

Nine Signs of Christ In Rigveda??

An Introduction To How Certain Christians Have Abused Hindu Religious
Books To Establish False Claims For The Christian Faith

Dr. Johnson C. Philip
Dr. Saneesh Cherian



A Statue Of God Prajapati: Is He Jesus Christ?

Analysis Of The Nine Signs

A good number of preachers, mostly pulpit-savvy Hindu-converts, have been claiming for the last 100 years that they came to Christ after they read about Jesus Christ from Hindu holy scriptures known as Vedas. A Tract by the name of “Sacrifice” is often promoted by these people.

According to these tracts and books, Rigveda gives nine signs of Christ. Quotations are given in their books to show how these nine signs match Christ exactly. Ignorant Christians are highly excited on hearing these false claims. They often tell Hindus, “Jesus is there in YOUR holy books. Just read and believe your own holy books”. Knowledgeable Hindus are puzzled by all this because on one hand they do not find these quotations in their book, but on the other hand they do not expect such lies from a Christian crowd.

Time has come for the Christian community to realize that the “Nine Signs Of Christ In Vedas” is a myth, a falsehood perpetrated by certain Hindu-converts to gain popularity. These signs were in turn picked up by many Christians, and they are everywhere now. Two men who have written numerous books on this topic are Dr. Koshy Abraham and Dr. Josphe Pandinjarekkara. In this book we will analyze their claims to show that their claims are nothing short of white lies, and also that many of the quotations alleged by them are pure fabrications.

We will first quote each of the Nine Points exactly as it stands in the original article/tract, and then quote the supporting passage which have been given in the two books. (Titles and pages have been mentioned in the previous chapter). The first bunch of quotations below each point are furnished by Dr. Koshy Abraham, and the second set by Dr. Padinjarekara. We will also quote profusely from the article of Dr. Krishnarao published in Hindu Vishwa in which he questions the validity and genuineness of the quotations advanced by the Prajapati people.

Alleged Sign 01 Of Christ From Vedas: “It (the lamb) must be without blemish”

Proof/quotation offered By Koshy Abraham:

- This man must be like gold from head to toe. (Chandogya Upanishad).
- This man is above all sins. (Chandogya Upanishad)

Proof/quotation offered By Padinjarekara:

- Brihadarayaka Upanishad says that he consumes and destroys sin through fire.

Analysis: Neither of the Prajapati proponents above has quoted from the Rigveda. They produce quotations only from other Hindu holy books, yet these quotations do not say that "the lamb should be without blemish". Much linguistic torturing would be required to fit the

quotations with the first point that the lamb must be without blemish. The Hindus understand this and they say:

- There is NO statement in the entire Chandogya Upanishad that the object of sacrifice should be without blemish (Dr. Krishnarao).

-

Alleged Sign 02 Of Christ From Vedas: “Balusu Bush Must Be Tied Around Its Head”

Proof/quotation offered By Koshy Abraham:

- Koshy Abraham CHANGES "balusu" to wild-vine so the quotations becomes: "wild vine must be tied on its head". The following are is the supporting quotation: A 12 yard vine should be tied around the head of the HORSE used in the sacrifice. (Shatpath Brahman)

Proof/quotation offered By Padinjarekara:

- Padinjarekara: He also changes "balusu"to wild-vine. But he is unable to demonstrate a quotation either from Rigveda or from its commentaries. He therefore brings in the EXCUSE that "the importance here is NOT to wild-vine or to crown of thorns, but the act of SEPARATING for sacrifice.

Several things become obvious immediately from the above exercise of the two gentlemen. Mr. Koshy Abraham had to abandon the widely circulated claim about the "Balusu Bush" and substitute a phrase (wild-vine) of his own. But even here he could find only a HORSE, not the Prajapati or sacrificial lamb around whose head the vine is tied. Of course, he and others have claimed that the horse sacrificed in the Ashwamedha represents Lord Jesus. Nothing could be more ridiculous, and the details of this are given in the portion that described Ashwamedha sacrifice.

Dr. Padinjarekara is more honest and he does not go hunting for imaginary statements to demonstrate the imaginary bush which was placed on the head of the imaginary sacrificial animal. Rather, he brings in a very interesting excuse that "the importance here is NOT to wild-vine or to crown of thorns, but the act of SEPARATING for sacrifice". The questions is, where is the proof in the Rigveda for his argument ? After all, they are all trying to prove everything from Rigveda, is it not ?

Further, when the venerable "Hindu Pundit" and "Acharya" wrote the original tract about "Prajapati Sacrifice" in the thirties, he said in no uncertain terms that: "Rigveda STRESSES the following qualifications for the true sacrificial animal". Thus when a modern-day writer disputes the claim of this "Acharya", he is accepting that the article written by the Acharya was fraudulent. (Full copy of the tract is given in another location).

The Hindus have also gone through their books and make the following observation:

- In the 100 chapters of the Shatpath Brahman, there is NO such statement (Dr. Krishnarao).

[Alleged Sign 03 Of Christ From Vedas: “It Must Be Tied To Sacrificial Post”](#)

Neither of the writers is able to demonstrate this quotation from the Rigveda. Here is their tortured explanation:

Proof/quotation offered By Koshy Abraham:

- Koshy Abraham: Purusha Prajapati was assumed to be an animal, and was tied to the post. (Rigveda). The sacrificial animal should not be killed without tying it to a post. (Shatpath Brahman).

Proof/quotation offered By Padinjarekara:

- Padinjarekara: So the gods tied Prajapati similar to a sacrificial animal. (Shatpath Brahman).

It is obvious that there is NO support for this point in the Rigveda. Since this point is a part of the original tract known as SACRIFICE, this once again goes to demonstrate that this tract was a fraud perpetrated upon innocent and trusting Christian folk.

The Hindu response is as follows:

- There is NO reference in the entire book that says that the sacrificial animal "must be tied to the post". (Dr. Krishnarao).
-

[Alleged Sign 04 Of Christ From Vedas: Nails Must Be Driven Into Its Four Legs Till The Bleed](#)

Proof/quotation offered :

- NEITHER of the writers is able to produce a single supportive quotation either from the Rigveda or from its commentaries.

Interestingly, here is a point at which many of the Prajapati pulpit speakers vex eloquent. They mention this point attributing it to Rigveda, and then weep for Christ the Prajapati who had to suffer nail-wounds and bleed till he died. Unfortunate for them, there is no such statement in the Rigveda or other Vedic literature. Even the combined forces of the

Prajapati proponents have not been able to locate a single such a reference. So they have silently dropped this point from their books, though the original tract written by Adhyaksha Anubhavananda still continues to propagate this point.

The clever way in which the more active writers have dropped this point silently points to the fraudulent nature of the tract written by Adhyaksha Anubhavananda.

[Alleged Sign 05 Of Christ From Vedas: “The Cloth Covering The Goat Should Be Divided Among The Four Priests”](#)

Proof/quotation offered :

- NEITHER of the writers is able to produce a single supportive quotation either from the Rigveda or from its commentaries.

Koshy Abraham cleverly changes this point to "the skin of the sacrificial animal should not be cut". Then he launches into a verbal acrobatics to show that this statement is equivalent to the original point that the cloth covering the goat should be divided among the four priests, etc. Any intelligent person can see that there is NO resemblance between these statements. If the skin is not cut, how can it be divided among four priests? This point is discussed below.

However, this point -- that the cloths should be distributed -- forms an important part of the tract written by Adhyaksha Anubhavananda. This tract is being distributed by many naive Christians even today, though this point has been demonstrated to be a hoax. This should not surprise the more inquiring readers because the entire Prajapati Edifice stands upon imaginary pillars joined together by the glue of deceptive arguments.

[Alleged Sign 06 Of Christ From Vedas: “None Of Its Bones Must Be Broken”](#)

Proof/quotation offered:

- Both of the writers quote the same passage from Eitereya Brahman. This is surprising because the original tract says that the quotation is found in Rigveda. Eitereya Brahman is only a commentary of Rigveda but not the Rigveda itself. For charity we can assume that the original writer took quotations not only from Rigveda, but from the entire Rigvedic family. But even then, the quotation produced by them is meaningless as can be verified by referring to the technical section below. The following are the quotations:
- Koshy Abraham: It is said that all 26 ribs of the sacrificial animal should be kept safe without any blemish. (Eitereya Brahman).

- Padinjarekara: It is said that all 26 ribs and also other bones of the sacrificial animal should be kept safe without any blemish. (Eitereya Brahman).

Bones being kept SAFE and without any BLEMISH does not automatically mean that bones should not be BROKEN. Further, the original tract by Adhyaksha Anubhavananda expressly states that Rigveda says that bones should not be BROKEN.

The falsehood of the claim and the supporting quotations are recognized by our Hindu friends who say:

- Prajapati has no bones. Further, there is NO such statement that the BONES of the sacrificial animal should not be broken (Dr. Krishnarao).

This again is a witness to fraudulent nature of the Nine-Point Prajapati sacrifice.

[Alleged Sign 07 Of Christ From Vedas: “The Goat Should Be Given A Drink Of Soma Juice”](#)

Proof/quotation offered:

- NEITHER of the writers is able to produce a single quotation supporting this statement either from the Rigveda or from its commentaries.

Interestingly, Adhyaksha Anubhavananda was very emphatic in the tract now titled SACRIFICE that such a statement IS there in the Rigveda. The deception becomes apparent when neither he, nor any of his disciples are able to produce a single quotation from the Rigveda or from the entire Vedic literature to support this point.

[Alleged Sign 08 Of Christ From Vedas: “After It Has Been Slain, It Must Be RESTORED To Life Again”](#)

Proof/quotation offered:

- NEITHER of the writers is able to produce a single quotation either from Rigveda or from its commentaries. The quotations given from other sources are irrelevant and only meant to confuse the people. This can be verified by referring to the technical section in the next chapter. Here are the quotations produced by them:

Amazingly, Koshy Abraham confesses the following: “The sacrificial animal DOES NOT LIVE again. Brahmanas say that its meat is eaten by those who sacrifice it. But please note what the Shatpath Brahman says about Prajapati Sacrifice: Prajapati sacrificed his own body for

the gods. Therefore we can assume that he receives back his body". If assumption is evidence, then anything in the world can be proved with the help of clever assumptions.

Padinjarekara brings another clever assumption: "When a tree is cut down, then new shoots come up from the stem that is left".

The question is, WHERE in Rigveda is the quotation that the sacrificial animal should be brought back to life?

Obviously, Koshy Abraham accepts his FAILURE to find out any Rigvedic passage, and then tries a debaters trick. Padinjarekara is not all that honest and therefore he produces an irrelevant quotation, as though all the readers are fools and morons who cannot see the difference between his statement and the actual point. This is a bad way of treating the audience in a presumably evangelistic book, especially when they belong to another religion. Dishonesty is surely not a virtue for Christians!

[Alleged Sign 09 Of Christ From Vedas: "Its Flesh Should Be Eaten"](#)

Proof/quotation offered:

- NEITHER of the writers is able to produce a single quotation from Rigveda or its commentaries to support this point. The quotations from other sources are invalid and irrelevant, as can be verified by referring to the technical section in the next chapter. Here are what they say:
- Koshy Abraham: This portion (Shatpath Brahman) speaks about a sacrifice known as "Vajpeyam". This is similar to the Grain offering in the Bible. In it the items offered were food for those who made the offering.
- Padinjarekara: Prajapati gave himself for the gods, so he became the food for gods. (Shatpath Brahman).

Obviously, the point exists only in the mind of the forger and his followers, not in the Rigveda or the in the Vedic literature. Hindus recognize this and say:

- "Such a statement is NOT found in the Shatpath Brahman" (Dr. Krishnarao).

These Christians are fooling not only the Hindus, but are also deceiving other Christians.

In summary: The Nine-Point Prajapati proponents have been stating their case for almost seven decades now. They have been using all the available media to convince people that this Nine-Point sacrifice is there in the Rigveda. In fact the Nine-Point Sacrifice of the Prajapati has even become a Shibboleth for many Christians. However, when asked to prove their point, neither the 160 page book of Padinjarekara, nor its 201 page brother birthed by

Mr. Koshy Abraham has been able to produce even a single point. These quotations simply DO NOT exist in the Rigveda. They are a FORGERY and FRAUD. As repeatedly said in this book, the Prajapati Theology stands upon pillars of deception, bound together by the cement of false interpretation.

Additional Signs Of Christ From Vedas

Out of nine classic signs propagated in the name of RIGVEDA, Dr. Padinjarekara tries to authenticate only six. He omits three of the classic signs, and substitutes three of his own invention. Similarly, Dr. Koshy Abraham also tries to demonstrate only six and invents four of his own. Both of them add a few new signs, and these signs are given below:

[Alleged Sign 10 Of Christ From Vedas: “His people should disown him” \(Point 3 in Padinjarekara and Abraham\)](#)

Proof/Quotation Offered:

- Koshy Abraham: The father, mother, brethren, and the relatives of the sacrificial ANIMAL should PERMIT it to be sacrificed. (Eitereya Brahman 2:6).

Padinjarekara repeats the same point as above.

Permitting an ANIMAL under one's ownership to be sacrificed is not the same as Prajapati's PEOPLE (FAMILY MEMBERS) disowning him. An animal has NO family relationship with humans, and one has to be a moron to believe that the above quotation from the Eitereya Brahman says so.

Further, the reader should know that the above quotation (or even the section) cited by Koshy Abraham, Joseph Padinjarekara, and many others DOES NOT EXIST in Eitereya Brahman. It is a FRAUD! Koshy Abraham is very emphatic in his book (Architect, Page 176) that it is in 6th section. However, there are only 5 sections in Panchika 2, and this is a FALSE citation. More details of this are given in the volume of Deceptions Perpetrated by the Prajapati Proponents. This fraud is emphasized by Hindu writers also who know their own books better than others. Here is what they say:

- That this quotation is false can be understood by merely checking the reference number. The Second Kanda of Eitereya Brahman has only 5 chapters. However, the quotation cited is alleged to be from the NONEXISTENT 6th chapter. (Dr. Krishnarao).

Alleged Sign 11 Of Christ From Vedas: "He suffers in silence" (Point 4 in Padinjarekara, 5 in Koshy Abraham)

Proof/Quotation offered:

Both of the writers quote the same passage from Rigveda, but interpret it differently.

- Padinjarekara: Just as the sacrificial horse is tied to the pole, I am also tied to the pole. I do not want to be rescued. (Rigveda 5:46:1).
- Koshy Abraham: The yoke which brings and takes away the stain of sin, that I bear. I do not want rescue from this yoke.

It is obvious that there is no statement to the effect that "he must suffer in silence". Rather this statement is an artificial derivative from a passage that does not say anything about the presumed Prajapati Sacrifice.

Koshy Abraham goes on to quote Rigveda 1:162:17 to support the statement that he must suffer in silence. Here is the interpretation of the passage:

- When the sacrificial animal being led to the altar cries and hisses and refuses to move, people kick, punch, and beat it with whips.

Several observations can be made. First, this reference has NO reference to the sufferings during sacrifice. Second, this has NO connection with Prajapati. Third, since the animal cries and hisses during this period, it does not match with the statement that he should suffer in "silence". Recognizing this, this is what the Hindu writer says:

- The subject of the quoted sloka (5:46:1) is praise for the God Consciousness in the Universe. Neither this sloka, nor the 10500 slokas stipulate that Prajapati should suffer in silence. (Dr. Krishnarao).

Alleged Sign 12 Of Christ From Vedas: Blood should be shed (Point 6 in Padinjarekara)

Since Christ's blood was shed on the cross, a lot of people are attracted when it is alleged that the Hindu Vedic literature also says the same thing. However, this is a fraudulent claim. The following are the quotations produced by the advocates:

- Padinjarekara quotes the slokas that say that when a tree is cut, sap comes out. When a man is slaughtered, blood comes out. Koshy Abraham also repeats the same ideas and cites Brih. Upanishad, 3:9:28.

It is obvious that they are unable to produce a quotation that says that blood should be shed.

In summary, the Prajapati-Christ story is a big myth. It has been perpetrated by Christians for the last 100 years only because listeners never asked whether these things are so. Here are a few observations that everyone must keep in mind

- Christians implicitly trust when someone makes a truth-claim
- As a result, the Christian community trusted the false claim made by many in the name of Prajapati-Christ-Vedas
- Numerous modern writers took this falsehood and developed it further. This includes people like Dr. Joseph Padinjarekkara, Dr. Koshy Abraham, Arvindaksha Menon, Sadhu Chellappa, Acharya Daya Prakash
- Not a single one of them has been able to show from Vedas the quotations that they use
- Many of the references that they have given have turned out to be non existent, which is deception.
- It is high time for Christians to reject the Prajapati-Vedas-Christ myth and lie



A Statue Of Prajapati: Is He Lord Jesus Christ?