

## AUTHENTICITY OF THE KARTARPURIBIR

Daljeet Singh

Introduction: It is Guru Arjun Dev who made the important and sagacious decision to compile the Adi Granth as the Sikh Scripture so that the spiritual and ideological identity of the Sikh Religion and Panth is established. An additional reason for the Guru to undertake the task was that it had come to his notice that persons outside the Panth were writing devotional hymns and giving them currency as the production of the Gurus. It is a settled and accepted tradition that the Fifth Guru compiled the Adi Granth with Bhai Gurdas as the scribe; and that the original Adi Granth has been present with the Sodhis at Kartarpur. After the study of this *Bir* by Dr Jodh Singh and the publication of his book, *Kartarpuri Bir De Darshan*, it was considered that the authenticity of the *bir* had been firmly established; but some oblique and incorrect observations by McLeod tended to throw doubt on its authenticity. It was, therefore, considered necessary to make a detailed study of the issue after a close examination of the *bir* at Kartarpur. This paper comprises the result of that examination.

Custody: After its preparation, the Bir was installed at Harmandir Sahib, Amritsar, on Bhadon Sudhi 1 Samat 1661. The tradition and historical writing are unanimous that from Amritsar the Adi Granth was shifted to Kartarpur, when the family of the Sixth Guru moved to that place. It is accepted that the original Adi Granth remained with the family of Dhirmal, the great grandson of the Guru, and his descendants at Kartarpur, even after the Gurus had shifted from there. Historical writings are also clear that during the time of the Ninth and the Tenth Gurus, the Adi Granth was with the successors of Dhirmal. For, many copies of the Adi Granth, in which the *Bani* (hymns) of the Ninth Guru had been recorded in the time of the, Ninth or the Tenth Guru, show that those had been corrected by comparison with the Granth of the Fifth Guru<sup>1</sup>. It is not in doubt that all through the subsequent period, the Adi Granth at Kartarpur remained the Granth of reference for authenticating the *bani* of the

Gurus and the *bhagats*<sup>2</sup>. And, it remained in the custody of the Sodhis of Kartarpur. After 1708 AD, the Sikhs passed through an extremely difficult time. In that period, the question of the change of the custody of the Adi Granth could not arise. After Ranjit Singh came into power, he procured this Granth for himself, and kept it with him as a national treasure of the Sikhs. After the British conquest of the Punjab, this *bir* passed into the hands of the Indian Government. Thereafter, this *bir* became the subject of a civil suit and it was restored to the descendants of Dhirmal. Therefore, its custody first with the Sodhis of Kartarpur, then with Ranjit Singh, and again with the Kartarpur family, is an important piece of evidence. Because, the presence and recovery of manuscript, document, or book from its natural and proper custody and environment is a relevant and weighty factor in showing its originality.

Claims of Originality Undisputed: We are not aware of any other copy of the Adi Granth on behalf of which any claim of originality has ever been made. In India where there is an unfortunate tendency to make false claims about the presence of sacred places, scriptures, documents, manuscripts, etc., the singular absence of any claim of originality for any other *Bir* is a very remarkable fact to show that the authenticity of the Kartarpuri Bir has never been in doubt. Before we record the internal evidence showing the authenticity of the *Bir*, we shall indicate the method adopted in writing the Kartarpuri Bir.

Method of Writing: The knowledge of this method is necessary for understanding why the original Adi Granth has certain unusual features and incongruities, and why those could never occur in a Granth which had been copied from the original or another Granth. The *bani* of the Adi Granth has been classified *rag* wise, and in each *rag* the *bani* has been recorded Guruwise, *bhagat bani* being at the end. A particular sequence in regard to *shabads*, *saloks*, *ashtpadis*, *chhants* and *vars* has been observed. In the *bhagat-bani*, the *bani* of Kabir ji comes first, then Namdev ji, and thereafter of *Bhagat Ravi Dass* and others. In order to eliminate any chance of interpolation the couplets or verses (*padas*) have been numbered. In addition, the *sabads*, *saloks*, etc., of a particular Guru or *rag*, have also been numbered serially. Further, reference of these numbers of *sabads* is

given in the table of contents, along with the quotation of the first words of each hymn. Hence, there cannot be any chance of interpolation without its being detected. The scribe had also to devise a method by which the task could be accomplished easily and speedily. It is important to understand that while the *bani* was being recorded in the Granth, the work of the collection of *bani* of the first four Gurus and the *bhagats* was also going on simultaneously. Therefore, the scribe had to take care of two things, first, that an adequate number of leaves was allotted to a particular *rag*, and within a *rag* to each Guru or *bhagat*, so as to enable the scribe to write within the allotted space the related *bani* anticipated to be available. Secondly, the *bani* under each *rag* was being written simultaneously, and, while the *bani* of one Guru, *bhagat*, or author was being collected, it was also being sorted out and recorded separately at appropriate places under each *Rag* in accordance with the set scheme that had been devised. There being a single scribe for this gigantic task, some times this anticipation went wrong, and many of the incongruities, as we shall see, are due to faulty anticipation, or late collection of the *bani*. We also find that the numbering of the leaves of the book had been done in advance. The pages of the Kartarpuri Bir show two things. If the book is opened, the number of the page stands given only to the page on the left hand side; the page facing on the right hand side is deemed to be a part of it. We might call the page on the left 15/1, and the one on the right 15/2. However, in the Kartarpuri Bir, the number given to the page on the left is 15 and not 15/1. Secondly, after making a rough guess about the *bani* likely to be available for each section or *rag*, one or more clusters or bunches of eight or sixteen leaves each, numbered in advance, were allotted for each *rag* or section of the *bani*. And, as and when the *bani*, or part of it, of a particular *rag*, section, Guru, or *bhagat*, was available, it was sorted out and copied at the appropriate place in the concerned packets or sections, in proper sequence. In addition, totals of *padas*, *sabads*, or *saloks* of each Guru or the totals of *sabads* of each *rag* are also given. We shall hereafter record pieces of internal evidence into two parts: (i) those that are individually conclusive, and (ii) those that are, coupled with other evidence, conclusive in showing the authenticity of the *bir*.

Individually Conclusive Factors: (1) The *Japu* of Guru Nanak was recorded by the Fourth Guru. In practically all the handwritten *birs* the practice was to record either the words *Japu Nisan*", or "Copy of the Copy of the *Japu* recorded by Guru Ram Dass." If the *bir* was a third copy of the original *bir* of the fifth Guru, it would say "Copy of the copy of the copy of the *Japu* recorded by Guru Ram Dass." As the Fourth Guru was the person who collected and wrote the *Japu*, and the Fifth Guru was the first person to compile the *Adi Granth* and *copy Japu* therein, in the *Kartarpuri Bir* alone it is written "Copy of the *Japu* recorded in the hand of Guru Ram Dass." No other *bir* records these words, for, Bhai Gurdas was the first person to copy the *Japu* from the collection and writing by the Fourth Guru.

(2) Secondly, in this *bir* at page 45 the dates of the demise of the first four Gurus alone, are with the same pen and ink, and in the hand of the original scribe of the *bir*. The date of the demise of the Fifth Guru is in the hand of the original scribe but with a different pen and shade of ink. No other *bir* fulfils this test. It is also very significant that while writing the dates of the demise of the first four Gurus, the day of the week is not mentioned. But in the case of the Fifth Guru, apart from the date, the day of the week is also mentioned although the scribe is the same. This shows clearly that the date of demise of the Fifth Guru was written by Bhai Gurdas on a later day, otherwise, had all the five dates been written at one time, either the day would have been mentioned in all the cases or been absent from all the five entries.

(3) Thirdly, the words, "*Sudh*" or "*Sudh Keeche*" ("It is correct" or "correct it") appear at so many places in the *bir*. These are supposed to be in the hand of the Fifth Guru, since these are in a different hand and not in the hand of the scribe of the *bir*, and the handwriting of these marginal observations resembles the handwriting of the *nishan* of the Fifth Guru in the *bir*. These words appear in other handwritten *birs* as well. But those are in the same hand as that of the scribe of the concerned *bir*, showing that the *bir* is a copy and not the original.

(4) The historical writings of Bhai Santokh Singh, Bhai Gurdas, Gur Bilas Chhevin Patshahi and others<sup>3</sup> and the tradition assert that the Fifth Guru completed the *Adi Granth* in *Bhadon Samat 1661*. The *Kartarpuri Bir* is the only *bir* which records that it was completed

in Bhadon 1661 "*Samat 1661 Miti Bhadon Vadi ekam 1 pothi likh pouhnche*". There is no handwritten *bir* the record of which claims the same to have been completed on Bhadon Samat 1661 or near about. In fact, this dated volume being the earliest, it is a good piece of evidence not only to show the authenticity of the Kartarpuri Bir, but also to fix the date of the preparation of the *Bir* by the Fifth Guru.

(5) We have explained the method of allotment of clusters of paper for a *raag* or a section of the Granth. For the expeditious completion of the work the adoption of this method was natural and necessary, especially when the work of copying and the collection of *bani* from different sources was going on side by side. This prior allotment of pages for a section had to be very liberal, so as to ensure that the available *bani* did not exceed the allotted space, nor thereby upset the entire system and sequence of *raags* and sections. But, evidently, this liberal allotment of leaves, based on rough anticipation of the *bani* likely to be available, was, in practice, bound to lead to a large number of pages remaining blank between different sections of the Adi Granth. And, this is what has exactly happened in the case of the Kartarpuri Bir. The total numbered leaves of the Kartarpuri Granth are 974, comprising 1948 pages. Of these pages, 453 are entirely blank, hundreds of other pages are partly blank, and considering that a fully utilised page accommodates 24 lines, the total space available on these partly blank pages comes up to another 133 full pages. Thus, of the total 1948 pages of this volume, the space of 586 of them remained unused. It is evident that this state of affairs could arise only in the originally written Adi Granth; it could never happen in an Adi Granth which had been copied from the original. It is a fact that writers like Jodh Singh, Harbhajan Singh and others, who have seen numerous handwritten *birs*, state that none of the old handwritten *birs* contains so many blank pages or spaces. Obviously, in a copy, the very question of hundreds of pages being left blank does not arise, especially when it is copied by a single scribe. Because, in such a case the copyist has the entire material, ready and in proper sequence, before him for being copied out. The Banno Bir which is supposed to be a copy of it, has only 467 folios. It is, therefore, out of the question that the Kartarpuri Bir with 974 folios could be a copy of a Granth which had material that could be accommodated in about

467 folios. Generally, all the old handwritten *birs*, including the Kartarpuri Bir, are in one hand. Therefore, this internal evidence in the Kartarpuri Bir is both incontrovertible and singly conclusive to show its originality.

(6) There are many *sabads of bani* which have been originally written twice, but later this duplication has either been erased by "Hartal" (a chemical used in those days to remove the writing), or scored out with observations in the margin that the *sabad* was a duplication. In a copied *bir* this duplication could never arise. This could happen only in the original in which case either the scribe himself or the compiler has on revision found the error and got the same removed by scoring out the duplicate *sabad* or *salok*. This duplication has happened at pages 96/2, 186/2, 483/1, 511/1, 550/2, 836/1, 943/2, etc. Thus these duplications too are conclusive to prove its authenticity.

(7) There is another set of corrected incongruities which shows conclusively the authenticity of the Kartarpuri Bir. At page 778/1 there is a marginal note that *salok* No. 22 of *mahila I* which is recorded at page 799, and is correct, should be read there at that page after *salok* No. 21. It is also indicated at this page 778/1 that *salok* "Maru Mahila 3" "Agam Agochar Veparwahe" which is there on this page, should be read at page 788. Further, at page 788 there is a corresponding note that the 23rd *salok* of *Mahila 3* "Agam Agochar VeParwahe" which is at page 778, should be read there. At page 799/2 *Maru Mahila 1*, the *Salok* of which the correct place is at page 778, after *salok* No. 21 of *mahila 1*, stands recorded. Now, these inadvertent incongruities are such as could not be rectified except by cross-references, especially as *salok of mahila 3* is long, and could not be accommodated in the margin at page 788, nor could *Maru Mahila 1* at page 799/2 be accommodated at page 778 and scored out at page 799/2. In the *tatkara* (contents of *saloks* and *sabads*) too, these incongruities are reflected but rectified. At page 16/1 of the *tatkara* the first lines of all the *saloks of mahila* are written with their serial number 1 to 21. But in the margin, against *salok* No. 21 of *mahila 1*, the first line of *salok* "Kudrat Kamehar Aparar" of *mahila 1*, is vertically recorded. Its number is noted as No.22 and page as 799.

Further, at page 16/1 of the *Tatkara*, since in the text *salok* of *mahila 3 "Agam Agochar Veparwahe"*, actually but incongruously, starts at page 778 immediately after *salok* No. 21 of *mahila 1*, its reference number and the first line of the *sabad* are recorded in the beginning, but its number is correctly given as *salok* No. 23 of *mahila 3*. Again, at this page 16/1 after the number and the first line of *salok* No. 22 of *mahila 3*, appears the number and line of *salok* 24 of *mahila 3*. This is so, because in the actual *text*, *salok* No. 23 of *mahila 3* comes between *salok* 21 of *mahila 1* and *salok* No. 1 of *mahila 3* at page 778, and not between *salok* Nos. 22 and 24 of *mahila 3* at page 788. Another important feature of this page 16/1 of the *tatkara* is that the original *salok* numberings of the first 23 *saloks* of *mahila 3* on this page, have been rubbed with Hartal, and thereafter, these very 23 *saloks* have been renumbered, the first one as 23, and the remaining 22 numbers as 1 to 22. This clearly shows that originally the incongruity in the placement of *salok* 23 of *mahila 3* and *salok* No. 22 of *mahila 1* that occurred in the text, was actually reflected in the *tatkara* by the scribe. But, when the out-of-sequence placements of these *saloks* were later detected at the time of supervision or otherwise, the incongruities in the text were rectified by giving cross-references in the margin of the text at the appropriate pages, and, errors in the *tatkara* were corrected by rubbing with Hartal the numbers of the first 23 *saloks* of *mahila 3* and renumbering them as 23 and 1 to 22 of *mahila 3*, and, in the case of *salok* No. 22 of *mahila 1*, by writing its page and number correctly in the margin of page 16/1.

We have detailed these connected sets of corrections in the text and *tatkara* because these incongruities could happen only at the time of the original writing and never in the case of copying from the original text compiled by the Fifth Guru. It is also important to mention that on examination no other *bir* has revealed this set of incongruities at pages 778, 788 and 799 of the text and in the corresponding portions of *tatkara*. By itself, this set of corrections alone, is conclusive in proving the authenticity of the Kartarpuri Bir.

(8) Here we shall record a number of other corrected mistakes which in their character, implication and importance, are similar to the ones described under item (7) above, (a) At page 804/2 it is recorded in the margin that instead of the 21st *Pauri*, 22nd has been

written. Correspondingly, on page 805/1 there is a note in the margin that the *Pauri* there should be sung and written as 21st *Pauri*. This error of sequence could never occur in a copy.

(b) There are numerous instances where *sabads*, *saloks* and a part of the *bani*, have been written in the margin, evidently, because in each case the *bani* appears to have been found or collected later, and there being no place on the relevant page, it had to be recorded in the margin. In some cases the *bani* has been given the proper serial number and the numbers of the subsequent *bani* adjusted. But, in some cases numbers following them have remained uncorrected, and the *bani* in the margin has been given the same number as the *salok* or *sabad* after which it has to be read. These incongruities are so large in numbers and the *bani* has been written in the margin at so many places that all this could happen only in the original, because either of the late collection of the *bani*, or the scribe, Bhai Gurdas, having omitted to record it in its right sequence or place. For example, at page 154/2, 252/1, 364/1, 694/1, 945, 182, 946/1, 148/2, 374/2, etc. additional *bani* has been written in the margins. At pages 940/1, 940/2, etc. the *bani* recorded in the margins has been given the same number as borne by one of the *sabad* on the page. Again, on page 251/1, 265/2, 266/2, 399/2, 252/1, 499/2, 689/2, 690/1, 842/2, 841/2, etc., portions of the *bani* have been written in the margin, and a mark given at the relevant place on the page to show where the marginal portion should be read.

(c) We know that at the end of each *sabad* or *salok* the total of *padas*, the total of *sabads* of each Guru, total of *sabads* of each *rag*, etc., have been recorded. The number of *mahila* is also invariably given in addition. But, in the Kartarpuri Bir in scores of cases the number, totals, etc., were missed originally, but were written later in small letters, either in between or above the lines, or in the margins, e.g., this has happened at pages 154/2, 164/2, 174/1, 240/2, 257/1, 267/1, 269/1, 270/1, 270/2, 399/1, 455/2, 802, etc. Apart from that, in quite a number of cases, these totals have not been given or given incompletely. This incongruity and its rectification, as mentioned above, are very common. There is a very clear reason for this feature of the Kartarpuri Bir. As the job of the collection of *bani* and its recording was being done simultaneously, the scribe was never sure

weather more *sabads* or *bani* of a Guru, requiring precedence of sequence over the *sabads of bani* already written, would or would not be available. As such, he had, as a necessary precaution, and in order to avoid repeated scoring out and alterations of the totals, to leave the work of totalling to a later date. Therefore, this task of recording the totals had to be done as one of the last jobs to be completed. Perforce, the totals had to be squeezed in between or above the lines in small sized figures or in the margins. But such a position, too, could never arise in a copied Granth, where the numbering would be complete and form a part of the line itself. The scribe could never fail to copy or record them in appropriate lines, even if in the original the numberings had been missing or been recorded in between or above the lines. In the other handwritten *birs* these incongruities do not occur. Even in the Banno Bir totals are given in the lines themselves. Hence this feature of the Kartarpuri Bir, especially the large number in which these incongruities or omissions appear, prove its authenticity and originality.

(d) There is another kind of discrepancy in the serial-wise numbring. On a number of pages the *bani* or the *sabad* has been scored out or removed by the use of Hartal. But, the old serial numbering has remained uncorrected, e.g. this has happened at pages 186/2 and 970/1. In some cases, the incongruity even stands reflected in the *tatkara*, because as the numbering has remained uncorrected in the Granth, it could evidently not be corrected in the *tatkara* which records only the state of numbering or sequence in the Granth, e.g., mention of *salok* number 94/1 in the *tatkara* at page 7 has been scored out, and the numbering of subsequent references stands uncorrected. The large number of cancellations and uncorrected numberings in this *bir* prove its originality, since such a state could never occur in a copy.

(e) As noted already, within the *bani* of a *rag* or section, the sequence of *sabads* or *saloks* is Guruwise. After it, normally comes the *bani* of Kabir ji, Namdev ji, Ravi Dass ji and then of other *bhagats*. But, the sources of the *bani* of *Bhagat* Kabir and other *bhagats* being quite scattered, its collection and selection for incorporation in the Granth must have taken quite long, since the same involved, in the case of each part, a scrutiny and decision by the Guru himself. The

result was that in many instances the *bani* of *Bhagat Kabir*, appears in between, and that also not at one place, or after the recorded *bani* of *Bhagat Namdev*. It might be argued that such an abnormal sequence being in the original, it would also be there in a copy of it; and that therefore, the Kartarpuri Bir cannot claim any originality on this account. But, it is significant that the *bani* of *Bhagat Kabir*, which is not in proper sequence has, evidently, been written on different occasions. This is clear from the fact that although the writing of these hymns is by the same scribe, in each case the writing differs in the size and shape of letters and the shade of ink. Had the Kartarpuri Bir been a copy, these differences in the shades of ink and the size of the letters that are there, could not have occurred, even though the break in sequence would have been there, because of the corresponding break being present in the original, e.g., pages 842/2, 810/1, and 863/2, although the scribe is the same, the shades of ink and size of writing are different even in the case of the *bani* of the same *bhagat* or Guru. Therefore, while variations in sequence can be explained, variations in pens, shades of ink, and size of letter of the *bani* of the same *Bhagat*, cannot be explained in a continuous writing, except on the assumption that the Kartarpuri Bir is the original and that these variations occurred because of the variant timings of collection, selection and recording of the *bani* of a particular *bhagat*. Besides, because of this\* non-continuous writing of *bhagat bani*, the totals of the *sabads* of a *bhagat* have not been given as has been done in other cases. The fact is that in the Kartarpuri Bir, the *bani* of *Bhagat Kabir*, and even some other *bani*, when found and selected later, have not at many places been recorded in the normal serial sequence of the *bir*. But, these hymns have been written wherever space was available, and even in the margin, or between the *bani* of other *bhagats*, e.g. at pages 885/2 and 945/1. But, the shades of ink and pens used for such *bani*, are different, showing clearly variant times of its original collection and recording in the Kartarpuri Bir.

(f) Another feature of the Kartarpuri Bir is the scores of pages where the original writing has been obliterated by Hartal, and later at those very places *bani* has been written. Sometimes the space accommodating a whole *sabad* or hymn, has been cleaned with Hartal and new *bani* rewritten at the place, e.g. at pages 840/1, 870/2, 966/1,

and 966/2. Had the Kartarpuri Bir been a copy of the original, such a large number of places requiring the need of scoring out or rubbing or cleaning with *hartal* could never have arisen.

(g) Another significant feature of the Kartarpuri Bir is that at numerous places the headings and words like "*Ek Onkar*" or the "*mahila*", or name of the *raag*, are written, but below these headings there is no *bani* or *sabad* and the place is blank. This is there at pages 279/2, 297/2, 248/1, 528/1, 520/2, 348/1, 468/2, 607/2, 617/1 and 621/2. This writing of the heading like *mahila*, *raag*, etc., by the scribe clearly indicates that it was thought that the *bani* of that Guru or *bhagat* would be available for being written there, but actually it was either not available or not approved by the Fifth Guru. In a mere copy of the Adi Granth, such a thing could never happen, because where the original has no *bani* the question of recording the heading of a *sabad* or *bani* could never arise. Such recording of headings only, without being followed by related *bani*, is not present in any other handwritten *bir*. It is also significant to mention that almost all these headings relate to the Fifth Guru who was alive at that time, e.g. pages 297/2, 248/1, 348/1, 418/2, 469/2, 528/1, 530/2, 607/2, 610/2, 617/1 and 621/2. Presumably, Bhai Gurdas' anticipation was that more *sabads* of the Guru were likely to be available under those *raags*. This is also an important feature to suggest the originality of the Kartarpuri Bir. Because in a copy the coincidence of all these extra or lone headings, involving unfulfilled anticipation, relating mostly to the Fifth or the living Guru could not arise.

(9) Other Important Factors: (a) The originality of the Kartarpuri Bir is also established by the *nishan* or mark of the Fifth Guru. This mark in those days meant, according to the accepted practice and tradition, the writing of *Mool Mantra* of the Japuji in the hand of the Guru, the Fifth Guru in this case. This *nishan* appears at page 29/1 of the *bir*. As a mark of adoration the page has been profusely decorated. The presence of the *nishan* of the Fifth Guru is also noted in the *tatkara*.

(b) At page 415/1 in the margin are written the words meaning, "The *sabad* is right". This *sabad* does not find mention in the *tatkara*. But, this observation in the margin shows that for this *bir*, there was a supervisor, other than the scribe, who alone could record such an

observation of approval regarding the *sabad* on the page. The observation shows the original character of the Kartarpuri Bir. Otherwise, if the *bir* had been copied from another *bir*, the question of such an observation by the scribe or some other person, would not arise.

(c) In the *tatkara* of *sabads* only the references of *sabads* 1 to 58 of *Ramkali Mahila 5* are given. But on page 681/2 of the *bir*, which starts with *Sabad* 59 of *Ramkali Mahila 5* and ends with *sabad* 60 of *Ramkali Mahila 5*, two additional *Sabads* of the Fifth Guru are written. Both these *Sabads* are in a different hand from that of the scribe and their reference in the *tatkara* of *sabads* is missing. This means that these two *sabads* were added or got added by the compiler. Here again, the absence of the reference of these two *sabads* in the *tatkara*, and their text being in a different hand from that of the original scribe, suggest that this feature could only be in the original and not in a copy. Because in the copy all the 1 to 60 *sabads* would normally be in the same hand. Similarly, *Ramkali Mahila 5 chhand* No. 21 has no reference in the *tatkara*, but the *chhand* is present at its proper place, although it is in a different hand. This, too, supports the earlier inference drawn in the case of *sabads* 59 and 60. In both cases the *bani* being of the Fifth Guru, it is very likely that he created it after 1604 AD, and got it added at the appropriate places in the *Adi Granth*. The position is similar in the case of *Basant ki Var* composed by the Fifth Guru, This *var* is recorded on page 854/2 in the middle of this page. But, there is no reference of this *var* in the *tatkara*, showing that the Fifth Guru composed it and got it included after *Bhadon* 1604 AD. Hence, it could not find mention in the *tatkara* that stood already completed. It is significant that in all other handwritten *birs*, including the *Banno Bir*, reference of the *var* is present in the *tatkara*.

(d) At page 540 of the *bir* the *nishan* of the Sixth Guru is present. Its presence is also mentioned in the *tatkara*. In the circumstances of the case, this is a very significant and natural thing to do. During the time of the Fifth Guru it had become abundantly clear that *Guru Hargobind* would succeed him. In fact, from the very start the Sixth Guru was associated with the task of the collection of the *bani* and preparation of the *Scripture*. Some writers have even suggested that some of the *dhunnis* were recorded by the Sixth Guru.

They derive this inference from the fact that it is in the Kartarpuri Bir alone that we observe the *dhunnis* of some *vars* recorded in a different hand, or in small letters in between or above the normal lines. In other copies of the Granth, including the Banno Bir, these have been written in the lines and in the same manner as the *bani* itself. It evidently suggests that in the Kartarpuri Bir the *dhunnis* were written on some later date, and presumably at the instance of the Sixth Guru.

(10) Conclusion from Internal Evidence: We have detailed above the various pieces and types of internal evidence, most of which are individually and incontrovertibly conclusive in proving that the Kartarpuri Bir is the original Adi Granth, compiled by the Fifth Guru in 1604 AD. The other pieces of evidence, we have recorded are cumulatively, or coupled with other evidence, equally conclusive in proving the authenticity of the Kartarpuri Bir to be the original production of the Fifth Guru.

In sum, our analysis and examination of the *bir*, the available material on the subject, and the statements of various authors lead us to the conclusion that the Kartarpuri Bir is incontrovertibly the authentic Adi Granth prepared by the Fifth Guru.

#### REFERENCES

1. Sahib Singh " : "Adi Bir Bare", pp. 168,197;  
Harbhajan Singh : "Gurbani Sampadan Nimai", pp. 137,160.
2. Harbhajan Singh : "Gurbani Sampadan Nimai", pp. 130-131,135,  
137-140.
3. Sahib Singh : op. cit., pp. 119-122.

**Note:** We have published this article from the book, Advanced Studies in Sikhism, so that the reader may see our criticism of Pashaura Singh and Piar Singh in its proper perspective.

Editor

