

**THE PROPHECY OF GREEN ARABIA AND THE  
POSSIBILITY OF MIRACLE: A REFUTATION OF  
DAVID HUME'S THEORY OF NO MIRACLE**

**DR. RAHMAH BT AHMED H. OSMAN\*,  
NASEEB AHMED SIDDIQUI\*\***

**\*Faculty of Islamic Revealed Knowledge & Human Science  
International Islamic University Malaysia, Malaysia**

**\*\*Ontario Tech University, Canada**

Email: [siddiquinaseeb@gmail.com](mailto:siddiquinaseeb@gmail.com)

Received on: 03-12-2018 Accepted on: 28-01-2021

**Abstract**

Despite the claim of scientific methodology to avoid revelation as a source of knowledge, the revelation inherently is science-friendly, and for some cases, the torchbearer unveils the mysteries of this universe. Hence, it can surely benefit the natural sciences particularly and humanity in general; and there are numerous apodictic connecting the revelation and the universe. However, western scholars, specifically David Hume denied altogether such relation that amplifies his argument to no miracle fantasy. This article attempts to analyse one of the prophecies of Prophet of Islam Muhammad (*Sal Allah-u-'alaihe wa sallam*), regarding an ancient event that fixed the course of earth's behaviour and hence further aggrandizes the deep democracy working beneath the verses and natural laws. This prophecy, according to Ḥadīth claims to engage with the ecological changes occurred in the Arabian Peninsula in the ancient time and unveils that Arabian Peninsula will become green again with rivers flowing abundantly. It signifies that Arabia was green and will return to its previous state of greenery in the future. At first, this research narrates and explains the Ḥadīth in detail followed by an exposition of David Hume's no miracle theory based on testimonies. The arguments have been presented to support the idea of a green Arabia in the past and how it will regain its greenery by considering scientific facts so far. It became apparent that, while considering the ice and warm ages along with abundant natural resources, the Ḥadīth is proven. It led to the complete denial of David Hume's no miracle theory according to his definition of testimonies. Therefore, this paper established two important aims, at first, it breaks the conventional framework of Western scholarship that did toil attempts to alienate revelation as a source of knowledge.

Second; for the first time it brings such a Ḥadīth and contextualizes it with scientific facts, besides providing answers of the implications. Moreover, how the revelation describes the process of earth-in-making through ecological changes of millions of years. Hence, the Miracle is a part of natural law.

**Keywords:** Green Arabia, Prophecy in Islam, Possibility of Miracle, History of Arabian peninsula, Global warming, David Hume and Miracle.

## 1. Introduction

The relation between Ḥadīth and history is so vital to be ignored in the Islamic world. The influence of Ḥadīth has two distinctive features in the promotion of related sciences. At first, the recounting of Ḥadīth narration in terms of its strict methodology<sup>1</sup> also inspired the study of history. Secondly, the Ḥadīth reveals excessive information about the social, political, and religious environment of pre-Islamic and post-Islamic Arab and the places where Islam came to power. *Tārīkh al-Raqqā wa-man Nazalaha min Ashāb Rasūl Allah Ṣalla Allah ‘alaihe wa Sallam wa ‘l-Tābi’īn ‘l-Fuqaha wa ‘l-Muhaddithīn* by Abu Ali Muḥammad Sad Qushayri Harrani (Raḥmat Allah ‘alaih) is a typical 10<sup>th</sup> century work which describes in detail the kinds of historical events that were being recorded. The book considered the biographies of muḥaddithīn, alongside the extensive different branches that sprung from the study of Ḥadīth compilation, to fix the method of transmission and transmitted both, in strict sense. It was followed by the separate and extensive studies about the cities to elaborate the changes Islam brought with it like *Tarīkh Baghdād* and *Tārīkh Nayshapūr*. Furthermore, detailed discussion about the early Islamic history can be found in the work of al-Balādhurī in *Kitāb al-Buldān* and of Imam al-Tabari’s (Raḥmat Allah ‘alaih) huge work of *Tārīkh al-Ṭabari*.<sup>2</sup> Imam Abu Hatim al-Razi’s (Raḥmat Allah ‘alaih), *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl* brought the Ḥadīth criticism to devoid tradition from any fabrication<sup>3</sup>. The central nerves for the history narration remained the strict methodology of traditionalist to cite the chain of transmitters relating any events which can be seen till 10<sup>th</sup> century. However, it waned with time and al-Māsudi is credited to have left the practice of citing chain of transmitters<sup>4</sup>.

However, the preface above has been set to highlight the intense relation between the Ḥadīth, its compilation and relation to the history recount in the early studies by ignoring the end results from the event

narrated. Furthermore, the authenticity of Ḥadīth has been well preserved and it is the second source of Islamic legal law without any major revolts by few<sup>5</sup>. Keeping these opening remarks at the front, let us turn to the Ḥadīth, regarding the prophecy of green Arabia. The Ḥadīth is narrated in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, in the book of Zakāt, the Prophet of Islam (*Ṣal Allahu-‘alaihe wa sallam*) says:

لا تقوم الساعة حتى يكثر المال ، و يفيض ، حتى يخرج الرجل  
بزكاة ماله فلا يجد أحدا يقبلها منه ، و حتى تعود أرض العرب  
مروجًا وأنهارًا

*“The Day of Judgment will not begin until wealth increases and becomes abundant, and until a man will go out with the Zakāt of his wealth and will not find anyone to accept it from him, and until the land of the ‘Arabs goes back to being meadows with rivers”* <sup>6</sup>

## 2. Research Objectives

The implication of this Ḥadīth is twofold. First, it is a Historical event that combines both the past and future based on testimony but contained a Prophecy which according to David Hume, is not rational. Secondly, it explicitly suggests that the 7<sup>th</sup> century Arabia was not natural state of that place. Therefore, it established a well-defined question that as to how Arabia changed so drastically. This article tries to answer both these historical questions in some detail.

## 3. Problem Statement

### David Hume and the conditions of Testimony

David Hume was the Scottish Enlightenment philosopher popularly known for his proposals about empiricism, skepticism, and naturalism. While developing his proposals being strict empiricist, he formulated a no-miracle ideology and supported it ferociously<sup>7</sup>. The basic argument of David Hume to deny the existence of any miracle is based on the testimony itself. He explained as follows:

“Everyone agrees that the authority of the scripture and of tradition rests wholly on the testimony of the apostles who were eye-witnesses to those miracles of our saviour by which

he proved his divine mission. So our evidence for the truth of the Christian religion is less than the evidence for the truth of our senses, because even in the first authors of our religion the evidence was no better than that, and obviously it must lose strength in passing from them to their disciples; nobody can rest as much confidence in their testimony as in the immediate object of his senses. But weaker evidence can never destroy a stronger; and therefore, even if the doctrine of the real presence were ever so clearly revealed in scripture, it would be directly contrary to the rules of sound reasoning to give our assent to it. It contradicts our senses which tell us that the bread isn't flesh and the wine isn't blood; yet both the scripture and the tradition on which the doctrine is supposed to be built have less evidential power than the senses have when they are considered merely as external evidences, that is, and are not brought home to everyone's breast by the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit"<sup>8</sup>

The argument and example included by Hume that discusses the history of Jesus (*'Alaih As-Salām*) and his supposed death<sup>9</sup> by default included Qur'ānic explanations too. Hume has based his premise by stating such histories and then explained the relation between testimony, transmitters, facts, and evidence. He says that "A wise man, therefore, proportions his belief to the evidence"<sup>10</sup>. Indeed, there is no exception to this statement but it can be asked how to decide about the evidence itself? Is it not possible to imagine a wise man who found his belief on revelation? Indeed there were and are. Nevertheless, Hume will not allow this because the problem is not the revelation but the concept of Experience. Hence, he contended that, "in conclusions that are based on an infallible experience, he expects the outcome with the highest degree of assurance, and regards his past experience as a full proof of the future existence of that outcome"<sup>11</sup>. Furthermore, Hume also believed that time wanes the experience "obviously it must lose strength in passing from them to their disciples"<sup>12</sup>. He also accepts the fallibility of the experience, "Though experience is our only guide in reasoning concerning matters of fact, it must be admitted that this guide is not altogether infallible"<sup>13</sup>. Hence, Hume then argues that the most important reasoning about our belief, is derived from the Human testimony. He says:

"No kind of reasoning is more common or more useful even

necessary to human life than the kind derived from the testimony of men and the reports of eye-witnesses and spectators”<sup>14</sup>

Hume then countered his own arguments by saying that, the connection between chains of narration has causal explanation. However, he denies on the charges that, it is man’s experience which finds a necessary connection between two interrelated things, a notion al-Ghazali (*Rahmat Allah ‘alaih*) raised in 12<sup>th</sup> century arguing against the philosophers accusation of necessary link between cause and effect<sup>15</sup>. Therefore, by analogy Hume concludes that, “there is as little necessary connection between testimony and fact as between any pair of items”<sup>16</sup>. By dislodging such natural scientific philosophy, he sets the rule for transmitters of the report. It can be listed in the following manner:

- . If memories were not tenacious to a certain degree.
- . If men didn’t commonly have an inclination to truth and a drive towards honesty.
- . If they were not given to shame when detected in a falsehood.
- . If all these were not found by experience to be qualities inherent in human nature.
- . We would never have the least confidence in human testimony.
- . The word of a man who is delirious, or is known for his falsehood and villainy, carries no weight with us.
- . If evidence comes from the opposition of contrary testimony.
- . If contrary evidence comes from the character or number of witnesses.<sup>17</sup>

Hume then concludes the testimonies based on the above possible errors related to transmitters and evidence of any events and says:

“We entertain asuspicion concerning any matter of fact when the witnesses contradict each other, when there are few of them or they are of a doubtful character, when they have something to gain by their testimony, when they deliver their testimony with hesitation or with over-violent confidence. Many other factors like these can reduce or destroy the force of anargument derived from human testimony”<sup>18</sup>

#### 4. Discussion

There is no doubt that the argument of Hume are in no case less evident than the evidence itself and probabilities of error in reporting events exist. However, it ought to be that Hume did not find Cristian scholars following the strict requirement of testimonies by evaluating its every aspect to avoid the chances of any mistake. They might not have followed the rules of testimonies set by Hume. Nonetheless, it will be no exaggeration that, Hume was not impressed by the religious environment that engulfed the Christian society, which lacks even the basic concept to define the criteria for testimonies. However, it is argued, the strict requirement, which Hume visualized to be reasons for inaccurate testimonies, had been well guarded while narrating Ḥadīth. In the introduction, it has been elucidated, though, in hurry, the painstaking work by the Islamic scholars to fulfil all the requirements which Hume had supposedly devised after 600-700 years later than its Islamic inception. It was not devoid of transmitters personal character, piousness, and truthfulness that Hume could not imagine. Furthermore, Islamic Ḥadīth scholars had more strict criterion<sup>19</sup> than Hume have thought in the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

However, by showing the fallacies in testimonies that might come from the listed requirements, Hume ventured one step further and relates the matter altogether on a different horizon. He says:

“Consider, for instance, testimony that tries to establish the truth of something extraordinary and astonishing. The value of this testimony as evidence will be greater or less in proportion as the fact that is attested to is less or more unusual”<sup>20</sup>.

There are problems with this statement. Firstly, if some historical events what so ever it is, has fulfilled all the requirement of Hume about supposed error, then why one further engages in analyzing the ‘nature of events’ itself. It is contradictory in the flow of argument.. People can believe that event and extract from that whatever is necessary for it. Hume here contradicts himself. However, his intention is not the proportion of events and testimony but, as he says:

“A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature; and because firm and unalterable experience has established these laws,

the case against a miracle is just because it is a miracle as complete as any argument from experience can possibly be imagined to be”<sup>21</sup>

Again, it is contradictory. Hume denied the necessary connection between cause and effect on the ground that it is the experience which confirms to such regularity, hence there is the possibility of no connection between testimony and facts. Surprisingly, with the same analogy, Hume claimed that natural laws have been established based on experiences. It simply means that ‘necessary connection’ between cause and effect became the focal point of both agreement and disagreement. At first, al-Ghazali (*Rahmat Allah ‘alaihi*) had dealt with this issue in length<sup>22</sup>. Secondly, the claim that ‘firm and unalterable’ experience has proved such rigidity of natural laws depends on the proclivity of events. Suppose that in the time of Hume, the universe was supposed to be eternal and static, and that was the rational examination throughout the centuries without any deviation. Consequently, any contrary assumption would be considered a miracle because that was being practiced. However, with Edwin Hubble people acknowledged that the universe is neither eternal nor static but is created in time and expanding. Hence, on the definition of Hume, it should be considered a miracle. Furthermore, Islam also teaches that the world was created and is not static...Thence, contrary to directly jumping on this conclusion, it is just the matter of ‘definition’ in a different time and environment about the miracle.

It creates another question, would it be considered then, the natural law established their existence being acknowledged by the Human experience? As Hume says, natural laws were never found to be violating themselves. The working principle of nature cannot be authenticated by mere acknowledgment of experience because that will only establish how some events ought to happen and not how they ought to be and why. Furthermore, the necessary connection is still not proven, which Hume asserts for testimonies. However, there is no need to indulge in this debate as ample has already been discussed after Hume<sup>23</sup>. Thirdly, Hume has no basis to claim such contradictory claims because he does not believe in testimonies; hence on what basis he can assert that natural laws never deviated? It is thus, the same argument of Hume, once to counter miracle and secondly to prove a miracle. Such an important historical ‘claim’ will be considered a miracle in itself, as Hume said, “No testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle unless it is of such a kind

that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact that it tries to establish”<sup>24</sup>. Indeed, the falsehood of Hume’s claim is miraculous than the miracle. The next question can be asked that if Hume denies the miracle based on testimonies and immutable natural laws, then would Hume have to say about the future events which are devoid of any testimonies due to the non-existence of events? It has only a prophecy that something is going to happen, would Hume consider it a miracle or not? Here Hume replied:

“Indeed, all prophecies are real miracles, and that is the only reason why they can be admitted as evidence for any revelation. If it did not exceed the capacity of human nature to foretell future events, it would be absurd to regard any prophecy as an argument for a divine mission or authority from heaven.”<sup>25</sup>

Hume included all prophecies in the definition of miracles. To clarify it more, any claim based on natural laws for future events will not be considered prophecy because due to the immutable attributes of natural laws, once known in full, events can be predicted like, weather prediction and consider the science of astrology also, which is different. To simply put, Hume denies any kind of miracle in the form of prophecy from religious grounds. Once defined, there are lots of miracles that have been performed and recorded in the Holy Qur’ān and Ḥadīth without any error and testimonies, which Hume should admit as per his requirements. Nevertheless, it would not be a wise way to indulge in historical debates. This is where the significance of quoted Ḥadīth will become apparent. As such the quoted Ḥadīth is related to future as well as past, about an environment which nobody knows until a century before. If it would be established that the prophecy made in that Ḥadīth is true then, Hume’s contention will become conjectures which can be declared void and outdated.

##### **5. Prophecy: in search of a ‘Cause’**

Since the beginning of its creation, the earth has gone through several transformation till it reached to serve life. It has a systematic ecosystem & ecology to inhabit different types of species distinct from each other but provides to each a resting place according to capacity.



Nature delivers the survival of the world through cause and effect. Milankovitch has created the mathematical model based on the previous scientist's research and predicted the cycles of weather change<sup>26</sup>. The search started with the same question that if there was an ice age, what was the reason behind its rise & fall? What made the earth went to glaciation and ice sheet to grow and withdraw?

W.M. Davis conducted a study on the ancient beach in 1933 and found that continental ice borne melted and released huge water that ocean level increased tens of meters. He thought to found a pattern of weather change and concluded, it is necessary for the earth to get warmer for some time before it gets cooled again.<sup>27</sup> The second theory was proposed by James Croll in the mid of 19<sup>th</sup> century by publishing his mathematical calculation in the 'Philosophical magazine' with headings- 'On the physical cause of the change of climate during geological Epoch'<sup>28</sup> which was based on the gravitational pulls of the sun, moon and other planets on earth motion & orientation. Croll proposed that due to such action, the earth oscillates around the sun in a cyclic form that ranged from tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of years. Between this period, for some years the northern hemisphere got less light, which changed the pattern of trade winds and finally a self-sustaining ice-age. The theory was simply remarkable as it considered the effect of cosmic causes on the earth<sup>29</sup>. Then the most debatable theory of this field which was given by Milankovitch a Serbian engineer came into existence. He used the work of J.A. Adhemer who was the first to suggest astronomical reasons for the ice ages in his book<sup>30</sup> 'Revolutions of the seas' and purported his theory of glacial climate using precession with the work of James Croll who used both eccentricity & precession in the account. He contented that if sunlight was very weak even in the summer on the hemisphere for some centuries, then the developed ice sheet due to amalgamation of snow will become thick with time. As it will become thick it will reflect the sun's heat much deeper, hence in the future it will become a continental ice sheet. Conceptually it deals with the slow variation of the sun's light at some particular area. The impact of this theory was so big that during the 1940's, the text book started discussion the ice ages.<sup>31</sup> Milankovitch's theory had a problem because it considered increased sun light in one hemisphere but decreased in the other hemisphere. That led to denial of a worldwide ice age pattern. It was said that an ice age which was based on paleoclimate record cannot be obtained from the Milankovitch theory at all.<sup>32</sup>

The radiocarbon dating technique can identify the age by studying the radioactive isotope of carbon-14. The lake deposit of western United States was measured with this technique and the cycle of flood & draught was calculated to be 21000 years. That was very much close to what Milankovitch had calculated. In 1947 Harold Urey invented one more technique based on oxygen content at a seashell. It depends on the water temperature that how much amount of heavier & lighter oxygen isotopes an organism takes from the sea bed, so the ratio of O18/O16 work as the thermometer to measure age<sup>33</sup>. Accordingly, Emiliani traced the layers of long core and found the records of temperature variation. Emiliani published a paper in 1955 that was the world's first high-quality record on ice age temperatures<sup>34</sup>. Then the chemist Hans Suess found the cycle of the ice age to be 40,000 years which was near to Milankovitch's calculation of 41000 years. In 1960 fossil reefs revealed how the ocean levels rise and fall. After sometime, when oceanographers managed to extract deep cores of the ocean they found the cycle reached back to 400000 years rejecting the general opinion of four ice ages according to the Pleistocene epoch. According to Hans Suess, ice ages were dozens because of irregular rise & fall of temperature and predicted that the new ice ages will start within few thousand years<sup>35</sup>.

Emiliani's theory found new support from the scientist analyzing the species foraminifera, supposing that different species live underwater according to temperature variation and found dozens of glaciation in past contrary to accepted four<sup>36</sup>. Due to such a claim whole traditional field of geology received a major blow. In 1968 Broecker and others took the sample from Barbados which convinced all that Milankovitch's theory is the number one in this run<sup>37</sup>. Then in 1972 Emiliani announced that the present cycle of climate is coming to an end and the warming of the earth due to human-made greenhouse gases might overwhelm the orbital shifts, so a runaway from glaciation will occur<sup>38</sup>. It was believed by the geologist that before millions of years earth flipped its magnetic field from north to south and vice versa, which can be found in the traces of lava & layers of sediments. Geologists found a way to plot the chronology of lava through radioactive isotopes of potassium which decayed very slowly. From this formula, Kukla accepted that the new ice age is very near<sup>39</sup>. Most of the research started when attention was made to the ice sheets of Greenland, scientist saw the changes in temperature of 10 degrees by working on the isotopes of oxygen. It was concluded further from the sample of Greenland & Antarctic that climate change was global, influencing both hemispheres at the same time<sup>40</sup>. During 1973 the

famous core of Vema 28-238 was analyzed by Nicholas (Nick) Shackleton which reached back millions of years with the inclusion of earth magnetic field reversal proposed to be before 70000 years. Now it was possible to prepare mathematical data for long time for the cycle<sup>41</sup>. The celebrated work of Hays, Imbrie, and Shackleton were of the same opinion and able to categorise the 20,000 years of the cycle into pairs which were the same as per astronomical calculation. So till 1970 most of the scientists convinced that orbital variation was the key factor for the ice age<sup>42</sup>.

In the 1980's a project started with the aim to analyse the spectral mapping (SPECMAP) and resulted in the same spectrum cycle calculated by the astronomical theory with hundreds of millennia precision. Five individual ice cores confirmed the same cause behind the movement of ice ages and that was a shift in earth's orbit<sup>43</sup>. After this conclusion scientists combined the pattern received from the ice core & sea bed and the striking news was related to the up & downs of the CO<sub>2</sub> level in the atmosphere as the function of temperature increase & decrease. By 1985 a Soviet Union team working at Vostok station in Antarctica analysed the ice core which reached to the warmer period after the cold one, a complete cycle. They saw that the concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> was much lower in the cold period than warm<sup>44</sup>. Similarly, one more ice core revealed the same cycle for the gas Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>). The conclusion of the Vostok team was depending on the concentration of greenhouse gases which directly affects the orbital shift of the earth. The rise & fall of temperature will eventually result in the rise & fall of greenhouse gases, which will further enhance their concentration with the seasons. All this was based on the sunlight. In 2012 came the final call when scientists analysed different ancient cycles and claimed that the next ice age is due within few thousands years<sup>45</sup>.

Scientists published the record of the Antarctic which included the major role of CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub>. They said, in the Antarctic, the concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> since 750,000 years ranged from 180 to 280 parts per million. On the contrary, the level of CO<sub>2</sub> in 2012 ranged to 400 ppm and going up due to human interference with the natural ecosystem. The same thing has been recorded for the gas CH<sub>4</sub><sup>46</sup>. In 90's it was predicted that if the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> doubled in the future then there will be 30 temperature rise and that will be a disaster. The opinions of scientists changed drastically<sup>47</sup> and they added not only the variation of earth orbit but also the geological effect like massive creation, flowing ice sheets, chemicals changed in oceans. They argued that changes in CO<sub>2</sub> and greenhouse

gases depend not only on geochemistry & ocean circulation but biological activity also<sup>48</sup>. Following that agreement, a new class of data came from the Devil hole, Nevada in 1992 which analysed the layers of calcite on the desert oasis. The data revealed that the age of glacial & interglacial was same as the ice sheet. But the ice age does not follow any specific pattern and depend on the internal connection between atmospheres, ice sheets, and oceans<sup>49</sup>.

The conclusion of all such extraordinary effort understanding the pattern of changes in earth geography was well described by the Spencer weard:

“The close of an ice age came when a shift in sunlight caused a slight rise of temperature, and that evidently raised the gas levels over the next few centuries. The greenhouse effect then slowly drove the planet’s temperature a bit higher, which drove a further rise in the gas levels... and so forth. On the other hand, when the sunlight in key latitudes weakened, that would not only bring more ice and snow, but also a shift from emission to absorption of gases, eventually causing a further fall in temperature... and so forth. Confirmation came in 2012 from evidence that the lag was confined to the Antarctic ice cores: after an initial temperature rise followed by evaporation of CO<sub>2</sub> from the Southern Ocean, globally the rise of CO<sub>2</sub> had preceded the rise of temperature”<sup>50</sup>

Our present pattern of climate change is not matching with a single historical data, on the contrary, it is opposite to what generally happened when by nature the geography of earth changes. As Spencer weard says in his book:

“Our addition of gases to the atmosphere was initiating the process, with the temperature rise lagging behind the rise of gas levels. Emissions were climbing at a far swifter rate than anything in the Pleistocene record, so the lag was measured not in centuries, but mere decades. And already by the 1980s the levels of greenhouse gases had climbed far higher than anything seen for many millions of years. Even if we stopped our emissions, would feedbacks drive things higher on their own? There were disturbing signs that feedbacks were indeed kicking in. Drying forests and warming seawater were getting

less efficient at taking CO<sub>2</sub> out of the air, and methane was seen bubbling up from Arctic wetland force. All through the Pleistocene, the greenhouse gas feedback had turned the planet's orbital cycles from minor climate variations to grand transformations that affected all life on the planet"<sup>51</sup>

Consequently, neither global warming is an illusion nor it is as simple to explain. Indeed, it is a natural occurrence that nature repeats as per its calculation with no fixed pattern. It can be sometimes up to one hundred thousand years to complete a cycle of ice and warm period and sometimes only 40,000 years. However, one thing is clear from the above fact that greenhouse gases are the most celebrated cause for the change in the earth environment. So, a further inquiry is made by considering the greenhouse gases (Mostly CO<sub>2</sub> & CH<sub>4</sub>) for environmental change which are directly dependent on astronomical effects. Now, it will be analysed what happened to Arabian Peninsula during these patterns.

## **6. Was Arabia green ever?**

The Arabian Peninsula rests in the middle of three continental weather patterns different from each other but closely connected. This single logical question raises further inquiry that how come Arabia is so barren with such great environments nearby? In April 2014 at the university of oxford, a conference was called in the name of green Arabia and that two days conference was very well summed up by Huw Groucutt that:

“We can no longer ‘draw lines through Arabia’ when considering the dispersal of modern humans. The peninsula, linking Africa to Europe and Asia, was a critical nexus in early prehistory and demands the close attention of archaeologists in years to come”<sup>52</sup>

Researchers were of the common opinion that during several periods in Pleistocene, Arabia was Green. Rick Potts and Adrian Parker said that:

“The peninsula sits at the confluence of three major global climate systems: the Mediterranean westerlies, the East African

monsoons and the Indian Monsoons. The latter two in particular form the potent 'inter-tropical convergence zone', which during interglacials shifted northwards from its present position, bringing water and life to the Arabian Peninsula. This was vividly demonstrated by Richard Jennings using global climate models"<sup>53</sup>

The discussion involved the possible connection of human movements from South Africa to Arabian lands and elsewhere due to the meadowlands in Arabia which were best for living. The leading researcher in this zone Petraglia had said:

"Many researchers contend that modern humans did not expand beyond their African homeland until 55,000 years or so ago, moving quickly eastward around the Indian Ocean to reach Australia within 10,000 years. But even before he spotted those artifacts in the desert, Petraglia had suspected that humans left their home continent tens of thousands of years earlier and wandered slowly eastward, deep into Asia. An ancient Arabia that welcomed modern humans with lakes and greenery fitted neatly into these ideas: "I understood immediately that it was a stepping stone toward South Asia,"<sup>54</sup>

He and his research team are currently involved in searching the evidence to establish the fact that several times Arabia was green in past. Indeed they have got some beautiful and convincing historical proof to support their arguments. They say that:

"Petraglia's group is using satellite data to map ancient lakes and river systems, and then traversing the vast region to confirm their findings on the ground. All told, they have pinpointed more than a thousand ancient lakes that were filled with water off and on during the past few hundred thousand years, along with hundreds of artifact-filled sites. In the past 3 years, his team and others dated a handful of these sites, the earliest of them to 125,000 and 211,000 years ago. What's still missing are bones of the people who left the artifacts, which could reveal who the peninsula's ancient inhabitants were modern humans or extinct human relatives"<sup>55</sup>

Quoting one more researcher's conclusion about the Arabian land and its history:

“During the wet spells, lakes filled up, rivers ran, and a savannah like environment resembling that of today's East Africa dominated Arabia. “There could be tens of thousands of former lakes and wetlands” in Arabia during the wet periods, says Paul Breeze of King's College London, a hydrologist who has already identified 1300 paleolake and wetland sites in just 10% of the peninsula”<sup>56</sup>

Figure 1 shows the abundance of lakes and greenery in the ancient Arabia. Some findings support the increase in rainfall and vegetation in Arabian lands which were the most suitable living place for humans crossing Arabia from Africa starting with the Neolithic revolution<sup>57</sup>. The living example is the Dhofar mountain of Oman which is green like anything with a waterfall as shown in Figure 2.

### Making the desert bloom

Researchers are working to further detail Arabia's ancient rivers and lakes.



Figure 1: Arabia's ancient rivers and lakes<sup>58</sup>

It can be seen from Figures 1 & 2, that rivers and green lands were flourished in great length especially the nearshore area of the red sea. Arabian Peninsula is the largest in the world which extends from Yemen, Oman, Qatar, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, and southern parts of Iraq & Jordan.

According to the Author, there is another important evidence that Arabia could have been green & meadow and that is the existence of vast amount of fossil fuel. The theory behind fossil fuel generation goes back to thousands of years when plants & animals were buried under the ocean or land. They already contained the carbon content and due to high pressure & temperature below the land, finally converted to fossile fuels according to the type of biomass. Now, logically a land can't produce oil and gas which was never touched by the small amount of those needed raw material, plants, animals, and oceans. They are dependent on each other. Without ocean, animal and plants can't grow in such a huge amount which can produce the oil in such vast quantity. Every action has its reaction, so for such a enormous effect in the form of fossil fuel must demand a greater amount of cause also. Because such a huge amount of fuel cannot travel to Arabian Peninsula beneath the land or water from anywhere else. Hence, it was a question for researchers that how in the middle of three different Monsoon Arabia became so barren? Indeed it is all about nature and its pattern throughout the earth's history. Some amazing information about Arabia have been revealed and the future will see the others soon.



**Figure 2:** A waterfall in the Dhofar Mountains of Oman  
(Credit: Hanne & Jens Eriksen / NPL)

## 7. The New Proposal

As per the above discussion that from the beginning earth's ecological system got a balance between atmosphere and land. For this reason, the content of the atmospheric gases remains unaffected by the



weather patterns. There is no indication that anything changed inside the earth due to the changes in the content of the gases because nothing was there which could have been contributed to the increase of gases & other catalysts. Whatever transformations earth had were solely based on the extra-terrestrial effect, mainly due to its orbital movement, shape, and eccentricity<sup>59</sup>. This view has been supported by many scientists and is still valid. It is a fundamental law of science that energy cannot be created nor destroyed, it can only change the form. Hence, If we take the periods of prehistory or say before 100,000 years then to absorb the effect these catalysts would have been too long for the earth. After annihilating the effect, the earth changed its behaviour and pattern through which it sustained the life. These patterns are not so direct and straightforward to affect the ecological system. They also depend on the subpattern to transfer their effect further. Through this process, the effect of the change in the atmosphere reaches the bottom of oceans, ice sheets and who knows where? The natural pattern is so connected with the deepest part of the earth that each cause takes thousands of years to become practical. To see our understanding, let us analyse the ocean carbon cycle. The ocean is called a carbon sink because it absorbs more amount of carbon than it gives back to the atmosphere. Then carbon dissolves on the surface of the water but some amount remains as dissolved gas and other changed to other forms. Due to photosynthesis, marine plants turned carbon into organic matter. Shells and skeletons use carbon to form calcium carbonate. Other than this route ocean receives carbon from the atmosphere through biological & chemical processes also.<sup>60</sup>

The amount of time needed for carbon to reach its final destination is not a short course but a lengthy route. Until the received energy reaches its last bifurcation point no one can say energy is conserved. After settlement to the zero points, it is not capable to make any direct effect until it exceeds its range. It has taken thousands of years for each cycle to complete and then exceeds its absorbing capacity. It is since there were no other forces to fast this speed of cause and effect of earth's ecological system. That's why the duration of ice ages and warm ages were described as thousands of years based on several facts.

Moreover, it is a fact that when the earth has received heat from the sun, its temperature increased slowly and varies according to location. Also, it was concluded that the concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> & CH<sub>4</sub> increased proportionally with temperature, indeed that duration was so large.

However, nowadays, there is no disagreement on this fact which we have seen earlier in regards to increase of CO<sub>2</sub> & CH<sub>4</sub>. The basic point is that when greenhouse gases like CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and water vapour to name a few, are assembled in the atmosphere, they protect all infrared radiation heat going outside the earth, maintaining the temperature balance inside the earth. If not, then earth's atmosphere could have been cold. Because the heat of the sun can vapourise the ocean water to again convert it into rain but due to earth geography ice are already there and according to time ice area will increase so the cold, and by the slow process, it will cover the entire earth with self-generated cold with its personal further effects. It will happen if one negates the shield-like atmosphere responsible for controlling the earth's temperature made of greenhouse gases. That is why the huge difference exists between Venus & mercury temperature as science predicts to be because of thick greenhouse gases environment<sup>61</sup>. The major consideration of this greenhouse effect depends on the gases other than water vapour because they are natural patterns nobody can change their concentration until it got affected by the connected effects. No one can raise the ocean water level out of nothing or can absorb more heat from the sun which the earth usually gets as per its orbital position. It is a cycle, the more the water vapourises, the more the concentration of water vapour cycle will work faster than what its nature is. For this to happen, some cause must be there to accelerate this movement. Based on this logical interpretation, CO<sub>2</sub> & CH<sub>4</sub> were declared as the most important catalyst to change the pattern of the earth and the main reason for warming the earth.

The above proposal is based on the fact that these gases can be created by humans and requires no direct effort from the outside earth. It is evident that whatever fossil fuel one uses, contains a certain amount of these gases. As per record, coal is responsible for the 43% CO<sub>2</sub> emission, 34% is produced by oil, and 18% by natural gas. In 2011 alone due to fossil fuel 33.2 billion of CO<sub>2</sub> was emitted into the atmosphere<sup>62</sup>.

If the logical understanding of the earth atmosphere is correct then it is certainly rational that due to fossil fuels burning the concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> & CH<sub>4</sub> has increased at faster rate compared to the previous pattern. And this is simply because now we have an extra players who is contributing to enhance the amount of these gases. Every industry does agree that they are emitting gases with fine accuracy. If it is true then these gases will certainly increase the atmospheric temperature which will fast the cycle of vapourisation & rain. At this junction of time, water vapour will not get time to settle down as per their natural pattern

& law, on the contrary, they will increase and will join the CO<sub>2</sub> and other greenhouse gases to further increase the temperature.

One thing is clear, the recorded pattern of Palaeocene age of temperature's up & downs is changed in the positive side, it means they are changing faster than ever before. It cannot go faster if it does not get extra support from somewhere and, as discussed above, this support has been provided by fossil fuel which suddenly increased the concentration of greenhouse gases at this junction of history. It is a fact whenever pattern changes drastic modification occurs on the earth, the barren land become Meadow & green and green land become barren, the ocean becomes desert and the desert becomes oceans. But from now onwards these changes will not take thousands of years because the Creator of these patterns has already planned to cease the function of this nature, so He created the catalyst that can accelerate the time consumption and complete the pending task before the total full stop of the universe. The prophecy of Meadow and green Arabia is the one part of that promise and plan which will come true soon, and this global faster warming will be the basis of that change. This universe works on the fundamental laws of cause & effect, so if there is some effect there must be a cause behind it. This inquiry revealed the cause behind the changes in Arabia and the fulfillment of Prophecy.

Returning to the argument of Hume that prophecy is a part of the revelation and must be considered within the definition of a miracle, has been positively met with reality. But surprisingly, no deviation from the natural law miraculously converted the whole ecological system of the earth. In establishing his arguments, Hume has taken the example of legendary actors who were supposed to change the course of the earth. But Hume was not aware of the work of Ibn Khaldun (*Rahmat Allah 'alaih*) who already criticized such type of legendry act as not supporting the events condition<sup>63</sup>. In absence of historical facts, Hume was unable to comprehend the concept of the Miracle. If, as this article tries to show, the prophecy of green Arabia is correct, which is the case, then the arguments of Hume can be considered incoherent.

## 8. Conclusion

This article brought a novel idea to deal with the religious prophecy from historical perspective. As per the prophecy, Arabia will become a meadow and the rivers will flow in it, which was its previous condition.

Such extraordinary prophecy was investigated in two senses. First, in the historical context of the Miracle debate initiated by David Hume, who denied any kind of miracle based on supposed errors in testimonies and acceptance of natural law as immutable. Apart from including the past reports regarding the miracles, Hume also included the prophecies in the definition of a miracle, which lessened the strength of his argument, and proved him wrong. Secondly, it seeks to find out why such strange phenomena had Arabia been through and how it will happen again. After analyzing the scientific records on the supposed ice and warm age, it was established that due to changes in greenhouse gases, such transformations happened in history and will again happen in near future but taking considerably less time than previous. Once established, Hume's claim regarding the negation of Miracle was proved wrong on the basis of testimonies that are authentic in the case of Ḥadīth narration and the evidence sprung in support of Green Arabia. Therefore, it is not all the time reason rules, but all the time revelation does.

#### Notes and References

1. Abū 'Amr 'Uthmān ibn 'Abd il-Raḥmān Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Kurdī al-Shahrazūrī Ibn-Salah, *An Introduction to the Science of the Ḥadīth/: Kitāb Ma'rifat Anwa ilm Al-Ḥadīth*, trans. Eerik Dickinson (Qatar: Garnet Publishing, 2005), 384.
2. Abu Jafar Muhammad bin Jarir al-Tabari, *History of al-Tabari . 1, The: General Introduction and From the Creation to the Flood*, trans. Franz Rosenthal (SUNY Press, 1985), 434, Muhammad Kazim Rahmati, "Tradition and History," in *Hadith: An Entry from Encyclopaedia of the World of Islam*, ed. Gholamali Haddad Adel, Hassan Taromi-Rad, and Mohammad Jafar Elmi (Kuala Lumpur: Islamic book trust, 2018), 69-77.
3. Eerik. Dickinson, *The Development of Early Sunnite Hadith Criticism/: The Taqdimā of Ibn Abī Hātim Al-Rāzī* (Netherland: Brill, 2001), 150.
4. Rahmati, "Tradition," 73.
5. Muḥammad Ibn Idris Al-Shāfi'i, *Al-Shāfi'i's Al-Risāla: Treatise on the Foundations of Islamic Jurisprudence*, trans. Majid Khadduri (Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Texts Society, 1987), 392.
6. Muslim ibn al-Hajjaj, *Sahih Muslim (Ḥadīth 2339)*, trans. Nasiruddin Al-Khattab (Riyadh: Darrulsalam publication, 2007), 56. This information is also recorded in *Musnad of Imam Ahmed*, 2-370.
7. Norman Kemp Smith and Don Garrett, *The Philosophy of David Hume: With a New Introduction* (UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 608. And also Norman Kemp Smith, *The Philosophy of David Hume: A Critical Study of Its Origins and Central Doctrines* (UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 568.
8. David Hume, *Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (Oxford: Jonathan Bennett, 2017), 55.

9. Ahmad Raza Khan, *Kanz Ul Iman/: The Treasure of Faith*, trans. Muhammad Aqib Farid Qadri (UK: Ahlus Sunnah Publications, 2010), 158-159.
10. Hume, *Enquiry*, 56.
11. Hume, *Enquiry*, 56
12. Hume, *Enquiry*, 55.
13. Hume, *Enquiry*, 56
14. Hume, *Enquiry*, 57.
15. Abu Hamid Al-Ghazali, *The Incoherence of the Philosophers*, trans. Michael E Marmura (USA:Brigham young university Islamic Translation Series, 2000), 301, [http://library.perdana.org.my/Bk\\_scan/297.261-GHA.pdf](http://library.perdana.org.my/Bk_scan/297.261-GHA.pdf).
16. Hume, *Enquiry*, 57.
17. Hume, *Enquiry*, 57.
18. Hume, *Enquiry*, 57
19. Iftikhar zaman, "The Science of 'Rijāl' as a Method in the Study of Hadiths," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 5, no. 2 (January 1994): 1–34., <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26196671?seq=1>.
20. Hume, *Enquiry*, 57.
21. Hume, *Enquiry*, 79
22. Griffel, Frank "Al-Ghazali, On causality and miracle: The 17<sup>th</sup> Discussion of the Incoherence" *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.ed. Edward N. Zalta (Summer 2020), <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2020/entries/al-ghazali>
23. Daniel Ahearn, *Scientific Nihilism/: On the Loss and Recovery of Physical Explanation* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1994), 57-61.
24. Hume, *Enquiry*, 59.
25. Hume, *Enquiry*, 68.
26. A. Berger, "Milankovitch Theory and Climate," *Reviews of Geophysics* 26, no. 4 (November: 1988): 624-657., <https://doi.org/10.1029/RG026i004p00624>.
27. Spencer R. Weart, *The Discovery of Global Warming* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008), 240.
28. James Croll, "On the Physical Cause of the Change of Climate during Geological Epochs," *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science* 28, no. 187 (August 1864): 121–37., <https://doi.org/10.1080/14786446408643733>.
29. James Rodger Fleming, "James Croll in Context: The Encounter between Climate Dynamics and Geology in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century 1," *History of Meteorology* 3 (2006): 43-53, [http://www.meteohistory.org/2006historyofmeteorology3/3fleming\\_croll.pdf](http://www.meteohistory.org/2006historyofmeteorology3/3fleming_croll.pdf).
30. Maureen E. and Raymo & Peter Huybers, "Unlocking the Mysteries of the Ice Ages," *Nature* 451 (2008): 284–85.
31. U.S. Geological Survey, *A Response to 'Milankovitch Theory Viewed from Devils Hole* by J. Imbrie, A.C. Mix and D.G. Martinson, open-file report, U.S. Geological Survey. Denver, 1993. [https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as\\_sdt=0%2C5&q=A+response+to+%60Milankovitch+theory+viewed+from+devils+hole&btnG=](https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=A+response+to+%60Milankovitch+theory+viewed+from+devils+hole&btnG=)
32. Michael D. Petraglia, Huw Groucutt, Ash Parton, and Abdullah Alsharekh,

- “Green Arabia: Human Prehistory at the Crossroad,” *Quaternary International* 382 (July 2015): 1–7.
33. Harold C. Urey, “The Thermodynamic Properties of Isotopic Substances,” *Journal of the Chemical Society* (January 1947): 562-81.,  
<https://doi.org/10.1039/jr9470000562>.
  34. Cesare Emiliani, “Pleistocene Temperatures,” *The Journal of Geology* 63, no. 6 (November 1955): 538–78.,  
<https://doi.org/10.1086/626295>.
  35. Urey, “Thermodynamic Properties,” 562-81.
  36. Emiliani, “Pleistocene Temperatures.” 538-78
  37. Wallace S. Broecker et Wallace S. Broecker, David L. Thurber, John Goddard, Teh-Lung Ku, R. K. Matthews and Kenneth J. Mesolella, “Milankovitch Hypothesis Supported by Precise Dating of Coral Reefs and Deep-Sea Sediments,” *Science* 159, no. 3812 (January 1968): 297–300,  
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.159.3812.297>.
  38. Cesare Emiliani, “Quaternary Paleotemperatures and the Duration of the High-Temperature Intervals,” *Science* 178, no.4059 (October 1972): 398–401,  
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.178.4059.398>.
  39. George J. Kukla and Alois Koci, “End of the Last Interglacial in the Loess Record,” *Quaternary Research* 2, no.3 (November 1972): 374–83,  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0033-5894\(72\)90061-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0033-5894(72)90061-0).
  40. C. C. Langway, H. Oeschger, and W. Dansgaard, “The Greenland Ice Sheet Program in Perspective,” in *Greenland Ice Core: Geophysics, Geochemistry, and the Environment*, ed. C. C. Langway, H. Oeschger, and W. Dansgaard (Washington: American Geophysical Union (AGU), 1985), 1–8
  41. John Imbrie, “Astronomical Theory of the Pleistocene Ice Ages: A Brief Historical Review,” *Icarus* 50, no. 2-3 (May 1982): 408–22.,  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0019-1035\(82\)90132-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0019-1035(82)90132-4).
  42. J. D. Hays, John Imbrie, and N. J. Shackleton, “Variations in the Earth’s Orbit: Pacemaker of the Ice Ages,” *Science* 194, no. 4270 (December 1976):1121-1132,  
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.194.4270.1121>.
  43. J Imbrie et al., “On the Structure and Origin of Major Glaciation Cycles 1. Linear Responses to Milankovitch Forcing,” *Paleoceanography* 7, no. 6 (December 1992):701-738,  
[http://ceas.oregonstate.edu/people/files/mixImbrie\\_etal\\_1992\\_Paleoc\\_Milankovitch\\_Linear.pdf](http://ceas.oregonstate.edu/people/files/mixImbrie_etal_1992_Paleoc_Milankovitch_Linear.pdf).
  44. Gabrielle Walker, “The Ice Man ,” *New Scientist*, January 29, 2000,  
<https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg16522234-700-the-ice-man/>
  45. See chapter first, Wallace S. Broecker and Robert. Kunzig, *Fixing Climate: What Past Climate Changes Reveal about the Current Threat—and How to Counter It* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2009), 253.
  46. Nicklas G. Piasias and Nicholas J. Shackleton, “Modelling the Global Climate Response to Orbital Forcing and Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide Changes,” *Nature* 310, no.5980 (May 1984): 757–59.,  
<https://doi.org/10.1038/310757a0>.
  47. E. J. Rohling et al., “Making Sense of Palaeoclimate Sensitivity,” *Nature* 491, no.

- 7426 (May 2012): 683–91.,  
<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11574>.
48. Peter U. Clark, Richard B. Alley, and David Pollard, “Northern Hemisphere Ice-Sheet Influences on Global Climate Change,” *Science* 286, no.5442 (November 1999): 1104-1111.,  
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.286.5442.1104>.
  49. Gina Moseley et al., “Reconciliation of the Devils Hole Climate Record with Orbital Forcing,” *Science* 351, no. 6269 (January 2016): 165–68.,  
<https://graz.pure.elsevier.com/en/publications/reconciliation-of-the-devils-hole-climate-record-with-orbital-for>.
  50. Spencer Weart, “Past Cycles: Ice Age Speculations,” Last Modified, January 2020,  
<http://www.aip.org/history/climate>. January 2020, <https://history.aip.org/climate/pdf/Cycles.pdf>.
  51. Weart, “Past Cycles: Ice Age Speculations,”.
  52. Joe Roe, “Review of Green Arabia: Human Prehistory at the Crossroads of Continents,” *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology* 24, no.1 (April 2014):1-7., doi:10.5334/pia.458..
  53. Roe, “Review,” 1.
  54. Andrew Lawler, “In Search of Green Arabia.,” *Science* 345, no.6200 (August 2014): 994–97.,  
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.345.6200.994>.
  55. Lawler, “In Search,” 996.
  56. Lawler, “In Search,” 996
  57. Ash Parton et al., , “Alluvial Fan Records from Southeast Arabia Reveal Multiple Windows for Human Dispersal,” *Geology* 43, no. 4 (April 2015):295-298, <https://doi.org/10.1130/G36401.1>.
  58. Lawler, “In Search of,” 996.
  59. Hays, Imbrie, and Shackleton, “Variations.” 1121-1132
  60. Shuang-Jing Wang, Long Cao, and Na Li, “Responses of the Ocean Carbon Cycle to Climate Change: Results from an Earth System Climate Model Simulation,” *Advances in Climate Change Research* 5, no. 3 (September 2014): 123–30,  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ACCRE.2014.11.004>.
  61. John D Fix, *Astronomy Journey to the Cosmic Frontier* (New York: McGraw-Hill Education, 2010), 768.
  62. C Le Qú Eréer’éré et al., “The Global Carbon Budget 1959-2011 Earth System Science Data The Global Carbon Budget 1959-2011,” *Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss* 5, no.1 (April 2012): 1107–57,  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/essdd-5-1107-2012>.
  63. Abū Zayd ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Khaldūn, *The Muqaddimah/: An Introduction to History*, trans. Franz Rosenthal and N.J. Dawood (New Jersey: Princeton university press, 1967), 512.