

“Verily ‘Eīsa did not die and he will return to you before the Doomsday.”
(Tafsīr Al-Tabari Narration # 7133)

HADĪTH & THE ALLEGED DEATH OF ‘EĪSA (عليه السلام)

A COMPREHENSIVE REFUTATION OF THE ARGUMENTS OF THE
AHMADIYYA

Waqar Akbar Cheema

7/6/2010

OPEN ORDER

THE AUTHOR GIVES AN OPEN LICENSE TO EVERY MUSLIM, INDIVIDUAL OR ORGANIZATION, TO REPRODUCE OR TRANSLATE THIS DOCUMENT WITHOUT ALTERNATIONS AND WITHOUT PRIOR PERMISSION AS LONG AS REFERENCE TO ISLAMICSEARCHCENTER.COM IS PLACED.

WALLAH! IF I HAD THE MEANS I WOULD HAVE FLOODED THE WORLD WITH SUCH LITERATURE.

[In case of any confusion or controversy, the copy of the document available at www.islamicsearchcenter.com should be taken as author’s actual word]

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
Methodology of research.....	5
First Argument: ‘Meaning of Tawaffa from Hadīth’	6
Second Argument: ‘All Prophets Had To Die’	10
Third Argument: ‘Death Within A Century’	12
Fouth Argument: ‘‘Eīsa’ (عليه السلام) Age given as 120’	15
Fifth Argument: ‘‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) Dead like Mūsa (عليه السلام)’	17
Sixth Argument: ‘Tomb of ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام)’	19
Seventh Argument: ‘‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) in Company of the Dead’	21
Eighth Argument: ‘‘Eīsa ’ (عليه السلام) Descent on Night of Mi’raj’	23
Ninth Argument: ‘Holy Prophet's Discussion with a Christian Delegation’	25
Tenth Argument: ‘Two Different Descriptions of ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام)’	28
Eleventh Argument: Statement of Jarūd (رضى الله عنه) in Bahrain	33
Twelfth Argument: Statement of Hassan (رضى الله عنه) in Kūfa	35
Closing Remarks:	37
Bibliography	38

Introduction

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم و الصلاة و السلام على خاتم الأنبياء و المرسلين

In the name of Allah, the Most Merciful, the Most Beneficent and all praise and blessings be upon the Last of the Prophets and Messengers.

Ahmadiyya is the greatest pseudo-religious movement that hides itself under the banner of Islam but to me the realization came rather quite late. While I had ample experience of debating Christians and Atheists once on a certain social networking site a committed Ahmadi came in my way. He hurled unto me so many arguments about the alleged death of ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام). Frankly I was taken off guard for I did not have enough knowledge about the issues he raised and the references he cited. But still I was able to respond and expose his lies regarding verses of the Qur’an but not so for many of the Ahādith. This happened for two reasons a) many of the Hadīth books from which he cited the references were unheard of for me and b) my inability to check if the translation he was giving for certain narrations was correct. Taken aback by this situation I decided to look for the details of all the narrations which members of the cult often bring forward. I worked on it for a while but with the passage of time other activities attracted more attention and the project got sidelined. Lately some friends who often debate and discuss with Ahmadi on various forums once more attracted my attention to this issue. With their help and continuous guidance I was able to at last complete this task.

The reason I decided to first work on the Ahādith rather than verses of the Qur’an is the fact that while people can manage to know the true interpretation and commentary of Qur’an; Ahādith are generally out of the reach of the common people especially the books from which Ahmadiyya bring the references. Thus I decided to have a thorough look and make all these details available for the general online readers.

I thank the Almighty Allah for His Blessings and choice of making me accomplish this task. And I pray to Him to bless all those learned men whose writings helped me in producing this document and similarly all those people who proved instrumental in getting me to accomplish this task.

And most importantly I pray to Allah to make this endeavor a source of learning for all the Sincere Seekers of the Truth!

Methodology of research

In this document I have taken the oft-repeated arguments of Ahmadiyya first ten of which first appeared in some Ahmadi magazine published by their outfit in Fiji and are now reproduced on atleast a couple of Ahmadi sites¹. And the last two from an Urdu page² of one of their sites.

For each argument I have first reproduced the text from one³ of their sites and then exposed their lies. Following points have been kept in mind in each refutation;

- 1- Whether the narration cited has a complete chain of narrators, for most certainly a narration without the chain of narrators is baseless and cannot serve as evidence.
- 2- If the complete chain is there, what is its status? How have the *Muhaddithīn* (Masters of the Sciences of Hadīth) categorized it?
- 3- If the translation given by Ahmadiyya is authentic? Often the translation given by Ahmadiyya is baseless. This, at times, becomes clear by a careful look into the wording even by a person with little know-how of the Arabic language and at times opinion of erudite scholars establishes this fact.
- 4- What do other similar narrations say? At times one narration may not be clear enough to determine the true meaning of a narration but once taken along with other similar narrations it is much easy to know the actual meaning.
- 5- What are the opinions of the celebrated scholars about a particular issue? Often there is a need to quote learned scholars in order to establish or support some interpretation. In such cases I have tried my best to find relevant references from the works of the scholars recognized as *Mujaddids* by Ahmadiyya themselves.

Having said this I accept that I was not the most suitable person to undertake this task but yet I am confident this work can well serve as a basis for a comprehensive refutation of the arguments brought forward by the Ahmadiyya cult.

May Allah make this work a source of learning for all!

¹ URLs: www.aaiil.org & www.muslim.org

² URL: <http://www.alislam.org/urdu/library/233/index.html> Last Accessed on July 6th, 2010

³ URL: <http://aaiil.org/text/articles/others/deathofjesusquranhadith.shtml#hadith> Last Accessed on July 6th, 2010

First Argument: ‘Meaning of Tawaffa from Hadīth’

Ahmadis use a Hadīth from Sahih Bukhari in an attempt to support to their false belief regarding Jesus’ (عليه السلام) death.

It is reported from Ibn Abbās that the Holy Prophet said in a sermon:... Then I shall say, as did that righteous servant of God (i.e. Jesus): I was a witness of them so long as I was among them, but when Thou didst cause me to die (tawaffaitani) Thou wast Watcher over them'... '

The last words of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) (‘I was a witness of them ...’) are taken from a verse of the Holy Qur’an where Jesus is quoted as replying in these very words on the Day of Judgement. It is agreed by all Muslims that, when these words are used by the Holy Prophet in the above Hadīth, the meaning of tawaffaitani occurring there is "Thou didst cause me to die". So, obviously they have the same meaning when used by Jesus, i.e., Jesus was taken from his people by death, not by rising alive to heaven.

The Truth:

Below is the complete text of the Hadīth and its true explanation.

عَنْ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا قَالَ خَطَبَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَقَالَ ... وَإِنَّهُ يُجَاءُ بِرِجَالٍ مِنْ أُمَّتِي فَيُؤْخَذُ بِهِمْ ذَاتَ الشَّمَالِ فَأَقُولُ يَا رَبِّ أَصِيحَابِي فَيُقَالُ إِنَّكَ لَا تَدْرِي مَا أَحَدْتُوا بَعْدَكَ فَأَقُولُ كَمَا قَالَ الْعَبْدُ الصَّالِحُ { وَكُنْتُ عَلَيْهِمْ شَهِيدًا مَا دُمْتُ فِيهِمْ فَلَمَّا تَوَفَّيْتَنِي كُنْتَ أَنْتَ الرَّقِيبَ عَلَيْهِمْ وَأَنْتَ عَلَى كُلِّ شَيْءٍ شَهِيدٌ } فَيُقَالُ إِنَّ هَؤُلَاءِ لَمْ يَزَالُوا مُرْتَدِّينَ عَلَى أَعْقَابِهِمْ مِنْذُ فَارَقْتَهُمْ

Ibn ‘Abbās: The Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) delivered a sermon and said, “...Lo! Some men from my followers will be brought and taken towards the left side, whereupon I will say, ‘O Lord, (these are) my companions!’ It will be said, ‘You do not know what new things they introduced (into the religion) after you.’ I will then say as the righteous pious slave, ‘Eīsa, said, ‘I was a witness over them while I dwelt among them when Thou didst take me up Thou wast the Watcher over them, and You are the Witness to all things.’ (5: 117) Then it will be said, ‘(O Muhammad) these people never stopped to apostate since you left them.”

(Sahih Bukhari, Kitābul Tafsir, Hadīth 4259)

Ahmadis argue that as the word *tawaffaitani* (تَوَفَّيْتَنِي) with reference to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) means physical death, it must have the same meaning with regards to Prophet ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام). But this is simply absurd and here I explain why;

1- When Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) said, **I will say just as the pious slave ‘Eīsa said...** clearly he sought a parallel only in the sayings and the not their whole context and implications. This is just as if someone who has been extremely successful in debating various religions and cults on a certain forum, when asked to comment about his achievements, pronounces; **I would rather say just as Julius Caesar said, ‘I came, I saw, I conquered.’** Most certainly he does not mean that he actually won a battle against the Army of Pharnaces II of Pontus, or does he?

2- The word *kama* (كما) between two phrases does not make them exactly same. For instance, in another Hadīth we read;

عن أبي واقد الليثي أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لما خرج إلى حنين مر بشجرة للمشركين يقال لها ذات أنواط يعلقون عليها أسلحتهم فقالوا يا رسول الله اجعل لنا ذات أنواط كما لهم ذات أنواط فقال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم سبحان الله هذا كما قال قوم موسى اجعل لنا إلهة كما لهم آلهة والذي نفسي بيده لتركبن سنة من كان قبلكم

Abu Waqid Laythi reported that when the Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) went out for the Battle of Hunayn, he passed by a tree belonging to the polytheists. It was known as Dhat Anwāt. They used to hang down their weapons over it. The companions said, “O Messenger of Allah, make for us a Dhat Anwāt as there is for them a Dhat Anwāt.” He said, “Glory be to Allah! This is just as what the people of Mūsa (عليه السلام) said, ‘Make for us a god as there is for them a god.’ By Him who has my soul in His hand, you will perpetrate the practices of the people gone before you.”

(Jami’ Tirmidhi, Kitābul Fitan, Hadīth 2180. Albani classified it as Sahih)

In this Hadīth Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) termed the wish of the pious companions to have a tree nominated to hang weapons on, akin to the wish of the people of Mūsa (عليه السلام) to have pagan deity like a certain people. Obviously the Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) did not mean that both wishes were exactly same rather, it only pointed to the same spirit of following the ways of disbelievers.

In the same way the Hadīth in question does not mean that both ‘Eīsa and Muhammad, peace be upon them both, experienced same kind of *tawaffa*. It rather points out to the fact that both were not present among their people when they deviated.

3- Further, it is NOT necessary that *tawaffaitani* means the same everywhere. According to linguists and scholars e.g. Abu Al-Baqā and Ibn Taymiya *tawaffa* has various meanings i.e. 1) To take in full, 2) Sleep and 3) Death. And the fact that one word may have different meanings for different subjects is proved from Qur’an. Infact in Surah Mā’ida’s same passage we read that ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) will say;

فَقَدْ عَلِمْتَهُ تَعَلَّمُ مَا فِي نَفْسِي وَلَا أَعْلَمُ مَا فِي نَفْسِكَ

“Thou knowest what is in my heart, Thou I know not what is in Thine [heart].” (Qur’an 5:116)

Here same word i.e. نَفْسٍ translated as heart or mind, is used for Allah and ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام). Does that mean that نَفْسٍ (i.e. heart/mind) of Allah and ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) is exactly of same nature?

[Exactly is our Lord above all they suggest]

Or as we read in Qur’an 33:43;

هُوَ الَّذِي يُصَلِّي عَلَيْكُمْ وَمَلَائِكَتُهُ

“He it is who sends salat (His blessings) on you, and his angels too (ask Allah to bless and forgive you)”

Most certainly here صلاة has different meanings with regards to Allah and the angels. Ibn Kathīr writes:

والصلاة من الله ثناؤه على العبد عند الملائكة، ... وقال غيره: الصلاة من الله: الرحمة ... وأما الصلاة من الملائكة، فبمعنى الدعاء للناس والاستغفار

“Allah’s Salah means that He praises His servant before the angels ...others said: “Allah’s Salah means mercy.” ... Salah from the angels means their supplication and seeking forgiveness for people.” (Ibn Kathīr 6/436 under Surah 33 Ayah 43)

Similarly the word ‘*tawaffa*’ does not mean exactly same for ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) and Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم). This goes perfectly in line with the fact that same word can have different meanings in different contexts and concerning different persons.

4- On the Ahmadi lines of the argument a Christian may say that perhaps Prophet Muhammad (صلى الله عليه و سلم) also died through crucifixion like ‘Eīsa as the same word is used for both of them. He can only be answered that it is known from other evidences as to how the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) died. Similarly from evidences other then this verse we know that ‘*tawaffa*’ of ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) was different from that of Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم).

5- As to the fact that Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) has used the past tense, it is because Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) will say this on the Day of Judgment and as the saying of ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) has already been told in the Qur’an so it was in his and the listeners prior knowledge when he uttered these words.

6- The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) will recite this verse as the implication is exactly same i.e. neither ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) was present among his people when they got involved in heresies (Trinity etc) nor was Prophet Muhammad (صلى الله عليه و سلم) present while some from his Ummah deviated and some even if went out of the pale of Islam by believing in false prophets. Both went away from their people before they were lead astray.

Second Argument: ‘All Prophets Had To Die’

Here is yet another Ahmadi argument:

In his last illness, during which he died, the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) entered the mosque with the support of two men to make the following address: "O people! I have heard that you fear the death of your Prophet. Did any Prophet before me live on so that I should be expected to live on amongst you? Listen! I am about to meet my Lord, and so will you. So I bid you to treat well the early muhajirs." (Al-Nawar ul-Muhammadiyya min al-Muwahib lil-Dinniyya, Egypt, p. 317).

The Truth:

Following is the actual text of the narration with reference to the original source and truth about its authenticity.

أيها الناس بلغني أنكم تخافون من موت نبيكم هل تحلّد نبي قبلي فيمن بعث إليه فأخلد فيكم؟، ألا إني لاحقٌ بري، وإنكم لاحقون به، وإني أوصيكم بالمهاجرين الأولين خيراً

“O people! It has reached me that you fear death regarding your prophet. Did any prophet before me live for ever that I should live forever amongst you? Lo! I am about to meet my Lord, so shall you meet Him. And I bid you to be good to the the early Emigrants.” (Mawāhib lil-Diniya vol.4 p.532 & Anwār-i-Muhammadiya min Mawāhib lil-Diniya p.386)

Truth about the Narration:

Qastalāni has not given any chain to this narration; he rather quotes it from Al-Fakihi’s Al-Fajar Al-Munīr who in turn quotes it from Saif bin ‘Umar’s book Al-Riddah wal-Futūh. See Al-Zarqāni’s Sharah Mawāhib lil-Diniya, vol.12 pp.110-111.

The same can be verified from Al-Fajar Al-Munīr.

Scholarly views about Saif bin ‘Umar:

Here are views of scholars about Saif bin ‘Umar, the person whose book, Al-Riddah wal-Futūh, is the actual source of this narration:

Al-Mizi quotes the opinions of different scholars about him;

“Abbās Al-Dāuri narrated from Yahya bin Ma’in:’[He is] weak in Hadīth.’

Abu Hātim said: ‘[He is] Matrūk (i.e. Rejected)’

Abu Dawūd said: ‘He has nothing.’

Nasāi’ and Dārquṭni said about him: ‘Weak’

Ibn Hibbān said: ‘He comes up with fabricated narrations attributed to trustworthy narrators.’”
(Tehzīb Al-Kamāl 12/324 No. 2676)

Tirmidhi said: ‘[He is] Majhūl’

(Jami’ Tirmidhī H.3866)

Ibn Hajr also quotes critical views of various scholars about him;

“Ibn Hibbān accused him of heresy.

Hākim said: ‘He is accused of heresy. And he is disconnected in his narrations’

Barqāni narrated from Darquṭni: ‘[He is] Matrūk (i.e. Rejected)’”

(Tehzīb Al-Tehzīb 4/259 No.517)

For this reason if you see the recent editions of the book *Mawāhib lil-Diniya* e.g. one with research of Shaykh Sālih Ahmad Al-Shāmi referenced above you will clearly find this narration under the heading ‘Weak Hadīth.’

In fact a weak narration like this coming through a person so severely criticized by the experts of the science of narration can never be reliable or brought as evidence except by those who are themselves of such character.

Moreover the narration only means no prophet could live forever and we Muslims do not say that he will live forever. He will most certainly die after his descent from the Heavens.

Third Argument: ‘Death Within A Century’

Ahmadis often use two Ahadīth to deceive people about the death of Prophet ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام). Below are the two Ahadīth and the facts about them.

1) First narration they bring forward is:

"There is no one alive today but will be dead before a hundred years have passed over it" (Muslim, Kunz al-Ummal, vol. 7, p. 170).

The Truth:

The Hadīth infact relates to only those who lived on earth.

عَنْ جَابِرِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ يَقُولُ سَمِعْتُ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَقُولُ... مَا عَلَى الْأَرْضِ مِنْ نَفْسٍ مَنْفُوسَةٍ تَأْتِي عَلَيْهَا مِائَةٌ سَنَةً

Jābir bin ‘Abdullah narrates that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) said: “... none upon the earth, the created beings (from amongst my Companions), would survive at the end of one hundred years.” (Sahih Muslim, Hadīth 4606. Kanz al-‘Ummāl 14/191, H.38336)

In Sahih Muslim same has been narrated in the reports of, 1) ‘Abdullah bin ‘Umar (Hadīth 4605, Kanz al-‘Ummāl 38344) and 2) Abu Sa’īd (Hadīth 4608. Kanz al-‘Ummāl 38341). All these narrations have the words عَلَى الْأَرْضِ (On the earth). This no way supports the Ahmadi belief against the Islamic belief because we Muslims do not hold that ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) is alive on earth, we say ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) is in the Heavens.

This explodes the Ahmadi argument.

2) They also twist the wording of another Hadīth and quote it as:

"The Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) said: ‘Allah sends a wind every hundred years which takes the soul of every believer’. This Hadīth is sound in transmission" (Mustadrak, vol. 4, p. 475).

The Truth:

Actually the Hadīth goes as:

إنَّ اللهَ رِيحًا يَبْعَثُهَا عَلَى رَأْسِ مِائَةِ سَنَةٍ تَقْبِضُ رُوحَ كُلِّ مُؤْمِنٍ

“Verily Allah will send a wind at the beginning of a century which will take away the soul of every believer.”

(Mustadrak Hākim, Hadīth 8543, quoted in Kanz al-’Ummāl 14/194, H.38345)

Wrong translation by Ahmadis:

Actually Ahmadis have mistranslated this Hadīth, they have made it;

‘Allah sends a wind every hundred years which takes the soul of every believer’

This translation is erroneous on two accounts;

1- The wording does not necessarily give the continuous sense as if it is a rule and the wind comes time and again in cycles. The Hadīth wording is just like we read in the Qur’an, Surah Hajj verse 7,

وَأَنَّ اللَّهَ يَبْعَثُ مَنْ فِي الْقُبُورِ

i.e. ‘that Allah will raise up all who are in the graves.’

2- There is nothing in the actual Arabic wording that says ‘every century.’ The word that means ‘every’ is not found in this Hadīth so it is wrong to assert that the wind comes at the start of every century. This becomes even clearer if we compare it with a Hadīth that tells us about Reformers whom Allah will raise at the beginning of every century. The Hadīth goes as;

إنَّ اللهَ يَبْعَثُ لِهَذِهِ الْأُمَّةِ عَلَى رَأْسِ كُلِّ مِائَةِ سَنَةٍ مَنْ يَجِدُّ لَهَا دِينَهَا

The Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) said: ‘Allah will raise for this community at the end of every century the one who will reform its religion for it.’..

(Sunan Abu Dawūd, Hadīth 4291. Albani classified it as Sahih)

Now anyone can see the difference in the Arabic wording, the Hadīth about reformers uses words ‘كُلِّ مِائَةِ سَنَةٍ’ while the one about the wind uses only, ‘مِائَةِ سَنَةٍ’. This difference certainly implies that the reformers will come at the beginning of every century but the wind will come at the beginning of a century.

3- And if the Ahmadi twisting is true, it would mean that no person lives for more than 100 years but this is not true. Many people do live for years more than a hundred; thus proved that their interpretation is utterly wrong for a true Prophet like our beloved Prophet Muhammad (صلى الله عليه و سلم) would never

make a false statement. It is only the prerogative of the false prophets like Mirza Ghulam Ahmed of Qadian.

Thus proved that Ahmadi translation is absolutely wrong and a fabrication.

True meaning of the Hadīth:

4- The Hadīth in actual refers to the End of Times i.e. it refers to the wind which is mentioned in other Ahadīth also and will come near the End of Times and take away the soul of every believer before the terrible Trumpet is blown.

Al-Manāwi in his commentary to Jami’ al-Kabīr says;

المراد أن ذلك يكون في آخر الزمان على رأس قرن من القرون

‘It means it will happen near the End of the Times at the beginning of one of the centuries...’

(Faidh al-Qadīr 2/610, Hadīth 2362)

This wind is also mentioned in other Ahadīth e.g.

Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) said;

كَذَلِكَ إِذْ بَعَثَ اللَّهُ رِيحًا طَيِّبَةً فَتَأْخُذُهُمْ تَحْتَ أَبْطَاهِمُ فَتَقْبِضُ رُوحَ كُلِّ مُؤْمِنٍ وَكُلِّ مُسْلِمٍ وَيَبْقَى شِرَارُ النَّاسِ يَنْهَارُجُونَ فِيهَا تَهَارُجَ الْحُمُرِ فَعَلَيْهِمْ تَقُومُ السَّاعَةُ

‘...at that time Allah would send a pleasant wind which would soothe (people) even under their armpits, and would take the life of every Muslim and only the wicked would survive who would commit adultery like asses and the Last Hour would come to them ...’ (Sahih Muslim, Hadīth 5228)

5- So the Hadīth in question gives only a piece of additional information that when this wind will come it will be the beginning of some century and that’s all. Otherwise there is nothing too novel or important about this particular Hadīth.

For Ahmadis only: Mirza Ghulam Ahmad died in 1326 A.H. so if the Ahmadi interpretation is true also proves that he was not a true believer for he did not die in the beginning of the century and actually lived through over a quarter of it.

Truly absurd and incoherent are the arguments they bring forward!

Fouth Argument: ‘Eīsa’ (عليه السلام) Age given as 120’

Ahmadis says that 'Eīsa (عليه السلام) died at the age of 120. They refer to a certain narration. In the following lines we unveil the truth about the narration and fragility of Ahmadi belief.

"Aishah (God be pleased with her) said that, in his illness in which he died, the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) said: `Every year Gabriel used to repeat the Qur'an with me once, but this year he has done it twice. He has informed me that there is no prophet but he lives half as long as the one who preceded him. And he has told me that Jesus lived a hundred and twenty years, and I see that I am about to leave this world at sixty' " (Hajaj at-Kiramah, p. 428; Kanz al-Ummal, vol. 6, p. 160, from Hazrat Fatima; and Mawāhib al-Ladīnya, vol. 1, p. 42)

The Truth:

Actually the narration comes from Mu'jam Tabarani Kabīr. It's a part a longer narration. Its last part relevant to our discussion here goes as:

وَأَخْبَرَنِي أَنَّهُ أَخْبَرَهُ أَنَّهُ لَمْ يَكُنْ نَبِيًّا إِلَّا عَاشَ نِصْفَ عُمُرِ الَّذِي كَانَ قَبْلَهُ، وَأَنَّهُ أَخْبَرَنِي أَنَّ عَيْسَى ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ عَاشَ عِشْرِينَ وَمِئَةَ سَنَةٍ وَلَا أُرَانِي ذَاهِبًا عَلَى رَأْسِ السِّتِينَ

"And I have been told that there is no Prophet after other Prophet but he lives a life half then the one who lived earlier. And I have been told that 'Eīsa, the son of Mary lived for a hundred and twenty years and I do not see myself but approaching sixties" (Mu'jam Tabarani Kabīr Hadīth 18464, Tarīkh Damishq 47/481-482 quoted in Kanz Al-'Ummāl 11/479 H.32262 & 13/676 H.37732)

Issues with the narration:

1- **According to the rules of narration (riwāyah):** Famous scholar, Hafiz Haithmi has called it *Da'if* (i.e. unauthentic). After quoting this narration he writes:

رواه الطبراني باسناد ضعيف ، وروى البزار بعضه أيضا وفي رجاله ضعف

"Tabarani narrated it with a weak chain and Bazzar also narrated similar to it and in its narrators (also) is weakness."

(Majma' Al-Zawāi'd Wa Manba Al-Fawāi'd 4/67, Chapter on the illness and death of the Prophet)

2- **In the light of reason (*dirāyah*):** According to the principle of *dirāya* (i.e. rationality) as well, this narration is not acceptable. The narration gives the notion as if every Prophet lives half the age of the Prophet immediately before him. This cannot be true and thus can never be uttered by the Noble and Truthful Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم). If ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) lived for 120 years then John the Baptist (Yahya عليه السلام) should have lived for 240 years but he lived less then the period ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) remained on Earth. Moreover following this cycle we have to believe that Adam (عليه السلام) perhaps lived millions of years which cannot be true.

3- **Confusion in the wording:** Moreover there is a lot of confusion regarding the wording of the narration which is even otherwise weak. In Ibn Asākir's *Tarīkh Damishq* (47/482) and Ibn Sa'd (2/195) there are narrations that tend to convey as if ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) lived for 150 years. Indeed these narrations are also of dubious nature like the one about 120 years.

Infact Ibn Asākir after quoting both these narrations says:

كذا في هاتين الروايتين والصحيح أن عيسى لم يبلغ هذا العمر

"It's like that in these two narrations [about 120 & 150 years] and the truth is that ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) did not reach this age." (*Tarīkh Damishq* 47/482, Chapter on ‘Eīsa bin Mathna al-Kalbi)

4- To **Turn the Tables**, let me ask why do the Ahmadis not take the Hadīth in full and apply it to other issues? Does the Hadīth not say: "And I have been told that there is no Prophet after other Prophet but he lives a life half then the one who lived earlier"? While it does, how could Mirza Qadiani be a Prophet for according to this narration any prophet, if there ever was one, would live only 31 or 32 years, half of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) age i.e. 63 and we know that Mirza lived for 73 years (1835-1908). Indeed this proves the fragility of Ahmadi arguments.

5- Recently I learnt that some Ahmadis twist this narration to avoid the troubling question above saying that the narration means a prophet must live *atleast* half the age of the Prophet immediately before him and not necessarily exactly half of that. Nothing can be far from truth than this. Firstly there is nothing in the narration to suggest the ‘atleast’ thing secondly, even this too much twisted interpretation fails to save the narration from rational scrutiny because Prophet Zakariyya (عليه السلام) lived for far more than hundred years while his son, Yahya (عليه السلام) at the most lived for forty two years which does not make up to half of hundred even. And most certainly a True Prophet, like our beloved Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم), could never make such an erroneous statement. If only Ahmadis can put off the glasses of prejudice they won't need to seek evidence with baseless narrations like the one in question.

Fifth Argument: “Eīsa (عليه السلام) Dead like Mūsa (عليه السلام)”

Ahmadis quote another saying:

"Had Moses or Jesus been alive, they would have had to follow me" (Al-Yawaqit wal-Jawahir, p. 240; Fath al-Bayan, vol. 2, p. 246; Tafisir Ibn Kathir, under verse 81 of Al Imran).'

The Truth:

The wording in Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr is:

لَوْ كَانَ مُوسَى وَعِيسَى حَيِّينَ لَمَا وَسِعَهُمَا إِلَّا أَتْبَاعِي

'If Mūsa and ‘Eīsa had been alive, they would have no choice but to follow me.'

There are certain issues with the narration and its meaning which can be easily understood if one is not preoccupied to believe in something;

1- Firstly we observe the statement has been mistranslated. The statement reads **'If Musa and Eisa ...'** but Ahmadis translate it as **'... Mūsa or ‘Eīsa ...'** this is itself a manifestation of their aim of playing with even otherwise baseless narration. By putting in an ‘or’ they want to give an impression of both these prophets being similar in the context of discussion.

2- This narration with a mention of ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) along with Mūsa (عليه السلام) has absolutely no chain thus its totally baseless. Truly only the followers of a baseless religion refer to baseless narrations. The proof of burden is upon the Ahmadis to show us the complete chain of any such narration that makes a mention of ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام).

3- Even if we, just for the sake of argument, give some consideration to this narration, we have to take it along other narrations on the same lines. Infact there are reliable narrations but they mention Mūsa (عليه السلام) only and not ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام). The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) said:

لَوْ كَانَ مُوسَى حَيًّا بَيْنَ أَظْهُرِكُمْ مَا حَلَّ لَهُ إِلَّا أَنْ يَتَّبِعَنِي

"If Mūsa were alive amongst you, he would have had no option but to follow me."

(Musnad Ahmad 14104. Musnad Abu Ya'la Hadīth 2081. Tafisir Ibn Kathīr 2/68. Shaykh Hamztl Zain

classified it as Hasan in his classification of Musnad Ahmad)

Even if we consider ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) along with Mūsa (عليه السلام) in the above narration it still doesn't go with the Ahmadi belief. The Hadīth clearly uses the words **بَيْنَ أَظْهُرِكُمْ** i.e. '**Amongst you**'. This implies that if Mūsa (عليه السلام) and ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) come alive amongst us, they would have no choice but to follow our Last Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم). This way it has nothing to say if either of them is alive anywhere or not. It can only be taken to mean that they are not alive 'amongst us' which needs no further proof. Moreover, it is an established belief among Muslims that once ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) will descend from the Heavens and live 'amongst us' he will only follow the Law brought by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم).

4- This statement doesn't say Mūsa and ‘Eīsa, peace be upon them both, are indeed in the same condition. It only stresses that if either of them were in a certain similar situation i.e. if they come amongst us, the Ummah of the Last Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم), they will but have to follow the Holy Prophet in the Law.

Sixth Argument: 'Tomb of 'Eīsa (عليه السلام)'

The Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) said: "May the curse of God be upon the Jews and the Christians who made the graves of their prophets into places of worship". (Bukhari, Kitab as-Salat, p. 296).

The Holy Prophet said this because he was anxious that Muslims should avoid the evil of making the tomb of their prophet into a place of worship, as Jews and Christians had done with their prophets' graves. The Jews had had numerous prophets but the prophet properly recognised by the Christians is only one - Jesus. This Hadīth shows that the Holy Prophet believed that Jesus had a tomb. And, in fact, this is the place where Jesus was kept after being removed from the cross (till he recovered from his wounds), which Christians revere greatly. Obviously, according to this Hadīth, Jesus did not rise up to heaven.

The Truth:

Actually the Hadīth they quote goes as:

عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ عَبَّاسٍ أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ لَعْنَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَى الْيَهُودِ وَالنَّصَارَى اتَّخَذُوا قُبُورَ أَنْبِيَائِهِمْ
مَسَاجِدَ

Narrated Ibn 'Abbās: The Messenger of Allah (صلى الله عليه و سلم) said: **"May Allah curse the Jews and Christians for they built the places of worship at the graves of their Prophets."** (Bukhari, Kitābul Salah, Hadīth 417)

1- Alhamdulillah our classical scholars have already clarified these things so I don't have to write anything from my side to refute this argument. Below is a passage from Hafiz Ibn Hajr's Fath al-Bāri along with translation. Insha'Allah this is enough to bust the Ahmadi argument. So here you go;

وَقَدْ أُسْتُشْكِلَ ذِكْرُ النَّصَارَى فِيهِ ؛ لِأَنَّ الْيَهُودَ لَهُمْ أَنْبِيَاءٌ بِخِلَافِ النَّصَارَى فَلَيْسَ بَيْنَ عَيْسَى وَبَيْنَ نَبِيِّنَا صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ نَبِيٍّ غَيْرِهِ وَلَيْسَ لَهُ قَبْرٌ ، وَالْجَوَابُ أَنَّهُ كَانَ فِيهِمْ أَنْبِيَاءٌ أَيْضًا لَكِنَّهُمْ غَيْرُ مُرْسَلِينَ كَالْحَوَارِيِّينَ وَمَرِيمَ فِي قَوْلٍ ، أَوْ الْجَمْعُ فِي قَوْلِهِ " أَنْبِيَائِهِمْ " بِإِزَاءِ الْمَجْمُوعِ مِنَ الْيَهُودِ وَالنَّصَارَى ، وَالْمُرَادُ الْأَنْبِيَاءُ وَكِبَارُ أَتْبَاعِهِمْ فَكَتَفَى بِذِكْرِ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ ، وَيُزِيدُهُ قَوْلُهُ فِي رِوَايَةِ مُسْلِمٍ مِنْ طَرِيقِ جُنْدُبٍ " كَانُوا يَتَّخِذُونَ قُبُورَ أَنْبِيَائِهِمْ وَصَالِحِيهِمْ مَسَاجِدَ " وَلِهَذَا لَمَّا أُفْرِدَ النَّصَارَى فِي الْحَدِيثِ الَّذِي قَبْلَهُ قَالَ " إِذَا مَاتَ فِيهِمْ الرَّجُلُ الصَّالِحُ " وَلَمَّا أُفْرِدَ الْيَهُودَ فِي الْحَدِيثِ الَّذِي بَعْدَهُ قَالَ " قُبُورَ أَنْبِيَائِهِمْ " ، أَوْ الْمُرَادُ بِالتَّخَاذِ أَعَمٌّ مِنْ أَنْ يَكُونَ إِبْتِدَاعًا أَوْ اتِّبَاعًا ، فَالْيَهُودُ إِبْتَدَعَتْ وَالنَّصَارَى اتَّبَعَتْ ، وَلَا رَيْبَ أَنَّ النَّصَارَى تُعْظَمُ قُبُورَ كَثِيرٍ مِنَ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ الَّذِينَ تُعْظَمُهُمُ الْيَهُودُ .

"Query has been raised regarding the mention of Christians here for, Jews had many prophets but not so the Christians as there was no Prophet between ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) and our Prophet [Muhammad], on whom peace and blessings of Allah and ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) has no grave. So the answer to this is, they [the Christians] also had prophets among them but they were not Messengers [sent by Allah], like the Disciples and Maryam according to one saying. Or in the word 'Prophets' are included all those [holy men] who rose among the Jews and the Christians. The reference is to Prophets and the ancestors whom they followed but only the Prophets have been mentioned. And this is supported by the narration of Muslim from Jundub which says "[those before you] used to take the graves of their *prophets and righteous men* as places of worship." (Muslim H.827). And it is for this reason that only the Christians are mentioned in the preceding Hadīth which says "When any *religious man* dies amongst those people [they would build a place of worship at his grave]" (Bukhari H.409). And for the same reason only the Jews are mentioned in the following Hadīth that says. "May Allah destroy the *Jews* [for they built the places of worship at the graves of their *Prophets*]." (Bukhari H.418). Or it may be to include all those who innovated and those who followed. The Jews innovated and the Christians followed [the innovation] for certainly Christians revered the graves of *many of the Prophets who were revered by Jews [as well]*." (Fath Al-Bāri 2/160, Kitābul Salah)

2- The idea that there were among Christians certain people considered prophets but were not sent as Messengers by Allah is supported by the present New Testament even. See e.g. Acts 11:27, 13:1, 21:10 etc.
And definitely Christians also revered all the Prophets revered by Jews. Hafiz Ibn Hajr's last point rests on this fact.

3- Did you notice, Hafiz Ibn Hajr categorically refutes the Ahmadi belief by saying about ‘Eīsa’ (عليه السلام);

وَلَيْسَ لَهُ قَبْرٌ

“And he has no grave.”

And Hafiz Ibn Hajr has been recognized as a *Mujaddid* by Ahmadis.

Seventh Argument: “Eīsa (عليه السلام) in Company of the Dead’

Ahmadis try to make an issue of the fact that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) met ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) along with other prophets during his miraculous Night of Ascension (*Mi'raj*).

The various Hadīth about the Holy Prophet's Mi'raj record:

i. "Adam is in the first heaven ... Joseph is in the second heaven, and his cousins Yahya (John the Baptist) and Jesus are in the third heaven, and Idris is in the fourth heaven" (Kanz al-Ummal, vol. VI, p. 120).

The Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) saw Yahya and Jesus in the same place; and as the former, indeed every other prophet seen, is dead, so must Jesus be.

ii. The above Hadīth is corroborated by another that tells us that in the Mi'raj vision the Holy Prophet met the spirits of all the previous prophets (Tafisir ibn Kathir, Urdu ed. published in Karachi, vol. III, p. 28).

The Truth:

1- We cannot take the affairs of the Heavenly domain on the lines we take the things here on this Earth for we do not know the exact nature of the affairs of the Other World.

2- But Ahmadi argument is utterly absurd for, reasoning on these lines suggests that either Mirza Qadiani 'died during his life time' or lied when he said:

"I have seen him (Masih ‘Eīsa) many times. On one occasion, Jesus and I ate beef out of the same dish."

(Al-Hakam vol.6 No.29, Dated August 17, 1902 P.12, Tadhkira [Eng.] p. 548 ed. 2009)

And,

"Once while awake I saw the Messenger of Allah (SAAW), along with the Hasnain, ‘Ali (RA) and Fatima (RA) and this was not a dream but a kind of wakefulness."

(Al-Hakam vol.6 No.44, Dated December 10, 1902 p.9)

3- Moreover, if such reasoning makes sense then it would also mean that the Holy Prophet Muhammad (صلى الله عليه و سلم) had died when he met the Prophets during *Mi'raj*. If he can, being alive, meet the 'dead prophets' why can ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) not be alive with them? If Mirza Qadiani during his life on Earth can

meet Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) and his family members and even join 'dead 'Eīsa' in meal than why can't 'Eīsa (عليه السلام) be alive at a place where other Prophets live after their bodily death?

4- Further, if someone takes Mi'raj only as a vision of the Prophet, and Ahmadis take it like that only, then it is more incumbent on him not to take any exception to the idea of Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) meeting 'Eīsa (عليه السلام) along with other prophets at the same place for, vision is only a vision and is most certainly above the bounds of real world perceptions.

islamicsearchcenter.com

Eighth Argument: “Eīsa ’ (عليه السلام) Descent on Night of Mi’raj’

Yet another Ahmadi twisting of plain things:

A Hadīth about the Miraj records:

"Then the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) descended in Jerusalem, along with all the other prophets. At the time of prayers, he lead them all in prayer" (Tafisir on Kathir, Urdu ed., vol. III, p. 23).

Among "all" the prophets is included Jesus. Had he, unlike other prophets, been alive physically in heaven, his "descent" to Jerusalem would have been with his material body. In that case, he would have had to rise up to heaven physically a second time. But the Qur’an mentions only one raf ("exaltation" which is misunderstood as "rising up to heaven") of Jesus!

This difficulty does not arise if we believe, as is clear from the various Hadīth about Mi`raj, that Jesus was in the same condition (i.e. dead) as were all the other prophets seen in the vision.

The Truth:

1- Like always, this Ahmadi argument also rests on a flawed assertion that if ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) is alive in the Heavens physically he must have descended with his physical body. The narrations about the miraculous night make no difference between ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) and other Prophets. There is no evidence from Hadīth that ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) was there with his physical body while there were only souls of other prophets.

2- If all of them descended in bodily form then there cannot be any objection for it was a miracle and the way one takes the case of other Prophets the same should be done in case of ‘Eīsa’ (عليه السلام).

3- If only the souls of all Prophets descended then again there is no particular issue about ‘Eīsa’ (عليه السلام). Someone may tend to ask if ‘Eīsa’ (عليه السلام) soul was there in Jerusalem, was he then dead in the heavens? The answer is, no! We do know from Qur’an and Hadīth that even when a person is not dead his soul can move as in sleep;

اللَّهُ يَتَوَفَّى الْأَنْفُسَ حِينَ مَوْتِهَا وَالَّتِي لَمْ تَمُتْ فِي مَنَامِهَا فَيُمْسِكُ الَّتِي قَضَىٰ عَلَيْهَا الْمَوْتَ وَيُرْسِلُ الْأُخْرَىٰ إِلَىٰ أَجَلٍ مُّسَمًّى
إِنَّ فِي ذَٰلِكَ لَآيَاتٍ لِّقَوْمٍ يَتَفَكَّرُونَ

“Allah fully takes away the souls (of the people) at the time of their death, (and (of) those who do not die, in their sleep. Then He withholds those on whom He had decreed death, and sends others back, up to an appointed term. Surely, in this, there are signs for a people who ponder.” (Qur’an 39:42)

4- Even if the Prophets were physically present, there is no issue still because the ayah about ‘Rafa’ i.e. Ascension talks of one particular instance and about ‘Eīsa only. It does not rule out the possibility of the same thereafter and that too at an event in which he was no exception.

5- Moreover on these lines we have a counter question for Ahmadis.

On April 7th 1908 an American couple came to interview Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. Following are the last two questions and their answers;

Q: In what way have you seen Christ, have you seen him in bodily form?

A: Yes, in bodily form and clearly while awake.

Q: We have also seen Christ and see him [still] but it’s in the spiritual sense. Have you seen him just like us?

A: No, I have seen him in physical form and in clear wakefulness.

(Malfūzāt [New Ed.] vol.5 p.521)

The question here is, if ‘Eīsa had died how Mirza Ghulam Ahmad could see him in bodily form and that too in wakefulness and not in a vision? Ahmadis believe he has been buried in some grave. So did he rise back to life to meet Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and will die again to come back to life with rest of the people on the Final Day? Does it not contradict Qurān which mentions only one death after a person is born?

Truly absurd and baseless are their contentions!

Ninth Argument: 'Holy Prophet's Discussion with a Christian Delegation'

Here is another Ahmadi argument and its refutation.

"When a delegation of sixty men from (the Christian) people of Najran came to the Holy Prophet, their chief priest discussed with him the status of Jesus and asked him as to who Jesus' father was. The Holy Prophet said...:

A lastum to `lamuna anna rabbana la yamutu wa anna `Tsa ata `alaihi-l fana' i.e., Do you not know that our Lord lives for ever while Jesus perished" (Asbab an-nuzul by Imam Abu-I-Hasan Ali bin Ahmad al-Wahide of Neshapur, published in Egypt, p. 53).

What clearer testimony could there be that Jesus has died than this saying from the blessed tongue of the Holy Prophet!

The Truth:

1-The incident of the delegation of the Christians of Nejrān coming to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) and their mutual dialogue is recorded in a number of Tafāsir (Commentaries of the Holy Qur'an). Normally if one wishes to quote it, he would certainly quote it from a much better and widely known Tafsir and the one which gives the complete chain of narrators for the narration.

2- But this is not true for Ahmadis. They quote it from a Tafsir, Wahidi's Asbāb Al-Nuzūl, which is though important and known, but comes no where closer to Tafāsir like that of Al-Tabari etc. And this is not without reason. We do smell a rat here and very rightly so.

3- It is true that in Wahidi's Al-Nuzūl the wording is same as they say but the thing we need to understand is that the author of the Tafsir does not give any chain for the narration. He rather says:

قال المفسرون

i.e. "Commentators said..."

Naturally we would like to know as to who all among the commentators before him have related this narration authoritatively i.e. have given the complete chain. When we search, we find that they were Ibn Jarīr Al-Tabari and Ibn Abi Hātim. And it was actually on their authority that the incident got reported in later Tafāsir like Asbāb Al-Nuzūl, Durr Manthūr and Tafsīr Kabīr of Al-Rāzi.

Al-Wahidi gives the particular sentence we are focusing on as;

أَلَسْتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ أَنَّ رَبَّنَا حَيٌّ لَا يَمُوتُ وَأَنَّ عَيْسَى أَتَى عَلَيْهِ الْفَنَاءُ

"Don't you know that our Lord is ever living but death did come to ‘Eīsa?"

But in the narration of both Al-Tabari and Ibn Abi Hātim the wording is:

أَلَسْتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ أَنَّ رَبَّنَا حَيٌّ لَا يَمُوتُ، وَأَنَّ عَيْسَى يَأْتِي عَلَيْهِ الْفَنَاءُ؟

"Do you not know that Our Lord (Allah) is ever living but death will come to ‘Eīsa?"

(Tafsīr Al-Tabari 6/154 Narration. 6544, Ibn Abi Hātim 9/408. Both have brought it under verse 1 of Surah 3)

Moreover Nizamuddin Qumi quoted the same narration in his *Tafsir Gharaib Al-Qurān* generally known as *Tafsir Nishapuri*, with reference to Wahidi. he says;

قال الواحدي : نقل المفسرون أنه قدم على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وفد نجران

‘Wahidi said: Mufassirin have recorded that a delegation from Nejran came to the Messenger of Allah (صلى الله عليه وسلم)’

And quoting the discussion on the authority of Al-Wahidi he writes;

أَلَسْتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ أَنَّهُ حَيٌّ لَا يَمُوتُ وَأَنَّ عَيْسَى يَأْتِي عَلَيْهِ الْفَنَاءُ؟ قَالَ

‘He (the prophet) said: ‘Do you not know that He (Allah) is Ever-living, the Eternal and death will come to Jesus?’ (Tafsir Nishapuri 2/199 under surah 3 ayah 1)

It means even Wahidi actually quoted from earlier scholars correctly and it was only some later scribe who made the mistake.

And as matter of fact even in Durr Manthūr (2/276) and Tafsīr Kabīr of Al-Rāzi (4/93) exactly the same wording is quoted i.e. word يَأْتِي (future tense) is used and not أَتَى (past tense).

Please note, both Suyūti and Al-Rāzi have been recognized a *Mujaddids* by Ahmadis.

To summarize; Al-Tabari (d. 310 A.H.) and others quoted it with complete chain and the wordings they give use the future tense. Nizāmuddin Qumi who quoted it from Wahidi (d. 468 A.H.) also gives the wording with future tense. Suyūti and Rāzi quote it and they also use the word يَأْتِي (future tense). Only in the prevalent edition of Wahidi’s Tafsir, that does not have the chain of narrators even, uses the word with past tense.

Having gone through all this detail any sensible person will agree that the wording as found in Al-Tabari and Ibn Abi Hātim and quoted by Nizāmuddin Qumi, Suyūti and Rāzi is the real authority in this case.

4- All this detail not only smokes off the Ahmadi argument and unveils their cunning tricks but also the actual wording of the narration is a proof that ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) did not die hence the Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) used the word signifying that the death of ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) is a phenomenon yet to take place.

The narration is evidence against Ahmadis:

This discussion of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) with the Christian delegation is infact Islamic evidence against heretic Ahmadi belief.

Tenth Argument: 'Two Different Descriptions of 'Eīsa (عليه السلام)'

1. In the Mi`raj the Messiah seen with Moses, Abraham, and other prophets, by the Holy Prophet, was described by him thus:

a. "I saw Jesus. "I saw Jesus. He was a man of a reddish complexion" (Bukhari, Kitab al-ambiya, ch. 24).

b. "I saw Jesus, Moses, and Abraham. Jesus had a reddish complexion, curly hair, and a wide chest"(ibid., ch. 48).

It is clear from both these Hadīth that by Jesus, who was seen here along with Abraham and Moses, is meant the Israelite prophet. He had a red complexion and curly hair.

2 Bukhari has recorded a Hadīth in which the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) relates a dream of his about the future: "In a state of sleep I saw myself circumambulating the Ka'ba, and I saw a man of a wheatish complexion with straight hair. I asked who it was. They said: This is the Messiah, son of Mary" (Bukhari, Kitab al-Fitn, ch. 27).

Thus, where Jesus is mentioned along with Abraham and Moses, he is described as of a reddish complexion with curly hair; but where he is seen along with the Dajjal in a dream about the future, he is said to have a wheatish complexion with straight hair. Evidently, these two different descriptions do not apply to one and the same person. So Jesus, the Israelite prophet, whom the Holy Prophet saw in the Mi`raj vision, and the Messiah who was to appear in the latter days to kill the evil Dajjal, are two different persons.

The Truth:

Following are the two Ahadīth they refer to along with their usual but erroneous translation;

أَنَّ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ بْنَ عُمَرَ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ بَيْنَا أَنَا نَائِمٌ رَأَيْتُنِي أُطَوِّفُ بِالْكَعْبَةِ فَإِذَا رَجُلٌ
أَدْمُ سَبَطُ الشَّعْرِ بَيْنَ رَجُلَيْنِ يَنْطُفُ رَأْسُهُ مَاءً فَقُلْتُ مَنْ هَذَا قَالُوا ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ

Narrated 'Abdullah bin 'Umar: Allah's Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, "While I was sleeping, I saw myself performing the Tawāf of the Ka'ba. Behold, there I saw a wheatish-lank-haired man (holding himself) between two men with water dropping from his hair. I asked, 'Who is this?' The people replied,

'He is the son of Mary '.

(Bukhari, Kitābul Ta’bir, Hadīth 6508)

Though normally the English translators have translated the words in red as 'whitish-red' but I have given the literal translation. The thing will be hopefully clarified in the lines below;

عَنْ ابْنِ عُمَرَ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا قَالَ قَالَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ رَأَيْتُ عَيْسَى وَمُوسَى وَإِبْرَاهِيمَ فَأَمَّا عَيْسَى فَأَحْمَرُ جَعْدٌ
عَرِيضُ الصَّدْرِ

Narrated Ibn ‘Umar: The Prophet said, "I saw Mūsa, ‘Eīsa and Ibrahim (on the night of my Ascension to the heavens). ‘Eīsa was of red complexion, curly hair and broad chest." (Bukhari, Kitābul Ahadīth al-Anbiya, Hadīth 3183)

Apparently there seem to be two contradictions here;

- 1) About Complexion
- 2) About Hair

In the following lines we discuss in detail all the various Ahadīth about the issue and expose the Ahmadi lie.

Complexion:

1- As to the complexion, apparently there seems to be a contradiction but there isn't any. One Hadīth of Ibn ‘Umar (رضى الله عنه) above says that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) described ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) to be of red complexion while other narration from him says he was described to be of wheatish complexion. This apparent contradiction is resolved considering other narrations.

عَنْ سَالِمٍ عَنْ أَبِيهِ قَالَ لَا وَاللَّهِ مَا قَالَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ لِعَيْسَى أَحْمَرٌ وَلَكِنْ قَالَ بَيْنَمَا أَنَا نَائِمٌ أُطُوفُ بِالْكَعْبَةِ فَإِذَا
رَجُلٌ آدَمٌ سَبَطُ الشَّعْرِ

Salim reports from his father (i.e. ‘Abdullah bin ‘Umar), he said: “No, By Allah, the Prophet did not say that ‘Eīsa was of red complexion but he said, "While I was asleep circumambulating the Ka'ba (in my dream), suddenly I saw a man of brown complexion and lank hair.” (Bukhari, Kitābul Ahadīth al-Anbiya, Hadīth 3185)

2- Considering the fact that Ibn ‘Umar (رضى الله عنه) himself so emphatically repudiates the idea that Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) described ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) to be of red complexion so we have to believe, the

narration which attributes to Ibn ‘Umar (رضى الله عنه) the report of Holy Prophet describing ‘Eīsa as such is perhaps a mistake by some later narrator. ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) was not purely of red complexion. Infact this is generally not true for the Semitic people.

3- The rightful description of ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) is as narrated by Ibn ‘Abbās (رضى الله عنه):

أَبْنُ عَبَّاسٍ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ... رَأَيْتُ عَيْسَى رَجُلًا مَرْبُوعًا مَرْبُوعًا الْخَلْقَ إِلَى الْحُمْرَةِ
وَالْبَيَاضِ سَبَطَ الرَّأْسَ

Narrated Ibn ‘Abbās: The Prophet said, "On the night of my Ascent to the Heaven, ... I saw ‘Eīsa, a man of medium height and moderate complexion inclined to the red and white colors and of lank hair." (Bukhari, Kitābul Bad’ al-Khalq, Hadīth 3000)

4- Infact his complexion was neither white as lime nor purely red but something between these two as described in the Hadīth above. And the same complexion was sometimes referred to as ‘wheatish’ or ‘wheat-colored.’

Al-Nawawi has written the same in his commentary to the Hadīth that speaks of red complexion of ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام):

وَأَنَّهُ اشْتَبَهَ عَلَى الرَّأْيِ فِيحُوزُ أَنْ يُتَأَوَّلَ الْأَحْمَرَ عَلَى الْأَدَمِ ، وَلَا يَكُونُ الْمُرَادُ حَقِيقَةَ الْأُدْمَةِ وَالْحُمْرَةَ بَلْ مَا قَارَبَهَا

“And this is confusion on the part of the narrator and perhaps he took red to be wheat-like and it does not mean tan or red but what is near to it.”

(Sharah Al-Nawawi on Sahih Muslim 1/302, Kitābul Imān)

5- The fact of the matter is that it’s not easy to describe ones complexion. The same is evident from the fact that Anas (رضى الله عنه) in one narration says Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه و سلم) was wheatish in complexion and in another narration says he was not wheat-colored. See Shamāil Tirmidhi Hadīth 1 & 2. (Both authenticated by Albani)

The Hair:

1- As to the hair; straight or curly, we need to have a look at the actual wording of the Hadīth that is taken to speak about the curly hair of ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام);

فَأَمَّا عَيْسَى فَأَحْمَرٌ جَعْدٌ

The usual translation goes as; **“‘Eīsa was of red complexion [and] curly hair.”**

Here the word جَعْدٌ is taken to mean curly hair but this is not the exclusive meaning of this word. Ibn Athir writes about it:

مَعْنَاهُ... شَدِيدُ الْأَسْرِ

i.e. “It means... ‘Of strong built.’” and further gives an example of it from Hadīth:

والحديث الآخر [على ناقة جَعْدَةٌ] أي مُجْتَمِعَةُ الْخَلْقِ شَدِيدَةٍ

“In another Hadīth⁴, ‘On a camel of strong built’ i.e. of rigorously stout built.”

(Nihāya fi Gharīb al-Asar 1/767)

Indeed scholars have always taken جَعْدٌ to mean ‘of strong built’ in this context. Hafiz Ibn Hajr mentions that it refers to his physical bearing and not hair. He says;

وَوَصَفَهُ لِجُعُودَةٍ فِي جِسْمِهِ لَأَنَّ شَعْرَهُ وَالْمُرَادَ بِذَلِكَ اجْتِمَاعَهُ وَاسْتِنَازَهُ

“And this is about sturdiness in body, not the hair and it refers to its compactness and robustness”

(Fath Al-Bāri 10/242, Kitābul Ahadīth al-Anbiya)

Al-Nawawi has also said the very same. He writes;

الْمُرَادُ بِالْجَعْدِ هُنَا جُعُودَةُ الْجِسْمِ وَهُوَ اجْتِمَاعُهُ وَاسْتِنَازَهُ وَلَيْسَ الْمُرَادُ جُعُودَةُ الشَّعْرِ .

“Here جَعْدٌ means firmness of the body i.e. its compactness and being thickset. And it does not refer to wrinkles of the hair’

(Sharah Al-Nawawi on Sahih Muslim 1/296, Kitābul Imān)

Please note, both Hafiz Ibn Hajr and Shaukh Al-Nawawi have been recognized as *Mujaddids* by Ahmadiyya.

2- So the correct and most suitable translation of the Hadīth which is generally taken to refer to the curly hair of ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) is:

⁴ Musnad Abi Ya’la Hadīth 2488

Narrated Ibn ‘Umar: The Prophet said, "I saw Mūsa, ‘Eīsa and Ibrahim (on the night of my Ascension to the heavens). ‘Eīsa was (person) with red complexion, robust body and a broad chest." (Bukhari, Hadīth 3183)

Similar Description of ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) as seen during Mi’raj and on his descent:

The thing of utmost importance we need to consider here is the fact that when the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) told about the features of the ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) to recognize him on his descent it went directly in line with the description of ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) found in the Ahadīth about Night of Ascension (*Mi’raj*).

أَبْنُ عَبَّاسٍ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ .. رَأَيْتُ عَيْسَى رَجُلًا مَرْبُوعًا مَرْبُوعًا الْخَلْقِ إِلَى الْحُمْرَةِ وَالْبَيَاضِ سَبِطَ الرَّأْسِ

Narrated Ibn ‘Abbās: The Prophet said, "On the night of my Ascent to the Heaven ... I saw ‘Eīsa, a man of medium height and moderate complexion inclined to the red and white colors and of lank hair." (Bukhari, Kitābul Bad’ al-Khalq , Hadīth 3000)

عن أبي هريرة أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال ليس بيني وبينه نبي يعني عيسى وإنه نازل فإذا رأيتموه فاعرفوه رجل مربوع إلى الحمرة والبياض

Narrated Abu Huraira: The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said: There is no prophet between me and him, that is, ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام). He will descend (to the earth). When you see him, recognize him: a man of medium height, complexion inclined to red and white..." (Abu Dawūd, Kitābul Malāhim, Hadīth 4324. Classified as Sahih by Albani)

This proves that the man who is described in the Ahadīth to descend from the Heavens near the End of Times will be same Israelite Prophet whom the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) met during the Miraculous Night (*Mi’raj*).

All these details expose the Ahmadi lies and infact upholds the unanimous Muslim belief that ‘Eīsa of Nazareth will indeed descend from the Heavens.

Eleventh Argument: Statement of Jarūd (رضى الله عنه) in Bahrain

Some Ahmadis quote a statement of Jarūd bin Ma’la (رضى الله عنه) from Muhammad bin Abdul Wahhāb’s book Mukhtasar Sirat Al-Rasūl. According to the statement as put on an Ahmadi website⁵:

“Some people of Bahrain turned apostate at the death of Holy Prophet (PBUH) on the premise that had he been a Prophet he would have not died. At this eve Jarud (RA) addressed them saying, Holy Prophet (PBUH) is the servant and Messenger of Allah. He lived as Moses and Jesus lived and died as Moses and Jesus died. On listening to this the people reverted to Islam.” (Mukhtasar Sirat Al-Rasul p.187 by Muhammad bin Abdul Wahhab. Darul Arabiya Beirut Lebanon)

The Truth:

In the following lines I reproduce the Arabic statement from the book, its translation and details about its authenticity. The actual wording goes as:

أنه قال : ما شهادتكم على موسى ؟ قالوا : نشهد أنه رسول الله . قال : فما شهادتكم على عيسى ؟ قالوا : نشهد أنه رسول الله قال وأنا أشهد أن لا إله إلا الله وأن محمدا عبده ورسوله . عاش كما عاشوا ، ومات كما ماتوا . وأتحمل شهادة من أبي أن يشهد على ذلك منكم . فلم يرتد من عبد القيس أحد .

“He [Jarūd bin Ma’la] said [to his tribe]; ‘What is your testimony regarding Mūsa?’ They said: ‘We testify he was a Messenger of Allah.’ He said: ‘What is your testimony regarding ‘Eīsa?’ They said: ‘We testify he was a Messenger of Allah.’ He said: ‘And I testify that there is no other deity except Allah and Muhammad is his servant and Messenger. He lived as they lived and died as they died. And I imply the testimony on the one who among you refuses to testify. So no one remained apostate from Abd Al-Qais.” (Mukhtasar Sirat Al-Rasūl 1/431, Chapter on Apostasy of the people of Bahrain)

Authenticity of the narration:

1- This narration has been given without any chain or a reference to some classical work that provides the chain for it. Infact with these words the narration is not found in any of the well known source books of Hadīth, Sirah and History. So now it is for Ahmadis to show us the complete chain of the narration with these words. Surely burden of proof lies upon the one who claims!

2- A narration on these lines is found in *Tarikh Al-Rusul wal Muluk (Tarikh Tabari)* of Ibn Jarir Al-Tabari. Here I reproduce it:

⁵ Site has the statement in Urdu. Here I have given the literal translation of what the site reads.

حدثنا عبيد الله ، قال : أخبرنا عمي ، قال : أخبرنا سيف ، عن إسماعيل بن مسلم ، عن الحسن بن أبي الحسن ، قال ... فقالت عبد القيس : لو كان محمد نبياً لما مات ؛ وارتدوا ، وبلغه ذلك فبعث فيهم فجمعهم ، ثم قام فخطبهم ، فقال : يا معشر عبد القيس ؛ إني سائلكم عن أمر فأخبروني به إن علمتموه ولا تجيبوني إن لم تعلموا . قالوا : سل عما بدا لك ، قال : تعلمون أنه كان لله أنبياء فيما مضى ؟ قالوا : نعم ، قال : تعلمونه أو ترونه ؟ قالوا : لا بل نعلمه ، قال : فما فعلوا ؟ قالوا : ماتوا ، قال : فإن محمداً صلى الله عليه وسلم مات كما ماتوا ، وأنا أشهد أن لا إله إلا الله وأن محمداً عبده ورسوله ، قالوا : ونحن نشهد أن لا إله إلا الله وأن محمداً عبده ورسوله ؛ وأنت سيدنا وأفضلنا

Ubaidullah narrated to us, he said: My uncle said: Saif [bin ‘Umar] narrated from Isma’il bin Muslim, [he] from Hasan bin Abi Hasan, he said: ‘... so the Abd Al-Qais said: ‘If Muhammad were a prophet why did he die?’ and they turned apostate and this news reached him [Jarud]. So, he reached them and gathered them and then addressed them: ‘O people of Abd Al-Qais, I ask you of a matter so answer me if you know it and do not respond if you do not know.’ They said: ‘Ask of the matter that concerns you!’ He said: ‘Do you know in the past there have been Prophets from Allah?’ They said: ‘Yes.’ He said: ‘Do you know that or you assume it?’ They replied: ‘No, we but know of it.’ He said: ‘What happened to them?’ They said: ‘They died!’ he said: ‘So if Muhammad died as they died, I testify there is no deity but Allah and Muhammad is his Servant and Messenger.’ They said: ‘And we also testify that there is no deity but Allah and Muhammad is his Servant and Messenger. And you [O Jarud] are our leader and the best of us.’

(Tarīkh Al-Rusul wal Mulūk 2/164. Chapter on the Expedition of Khalid towards Bani Juzaima)

3- The narration has been classified as *Da‘īf* by scholars. See Tarīkh Al-Tabari with research of Muhammad bin Tahir Barzinji & Subhi Hasan Hallāq. Its chain has the same narrator Saif bin ‘Umar whose status we [discussed under the Second Argument](#).

4- In conclusion, we can say that there is no authentic narration with complete chain of narrators that mentions what Ahmadis cite. The closest narration found is utterly weak and thus does not serve as evidence.

Twelfth Argument: Statement of Hassan (رضى الله عنه) in Kūfa

A statement of Hassan bin ‘Ali (رضى الله عنه) recorded in Tabaqāt Ibn Sa’d is also brought forth in an attempt to prove the death of ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام). According to the statement as put on an Ahmadi website⁶:

*At the eve of death of Ali (RA), Imam Hassan (RA) while addressing the people said:
‘Ali (RA) died the night Jesus’ soul ascended i.e. 27th night of Ramadan. (Tabaqat
Ibn Sa’d vol.3 p.39)*

The Truth:

Let’s discuss the actual wording, authentic and various version of the narration. Ibn Sā’d’s narration goes as:

أخبرنا عبد الله بن نمير عن الأجلح عن أبي إسحاق عن هبيرة بن يريم قال: لما توفي علي بن أبي طالب قام الحسن بن علي فصعد المنبر فقال: أيها الناس... ولقد قبض في الليلة التي عرج فيها بروح عيسى بن مريم ليلة سبع وعشرين من رمضان

‘Abdullah bin Numayr narrated to me from Al-Ajlah, [he] from Abi Ishāq, [he] from Habīra bin Yarbam who narrated: When ‘Ali bin Abi Tālib (رضى الله عنه) died, Hassan bin ‘Ali stood and went to the pulpit, then he said: ‘O people! ... Verily he has died that night the soul of ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) was ascended, the 27th night of Ramadan.’ (Tabaqāt Ibn Sa’d 3/39 Chapter on Abdul Rahmān ibn Maljam)

This narration has quite a number of problems:

1- In its chain is the narrator Al-Ajlah bin ‘Abdullah who has been criticized by the scholars. Hafiz Ibn Hajr quotes the opinions of various scholars about him;

Ibn Abī Hātim said: ‘He is not strong. Write his narrations but do not seek evidence with them.’

Nasāi said: ‘Weak! He has nothing’

Abū Dawūd said: ‘[He is] Weak’

Jozjāni said: ‘[He is a] Liar’

(Tehzīb Al-Tehzīb 1/166 Entry 353)

Infact Ibn Sā’d who quoted this narration termed him extremely weak. After giving his basic bio-data he writes:

⁶ Site has the statement in Urdu. Here I have given the literal translation of what the site reads.

‘And he is extremely weak.’ (Tabaqāt Ibn Sa’d 6/350)

Hence the narration is extremely weak even according to the judgment of the author of the book.

2- The narration with this particular wording is unreliable as it contradicts another narration on similar lines reported by trustworthy narrators. We read in Al-Hākim’s collection;

حدثنا الأستاذ أبو الوليد الميثم بن خلف الدوري ، ثنا سوار بن عبد الله العنبري ، ثنا المعتمر قال : قال أبي : حدثنا الحريث بن مخشي ، أن عليا قتل صبيحة إحدى وعشرين من رمضان ، قال : فسمعت الحسن بن علي يقول ، وهو يخطب وذكر مناقب علي ، فقال : « قتل ليلة أنزل القرآن ، وليلة أسري بعيسى ، وليلة قبض موسى »

Abū Al-Waleed Al-Haitham narrated from Sawār bin ‘Abdullah Al-Anbari; he said, Mu’tamar narrated to us; he said: ‘My father said’; Harīth bin Makhshi narrated: ‘Ali (رضى الله عنه) was murdered the morning of 21st Ramadan. He said; I heard Hassan bin ‘Ali (رضى الله عنه) speaking. He was making an address and talking of the virtues of ‘Ali (رضى الله عنه); he said: ‘He has been killed the night Qur’an was revealed, the night ‘Eīsa (عليه السلام) was made to travel and the night Mūsa (عليه السلام) died.’ (Mustadrak Hākim, Hadīth 4671. Hākim said it is Sahih)

Same narration has been quoted by Jalaluddin Suyūti in Durr Manthūr 2/348 under Qur’an 3:54-57

Obviously the second narration which has been authenticated by the scholars must be considered and first one stands rejected because of its weak chain and difference with the authentic narration. And the second narration does not give any hint to what Ahmadis suggest.

3- Interestingly Imam Nasāi who termed a key narrator of the narration in question as weak and Imam Hākim and Suyūti who have quoted and authenticated the other narration have all been recognized as Mujaddids by Ahmadis.

Thus no authentic narration supports the Ahmadi contention.

Closing Remarks:

The Ahmadi belief that the Noble Prophet of Allah, ‘Eīsa Ibn Maryam (عليهما السلام) died a natural death and is buried in Kashmir and that the Promised Messiah appeared in the person of Mirza Ghulam of Qadian is in direct clash to the established Islamic belief.

While the present work refutes the Ahmadi arguments from Ahadith, there is still a need to expose their lies on the same lines about Qur’an and the learned scholars. With the help of Allah I wish to undertake this task soon.

I may be contacted for comments, suggestions, criticism or discussion at:

waqarakbarcheema@hotmail.com

I thank the Almighty for His continuous guidance and help!

* ----- *

فان كان صوابا فمن الله وحده لا شريك له وإن كان خطأ فمني ومن الشيطان

“So if [all] this was correct then it was from Allah, the One Who has no equal, and if it was erroneous then it was from me and the Satan.”

Bibliography

- 1- ‘Abdullah Yusuf ‘Ali’s, *The Holy Qur’an Translation*, pub. Da’wah Academy, Islamabad 2006
- 2- Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr al-Qur’an al-Azīm*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 3- Muhammad bin Isma’il Bukhari, *Al-Jāmi’ Al-Sahīh*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 4- Muslim bin Hajjāj bin Muslim Al-Qashīri, *Al-Sahīh Al-Jāmi*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 5- Nasiruddīn Albani, *Sahīh wa Da’if Jami’ Tirmidhi*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 6- Nasiruddin Albani, *Sahih wa Da’if Sunan Abu Dawud*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 7- Ahmad bin Muhammad Qastalāni, *Mawāhib lil-Diniya*, Makteb Al-Islami, Beirut 2004
- 8- Yusuf bin Ismāil Nabhāni, *Anwār-i-Muhammadiya min Mawāhib lil-Diniya*, Dārul Kutab Al-Ilmiyah, Beirut 1997
- 9- Al-Zarqāni, *Sharah Mawāhib lil-Diniya*, Darul Kutab Al-Ilmiyah, Beirut 1996
- 10- Al-Fakīhi, *Al-Fajar Al-Munīr*, pub. Makteba Mishkāt Al-Islamiyah
- 11- Al-Mizī, *Tehzīb Al-Kamal*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 12- Ibn Hajr, *Tehzīb Al-Tehzīb*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 13- Ali Muttaqi, *Kanzul ‘Ummāl*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 14- Al-Hakim Nishāpūri, *Mustadrak*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 15- Al-Manāwi, *Faidh Al-Qadīr*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 16- Al-Tabarani, *Mu’jam Al-Kabīr*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 17- Ibn Asākir, *Tārīkh Damishq*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 18- Nūruddīn Haithmi, *Majma’ Al-Zawāi’d Wa Manba Al-Fawāi’d*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 19- Ibn Sa’d, *Tabaqāt Al-Kubra*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 20- Ahmad bin Hanbal, *Al-Musnad*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 21- Hamzatul Zain, *Tehqīq wa Sharah Musnad Ahmad* pub. Dar al-Hadīth Cairo, 1995
- 22- Ibn Hajr, *Fath Al-Bāri*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 23- Ibn Jarir Al-Tabari, *Jami’ Al-Bayān fi Tawīl Al-Qur’an*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 24- Jalaluddīn Suyūti, *Durr Manthūr*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 25- Fakharuddin Al-Rāzi, *Tafsīr Al-Kabīr*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 26- Ali bin Ahmad Al-Wāhidi, *Asbāb Al-Nuzūl*, pub. Dārul Islāh Dammām, 1992
- 27- Ibn Abi Hatim, *Tafsīr Al-Qur’an Al-Azīm*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 28- Nizamuddīn Qumi, *Tafsīr Nishāpūri*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 29- Yahya bin Sharf Al-Nawawi, *Sharah Sahih Muslim*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 30- Ibn Athīr, *Nihāya fi Gharīb Al-Athar*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 31- Abi Ya’la Al-Mosali, *Al-Musnad*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 32- Muhammad bin Abdul Wahhāb, *Mukhtasar Sirat Al-Rasūl*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 33- Ibn Jarir Al-Tabari, *Tārīkh Rusul wal Mulūk*, Makteba Al-Shamela
- 34- Muhammad bin Tahir Barzinji & Subhi Hasan Hallāq, *Sahīh wa Da’if Tārīkh Tabari*, pub. Dār Ibn Kathīr, Beirut, 2007

- 35- Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, *Malfūzāt*, New Ed.
- 36- Al-Hakam, vol.6 ,1902 (www.aaiil.org)
- 37- Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, *Tadhkira [Eng. Translation]*, pub. Islam International Publications Ltd. Surrey 2009

islamicsearchcenter.com