

Is He Really Predicted in Bhavishya Purana

 stephen-knapp.com/mohammed_is_he_really_predicted_in_bhavishya_purana.htm

So here is the Roman transliteration of the Sanskrit in the *Bhavishya Purana*, however accurate it may be (Prati Sarga: Part III, 3.3.5-27).

mahamadh ithi khayat, shishya-sakha-samniviyath 5

..... mahadev marusthal nivasinam.

mahadevthe snanya-pya punch-gavua samnivithya

tripurarsur-nashav bahu-maya pravathiney 7

malech-dharma shav shudhaya sat-chit-anandaya swarupye,

thva ma hei kinkare vidhii sharanaghatham 8

suta uvacha: ithi shurthiya sthav deva shabadh-mah nupaya tam,

gath-vaya bhojraj-ney mahakhaleshwar-sthale 9

malech-shu dhushita bhumi-vahika nam-vishritha

arya dharma hi nav-vathra vahike desh-darunya 10

vamu-vatra maha-mayi yo-sav dagdho myaa pura

tripuro bali-daithyane proshith punaragath 11

ayoni sa varo math prasava daithyo-vrudhan

mahamadh ithi khayath , paishacha-kruthi thathpar 12

nagathvaya thvya bhup paisachae desh-vartake

math prasadhayane bhupal tav shudhii prajayathe 13

thi shruthva nupshav svadesha-napu maragmath

mahamadh toi sdhav sindhu-thir mupaye-yav 14

uchav bhupati premane mahamadh-virshad

tva deva maharaja das-tva magath 15

mamo-chit sabhu jiya-dhatha tatpashya bho nup

ithi shruthya ththa hata para vismaya-magath16

malechdhano mathi-shasi-tatsaya bhupasaya darutho17

tucha tva kalidas-sthu rusha praah mahamadham

maya-thei nirmithi dhutharya nush-mohan-hethvei 18

hanishyami-duravara vahik purusha-dhamum

ityak va sa jidh shrimanava-raja-tathpar 19

japthya dush-sah-trayach tah-sahansh juhav sa

bhasm mutva sa mayavi malech-dev-tva-magath 20
maybhithashtu tachya-shyaa desh vahii-kamayuuah
guhivta svaguro-bhasm madaheen tva-magatham 21
swapiit tav bhu-ghyot-thro-shrumadh-tathpara
madaheen puro jath thosha trith sayam smurthaum 22

rathri sa dev-roop-shav bahu-maya-virshad
paisacha deha-marathaya bhojraj hi so trivith 23
arya-dharmo hei to raja-sarvoutham smurth
ishapraya karinayami paishacha dharma darunbhu 24
linga-chedri shikhaheen shamshu dhaari sa dhushak
yukhalapi sarva bhakshi bhavishyat jano maum 25
vina kaul cha pashav-thosha bhakshava matha maum
muslanav sanskar kushariv bhavishyat 26
tasman-musal-vanto hi jathiyo dharma dhushika
ithi pishacha-dharma mya kruth 27

To set the scene, in this section of the *Bhavishya Purana*, Shri Suta Gosvami first explained that previously, in the dynasty of King Shalivahana, there were ten kings who went to the heavenly planets after ruling for over 500 years. [This gives these kings roughly 50 years of rule for each one.] Then gradually the morality declined on the planet. At that time, Bhojaraja was the tenth of the kings on the earth [who would have ruled about 450 years after King Shalivahana]. When he saw that the moral law of conduct was declining, he went to conquer all the directions of his country with ten-thousand soldiers commanded by Kalidasa. He crossed the river Sindhu [modern Indus River] going northward and conquered over the *gandharas* [the area of Afghanistan], *mlecchas* [present-day region of Turkey], *shakas*, Kashmiris [Kashmir and present-day Pakistan], *naravas*, and *sathas*. Crossing the Sindhu, he conquered the *mlecchas* in Gandhar and the *shaths* in Kashmir. King Bhoj grabbed their treasure and then punished them.

Then, as verses 7-8 relate, the Aryan King Bhojaraja, who had already left India for the lands across the Sindhu River and to the west, meets Mahamada [some say this is Mohammed], the preceptor of the *mleccha-dharma* [religion of the *mlecchas*], who had arrived with his followers. Thereafter, however, the King went to worship the image of Lord Mahadev, the great god Shiva, situated in the *marusthal*, desert. King Bhoj bathed the image of Shiva with Ganges water and worshiped him in his mind with *panchagavya* (the five purificatory elements from

the cow, consisting of milk, ghee, yogurt, cow dung, and cow urine), along with sandalwood paste, etc., and offered him, the image of Shiva, sincere prayers and devotion. King Bhoj prayed to Lord Mahadev, "O Girijanath who stays in the *marusthal* (land of deserts), I offer my prayers to you. You have forced *maya* [the illusory energy] to destroy Tripurasur [the demon Tripura]; but the *mlecchas* are now worshipping you. You are pure and *sat-chit-anand swaroop* [eternal knowledge and bliss]. I am your *sevak* [servant]. I have come under your protection."

Verses 10-27 relates next that Suta Goswami explained: After hearing the king's prayers and being pleased with him, Lord Shiva said: "Let the King go to Mahakaleshwar (Ujjain) in the land of Vahika, which is now contaminated by *mlecchas*. O King, the land where you are standing, that is popular by the name of Bahik, has been polluted by the *mlecchas*. In that terrible country there no longer exists Dharma. There was a mystic demon named Tripura (Tripurasura), whom I have already burnt to ashes once before, he has come again by the order of Bali. He has no origin but he achieved a benediction from me. His name is Mahamada and his deeds are like that of a ghost. Therefore, O king, you should not go to this land of the evil ghost. By my mercy your intelligence will be purified." [This would seem to indicate that this Mahamada was an incarnation of the demon Tripura.] So hearing this, the king came back to his country and Mahamada came with them, but only to the bank of the river Sindhu. He was expert in expanding illusion, so he said to the king very pleasingly, "O great king, your god has become my servant. Just see, as he eats my remnants, so I will show you."

The king became surprised when he saw this happening before them. Then in anger Kalidasa, the king's commander, rebuked Mahamada, "O rascal, you have created an illusion to bewilder the king, I will kill you, you are the lowest..." Then the king left that area.

Later, in the form of a ghostly presence, the expert illusionist Mahamada appeared at night in front of King Bhojaraja and said: "O King, your religion is of course known as the best religion among all. Still, by the order of the Lord, I am going to establish a terrible and demoniac religion and enforce a strong creed over the meat-eaters [*mlecchas*]. My followers will be known by their cut [circumcised] genitals, they will have no *shikha* [tuft of hair on their head, like Brahmanas], but will have a beard, make noise loudly, and eat all kinds of

animals except swine without observing any rituals. They will perform purificatory acts with the musala, and thus be called musalman, and not purify their things with *kusha* grass [one of the Vedic customs]. Thus, I will be the originator of this *adharmic* [opposed to Vedic or Aryan Dharma] and demoniac religion of the meat-eating nations." After having heard all this, the *Bhavishya Purana* goes on to relate that King Bhojaraja returned to his land and palace, and that ghost of the man also went back to his own place.

It is lastly described how the intelligent king, Bhojaraja, established the language of Sanskrit amongst the three *varnas* -- the Brahmanas, Kshatriyas and Vaisyas - - and for the Shudras he established *prakrita-bhasha*, the ordinary language spoken by common men. After ruling his kingdom for another 50 years, he went to the heavenly planets. The moral laws established by him were honored even by the demigods. The *arya-varta*, the pious land is situated between Vindhyachala and Himachala, or the mountains known as Vindhya and Himalaya. The Aryans reside there, but the *varna-sankaras* reside on the lower part of Vindhya. The musalman people were kept on the other [northwestern] side of the river Sindhu.

* * *

Thus, from the interpretations of the present editions of the *Bhavishya Purana* that are available, it seems to say there was someone named Mahamada that King Bhojaraja met in the desert, who was supposedly a reappearance of the Tripura demon, who would start his own religion for those *mlecchas* who are unable to follow the spiritual codes of the deeper aspects of spiritual culture, or Vedic Dharma, and who would also spread *adharma*, or that religion that would be opposed to Vedic Dharma. Plus, Mahamada knew and accepted the depth of the Vedic spiritual path and admitted to its superiority. But is Mahamada really Prophet Mohammed?

Let me assure everyone that this section is not a commentary on Prophet Mohammed, and is only an explanation of what is said in the *Bhavishya Purana*. But since some people accept this to be a prediction, we need to take a closer look at it.

So, the first few lines of this translation does seem to hold a possibility of referring to the Prophet. But after that, it could be questionable whether a person would really want to accept this story to be about Prophet Mohammed or not.

Historically, however, we know that Prophet Mohammed was born between 570-580 CE, became interested in religion at age 40, preached in Mecca for 10 years, and then went to Medina in 621 CE at age 51 when he finally established a following. He started engaging in armed conflict in 624 CE, gained possession of Mecca in 630, and died in 632 CE at age 62. So, he would have had to have met King Bhojaraja only after he had a following, between the years of 621 and 632. That is an extremely narrow eleven-year window of time. However, herein it also says that Mahamada went with King Bhojaraja to the Sindhu River, but there is never any historical record that Prophet Mohammed personally went to that area, which establishes another doubt of whether this could have been the Prophet.

Furthermore, even though it is described how King Bhojaraja conquered over the *gandharas* [the area of Afghanistan], *mlecchas* [present-day region of Turkey], *shakas*, Kashmiris [Kashmir and present-day Pakistan], *naravas*, and *sathas*, it never mentions that he went into the area of central Saudi Arabia where he would have had to go in order to meet the Prophet at the particular time when the Prophet had a following.

Plus, if King Bhojaraja was the tenth king after Shalivahana, who was supposed to have existed about the time of Jesus Christ, according to the evidence provided in the previous section, that would mean that this king lived about 450 to 500 CE. This is too early to allow for a possibility to have met the Prophet. However, there are a few King Bhojaraja's that are recorded in history. The one in the *Bhavishya Purana* is noted as intelligent, and who "established the language of Sanskrit amongst the three *varnas* -- the Brahmanas, Kshatriyas and Vaisyas -- and for the Shudras he established *prakrita-bhasha*, the ordinary language spoken by common men." The King Bhojaraja who was known for being a Sanskrit scholar is credited with being the author of two books, the *Saraswatikanthabharana*, and the *Shringaraprakasha*. Of these, the first is a compendious volume in five chapters, dealing with the merits and defects of poetry, figures of speech, language, etc. However, this scholar King Bhojaraja is said to have lived from 1018 to 1054 CE. This is way too late to have enabled him to personally have met the Prophet.

Therefore, at least with the present information that is available, we are left to conclude that, though King Bhojaraja may have indeed met a person named Mahamada, the meeting between the king and Prophet Mohammed as an accurate historical event is extremely unlikely. Thus, in this description from the *Bhavishya Purana*, Mahamada is not the Prophet. Beyond this point of view, is this a later interpolation? Who can say? Or is this is a prophecy in an allegorical form? That would be left to one's own opinions or sentiments.

* * *

Was Prophet Muhammad in the Vedas?

Starting With the Rig-Veda

In this article we will take a look at some of the verses in the *Vedas* that some people, such as Dr. Zakir Naik, say that Mohammed is mentioned or foretold in them. This is a summary based on the research by Dr Radhasyam Brahmachari and others, and shows that these verses in fact do not speak of Prophet Mohammed, but are used in a way that is based on mistranslations to justify that idea.

First of all, the *Rig-Veda* is globally recognized and accepted as the oldest book created by man and hence if it could be shown that there is mentioning of Prophet Mohammed in that text, it will be immensely helpful to paint the Arabian Prophet as a divine personality. Not only that, it will be helpful to deceive the Hindus and convert them to Islam. So, it does not become difficult to understand what has inspired Dr Zakir Naik and others to discover the mentioning of Mohammed in the *Rig-Veda* and in other Vedic texts. But as his investigation culminated into a failure, he had no other way but to apply stupid arguments to befool the kafirs and infidels but to twist the meanings and translations into something different, all the while acting most scholarly and convincing.

First of all, we should see what the *Rig-Veda* actually says about Prophet Muhammad. It should also be mentioned at the outset that two Sanskrit words *śaṁsata* and *narāśaṁsa* play the central role in these arguments of such people as Zakir Naik. According to him, the word *śaṁsata* stands for an individual who praises. In Arabic, such an individual is called Ahammad, the other name of Prophet Muhammad. Therefore, wherever he could find the word *śaṁsata*, he took it as the mentioning of their Prophet.

According to him, the second word *narāśaṃsa* means an individual who is to be praised or who is praiseworthy. The Arabic word Muhammad means a man who is praiseworthy. So, wherever he could have found the word *narāśaṃsa* in any Sanskrit texts, he took it to be a mentioning of Muhammad.

In fact, both the Sanskrit words *śaṃsata* and *narāśaṃsa* stand for a deity or God, who is praiseworthy. According to Sāyana, the most reputed commentator of the *Vedas*, the word *narāśaṃsa* means a deity or a respectable entity (not a man) that deserves to be praised by man.

However, we should have a closer look to see what Zakir Naik has to say. According to him, the verses (1/13/3), (1/18/9), (1/106/4), (1/142/3), (2/3/2), (5/5/2), (7/2/2), (10/64/3) and (10/182/2) of the *Rig-Veda* contain the word *narāśaṃsa*, and hence mention Muhammad, and the verse (8/1/1) of the *Rig-Veda* contains the word *śaṃsata* (Ahmmad), or the other name of Muhammad. So here he begins with another blatant lie and says that the word *śaṃsata* stands for a man who praises, the Arabic equivalent of Ahammad and hence mentions Muhammad. The said verse (8/1/1) of the *Rig-Veda* reads:

Mā cidanyadvi śaṃsata sakhāyo mā riṣṇyata ।

Indramitstot ā vṛṣaṇaṃ sacā sute muhurukthā ca śaṃsata ॥ (8/1/1)

“Glorify naught besides, O friends; so shall no sorrow trouble you. Praise only mighty Indra when the juice is shed, and say your lauds repeatedly.” (Translation: R T H Griffith; *The Hymns of the R̥gveda*, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Delhi; 1995, p-388). So the word *śaṃsata* (praiseworthy) in the above verse refers to deity Indra, and not a man who praises (Ahammad) as claimed by Dr Zakir Naik.

We shall now see what the verses containing the word *narāśaṃsa* say. In *Rig-Veda*, a verse is referred as (x/y/z), where x stands for Mandala, y stands for Sukta and z stands for the Verse or Ṛk. The verse (1/13/3) of *Rig-Veda*, as mentioned above, belongs to 13th Sukta of the 1st Mandala. It should also be noted here that every Sukta of the *Rig-Veda* is dedicated to a deity. The presiding deity of the 13th Sukta of the 1st Mandala is Agni (the God of Fire). The verse says:

Narāśaṃsamiha priyamasminajña upahvaye ।

Madhujihvat haviṣṛtam ॥ (1/13/3)

“Dear Narāśaṃsa, sweet of tongue, the giver of oblations, I invoke to this our

sacrifice.” (tr: ibid, p-7)

As Agni is the deity of the entire 13th Sukta, there is no doubt that the word *narāśaṃsa* (praiseworthy to man) in the verse refers to Agni. One should also note that the word *narāśaṃsa* does not signify a man who is praiseworthy, as some people claim.

The verse (1/18/9) of the *Rig-Veda* says:

Narāśaṃsaṃ sudhr̥ṣṭamamapaśyam saprathastam I
Divo na sadmakhasam II (1/18/9)

“I have seen Narāśaṃsa, him most resolute, most widely famed, as ‘twere the Household Priest of heaven.” (tr: ibid, p-11)

The 18th Sukta, to which the verse belongs, is dedicated to Brahmanaspati, the Priest of heaven and hence the word *narāśaṃsa* (praiseworthy to man) in this verse refers to Brahmanaspati, the Priest of heaven.

The verse (1/106/4) of the *Rig-Veda* says:

Narāśaṃsaṃ vajinṃ vajayinniha kṣayadvīraṃ pūṣaṇaṃ summairī mahe I
Rathaṃ na durgādvāsava sudānavo viśvasmāno ahaṃso niṣpipartana II
(1/106/4)

“To mighty Narāśaṃsa, strengthening his might, to Pūṣaṇa, ruler over men, we pray with hymns. Even as a chariot from a difficult ravine, bountiful Vasus, rescue us from all distress.” (tr: ibid, p-69)

The 106th Sukta of 1st Mandala, to which the verse belongs, is dedicated to the Viśvadevas, and hence the word *narāśaṃsa* (praiseworthy to man) in this verse refers to the Viśvadevas, again not to Mohammed.

The verse (1/142/3) of the *Rig-Veda* says:

śuci pāvako adbhuto madhvā yajñaṃ mimikṣati I
narāśaṃsasthirā divo devo deveṣu yajñīyaḥ II (1/142/3)

“He wondrous, sanctifying, bright, sprinkles the sacrifice with mead, thrice, Narāśaṃsa from the heavens, a God amid Gods adorable.” (tr: ibid, p-98)

The 142nd Sukta, to which the verse belongs, is dedicated to the deity Āprī, and hence the word *narāśaṃsa* in this verse refers to Āprī. Most of the scholars agree that Āprī is the other name of Agni and hence the word *narāśaṃsa* in this verse

refers to Agni, the god of fire.

The verse (2/3/2) of the *Rig-Veda* says:

Narāśaṃsaḥ prati dhāmānyañjan tisro div prati mahṇā svarciḥ I

Ghṛtapruṣā manasā havyamundanmūrdhanyajñasya sanamaktu devān II (2/3/2)

“May Narāśaṃsa lighting up the chambers, bright in his majesty through threefold heaven, steeping the gift with oil diffusing purpose, bedew the Gods at chiefest time of worship.” (tr: ibid, p- 132)

Like the earlier one, 142nd Sukta of 1st Mandal, this present 3rd Sukta of 2nd Mandala, is dedicated to the deity Āprī or Agni and hence the word *narāśaṃsa* in this verse refers to Agni the Fire God.

The Verse (5/5/2) of *Rig-Veda* says:

Narāśaṃsaḥ suṣūdatīmṃ yajñamadābhyaḥ I

Kavirhi madhūhastāḥ II (5/5/2)

“He, Narāśaṃsa, ne’er beguiled, inspireth this sacrifice; for sage is he, with sweets in hand.” (tr: ibid, p- 240)

This 5th Sukta of 5th Mandala is also dedicated to Āprī or Agni and hence the word *narāśaṃsa* in this verse refers to Agni the Fire God.

The verse (7/2/2) of *Rig-Veda* says:

Narāśaṃsasya mahimānameṣamupa stoṣāma yajatasya yajñaiḥ I

Ye sukratavaḥ śucayo dhiyandhāḥ svadanti devā ubhayāni havyā II (7/2/2)

“With sacrifice to these we men will honor the majesty of holy Narāśaṃsa – to these the pure, most wise, the thought-inspires, Gods who enjoy both sorts of our oblations.” (tr: ibid, p- 334)

Again this 2nd Sukta of 7th Mandala is dedicated to Āprī or Agni, and hence the word *narāśaṃsa* in this verse refers to Agni the Fire God.

The verse (10/64/3) of the *Rig-Veda* says:

Narā vā śaṃsaṃ pūṣṇamagohyamagni deveddhamabhyarcase girā I

Sūryāmāsā candramasā yamaṃ divi tritaṃ vātamuṣasamaktumaśvinā II (10/64/3)

“To Narāśaṃsa and Pūṣaṇ I sing forth, unconcealable Agni kindled by the Gods. To Sun and Moon, two Moons, to Yama in the heaven, to Trita, Vāta, Dawn, Night and Aśvins Twain.” (tr: ibid, p- 578)

This 64th Sukta of 10th Mandala is dedicated to the Viśvadevas, and the word *narāśaṃsa* in this verse refers to the Viśvadevas.

The verse (10/182/2) of *Rig-Veda* says:

Narāśaṃso na avatu prayāje śaṃ no astvanuyajo habeṣu |
Kṣipadaśtimapa durmati hannathā karadyajamānāya śaṃ ṣoḥ || (10/182/2).

“May Narāśaṃsa aid us at Prayāja; blest be out Anuyāja at invokings. May he repel the curse, and chase ill-feeling, and give the sacrificer peace and comfort.”
(tr: ibid, p- 650)

The 182nd Sukta of 10th Mandala, to which the above verse belongs, is dedicated to Vṛhaspati, and hence the word *narāśaṃsa* refers to Vṛhaspati, the Priest of the Gods.

Another verse (1/53/9) of the *Rig-Veda* says,

Tvametāñjanarājñō dvirdaśābandhunā suśravasopajagmaṣaḥ |
ṣaṣṭiṃ sahasrā navatiṃ nava śruto ni cakreṇa rathyā duṣpadā vṛṇak || (1/53/9)

“With all-outstripping chariot-wheel, O Indra, thou far-famed, hast overthrown the twice ten Kings of men, with sixty thousand nine-and-ninety followers, who came in arms to fight with friendless Suśravas.” (tr: ibid, p-36)

To narrate the incident, Sayana, the renowned commentator of the *Rig-Veda*, says that twenty kings with a force, 60,099 strong, attacked the King Suśrava (Prajapati) and Indra alone defeated them and frustrated their ambition (the *Vayu-Purana* also narrates the incident).

Most of the scholars agree that the *Rig-Veda* was composed more than 5000 years BCE, and hence the incident narrated in the verse (1/53/9) took place more than 7000 years ago. And Muhammad conquered Mecca in 630 AD. But Zakir Naik has proceeded to link the incident with Muhammad’s capturing Mecca, which any sane man, except a Muslim, would feel shy to undertake. To give his mischief a shape, he has, firstly replaced the word Suśrava with Suśrama and says that the word Suśrama stands for one who praises, and hence equivalent to Ahammad in Arabic, the other name of Muhammad. And he claims that the verse narrates Muhammad’s conquering Mecca, as the then population of the city was

about 60,000 and Muhammad had invaded Mecca with 20 of his closest followers. It is not difficult for the reader to discover the absurdity of this claim and the deceit involved with making it.

The verse (8/6/10) of the *Rig-Veda* says,
Ahamiddhi pituṣpari medhamṛtasya jagrabha I
Ahaṃ sūrya ivājrani II (8/6/10)

“I from my Father have received deep knowledge of the Holy Law: I was born like unto the Sun.” (Tr: ibid, p- 396).

In this verse the word *ahamiddhi* stands for “I have received.” But as the word spells like Ahammad, the other name of Muhammad, Zakir Naik claims that the verse mentions Muhammad, which shows how he is prone to error on account of his Islamic bias.

Thus we have studied all the verses of the *Rig-Veda* which, according to Naik, mention Muhammad. It has been said above that the Sanskrit word *narāśaṃsa* stands for a deity or God who is praiseworthy to man, but not a man who is praiseworthy to other men, which is what Naik claims. So, according to this kind of childish logic, whenever someone uses the word “praiseworthy,” it should be taken granted that he mentions Prophet Muhammad. But that is far from the truth.

However, the intellectual level of those who try to use these techniques of mistranslations are revealed when they try to do the same thing with the word *narāśaṃsa* in other *Vedas*, like *Atharva-Veda* and *Yajur-Veda* and is again projecting them to be mentioning Prophet Muhammad. Though it is sheer wastage of time to deal with the utterances of such insane people as this, we may discuss these matters more thoroughly in the future. In the meantime, many are those who are realizing the confusing and inaccurate conclusions such as these and are losing confidence in such people who depend on this kind of tactic, as they also become an embarrassment to the religion they represent.

Debunking the *Atharva-Veda* Connection

Atharva-Veda, HYMN CXXVII

A hymn in praise of the good Government of King Kaurama

- 1 Listen to this, ye men, a laud of glorious bounty shall be sung. Thousands sixty,
and ninety we, O Kaurama, among the Rusamas have received.
- 2 Camels twice-ten that draw the car, with females by their side, he gave.
Fain would the chariot's top bow down escaping from the stroke of heaven.
- 3 A hundred chains of gold, ten wreaths, upon thee Rishi he bestowed,
And thrice-a-hundred mettled steeds, ten-times-a-thousand cows he gave.
- 4 Glut thee, O Singer, glut thee like a bird on a ripe-fruited tree.
Thy lips and tongue move swiftly like the sharp blades of a pair of shears.
- 5 Quickly and willingly like kine forth come the singers and their hymns:
Their little maidens are at home, at home they wait upon the cows.
- 6 O Singer, bring thou forth the hymn that findeth cattle, findeth wealth. p. 364
Even as an archer aims his shaft address this prayer unto the Gods.
- 7 List to Pariksit's eulogy, the sovran whom all people love,
The King who ruleth over all, excelling mortals as a God.
- 8 'Mounting his throne, Pariksit, best of all, hath given us peace and rest,'
Saith a Kauravya to his wife as he is ordering his house.
- 9 'Which shall I set before thee, curds, gruel of milk, or barley-brew?'
Thus the wife asks her husband in the realm which King Pariksit rules.
- 10 Up as it were to heavenly light springs the ripe corn above the cleft.
Happily thrive the people in the land where King Pariksit reigns.
- 11 Indra hath waked the bard and said, Rise, wander singing here and there.
Praise me, the strong: each pious man will give thee riches in return,
- 12 Here, cows! increase and multiply, here ye, O horses, here, O men.
Here, with a thousand rich rewards, doth Pūshan also seat him-self.
- 13 O Indra, let these cows be safe, their master free from injury.
Let not the hostile-hearted or the robber have control of them.
- 14 Oft and again we glorify the hero with our hymn of praise, with prayer, with our
auspicious prayer.
Take pleasure in the songs we sing: let evil never fall on us.

This hymn is merely a praise of King Kaurama (probably of Rajasthani origin). Some people, like Zakir Naik, have tried to twist this to mean that the first 13 verses tell the story of Mohammed! "*Kaurama*" actually means "born of a noble family" and has nothing to do with referring to Mohammed. It is closely related with the term Kaurava. And "*Kuntapa*" merely means the internal organs in the belly and has no alternate meaning as "safe journey" or as such. Sanskrit words aren't as multi-layered as Arab words. All the verses in the *Atharva-Veda* from

126-133 are considered Kuntapa, but only one mentions a desert.

The *Sama-Veda* Connection

Some people (and you can guess who) think that the *Sama-Veda*, Book II, Hymn 6, verse 8, refers to Mohammed.

The verse -

1. Indra whose jaws are strong hath drunk of worshipping Sudaksha's draught,
The Soma juice with barley brew.
2. O Lord of ample wealth, these songs of praise have called aloud to thee,
Like milch-kine lowing to their calves!
3. Then straight they recognized the mystic name of the creative Steer,
There in the mansion of the Moon.
4. When Indra, strongest hero, brought the streams, the mighty waters down,
Pushan was standing by his side.
5. The Cow, the streaming mother of the liberal Maruts, pours her milk,
Harnessed to draw their chariots on.
6. Come, Lord of rapturous joys, to our libation with thy bay steeds, come
With bay steeds to the flowing juice
7. Presented strengthening gifts have sent Indra away at sacrifice,
With night, unto the cleansing bath.
8. I from my Father have received deep knowledge of eternal Law:
I was born like unto the Sun.
9. With Indra splendid feasts be ours, rich in all strengthening things, wherewith,
Wealthy in food, we may rejoice
10. Soma and Pushan, kind to him who travels to the Gods, provide
Dwellings all happy and secure.

So some people say that verse eight says "Ahmed acquired from his Lord the knowledge of eternal law. I received light from him just as from the sun." Then they associate the word as Ahmed to be Mohammed. But let us understand the verse accurately.

In these verses, Indra is strengthened with Soma sacrifice and the Priests cry out for Indra's arrival. The priests recognize the name of the creative Seer - the personification Soma, there in the mansion of the moon - which in Vedic symbolism, resembles a drop of Soma. Next, Indra's legendary battle with Viritra

the dragon who holds back the waters of the Earth is reflected and it is seen how Indra brings the streams towards Earth with Pushan by his side. The description of a cow pouring forth her milk is also given and is thought akin to Indra's action. Then, the priests once again call to Indra as the lord of joy to give his strengthening gifts to Soma and Indra doing so, fades away. The Priests partake in the Soma and receive knowledge of the eternal law - the law that governs nature (no Law in the 'Jurisdiction' sense) and share a feeling of warmth as if they were born unto the Sun. Once again, the Soma is praised for its strengthening qualities. Soma the personification and Pushan thus travel to the Gods.

Soma is a non-intoxicant juice from a certain vine that is burnt in Vedic rituals and the leftover remnants are eaten. This is not done anymore because nobody knows what the Soma plant is (presumed extinct). The Soma plant is renown for its strengthening properties and is drunk before war. Indra is a deity especially fond of Soma.

So the conclusion for this verse from the *Sama-Veda* is that there is no place for any "Ahmed" in this verse either storywise or literarywise. Adding "Ahmed" here is saying the grammatically incorrect (the Veda is gramatically perfect) – "Ahmed have received." And besides, it is akin to saying Mohammed himself did the ritual to Indra's glory, and partook in the leftovers and knew the Sharia - which is once again akin to idolatry for Muslims. The phrase "I from my father" seems second most likely (it refers to the Priests receiving knowledge from "Soma" about the Eternal Law) but the most likely seems to be Aham + Atha. It would translate the sentence to – "I now have received the eternal law."

* * *

We could go on like this, and other people have, and compare additional verses from the *Vedas* to show how by mistranslations, people have tried to place references to Prophet Mohammed in them, thus misleading the public into thinking that the Vedic literature was advocating and giving credence or even prophecies to the Prophet Mohammed, but no such honest references can be found therein. It is another trick, the type of which is becoming increasingly common in order to persuade people to drop out of the Dharmic spiritual path and to convert to something else.

Such trickery is only successful with those who are under-educated in the

Vedic philosophy, and are used by those who still lack genuine spiritual depth that can itself attract people. When that is missing, then they have to resort to all kinds of deceit and trickery, or worse, such as types of violence and attacks, to show the superiority of their religion. This is a pathetic technique but seems to be the last resort of those religions who especially want to gain popularity without showing a truly deep and sacred and enlightening spiritual path that is meant solely for the upliftment of the individual and society in general, rather than control through dogma and peer pressure and status from a growing congregation.

[This article and more information at www.stephen-knapp.com]
