

HADHRAT NABI ISAA

Alayhis Salaam

IS HE DEAD OR ALIVE?

Our response to the mulhid followers
of the imposter: Mirza Gulam of Qadian-
Founder of the Qadiani/Ahmadi cult

Published By:
Mujlisul Ulama of S.A
PO Box 3393
Port Elizabeth
6056

HADHRAT NABI ISAA (Alayhis salaam)— IS HE DEAD OR ALIVE?

No one on this earth— be he Muslim or non-Muslim—disputes the fact that Islam in its final form was the Message delivered to mankind by Nabi Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) more than 1425 years ago. There is consensus of all people that Islam is not the product of this age or of a few decades ago or of a couple of centuries ago. When it is said that Muhammad Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) delivered to mankind the Islam which Allah Ta'ala had revealed to him, it is understood thereby that he handed to the world a set of beliefs and practices – *the Aqaaid and A'maal* of Islam. He did not leave Islam as an ambiguous concept subject to the understanding and interpretations of the multitudes of people.

It is only logical and a simple fact to understand that the beliefs and practices of the Sahaabah and the early Muslims of the *Khairul Quroon* (the three noblest ages of Islam) constitute Islam, and that only their Beliefs and Practices are authentic and valid. Any belief or practice which conflicts with the *Aqaaid and A'maal* of the Sahaabah will not be part of Islam. Thus, if someone today has to claim that there are only three Fardh Salaat instead of the five that we know of and adhere to, then the first question such a proponent will have to answer is: When did this belief or teaching of three Salaat develop in Islam? If he cannot prove that it originated with the Sahaabah, then obviously it will be expunged as kufr and branded a figment of the shaitaan's evil whispering into the heart of the one who contended the belief or act of kufr.

If a belief or practice cannot be reliably and authoritatively traced to the Sahaabah, it shall be thrown out into the garbage can of kufr. The very first obstacle any propounder of kufr has to surmount is to prove that the doctrine he is propagating has always been the belief

of the People of Islam from the inception of Islam. No man can impose his personal idea as Islamic doctrine and claim that this is what the Qur'aan says, if his personal doctrine has not been the official belief or practice of the Ummah from the time of the Sahaabah.

Islam is not an interpretation of the Qur'aan which modernists or deviates of this age present. Irrespective of how much the interpretation may appeal to and appease the western mind and the western intellectual masters of the modernists, it will never be part of Islam if it cannot be substantiated on the basis of the *Ijma'* of the Ummah. Such consensus has its roots in the Beliefs and Practices of the Sahaabah. Hence, the proponent of a belief which is at variance with the Beliefs of the Ummah or in conflict with the *Ijma'* which has been transmitted down the centuries from the age of the Sahaabah is under obligation to furnish his Shar'i evidence for his theory/idea. Evidence is not personal opinion nor is evidence of the Shariah a man's interpretation of the Qur'aan. Evidence of the Shariah is what the official position of the belief or practice was during the age of the Sahaabah and the *Khairul Quroon*, and whether the belief advocated by the deviate was the belief or practice of the Ummah from the inception of Islam.

It is on the basis of this criterion of authenticity that the beliefs pertaining to Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) as well as all other beliefs and alleged beliefs are to be examined. Any belief, practice or teaching which does not satisfy this criterion stands rejected and will be branded as kufr which expels the proponent from the fold of Islam. Explicitly and emphatically stating this conception of *Ijma'* and this criterion of authenticity which is the belief and practice of the Ummah from the time of the Sahaabah, the Qur'aan Shareef says:

"And if among the people are those who say: "We believe in Allah and the Last Day, while (in reality) they are not Mu'mineen (Believers). They (try to) deceive Allah and those who have Imaan.

However, they deceive none but themselves whilst they lack understanding." (Sarah Baqarah, Aayats 8 and 9)

***"And when it is said to them: "Believe in the manner in which the people (i.e. the Mu'mineen) believe, they say: 'What shall we believe as the ignoramuses believe?' Heed well! Verily, they are the ignoramuses, but they do not know."
(Sarah Baqarah, Aayat 13)***

It is quite evident from these verses of the Qur'aan Majeed, that Imaan is not the personal idea or conception of any person. A man's contention of belief in Allah and the Aakhirah is of no significance and validity if it is in conflict with the Belief of *"The People"*, i.e. the People of Islam who inherited their Beliefs and Practices from the Sahaabah. The Sahaabah are in the highest category of *"The People"* whom the Qur'aan commands to follow. Elsewhere in the Qur'aan Majeed Allah Ta'ala commands the selfsame obedience and following to *"The People"* of Imaan. Thus He says:

"And, follow the Path of those who turn (and lead) towards Us."

These as well as other Qur'aanic Aayaat categorically command the Mu'mineen to follow the Path of *"The People"*, not the path of personal opinion. Hence, the Consensus of the *"The People"* is the criterion of authenticity for the beliefs and practices of Islam. Any concept which is at variance with or in conflict with the conception of Imaan of *"The People"* of Imaan and Islam is *kufr* which *extinguishes Imaan and assigns the proponent into irtidaad* (making him a renegade) for which the punishment in a truly Islamic state is *Qatl* (execution).

THE MULHIDS BELIEF OF KUFR

One *mulhid* who has sprouted up from somewhere, seeking some cheap publicity, stating his ideas about Hadhrat Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam), wrote to the non-Muslim press that Nabi Isaa (alayhis

salaam) is dead. He is not alive in Heaven as the Ummah of Islam believes and has believed from the age of the Sahaabah. He presents as his 'proofs' the following arguments:

(1) The Sunni Muslims derive their support from their 'priests' whose basis is the traditions (Ahadith). These Ahadith are derived from Israeli sources.

(2) These sources were from Jews and Christians who embraced Islam, and who had introduced their 'apocryphal' literature in the Ahadith and the commentaries of the Qur'aan.

(3) The Qur'aan declares "Messengers had passed away before Him (Muhammad)." (Q3:144)

(4) "Further: God will cause you (Jesus) to die (or take You away) and exalt, honour and raise You in My Presence." (Q3:55).

(5) "God caused Jesus to die or took Him up". (Q5:120)

(6) "That Jesus is dead is confirmed by the Qur'an and some Ahadith (traditions), jurists and modern scholars."

If these are called 'proofs' (daleel), then we must say that they are an insult to the term as well as an insult to intelligence. Although these stupidities do not warrant an intelligent response, nevertheless, such a response becomes necessary in view of the large scale ignorance prevailing among the Muslim masses on the issue of *Aqaa-id* (Beliefs). Unwary persons and simple-minded folk are quickly misled by the most absurd specimens of kufr offered by just any *jaahil* who reads a few lines of Yusuf Ali's commentary.

The proponent of the kufr belief has made claims without presenting any substantiation whatsoever. He makes allegations

about the Qur'aan and "some Ahadith" confirming the death of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) without tendering the relevant Qur'aanic verses and "some Ahadith" which he claims support his idea of kufr.

The very first attack against the belief of Hadhrat Isaa's death is that it miserably fails the Criterion of Authenticity explained earlier. The death of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) never was a doctrine of Muslims at any time in the history of Islam. If the deviate claims that it was, then it devolves on him to produce his evidence, not his opinion. At what stage in Islam's history did the belief in Nabi Isaa's death develop among Muslims? Did the Sahaabah believe in the death of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam)? Was this the belief of *"The People"* whose obedience the Qur'aan commands? If it was, the zindeeq should produce his proof

He should not endeavour to conceal himself in ambiguity and say that according to "some Ahadith" Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) has died. He should produce these "some Ahadith" and the academic discussion pertaining to such traditions. If this mulhid is reborn and he devotes his entire new life to the search for proof to prove that *"The People"* of Islam had ever held this belief of kufr, then too he will miserably fail to do so other than making baseless claims which cannot be substantiated on the basis of Shar'i evidence.

The Mulhid's First and Second arguments

In this stupid 'proof' he claims that Islam's belief of Hadhrat Isaa's death is based on 'apocryphal' traditions which Jews and Christians had introduced into Islam when they had embraced this religion. The absurdity of this ludicrous claim is not hidden from any person who has made even a superficial study of the Science of Hadith compilation. Even a man who lacks expert Islamic Knowledge, but has read some English books on the subject of Hadith compilation, will laugh at the stupid claim which this mulhid has ventured so audaciously. It is said that fools rush in where angels fear to tread.

This is the similitude of the proponent of Nabi Isaa's death. Can any sane Muslim who does not have kufr concealed in his heart —who is not a munaafiq —ever accept that the wonderful and authentic Hadith compilations of the illustrious Muhadditheen who devoted their entire lives to the science of Hadith authentication are 'apocryphal' as the Zindeeq alleges? (Apocryphal refers to traditions which are baseless, untrue, legendary, and fabricated).

The mulhid has made his claim that the belief the People of Islam regarding Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) being alive in Heaven is based on 'apocryphal' traditions which Jews and Christians had interpolated into the Hadith Compilations which the People of Islam regard to be correct and authentic. It devolves on him to now produce these 'apocryphal' traditions which he claims constitute the basis of the Belief of "*The People*" whom the Qur'aan commands us to submit to. Any Tom, Dick, Harry and atheist can present their personal ideas of whim and fancy, and tender just any stupid and absurd argument. But they cannot present evidence to back up the kufr they gorge up. We want to know about these 'apocryphal' traditions which the Jew and Christian converts had introduced into Islam. It might benefit the mulhid to hear what Allah Ta'ala Himself says about the Christians who had converted to Islam. The Qur'an Majeed says in this regard:

'And most certainly, you will find the closest (to you, O Muslims!), in love, are those who say; 'Verily. we are Nasaaraa'. That is so because among them are men of justice and Ulama who are not proud. And, when they hear what has been revealed to the Rasool, you will see their eyes flowing With tears because they have recognized the Haqq.' (Qur'aan, Surah Maaidah, Aayats 82 and 83)

The reference here is to the early Nasaaraa who had embraced Islam. There were highly qualified Ulama and experts of the Taurah and Injeel among them. It is an insult to the Qur'aan to claim that these noble, pious and knowledgeable members of Ahl-e-Kitaab had introduced 'apocryphal' traditions into Islam. It is an even greater insult to claim that 'apocryphal' traditions of the Jews and Christians were used by the illustrious authorities of Islam to formulate *Aqeedah* when it is a fact as clear as daylight that Beliefs are based on only Ahaadith which are of the, *Qatiyuth Thuboot* category. The ignorance of the mulhid is stark and quite evident. He simply does not know what he is trumpeting.

This deviate who in all probability lacks knowledge in the very elementary teachings of Islam is too stupid to understand or to even know that the Fuqaha (Jurists of Islam) never employed *Dhaeef* (Weak, technically speaking) Ahaadith which are authentic, as basis for *Fardh* and *Waajib Ahkaam*, leave alone *Aqaa-id*. His sweeping statement simply displays his crass *jahaalat*. His argument is absolutely devoid of substance.

His claim that "Sunni Muslims" believe in Isaa (alayhis salaam) being alive on the basis of "support from their priests and jurists" is designed to ridicule. This type of stupid childish stratagems of ridicule is a salient feature of the mulhideen who are bereft of rational and Islamic arguments for their concepts and theories of kufr. If the beliefs of the Sunni Muslims are supported by their "priests" and jurists, it lends more strength to the authenticity of the beliefs of the masses. It is evidence for the correctness of the beliefs of the masses. It shows that the beliefs of the masses are based on scholarly, rational and factual basis, and are not the product of wild speculation of the vacillating nafs (whim and fancy —self-opinion) of men of ignorance. It is simply logical and acceptable that the masses accept the beliefs as explained to them by their "priests" and jurists. These "priests" and jurists are members of the class of men whom

the Qur'aan designates "*The People*", and whose obedience the Qur'aan commands. The Qur'aan commands that Muslims should believe as "*The People*" believe, not as the nafs dictates.

An intelligent mind will present evidence to substantiate the claim that the "priests" and the jurists have erred and that they had in turn based their belief on the 'apocryphal' traditions of the Jews and Christians. What proof does the zindeeq have for his contention in this regard? If he has even a vestige of evidence, let him produce it. The zindeeq is guilty of a blasphemous slander for his contention that the Jurists of Islam had based the beliefs pertaining to Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) on the apocryphal traditions of the Jews and Christians.

It is incumbent for him to define exactly what he means by 'apocryphal traditions' and on which such traditions of the Jews and Christians did "*The People*" of the, Qur'aan base their belief. Since he has manipulated the term 'apocryphal' to serve his kufr idea, he has to explain his criteria for labelling a Jewish or a Christian tradition as 'apocryphal'. Or perhaps he is a muqallid (blind follower) of the Jewish and Christian theologians and priests who have categorized their own respective traditions. Just look at this zindeeq! He becomes a blind muqallid of the Jewish and Christian theologians and priests who have studied and classified their traditions, but he refuses to accept the highly authentic Ahaadith classified by the illustrious Muhadditheen such as Imaam Bukhaari, Imaam Muslim and others of high rank. He must say who had classified the relevant Jewish and Christian traditions to be apocryphal, and on what basis does he (the zindeeq) accept such classification. Then he should provide his *dalaa-il* for his biggest calumny, viz., the Fuqaha of Islam had based the beliefs regarding Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) on such 'apocryphal' traditions of the Jews and Christians.

Another stupidity of the 'apocryphal' argument is that as far as the Jews are concerned, they do not even accept Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis

salaam) to be a Nabi. His ascension into Heaven, his second advent and him being alive or dead do not concern them. They have no apocryphal literature on Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam).

The Christians on the otherhand believe that Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) had first died a physical death, then after resurrection he ascended into the heaven. But the Qur'aan rejects the notion of his death. He was not crucified nor killed in any manner whatsoever. This is the official and authoritative belief of *"The People"* whom the Qur'aan commands us to follow. Since the Christians do believe in Nabi Isaa's ascension, his existence in the heavens and his second advent, their narrations are not apocryphal for them on this particular issue. Those narrations and traditions which are in conflict with their beliefs are rejected by the Christians and termed 'apocryphal', e.g. the Gospel of Barnabas which predicts the advent of our Nabi Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Thus, the argument that the People of Islam based their beliefs regarding Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) on the 'apocryphal' traditions of the Jews and Christians is utterly stupid and fallacious.

Furthermore, if Muslims had based their beliefs on any such traditions, the belief of Isaa's death would have also been incorporated into Islamic Aqeedah in terms of the logic of the zindeeq because he claims that Islamic Belief is the consequence of Christian and Jewish 'apocryphal' (but non-existent) traditions. The absurdity of the mulhid's arguments should thus be conspicuous.

In Tafseer *Durr-e-Manthur* appears the following narration:

"Ishaaq Bin Bishr and Ibn Asaakir narrating from Jauhar who narrates from Dhuhhak who narrates from Ibn Abbaas (radhiyallahu anhu) (the tafseer) of the Allah's statement: "Verily, I shall cause you to die and raise you up to Me"--i.e. "Shall raise you, then cause you to die in the last of ages (aakhiruz zamaan)." (Page 36, Vol. 2)

Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas (radhiyallahu anhu) was not a Jew or a Christian who had embraced Islam. He does not present the *tafseer* of this Aayat No.55 of Surah Aal-e-Imraan on the basis of any narration or tradition of Bani Israaeel. He states the meaning as he had acquired it from Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas (radhiyallahu anhu) is known as *Raeesul Mufasssireen* (The Chief of the Mufasssireen).

We shall discuss this tafseer further in the ensuing pages, In-sha'Allah. Suffice here to say that the Sahaabah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), not only the noble Ulama of the Yahood and Nasaaraa who had embraced Islam, taught the belief that Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) did not die but was physically raised into the Heavens. This belief which the Sahaabah propagated was not based on any apocryphal tradition of the Jews and Christians. The mulhid should present his proof for his fallacious contention of kufr.

For ignoramuses it is quite easy to tender sweeping and ridiculous contentions. But to substantiate such claims is entirely a different matter. When proof for their *nafsaani* speculation is demanded, they are adept in the art of seeking refuge in impregnable fortresses of silence and in childish stratagems of ridicule. It behoves this mulhid to produce his Qur'aanic and historical evidence for his absurd contention that the Beliefs of Islam pertaining to Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) are based on apocryphal traditions of the Jews and Christians. He supposedly regards himself as a member of the 'enlightened intelligentsia'. If so, he has to necessarily provide his rational and historical evidence for his claim. Just when - at which period in the history of Islam- did the belief of Isaa's death on the basis of Jewish and Christian traditions develop in Islam? Let the miserable zindeeq answer.

The Mulhid's Third argument

In this argument the mulhid avers: *"The Qur'aan declares: Messengers had passed away before Him (Muhammad)". Q3:144"*

The ignorance of the mulhid is manifest from his citation of this Aayat which does not have the remotest relevance to Hadhrat Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam). Even the general purport of the Aayat cannot be adduced to substantiate the kufr belief of the zindeeq.

He is unable to even present a correct translation of the verse he cites as his 'proof' for the imagined death of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam). Since the mulhid has merely lapped up what Yusuf Ali says in his translation, he presents the erroneous translation of Yusuf Ali as well. The translation of the Aayat is: *"Verily, numerous Messengers passed before you."* By saying "passed away", the meaning of 'died' is proffered. Although it is understood that the numerous Ambiya who appeared before Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had passed away (died), the word in this Aayat does not mean "passed away" or 'died'.

Even if the meaning of "have died" or have passed away is taken, it does not in any way whatsoever support the contention that Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) too had died. The Aayat does not say that each and every Messenger before Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) without any exception had died. The tenor of the Aayat does not preclude exceptions. It is a general statement simply mentioning that just as the Messengers before Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had died so too will he also die. The exception of Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) is based on other dalaail.

The contention is not that Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) will never die. The belief of Islam is that he has not yet died and that after his *Nuzool* (Descent) from the Heavens, he will die a normal physical death. The mulhid believes that he is an intellectual and a member

of the 'Intellegentsia'. However, his stupidity boggles the mind. He is totally ignorant of the fact that *Aqeedah* (Belief) is not the product of interpretation and opinion, least of all the absurd opinions of *juhala* and *mulhideen*. Beliefs are based on Qur'aanic Aayaat or Ahaadith-e-Mutawattirah which are Ahaadith of absolute certitude, which do not brook the slightest vestige of doubt, ambiguity or uncertainty. The number of the raka'ts, for example, are established on the basis of such Proofs.

Instead of presenting any *daleel* of absolute certitude, the mulhid presents a verse which has no relevance whatsoever with Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam). He employs and misinterprets this Aayat in blind imitation of the Qadiani mulhideen who went before him, and on the basis of such fallacious interpretation, he offers, the belief of Hadhrat Isaa's death. And, in his presentation of this kufr belief he perpetrates the chicanery of endeavouring to convey the impression of originality, namely, that his own 'ingenuity' has unraveled the mystery surrounding Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) —the mystery which the Christians had failed to unravel. He fails to acknowledge his 'imaam', Yusuf Ali and others of his ilk who had peddled these baseless, legless and stupid arguments.

The Qur'aanic averment that Messengers had "passed away" before Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) does not negate the fact and belief that Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) had not died and that he was raised bodily into the Heavens whilst alive and awake. These beliefs are structured on independent *Dalaa-il* of the Shariah. This specific Aayat does not negate the longevity of the lifespan of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam). The demise of innumerable Messengers, in fact all except Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam), before Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) does not rationally or logically or Islamically preclude any being born before Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) outliving him. What is the rational argument to prove that a person who was a Nabi and born before Rasulullah

(sallallahu alayhi wasallam), could not have lived beyond the lifespan of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? Only mulhids who deny the infinite Power of Allah Ta'ala, covertly refute the Qur'aanic proclamation:

"Verily, Allah has power over all things."

What is the Islamic proof for claiming that Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) was not alive when Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was born and that he did not remain alive after the demise of Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and that he will not remain alive until the great signs of Qiyaamah materialize? Independent proof of the category of absolute certitude (*Qatiyyuth Thuboot*) is imperative for claiming a belief which conflicts with the 14 century belief of *The People* –the Sahaabah, Taabieen, Tab-e-Tabieen –all the Aimmah Mujtahideen, Fuqaha, and the entire Ummah down the long corridor of Islam's history.

It devolves on the mulhid to prove with Shar'i facts the stages of origin of the two diametrically opposite beliefs—the belief that Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) is alive and the kufr belief of his death. While we can conclusively claim that the belief of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah –*the belief of The People of the Qur'aan* – has its origin in the Qur'aan and Ahaadith, the zindeeq fails hopelessly to produce even one valid argument to substantiate his belief of kufr.

It is thus illogic and in conflict with Islam to claim the death of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) on the basis of the Aayat which merely states that numerous Messengers had passed away before Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The Mulhid's fourth argument

In this argument, the mulhid offers the Aayat No.55 of Aal-e-Imraan. Thus he says: *"Further: God will cause You (Jesus) to die (or take You away) and exalt, honour and raise You in My Presence."*

Firstly, he has ventured a corrupt translation. The correct translation of the Aayat is:

"(Remember) when Allah said: 'O Isaa! Verily I shall cause you to die and I shall raise you towards Me, and I shall exonerate you from the disbelievers "

He translates the word '*raafiuka*' to mean '*exalt, honour and raise you in My Presence*'. But this word in the context of the Aayat does not mean 'exalt and honour'. When the term '*rafa*' is used with the word '*ilaa*', it does not mean exalting the rank of a person. It clearly refers to physical raising or lifting. Furthermore, this meaning has been determined by the explanations of the Sahaabah. It has thus to be translated in the context of the meaning and belief of *The People* whom we are commanded by the Qur'an to follow. Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) already had an exalted rank by Allah Ta'ala. He was among the great Ambiya. The figurative meaning ascribed to the term in the context of this Aayat is palpably erroneous. In other verses where the term '*rafa*' is used for elevation of rank, the term '*ilaa*' is not used. Hence, the Qur'aan says: ***"He has elevated some over others by ranks."*** ***"Allah exalts the Believers among you "***

In these verses and many others, the word '*rafa*' to mean elevation of ranks is used without '*ilaa*'. It should thus be clear that the term '*ilaa*' when used in conjunction with the word, '*rafa*' produces the meaning of physical lifting or raising upwards physically. There is also no need for us to substantiate the belief of Isaa (alayhis salaam) on the basis of this interpretation of the word '*rafa*'. The belief is based on the *Ijma'* of the *Ummah*—"The People" whom the Qur'aan says we have to obey and follow.

The physical transportation of Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) into the Heavens is further confirmed with emphasis in the following Aayat of Surah Nisaa, which rejects the notion that Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) was killed:

"They most certainly did not kill him. But, on the contrary, Allah lifted him (Isaa) to Him (Allah Ta'ala)."

The word *rafa'* (lifted) is brought here in this Aayat to negate and refute the claim of the Yahud that they had physically killed Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam). Refuting their contention, the Qur'aan Majeed declares with emphasis that they did not kill him. On the contrary, Allah Ta'ala saved Isaa (alayhis salaam) by lifting him up to the Heavens. The meaning of 'exalting' or 'honouring' will be improper in the context of the refutation stated in this Aayat.

"CAUSE TO DIE"

The translation which even the Mulhid presents, is: *"cause you to die"*. The Aayat does not say that. Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis Salaam) had died. Allah Ta'ala does not say: "Isaa is dead or has died." In this verse, Allah directly addressing Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam), says: ***"O Isaa! Verily, I shall cause you to die, and I shall lift you up to Me"***. Isaa (alayhis salaam) at the time of the Divine Address was being pursued by the Yahood who wanted to have him killed. Allah Ta'ala in this Aayat assures him of the failure of the plot of the Yahood. Hence, the Qur'aan states immediately before this Aayat: ***"They (the Yahood) plotted, and Allah plotted, and Allah is the best of plotters."***

The Aayat assures Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) that the Yahood will not succeed in killing him. He will die at some time in the future. Meanwhile he will be raised up into the Heaven. It is absurd to infer from an event which has not yet transpired that it has already happened. The absurdity is obvious. By what warped and stupid logic does the mulhid argue? He claims that Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) has died. But in support he presents an Aayat which says that Allah Ta'ala will cause Isaa (alayhis salaam) to die in the future.

Islam does not negate the future death of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam). *"The People"* do not contend that Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) will never die. The belief is only that he has not yet died, but will die

after his descent from Heaven. The fallacy of this argument of the mulhid should also be conspicuous.

The Mulhid's fifth argument

In this argument he says: *"God caused Jesus to die or took him up. Q5:120"*

Firstly, Aayat No.120 of Surah Maaidah does not remotely refer to Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam). The translation of Aayat 120 is:

"Unto Allah belongs the sovereignty of the heavens and the earth and whatever is therein. And, He is All-Powerful over everything"

However, the mulhid, Yusuf Ali, in his erroneous numbering of the verses has numbered the relevant Aayat No.120 when in fact it is No.117. Pick up any copy of the Qur'aan and it will be seen that the number of the Aayat to which the mulhid and Yusuf Ali refer is No.117. The translation of the relevant portion of the Aayat to which the mulhid has referred is:

"I was a witness over them while I was among them. Then, when you took me away (i.e. caused me to die), then You were the Guard over them." (Aayat 117, Surah Maaidah)

The entire discussion of the Aayat (the above is only a portion of the Aayat) is an event which will transpire in Qiyaamah – in the future. It is not a discussion which Allah Ta'ala already had with Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam). It is a discussion which will yet take place after resurrection in Qiyaamah. Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) says (in this Aayat): "You caused me to die". It should be obvious that he is speaking here after his death, not prior to his death. To claim that this discussion took place on earth prior to Nabi Isaa's death is absurd. He himself says: *"When You (O Allah!) caused me to die"*. Hence the discussion logically will take place after resurrection in Qiyaamah. And this is confirmed by the authentic Ahaadith.

Since this is a discussion which will yet take place in the Hereafter, it is fallacious to present it in substantiation of the kufr belief. The manner in which the Mulhid quotes the portion of the Aayat out of its context, is designed to convey the deceptive idea that Allah Ta'ala says in the Qur'an that Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) has already died, hence the zindeeq says: "*God caused Jesus to die*", It is not refuted that Allah Ta'ala will cause Nabi Isaa to die. But his death will be caused after his *Nuzool* to earth. It is therefore baseless to present this Aayat as proof for the contention that Isaa (alayhis salaam) is dead.

The Mulhid's sixth argument

In this 'argument', the Mulhid merely makes a claim without providing any evidence. He simply says: "*That Jesus is dead is confirmed by the Qur'aan, and some Ahadith (traditions), jurists and modern scholars.*"

In his letter there is not a single Qur'aanic verse to confirm his claim. We have refuted and demolished the arguments which he had based on certain Qur'aanic verses which do not even remotely suggest that Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) had died.

He speaks of "some Ahadith" which allegedly confirm the kufr belief. Firstly, he should not cite Ahaadith because in terms of his own claim, Ahadith are the products of the apocryphal traditions of the Jews and Christians. Secondly, he should present these Ahaadith for examination. There are no Ahaadith which confirm the belief of the death of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam).

Then he speaks about confirmation by the 'jurists'. The Mulhid is the last man who should speak about the jurists. According to his claim the Jurists had formulated the belief of Hadhrat Isaa's death on the basis of the apocryphal traditions of the Jews and Christians. He should now not seek to extract capital from the Jurists for his kufr

belief. It is furthermore, a blatant falsehood to claim that the Fuqaha or some of them believe in the death of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam). He should provide his proof for this claim of confirmation by the Fuqaha.

As far as "modern scholars" are concerned, their ranks preponderate with mulhids and zindeeqs. Anyone whose beliefs conflict with the *Ijma'ee* Belief of *The People* of Islam is not a scholar of Islam. Such a modernist is a deviated ignoramus. He is unacceptable to Islam. The views of some of these modern day "scholars" are repugnant and of no concern. Their views cannot be cited as proof of the Shariah. It is truly amazing that a man who regards himself as an "investigative" scholar and researcher—a deviate who is prepared to denounce and reject a Belief which the Ummah has believed in for the past 1438 years—citing "modern scholars" as his proof. How rapidly does he become a muqallid of just anyone whom he thinks is worthy of eking out support. Thus, while he rejects and criticizes the Fuqaha, he is quick to cite "some" of them when he thinks that there is some support for his doomed cause of kufr. No one is interested in the "modern scholars" of deviation (*dhalaal*), falsehood (*baatil*) and *kufr*. The views of such "scholars" do not occupy the category of any class of Shar'i proof; leave alone the highest class of evidence on the basis of which Aqeedah is structured.

Alhamduliilaah! We have adequately refuted and demolished the fallacious arguments of the Mulhid. We now present the Proofs of those People whose system of Imaan, according to the Qur'aan, is the only valid conception of Belief (Imaan), and whom we have been commanded to follow.

IJIMA' (CONSENSUS OF - UMMAH)

The strongest *daleel* (proof/evidence) for any belief, practice or teaching of Islam is *Ijma*. This Daleel is the command of Allah Ta'ala stated in several Aayaat of the Qur'aan Majeed.

"Whoever opposes the Rasool after the Hidaayah (Guidance of the Deen) has become manifest, and he follows a path other than the Path of the Mu'mineen, We divert him to that (path of deviation) which he follows. And, We shall cast him into Jahannum. Indeed, it is an evil abode." (Qur'aan, Aayat 115, Surah Nisaa)

"And follow the Path of him who turns to Me."

The basis of the validity of Imaan is to believe as the Ummah believes, i.e. to subscribe to all the beliefs which the Ummah has acquired from Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) via the agency of the Sahaabah. The Qur'aan says in this regard:

"Among mankind are those who say: 'We believe in Allah and the Last Day", while (in reality) they are not Mu'mineen (Believers)". (Surah Baqarah, Aayat 8)

"And, when it is said to them: 'Believe just as the people (believe)', they say: What! Shall we believe like the ignoramuses believe?'. Behold! Verily, they are the ignoramuses, but they know not." (Surah Baqarah, Aayat 13)

The Qur'aan Majeed does not instruct Muslims to follow their personal opinions and understanding of the Qur'aan. It commands us to follow *The People, The Mu 'mineen*. Those who diverge from the Path of the Mu'mineen, the Qur'aan declares un-equivocally: *"We shall cast them into Jahannum"*. It is abundantly clear from the Qur'aanic Aayaat that in order to be among the Mu'mineen, the essential requisite is to *"Believe as the People believe."* Thus, any belief, interpretation, idea or view which conflicts with the Beliefs of the Sahaabah who were the very first Wrung in the Ladder of *The People* to whom the Qur'aan commands obedience, is kufr.

Ijma' is the Path of the Mu'mineen from which divergence according to the aforementioned Aayat leads to Jahannum. *Ijma'* is in the category of the Qur'aan Majeed since the Qur'aan commands

Muslims to follow the Path of the Mu'mineen. There is no difference of opinion among the Fuqaha and Authorities of Islam on the issue of *Ijma'* being a *Hujjat* (Proof and Authority) in the category of the Qur'aan. Denial of any belief or teaching evidenced by *Ijma'* is kufr. This is the unanimous ruling of all Authorities of Islam.

Ijma' of the Ummah —of *The People* to whom obedience is commanded in the Qur'aan, has been recognized as *Hujjat* for the Ahkaam of the Shariah from the very inception of Islam since it is a command of the Qur'aan itself. There is no need to delve further on this subject in this concise booklet. Only a moron will deny that the Ummah's beliefs pertaining to Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) are structured on the basis of *Ijma'*. In spite of the Mulhid's denial of the validity and truth of these beliefs, he does concede that Isaa (alayhis salaam) being alive is the Belief of this Ummah. Hence, he had no alternative but to concede: *"The belief that Jesus is still alive in heaven is held by both Christians and Sunni Muslims."* Whoever now denies this Belief denies the validity of *Ijma'* and in consequence he has to be prepared to be cast into Jahannum by Allah Ta'ala. Who has warned in the Qur'aan Shareef that those who diverge from the Path of the Mu'mineen will be the inmates of Hell-Fire.

THE QUR'AAN

Ijma' on the Beliefs centering around Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) are structured on the basis of the Qur'aan and Ahaadith-e-Mutawaatirah — the highest category of authentic and reliable Ahaadith. Refuting the belief of Hadhrat Isaa having died, the Qur'aan Majeed declares with the greatest emphasis and unambiguity:

"And (the punishment they received) was because of their claim: 'Verily, we have killed the Maseeh, Isaa, the son of Maryam who was the Rasool of Allah. (However), they neither killed him nor crucified him, but they (the Yahood) were thrown into confusion (regarding Hadhrat

Isaa)..... And most certainly they did not kill him. On the contrary, Allah lifted him up to Him. And Allah is Mighty, The Wise." (Surah Nisaa, Aayat 157).

The Qur'aan in this Aayat categorically rejects the claim of the death of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam). The Yahood had claimed that they had killed Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam). Vehemently refuting this claim the Qur'aan affirms the ascension of Nabi Isaa into the Heavens. There is absolutely no difference of opinion among the Authorities of Islam on this belief. It is an *Ijma'ee* Belief that this Aayat confirms the physical ascension into the Heavens of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam). This is the belief of the Mu'mineen — the unanimous belief from the earliest time of Islaam. Any Mulhid who in his stupidity is so audacious as to deny the fact that these beliefs are based on *Ijma'* of the Ummah should produce his proof in refutation of this claim we are making.

Ayat No,159 of Surah Nisaa' states:

"And there will be none of the Ahl-e-Kitaab, but he will believe in him (Isaa) before his Maut (death)."

In the tafseer of this Aayat, Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (radhiyallahu anhu) said:

"Nabi (alayhis salaam) said: 'Most assuredly, the Son of Maryam will descend (to earth) as a just ruler. Then he will most certainly slay Dajjaal, kill pigs and destroy crosses. And, (at that time) Sajdah (Ibaadat) will be exclusively for Allah Rabbul Aalameen.' Then Abu Hurairah said: If you wish recite (aayat No.159) He added: Before the Maut of Isaa. He repeated this thrice." (Ma-aariful Qur'aan)

All members of the Ahl-e-Kitaab will ultimately accept Imaan at the hands of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) before his death. This too testifies to the belief of him still being alive. Millions and millions of Ahl-e-Kitaab have not yet believed in Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam)

in the way Islam requires belief. This will happen after his *Nuzool* from the Heavens.

The *Nuzool* of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) is further confirmed by Aayat 61 of Surah Zukhruf:

"Verily he (Nabi Isaa) is certainly a sign for the Hour. Therefore, never ever doubt in it (i.e. the Hour of Qiyaamah) and obey me."

The Mufasssireen commenting on this Aayat say that Isaa (alayhis salaam) will be a sign of Qiyaamah. This Aayat conveys the information of his descent from Heaven in close proximity to Qiyaamah. Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas, the eminent Sahaabi who is known as Raeesul Mufasssireen, narrated regarding this statement of Allah Ta'ala: *"(It means) the emergence of Isaa (alayhis salaam) before the Day of Qiyaamah."*

The *Nuzool* of Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) presupposes him being alive in the Heaven. The unanimous Belief of the Mu'mineen is that Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) was raised bodily into heaven while he was alive; that he is alive in Heaven; that he will return to earth before Qiyaamah. There is complete unanimity of the People of Islam on these beliefs. Only munaafiqeen and mulhideen deny these unanimous beliefs of the Mu'mineen.

Also declaring that Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) was not killed and that he was raised up bodily into the Heaven, the Qur'aan states:

"O Isaa! I shall cause you to die, and I shall raise you to Me, and I shall exonerate you from the unbelievers..."

(Surah Aal-e-Imraan, Aayat 55)

There is complete unanimity of the Mufasssireen and Authorities of Islam regarding the meaning of this Aayat. They all state with-out any difference that Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) was lifted alive and physically into the Heaven. The Authorities of Islam unanimously

aver that Allah *"will cause Hadhrat Isaa to die"* before Qiyaamah after his descent to earth. It is only mulhideen who have taken up the cause of the Qadiani impostor, Mirza Gulam Ahmad. After thirteen centuries of complete unanimity in the beliefs pertaining to Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam), Mirza, the impostor presented his kufr misinterpretation and opinion of Isaa's death, etc. The mulhideen in our day are all the muqallideen of the dajjaal, Mirza of Qadian.

THE SUNNAH

The proofs of the Sunnah are overwhelming. Only a total *kaafir* — one who has been destined for Jahannum from the moment he was conceived — denies the Sunnah with its vast volume of authentic Ahaadith which the Qur'aan Majeed imposes on Muslims to accept and obey as an integral part of Imaan, without which, Imaan is not valid. In many Qur'aanic Aayaat, Allah Ta'ala commands:

"Obey Allah and obey the Rasool"

This is an oft-repeated Aayat and theme of the Qur'aan. In another ayat, the Qur'aan states:

"Whatever the Rasool brings to you, hold on firmly to it, and whatever he forbids you of abstain from it"

Obedience to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with the axiomatic consequence of accepting and submitting to the *Saheeh* Ahaadith is denied only by those who have no share in Imaan. Refutation of the Ahaadith is precisely denial of the Qur'aan which commands obedience to the Rasool. The teachings, instructions, commands, prohibitions and beliefs delivered and, explained by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are all encapsulated in the Saheeh Ahaadith. Denial of these Ahaadith is denial of Allah Ta'ala and Islam because it is Allah Ta'ala Who in the Qur'aan Majeed commands acceptance and obedience to the Ahaadith of Rasulullah

(sallallahu alayhi wasallam). That the Saheeh Ahaadith are part of *Wahi* revealed by Allah Ta'ala, is confirmed by the Aayat:

"He (Muhammad) does not speak of desire (whim, fancy and personal opinion). It (his speech) is nothing but Wahi which is revealed to him (from Allah Ta'ala)."

If one stupid Mulhid today refutes without being able to furnish the slightest vestige of Shar'i evidence regarding the beliefs pertaining to Hadhrat Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam), then on the basis of the stupid 'logic' of Mulhid No. 1, tomorrow Mulhid No.2 can contend that the daily five Salaat are not Fardh because this perculiar institution of Salaat is the product of the apocryphal traditions of the Jews and Christians. The Qur'aan is silent on the number of times, viz.5, that Salaat has to be performed daily. It is even more silent on the number of raka'ts and the multitude of *masaa-il* related to Salaat. By the same shaitaani token, Mulhid No.3 can claim that the one fortieth annual Zakaat tax which the Jurists have fixed is based on apocryphal traditions of the Jews and Christians because the Qur'aan is silent on this issue. In fact, the Qur'aan does not even say that Zakaat means payment of money annually. The literal meaning of Zakaat is NOT payment of annual tax. In this the multitude of mulhids, munaafiqs and zindeeqs who lay hidden among the ranks of the Mu'mineen can torpedo and extinguish the whole of Islam. In fact, this is precisely the conspiracy of the West which is in progress at this moment. The satanic plot is being spread like mines and being planted, to bring about total change in the Immutable Shariah by means of "internal initiatives". This plot is being applied in different dimensions of Islam. Every mulhid is a cog in this plot.

ALL the Ahaadith on which are based the Islamic doctrines related to Hadhrat Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) are of the highest category of authenticity on par in force and strength with Qur'aanic Aayaat in the Shariah's law-formulation process. *Ahaadith-e-Mutawaatirah* producing the effect of *Qatiyuth Thuboot* (Authenticity of such a

lofty degree which does not admit the slightest vestige of uncertainty) constitute the basis for these *Aqaaid*. There is not a single authentic Hadith of a lesser class, leave alone Israeli fabrications and apocryphal traditions, which forms the basis for the beliefs pertaining to Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam). Only morons, ignoramuses and doomed men with stercoraceous minds will claim that these highly authentic Ahaadith which have the force of Qur'aanic Aayat, are the products of the apocryphal traditions of the Jews and Christians.

Shayaateen of this ilk imply by their ludicrous opinions that from its very inception Islam was smothered and it did not attain its pinnacle of perfection to which the Qur'aan attests. In fact, this noxious opinion of these juhhaal leads to the inevitable conclusion that the whole of Islam, in fact the Qur'aan itself, is a fabrication based on Jewish and Christian legend and mythology because it is an irrefutable fact which no sane Muslim or non-Muslim will deny that the authenticity of the Qur'aan is based on *Ahaadith-e-Mutawaatirah*. Without Hadith there is NO Qur'aan.

The Qur'aan Kareem makes a brief reference to the physical lifting of Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) just as it makes a brief reference to Zakaat in its verses, and just as it makes brief references to Salaat in the verses commanding Salaat. The elaboration of these concepts and institutions has been assigned to the Ahaadith. Thus, the Qur'aan Majeed commands:

"Verily whoever has obeyed the Rasool has obeyed Allah."

In exactly the same concise style the Qur'aan refers to the descent of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam), leaving the explanation to the Ahaadith. These Ahaadith as mentioned earlier are of the *Tawaatur* category, denial of which is kufr of the highest degree. Haafiz Bin Hajar states this fact explicitly in Fathul Baari, Sharh (commentary) of Bukhaari Shareef. The illustrious Mufasssir, Haafiz Ibn Katheer

confirms these Ahaadith and their category in his famous Tafseer. In *Tal-kheesul Habeer*, Haafiz Ibn Hajar states:

"All the authorities of Hadith and Tafseer have concurred that the ascension of Isaa (alayhis salaam) was a physical ascension."

Haafiz Ibn Katheer has compiled in his Tafseer ten big pages full with these Ahaadith which state and describe Hadhrat Isaa's bodily ascension while he was alive, his presence in the Heaven in his physical state, i.e. with his physical body, and his appearance on earth in close proximity to Qiyaamah. It has been explicitly mentioned that these issues are *Ijma'ee*, *Qat'ti* and *Ittifaqi* in which there exists absolutely no difference of opinion.

The entire life of Hadhrat Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) was a *Mu'jizah* (Divine Miracle). His mother, Hadhrat Maryann (alayhas salaam) was a Virgin. He was born without the agency of a father. He spoke when he was an infant of a day old proclaiming his Nubuwwat and the Ahkaam of Salaat and Zakaat. He left this world alive in the miraculous state of ascension into the Heavens. He lives there to this day, alive in the way all human beings are alive. His descent to earth will be miraculous. His task of slaying Dajjaal will be miraculous. Are all these irrefutable facts of Imaan the products of the apocryphal traditions of the Jews and Christians? Only men whose kufr was stamped on their hearts when they were still in the wombs of their mothers can have the audacity of denying these *Aqaaid* of incontrovertible truth. We supplicate to Allah Ta'ala to preserve our Imaan and to eliminate the kufr from the hearts of the mulhideen in our midst. After all, Allah Ta'ala has the power to eliminate kufr from even the sealed and stamped hearts of zindeeqs.

"Verily, Allah has power over all things." -

NUZUL (Decension) of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam)

By Hazrat Maulana Muhammed Badre-Alam

Common Muslim belief

Muslims believe that Nabi Isaa (Alayhis Salaam) will suffer a natural death after *Nuzul* (decension). They differ with other people only about his previous death. According to common Muslim belief Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) has been taken up to the heavens bodily alive and that he will return to this world and die a natural death. There are no sectarian differences among Muslims on these points from the early days of Islam. Not to speak of many other incidents of his life which strongly disprove the Divinity of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam), the belief about future death stands out almost as final repudiation of such divinity. Consequently, once you believe in his physical birth and death there remains absolutely no risk of conceding even a shadow of divinity though you also believe that he had ascended safely to the heavens.

Here we may refer to the interpretation of "I shall receive you" as "I will cause you to die" which has been given by Hazrat Ibne Abbas and so it is no way inconsistent with beliefs entertained by Muslims. The suggested interpretation can neither be correctly to the great commentator of Qur'aan nor has it been countenanced by any Muslim authority of repute. In fact there are several other traditions on the authority of Hazrat Ibne Abbas which unequivocally affirm the common Muslim belief that Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) will descend into this world and thereafter die a natural death.

"KITAABUT TAFSEER" AND "CONSTRUCTION OF WORDS" IN "KITABUL TAFSEER" BY IMAM BUKHARI THE CHAPTER RELATION TO "CONSTRUCTION OF WORDS" HAS NOT BEEN WRITTEN BY HIM BUT WAS COMPILED BY IMAM UBAIDA IBNE HAZM."

People of deficient knowledge have fallen victim to serious misunderstanding in that the single version of Hazrat Ibne-Abass

referred to, occurs in the compilation of Imam Bukhari which fact leads to an inference that the latter also agreed with it. Besides the foregoing comments, it may not be overlooked that in this very compilation elsewhere specific traditions relating to "Nuzul" are included. How then can it be argued that death of Nabi Isa (alayhis salaam) mentioned in the version in dispute signifies a foregoing one. Since in the other traditions the views of Hazrat Ibne Abass are clearly brought out, why not infer that Imam Bukhari held the same belief, knowing as we do that Bukhari itself records numerous traditions to that effect and the Imam must be supposed to have taken full responsibility for the authenticity of these traditions.

Another authority who is often quoted in support of the view of previous death is Ibne Hazm. The uncorroborated opinion of a single authority of medium rank can hardly have any weight against the unanimous pronouncements of leading Ulama And Ibne Hazm is already notorious in holding arbitrary views on different subjects. He too in certain places has clearly opined that Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) is destined to descend to the earth towards the end. In his well-known book, *Al Muhalla*, page 391, he has described the doctrine of "Nuzul" as one of the basic beliefs of the majority of Muslims. The same opinion has been expressed by him in *Kitaabul-Fasl*, see pages 23, 55, 73, 77 and 87. One such extract from the book runs as follows:

"The reliable narrators who have conveyed to us the doctrines of prophethood of our Holy Prophet Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) proclaimed that no new Prophet will appear after him except Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam). The prediction of his "Nuzul" is embodied in authentic traditions. It is the same apostle of Allah who had been sent unto Bani Israel and whom the Jews claimed to have killed by crucifixion. Hence it is incumbent upon us to believe in these things. And it is proved from reliable sources that no new Nubuwwat will exist after the passing away of our Holy Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).