give handfuls of wealth to the people without counting it. I said to Abu Nadra and Abu al-'Ala: Do you mean 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Aziz? They said: No (he would be Imam Mahdi). (Sahih Muslim # 2913 a)

This will only be fulfilled when Imam Mahdi (ra) will be born and he will do so.

Hadith # 3, 4 , and 5 (Imam Abu Dawud rah made whole chapter on Imam Mahdi and then narrated some hadiths. Some of which are weak and some authentic. However none of those hadiths can apply on Mirza -Muhaditheen making chapters and bringing hadiths which clearly go against Mirza is by itself a proof of some of them being authentic -Imam Abu Dawood also narrated the hadith under this chapter thay all Twelve caliphs will be from Quraish and this includes Imam Mahdi (ra) as well. Mirza Dajjal was not an Arab from Quraish).

1. Narrated Umm Salamah, Ummul Mu'minin:

The Prophet (ﷺ) said: The Mahdi will be of my family, of the descendants of Fatimah. Abdullah ibn Ja'far said: I heard AbulMalih praising Ali ibn Nufayl and describing his good qualities. (Sunnan Abu Dawood # 4284)

Declared Sahih by Salafi scholar Albani.

Salafi scholar Zubair Ali Zai declared chain Hasan.

2. Narrated Abdullah ibn Mas'ud:

The Prophet (ﷺ) said: If only one day of this world remained. Allah would lengthen that day (according to the version of Za'idah), till He raised up in it a man who belongs to me or to my family whose father's name is the same as my father's, who will fill the earth with equity and justice as it has been filled with oppression and tyranny (according to the version of Fitr). Sufyan's version says: The world will not pass away before the Arabs are ruled by a man of my family whose name will be the same as mine.

Abu Dawud said: The version of 'Umar and Abu Bakr is the same as that of Sufyan. (Sunnan Abu Dawood # 4282)

Declared Hasan Sahih by Salafi scholar Albani. Salafi scholar Zubair Ali Zai said its's chain is Hasan.

3. Narrated Ali ibn AbuTalib:

The Prophet (ﷺ) said: If only one day of this time (world) remained, Allah would raise up a man from my family who would fill this earth with justice as it has been filled with oppression. (Abu Dawood # 4283)

Declared Sahih by Salafi scholar Albani.

Salafi scholar Zubair Ali Zai called it's chain Hasan.

Even if independently these hadiths are deemed weak but remember that in collaboration they become authentic. And they cannot in any way fit on Mirza.

May Allah safeguard the Ummah from this worst Kafir cult and also from people who think like them due to so called modernism.