

THE HISTORICAL IDENTITY OF **DASAM GRANTH**

By Jagjit Singh

From Abstract of Sikh Studies, July 1994

The first and foremost prerequisite for the historical study of a document is to verify its identity and validity. For, otherwise, if the foundation becomes questionable, the superstructure built upon it automatically loses its validity. So, let us begin with the **history** of the origin of the earliest *birs* (original manuscripts) of '**Dasam Granth**'.

1. **HISTORY** OF THE BIRS

Gyani Gyan Singh has given in his 'Panth Parkash' (published by Bhasha Vibhag, Punjab, 1977) recognition to four *birs* (pp. 321- 322), and Mahan Kosh, out of these four, to two (p. 616). These four are: First one associated with the name of Bhai Mani Singh, second deposited at present in Gurdwara Moti Patiala, third deposited in the Dewan Khana, Sangrur, and the fourth deposited in Gurdwara Janam Asthan, Patna.

Dr Ratan Singh Jaggi is the only scholar who claims to have examined these four *birs* from the point of view of probing their **history** and origin. He has examined many other *birs*, besides these four, but he does not consider them to be very old. (**Dasam Granth**, Karitartav, p. 91). Hence, we will confine our examination to the four *birs* listed above.

The first *bir*, associated with the name of Bhai Mani Singh, was in the custody of Raja Gulab Singh (Hanuman Road, New Delhi), when Dr Jaggi interviewed him on 5. 12. 1959. According to Raja Singh, some armyman (*sainik*) happened to get this *bir* in the loot, when Multan was conquered by Maharaja Ranjit Singh in 1818 A.D. Afterwards, this *sainik* was one of the contingent of 800 men the Maharaja sent to Hyderabad (Deccan), and the *sainik* took the *bir* along with him. He and his descendants came to settle permanently at Hazur Sahib (Deccan), and the *bir* remained with them till Raja Gulab Singh bought it from them in 1944-45 (Karitartav, p. 92).

The original source of the second *bir* (i.e., of Gurdwara Moti Bagh) is traced by Gyani Gyan Singh to Bhai Sukha Singh, *granthi* of Gurdwara Patna. According to his Panth Parkash (pp. 321-322), Bhai Sukha Singh composed, or compiled, or created (*rachi*) this *bir* in Samat 1832 (1775 A.D.). Afterwards, his son Charat Singh added five leaves to it, imitating the hand-writing of Guru Gobind Singh. He claimed these leaves to be Guru's own handwriting just for the sake of monetary considerations. From Charat Singh this *bir* passed on to Baba Hakim Singh, and from Hakim Singh to Gurdwara Moti Bagh.

One 85 year old Bedi Natha Singh, who claimed to be a descendant of Baba Hakim Singh, and a resident of village Raghu Majra (Patiala), told Dr Jaggi in October 1959 that it was in fact Nahar Singh who got the *bir* from Charat Singh, and presented it to Maharaja Ranjit Singh. Ranjit Singh got the *bir* installed in a private gurdwara, and put Nahar Singh in charge of it. On the death of the Maharaja, Nahar Singh brought the *bir* to his home, from where it passed on to Baba Hakim Singh, who was the son-in-law of Nahar Singh and a grandson of Charat Singh. Baba Hakim Singh presented the *bir* to Maharaja Mahinder Singh of Patiala (1862-1876 A.D.). The Maharaja got the *bir* installed in Gurdwara Moti Bagh (Karitartav, p. 94). The story has no corroborative evidence whatsoever.

All the information Dr Jaggi could get about the third important *bir*, which is in the custody of Dewan Khana, Sangrur, was from *granthi* Bhai Nandan Singh. He told Dr Jaggi that this *bir* was presented to Maharaja Sarup Singh of Jind (1837-1864 A.D.) by a Pathan at Delhi in 1857, when the Maharaja helped the British in the mutiny (Karitartav, p. 95). The *bir* has no earlier **history**.

The fourth important *bir* is stored, along with some other *birs*, in the store-house attached to Gurdwara Janam Asthan, Patna (Bihar). Nobody was able to give any information regarding the **history** of this *bir* there (Karitartav, p. 97).

These stories about the **history** of the four *birs* are just cock and bull stories. How did a val-

document, such as the *bir* associated with the name of Bhai Mani Singh, come to be in Multan in 1818 when this place was, at that time, far away from the centres of Sikh culture or political power? Similarly, did the *bir*, at present at Sangrur, come to be in the possession of a Pathan (and not a Sikh) in far off 1857 A.D.? Apart from this, these stories about the **history** of the four *birs* can by no means be regarded as reliable historical evidence.

What is very significant is what these stories, relating to the **history** of the two important *birs* with, in the case of the first one, with the conquest of Multan in 1818 A.D., and in the case of the third the Mutiny of 1857 A.D. As Bhai Mani Singh was martyred in 1734 A.D., the supposed compilation of Dasam Granth by him could not have been completed later than that period. This leaves a time-gap of at least 83 and 120 years between the time of the sudden discovery at odd places, of the first and third *birs*, respectively, and the period of Bhai Mani Singh. How is it that these documents, which the Sikh society should have had if they been genuine, remained unknown and unnoticed for so long? In any case, there is no historical evidence available to trace the 'missing link'.

2. HISTORICITY OF DASAM GRANTH

The historicity of Dasam Granth, is also non-existent. The only source-material relating to Dasam Granth is Sikh literature. And the contemporary and near-contemporary Sikh literature of the period of Guru Gobind Singh (Sri Gur Sobha, Parchian Sewa Das, Koer Singh's Gurbilas Patshahi Das) does not mention Dasam Granth or any like literature of the Guru period at all. It is only in the Sikh literature of the post-Guru period one comes across sketchy references to some compositions of the time of the Tenth Guru. See Bhai Mani Singh's Letter.

Chronologically, the so-called letter of Bhai Mani Singh to Mataji is the first document which has been given importance by some scholars for connecting the compilation of Dasam Granth with the name of Bhai Mani Singh. This letter could not have been written earlier than 1716 A.D., as it mentions the rumour of Bhai Mani Singh having escaped from custody. For he was arrested and executed in that year.

Dr Jaggi has given solid reasons for suspecting this letter to be fake. In all the Gurmukhi prose of that period (e.g., the *Hukamnamas* of Guru Gobind Singh and Banda), words constituting a sentence are joined together, without leaving blank spaces between them. And, this method of writing continued to be followed right upto 1867 A.D., as shown by a copy of the newspaper 'Akhbar Sri Darbar Sahib' published in that year. But the words in the so-called letter of Bhai Mani Singh are not joined together, and are separated by blank spaces. Also, as Dr Jaggi has discussed in detail, the shape of letters and the liberal use of *bind* in the Gurmukhi script in the letter are different from the writings of Bhai Mani Singh's period. This clearly shows that the so-called letter of Bhai Mani Singh is forged, and it was so done at a much later period than 1867 A.D. (for details, see Karitartav pp. 38-45). Secondly, the letter is a clear fake attempt to associate Bhai Mani Singh's name with Charitro Pakhyan. For, it is unthinkable that a learned Sikh like Bhai Mani Singh would send Charitro Pakhyan to Mataji, as it is a document which Sikhs are reluctant to read or recite in the presence of a *sangat*.

Bansavalinama.

The second document of note is 'Bansavalinama Dasan Patshahian Ka' written by Kesar Singh Chhibber, who completed his work in 1779 A.D., i.e., 71 years after the demise of Guru Gobind Singh and 45 years after the martyrdom of Bhai Mani Singh (edited by Dr Jaggi, pp. 135-136). Chhibber tells us that Guru Gobind Singh composed, 'Samund Sagar *Granth*', and that this *granth* was consigned to the waters of the river in Samat 1758. '*Samat Saturan Sai Athwanje so granth jee nadi pavaia*'. He further tells that the Guru Gobind Singh composed another *granth* 'Avtar Leela' and the packets (*sanchian*) of this *granth* were scattered to the winds due to warfare. '*Khind gaian, judh larai Karke Kidhre Kidhre so gaian*'. He also adds that Bhai Mani Singh collected the Avtar Leela *Granth* in 1782 Samat (1725 A.D.). It is a clear self-contradiction of Chhibber that what was completely lost or scattered, Bhai Mani Singh could bring intact again in 1725 A.D., about 57 decades later, especially when there is historically no trace of it for a century thereafter.

Statements of Chhibber cannot at all be considered historical evidence. Besides, his work is written 71 years from the period of the Tenth Guru by 71 years; and from that of Bhai Mani Singh by at least 45 years, more. Evidently, his work rests, not on any historical basis, but on hearsay, as he himself admits at several places in his accounts. He writes in the very beginning (p. 1) that his account is based on what he has heard and, what he he remembered. '*Suni Sunai bolke joi rahi hai yad*'. Again "That story I had heard, I have

incorporated into my book for my own entertainment". '*Soi Kahani Suni Sunai, apni sauk nal pothi ha*. How can such memory or record be taken to be reliable. He was over 70 years old when he completed and, has, according to authorities, made clear mistakes in the dates he records. (Karitartav, pp. 28-29)

However, we will point out an implication which Chhibber's account leads to. He says that the *Vidya Sagar Granth* which Guru Gobind Singh composed was thrown into a rivulet in his life time, and that the *granth* was scattered to different places due to warfare. If that is so, what is the historical evidence to what the previous literature exactly related to, or, who were its authors? Could it be imagined that literature been of any importance to Sikhs, it would have been thrown in a river? Therefore there is no validity to link the literature of the period of Guru Gobind Singh with that of the post-Guru period.

Other Documents.

The third document we need mention is *Mehma Parkash* (1800 A.D.). However, it does not go telling that *granth* named *Vidya Sagar* was compiled at the time of Guru Gobind Singh, and names so many poets whose compositions were included in it.

Besides these three documents we have noted above, there are '*Guru Partap Suraj*', by Bhai Mani Singh (1843 A.D.), '*Panth Parkash*', by Gyani Gyan Singh (1930 A.D.) and *Mahan Kosh* (1930 A.D.). They should not even be taken into account, as they belong to a very late period, and appear to only reiterate, in one way or other, what had been written earlier.

CONCLUSION

The origin and history of the earliest available *birs* of Dasam Granth besides being unknown, is highly suspect. The history of the compilation of '*Dasam Granth*', as one volume, is equally unknown. As we go back to the beginning, if the foundation becomes questionable, the superstructure built upon it automatically loses its validity.

There is no historical evidence for linking the Dasam Granth in its present form, either with the *Dasam Granth* of Master, or with the literature thrown or lost, or with the name of Bhai Mani Singh, or with any known material existing for over a century before it. The recent story of a *granth* presented by the Tenth Master, whose existence, is also of the same brand. For, it has been now introduced three centuries after the alleged