

# Twitter Thread by Aabhas Maldahiya ■■



**Aabhas Maldahiya** ■■

@Aabhas24



1/n Many cited this article as evidence for historicity of Md

It is work of some Ahemdiya and is full of non-scholarly arguments.

In this thread I rebut each claim one by one.

Truth: no archaeological evidence for Muhammad from around his

2/n Lies around Gospel of Mark, Mathew, Luke

## BL ADD MSS 14461

- This MS is dated to 6<sup>th</sup> century, kept in British Library and contains Gospel of Matthew-Gospel of Mark, Gospel of Luke-Gospel of John

### CLAIM

The second oldest evidence found, thus far, on the existence of the Holy Prophet<sup>sa</sup> is interestingly a non-Muslim source. It is a note in a manuscript containing the gospels of Mark and Mathew. The manuscript is kept at the British Library under the shelf mark "BL ADD MSS 14461". The author writes:

"... and in January, they took the word for their lives [the sons of] Emesa, and many villages were ruined with killing by [the Arabs of] Muhammad [MULmad] and a great number of people were killed and captives [were taken] from Galilee as far as Bēth [...] and those Arabs pitched camp beside [Damascus] [...] and we saw everywhere [...] and olive oil which they brought and them. And on the [twenty sixth] of May went Saccellarius [...] cattle [...] from the vicinity of Emesa and the Romans chased them [...] and on the tenth [of August] the Romans fled from the vicinity of Damascus [...] many [people] some 10,000. And at the turn of the year the Romans came, and on the twentieth of August in the year [nine hundred and forty-seven] there gathered in Gabitha [...] the Romans and great many people were killed of [the R]omans, some fifty thousand". (Hoyland, *Seeing Islam as others saw it*, p.117)

The year 947 AG (Alexandrian Era) in which the battle of Gabitha took place corresponds to the year 636 AD. The battle of Gabitha is known in Muslim sources as the Battle of Yarmuk (Andrew Palmer, *The Seventh Century in the West-Syrian Chronicles*, Liverpool [1993] p. 4), in which Khalid<sup>ra</sup> bin Walid was commanding the Muslim troops (Tabari, *Tarikh ar-Rusul wal-Muluk*). With this decisive victory, a path was paved for further advancing in the Levant and eventually Egypt, which were very quickly conquered. The author seems to have lived in that period and may have witnessed the events. He wrote this note apparently knowing the historical significance of these unfolding events. This is one of the oldest dated historical sources mentioning the name of the Holy Prophet<sup>sa</sup> and was written only four years after his demise.

### Rebuttal

- The article cites the book "Seeing Islam as Others saw it" by Hoyland who is referring to a note in folio-1 of MSS 14,461 at British Library.
- Interestingly, as per the Library's records, the manuscript dates to the 6<sup>th</sup> century and not 7<sup>th</sup> century
- Author Hoyland talks of a note in folio-1 mentioning of "Battle of Gabitha" (636 AD) but no Library records talk of any such note.
- Hence this claim via Hoyland is absolutely bunkum

3/n Lies through Thomas the Presbyter

# Thomas the Presbyter's Syriac Chronicle of 640

- This MS is found to have been edited in 724 AD.

## CLAIM

Another dated Syriac manuscript was written by Thomas, the Presbyter, a Christian priest from the Levant. He writes:

"AG 945, indiction VII: On Friday, 4 February, [i.e., 634 CE] at the ninth hour, there was a battle between the Romans and the Arabs of Muhammad [Syr. *tayyaye d-Mhm̐*] in Palestine twelve miles east of Gaza." (Hoyland, *Seeing Islam as others saw it*, p.120)

Here, again, events taking place in Palestine and Syria are described by the author. The Arabs here are mentioned as the Arabs of Muhammad [Syr. *tayyaye d-Mhm̐*] identifying them clearly as the followers of the Holy Prophet Muhammad<sup>29</sup>. The year 945 corresponds to the year 634 or 12 Hijra, which suggests that merely two years after the demise of the Holy Prophet<sup>30</sup>, his name was known to this non-Muslim author.

## Rebuttal

- Mhmt for Syrians had always meant "Praised". It certainly not meant the "Muhammad" the messenger. Moreover it does not confirm of these Arabs being Muslims.
- There is "0" reference of these Arabs being Muslims.
- This MS was edited in 724 AD though some claims state that it was only the insertion of names of Caliphs but this is ambiguous.
- What is even more alarming that not even the first biography of Muhammad (Ishaq, Hisham) do not use this as source for Muhammad's historicity.

4/n The myth of Sebeos

# Armenian bishop and historian, Sebeos' writing

- A History of Heraclius by Sebeos is used

## CLAIM

Around the year 660, the Armenian bishop and historian, Sebeos, writes more biographical details on the Holy Prophet<sup>31</sup>. Sebeos' historical accounts were most probably written between 656 and 661 because he mentions in them the first civil war, the so-called first *fitna*, during the time of Muawiyah<sup>32</sup>. This means that these accounts were written around 30 years after the demise of the Holy Prophet<sup>33</sup> at a time when many of the Companions<sup>34</sup> were still alive. Sebeos writes:



Two early Islamic inscriptions photographed by the author near Mecca in 2016. It reads:

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم  
في سنة ثمان من الهجرة النبوية  
بني كعب بن عبد الله

According to the biographical compendium *Tahdhib al-Tahdhib*, Abdur Rahman bin Kaab was the son of Kaab bin Malik al-Ansari as-Sakami, a renowned companion of the Holy Prophet<sup>35</sup>. It may be that this inscription is from his son Abdur Rahman, which, if true, would be a very interesting new find. God knows best.

"In that period a certain one of them, a man of the sons of Ishmael named Mahmed, became prominent. A sermon about the Way of Truth, supposedly at God's command, was revealed to them, and Mahmed taught them to recognise the God of Abraham, especially since he was informed and knowledgeable about Mosaic history. Because the command had come from on High, he ordered them all to assemble together and to unite in faith. Abandoning the reverence of vain things, they turned toward the living God, who had appeared to their father Abraham. Mahmed legislated that they were not to eat carrion, not to drink wine, not to speak falsehoods, and not to commit adultery. He said: God promised that country to Abraham and to his son after him, for eternity. And what had been promised was fulfilled during that time when God loved Israel. Now, however, you are the sons of Abraham, and God shall fulfill the promise made to Abraham and his son on you. Only love the God of Abraham, and go and take the country which God gave to your father Abraham. No one can successfully resist you in war, since God is with you." (ibid.)

Sebeos gives us, although still very sketchy, more information about the events taking place in Arabia and the new religion, showing very clearly that people outside of Arabia were familiar with the new religion and the new prophet who had appeared among the Arabs. They even knew some basic information about his teachings.

## Rebuttal

- Sebeos's writings and the history attributed to him is a source for much scholarly debate.
- His work was first published in 1851 in Constantinople under the title 'History of bishop Sebeos on Heraclius'. The text was first published by Tadeos Mhrdtean and both manuscripts he used had neither a title nor name of the author.
- "This manuscript, Mat 2639 was one of the two MSS used by Mhrdtean for his 1851 edition. The other was an older MS, dated to 1568, which has now disappeared. A remains the earliest surviving witness of the History attributed to Sebeos, and from it all other known copies derive".
- So again to use Sebeo as source to establish historicity of Muhammad is an unwise attempt as there is no authenticity of his manuscripts itself.
- The Muslims need t raise this question that why Sebeo was not mentioned anywhere in writing of Hisham.

5/n Papyrus letter sent by Muslim Admin in Egypt

# Papyrus letter sent by a Muslim admin in Egypt

- This letter is dated to 660 AD

## CLAIM

The next interesting evidence mentions the Holy Prophet<sup>sa</sup> indirectly. It is a papyrus letter sent by a Muslim administrator in Egypt to one of his subordinate officials, admonishing him to be mindful of his duties, saying:

"In the name [of God] the Merciful, the Compassionate. From [Bayyan ibn] Qays to Yazid ibn al-Aswad and 'Ubayd All[ah] ibn [...]. Peace upon you. I praise God beside Whom there is no other god. God does not like wrongdoing or corruption and as regards you, I did not appoint you to a job for you to act sinfully and behave unjustly in it [...]. That which you will be sorry for and will suffer for is [... to you] [... and [... taking possession. Indeed, your way of thinking is despicable, (namely) that [... and you take the (financial) worth of it, even though I have [... for as regards Yazid ibn Fa'id there is not due to him [... due to him payment, and the people of Nessana have the protection of God and the protection of His messenger. So do not reckon that we acquiesce to your corruption and injustice in respect of it" (R Hoyland, *The Earliest Attestation Of The Dhimma Of God And His Messenger And The Rediscovery Of P Nessana 77 (60s AH / 680 CE)* in: *B Sadeghi, AQ Ahmed, A Silverstein, R Hoyland, Islamic Cultures, Islamic Contexts – Essays In Honor Of Professor Patricia Crone*, Brill [2015])

The phrase "protection of God and the protection of His messenger" (*dhimmat Allah wa-dhimmat rasulih*) is a very common phrase that we also find in other Islamic sources. It is reported to have been used in many of the letters the Holy Prophet<sup>sa</sup> sent to different tribes and kings (Bayhaqi, *Sunan al Kabir lil Bayhaqi*, Bab hukm al-jizya). Also it is reported in a very famous Hadith of Bukhari:

"Whoever prays like us and faces our qibla and eats our slaughtered animals is a Muslim and is under Allah's and His Prophet's protection (*dhimmatu Allahi wa-dhimmatu rasulih*). So do not betray Allah by betraying those who are in His protection." (*Sahih al-Bukhari*, Bab fadhli istiqa'a al-qibla)

## Rebuttal

- Claims look bit too ambitious as the letter only talks of Messenger and Prophet but names none. Why can't this messenger be Jew or Christian?
- The coincidence that it appears in Shahih Al-Bukhari, written 2 centuries after alleged demise of Muhammad speaks volumes that how the personality called Muhammad was being created in 8<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> century based on records found in the past.

7/n The biggest propaganda through Abd-Al-Malik

# Abd al-Malik ibn Marwan's Islamic Coin

- This coin is dated to 697-8 AD

## CLAIM

Till present, the oldest discovered coin mentioning the name of the Holy Prophet<sup>sa</sup> is from 66 AH. It is a dirham by Abdul-Malik ibn Abdullah, the Governor of Persia, during the short reign of Hazrat Abdullah<sup>ra</sup> bin Zubair. The Arabic inscription on the side of the coin reads, "bismillah Muhammad Rasul Allah", translating as, "In the name of Allah, Muhammad is the prophet of Allah" (H Gaube: *Arabosasanidische Numismatik* [1973] Handbücher Der Mittelasiatischen Numismatik, Vol. 2, Klinkhardt & Biermann: Braunschweig, p. 62).



Figure-2

## Rebuttal

- Yes, this exactly is where the Historicity of Muhammad falls big time.
- This is the first archaeological evidence for mention of word "Muhammad" which could have to do something with Islam as it reads Kalima.
- Questions should be asked by Muslims that why no earlier caliphs ever issued an Islamic coin. The first one happens to be this one issued by Abd al-Malik ibn Marwan in 697-98 AD? This is almost 65-66 years after the alleged death of Muhammad (Figure-1)
- The initial coin used by even Abd al-Malik ibn Marwan was not Islamic. It was Christian in nature, very much like that of Byzantine. Look at Figure 2.



Figure-2

Abd al-Malik ibn Marwan to al-Walid I ibn 'Abd al-Malik - pseudo-Byzantine type (691-715 AD) Umayyad Caliphate Coin

Front: Byzantine-style bust, wearing crown with cross; cross in field above; Sasanian legend around

Rear: Large M; cross above, hooked base below; mint name to right

8/n Abd Al Malik, was being transformed into Muhammad.



# Abd al-Malik ibn Marwan's Islamic Coin

- This coin is dated to 695 AD



Figure-1

Umayyad Caliph 'Abd al-Malik: 'Caliphal Image solidus' or Standing Caliph solidus struck from 74-77 AH. Based on Byzantine numismatic traditions. Note that, contrary to popular belief, there are official representations of the human figure in the Islamic context. More over, the person portrayed is the caliph as per the Reverse field of A Mixed Arab-Sassanian And Arab-Byzantine Coin From The Time Of Caliph 'Abd Al-Malik, 75 AH / 694-695 CE reads, "khalifa of God, Commander of the Faithful"

## Rebuttal

- Abd al-Malik ibn Marwan had issued first Islamic Coin in 695 AD with depiction of Caliph (Figure-1)
- We all know very well that Islam prohibits depiction of Caliphs, then how was Abd-al-Malik seated in coin of 695 (two years before first coin with Muhammad mentioned)?
- Interestingly this coin does not talk about "Muhammad" but praises caliph as the commander of faithful?
- **Was Abd-Al-Malik being transformed into Muhammad?**

9/n

# Abd al-Malik ibn Marwan's Coin

- This coin's exact date is unknown



Figure-1

The obverse of a glass coin weight inscribed with the name of Caliph Abd al-Malik ibn Marwan (r. 685-705). The inscription, in Arabic, reads: "li-'Abd Allah 'Abd al-Malik Amir al-Mu'minin (The servant of God, Abd al-Malik, Commander of the Faithful). The weight was produced in Damascus, Syria.

The weight is for a half-dinar and is currently housed by the American Numismatic Society in New York.

## Rebuttal

- This is a glass coin of Abd al-Malik where again he himself is praised and there is no mention of Muhammad
- **Was Abd-Al-Malik being transformed into Muhammad?**

10/n Tombstone Of ■Ab■ssa Bint Juraij, 71 AH / 691 CE, first inscription mentioning Muhammad and Islam but after 50 years from alleged death of former and at a distance of 950 miles from Mecca.

Does it not look like problem?

# Tombstone Of ‘Abāssa Bint Juraij, 71 AH / 691 CE

- This is first inscription of Shahada and mention of term “Islam”

## CLAIM

From 71 AH Egypt, we come across an Umayyad period tombstone from Aswan. It reads:

"In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate. The greatest calamity of the people of Islam [*ahl al-Islam*] is that which has befallen them on the death of Muhammad the Prophet; may God grant him peace. This is the tomb of 'Abassa daughter of Juraij [...], son of [...]. May clemency forgiveness and satisfaction of God be on her. She died on Monday fourteen days having elapsed from Dhul-Qa'dah of the year one and seventy, confessing that there is no god but God alone without partner and that Muhammad is His servant and His apostle, may God grant him peace."  
(JL Bacharach, S Anwar, Early Versions Of the Shahada, A Tombstone From Aswan Of 71 AH, The Dome Of The Rock, And Contemporary Coinage, in: *Islam* [2012] Vol. 89, pp. 60-69)

## Rebuttal

- This is an inscription after 5 decades from the alleged death of Muhammad that too almost 950 miles away from Mecca.
- Does it not appear fishy to all of you that though claims are made that Qur'an was already written within two decades from the death of Muhammad but there is no biography of him. We hear about the name "Muhammad" as the "Prophet" for the first time along with "Islam" after 5 decades from Muhammad's death and at the distance of 950 miles from the so called "Ka'ba"?
- This claim also fails to prove historicity of Muhammad.

©Aabhas