

Review Article**Reflections on *Prem Sumārag*****W. H. McLeod***University of Dunedin, Otago*


---

W. H. McLeod, *Prem Sumārag*, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2006), 129pp. (hb) Rs. 450 ISBN 978-0-19-567150-0.

---

In 2006 Oxford University Press in New Delhi published my English translation from Punjabi of *Prem Sumārag*.<sup>1</sup> The sub-title of the work, *The Testimony of a Sanatan Sikh*, indicated that *Prem Sumārag* expressed a view of the Khalsa which was clearly Sanatan. It was, in other words, a 'traditional' notion of the Sikh faith, assuming an inclusive view which accepted a wide range of beliefs, particularly those drawn from popular Hindu convention and practice. Composed at some time in the late eighteenth century it affirmed concepts that were very different from those which were to be enunciated by the Tat Khalsa in the early years of the twentieth century. The Tat Khalsa was the radical view of the Singh Sabha, soon to be acknowledged by a large majority of educated Sikhs as truly the voice of the Guru. It by contrast is strictly exclusive, declaring that Sikhs emphatically are not Hindus.

*Prem Sumārag* is a *rahit-nama*, a manual which decrees the code of belief and discipline required of all initiated Sikhs. It is, however, a very different kind of manual from most other *rahit-namas* of the eighteenth century. Whereas other *rahit-namas* of that period were generally brief works written in a highly economic style *Prem Sumārag* was composed in a relaxed and expansive mode, most features being spelt out in detail. In this respect it bears an obvious resemblance to the *rahit-nama* of Chaupa Singh, the only other eighteenth-century work enunciating a view of the *Rahit* which was written in this style.<sup>2</sup>

The translating of this work had occupied me intermittently ever since 1978, yet even after such a lengthy period of gestation I continued to reflect on the work after it was published and to discover fresh features of which I was unaware when I submitted the text for publication. Since the book appeared four issues have emerged. These involve either new material that has come to light or they require a lengthier explanation of what was perhaps a little too briefly expressed in the published version.

**1. The dating of *Prem Sumārag***

The first of these issues concerns the date when *Prem Sumārag* was first recorded. It is still not possible to determine the exact date and it seems highly

unlikely that this can ever be achieved. The period can, however, be determined. In *Sikhs of the Khalsa* I expressed the view that the dating of the work was located in the first half of the nineteenth century, the middle or the later years of Ranjit Singh's reign.<sup>3</sup> This has proved to be incorrect. In the introduction to *Prem Sumārag* I acknowledged this and expressed the hesitant view that the work was probably first recorded in the eighteenth century.<sup>4</sup> This hesitant view should be converted into a positive fact. Later in this article I shall be referring to a translation of *Prem Sumārag* by John Leyden's which was made in or before 1809. This work strongly encourages the belief of a pre-1800 recording and other internal features make it certain that the date was in fact before 1800.

The actual period within the eighteenth century remains a matter for debate. I still regard it as being the later eighteenth century as opposed to Professor Grewal's view that it probably belongs to the early part of the century, though one hesitates to disagree with him.<sup>5</sup> My view does, however, firmly disagree with the opinion of Kahn Singh and Teja Singh, both of whom placed *Prem Sumārag* in the nineteenth century.<sup>6</sup> This is definitely mistaken. Their opinion, it seems, was governed by their resolute allegiance to the ideals of the Tat Khalsa. *Prem Sumārag*, they would have maintained, contains procedures which in their view would never have been upheld by Khalsa Sikhs of the eighteenth century. It was only as Gurmat declined in the nineteenth century and produced those Hinduised practices which were followed by the Sanatan Sikhs of the pre-Singh Sabha period that *Prem Sumārag* could have been written. This may or may not have been the reason why they declared the date to be in the early nineteenth century. Their conclusion was, however, clearly a mistaken view.

## 2. The Gul-shasatr: a martial symbol of the eighteenth-century Khalsa

Certain sections of *Prem Sumārag* were very difficult to translate, particularly parts of the eighth chapter which is headed 'The pattern of political conduct'. One such passage was a portion of chapter 8:17, the description of the gul-shasatr, and this I translated as follows. Footnotes have been added to explain terms which in the published version would have been covered by references in the preceding text.

For the commanders of 2000 to 5000 [cavalry] the symbols of authority are as follows. A commander of 2000 [men receives] a weapon called a *gul-shasatr*. What is a *gul-shasatr*? It is that weapon which everyone wields - a dagger (*katĒa'ri*'), a knife (*chhuri*'), a poniard (*jamadār*), a sword (*kripān*), a bow and quiver (*kamān tarakas*), a curved dagger (*bānk*), a shield (*dhāl*). All these unsheathed weapons are strung out below it. What is the form of a *gul-shasatr*? First, heat its four feet underneath as with an oil lamp. Then apply wool to it so that like a lampstand a staff may stand up [in it]. All four feet should be six girah long transverse [and] three or four girah [long].<sup>7</sup> The staff, about one-and-a-half or two gaz in length, should stand between these feet,

each of which should measure four girah round.<sup>8</sup> Two staves, each one-and-a-quarter gaz long, [should support it], and in the middle should be a hole into which the staff should be affixed, projecting upwards like a spinning-wheel. Affix it from east to west, from north to south, and from top to bottom. Fasten the legs at intervals of six girah above each other. Then on those big staves, on the top of which are affixed the small staves, fix them transversely at distances of a gaz in length. Let there be five symbols of authority. Up to the fifth there are four symbols, each marked by a staff. Each symbol should be a staff four girah less [than the last one]. On top of the gul-shasatr construct a large lion, four girah high and six or seven girah in length. Above it [mounted on the lion], construct a model of the immortal and supremely brave Bhavani Devi.<sup>9</sup>

On top of those staves that stand symbolically on all four sides, make small lions with lightly armed warriors sitting on each. Under those lions put hinges on all four sides. Taking the lions where the staves are transverse put three hinges all facing the same way to hang a sword. Fix four hinges underneath the large lion, which is at the end. And above it, where the idol is, place an umbrella. In this way is a gul-shasatr constructed. 4.

The commander of 2000 [cavalry] should receive one gul-shasatr of unsheathed weapons with the shield and the quiver in a scabbard. All [other] weapons should be unsheathed - three jamadar-barchhe<sup>10</sup> and four kripan-barchhe.<sup>11</sup> These are symbols of authority. 5.

The commander of 3000 [cavalry should receive] two gul-shasatr - one of unsheathed weapons and the other of sheathed stabbing weapons - four jamadar-barachhe and five kripan-barachhe. 6.

The commander of 4000 [cavalry should receive] three gulshasatr - one of unsheathed weapons, which cannot take a scabbard, and two of sheathed weapons - five jamadar-barachhe and six kripan-barachhe. 7.

The commander of 5000 [cavalry should receive] four gul-shasatr - one of unsheathed weapons and three of sheathed - six jamadar-barachhe and seven kripan-barachhe. From 2000 to 5000, the symbol of authority should be of gold. Whether it is jamadar-barachha or kripan-barachha or gul-shasatr they should each receive a symbol of gold. All other symbols should be of

silver. When they are mounted on elephants or on horses these symbols should not accompany them. 8.<sup>12</sup>

Soon after it was published my translation was read by Gurpreet Singh Dhillon of Birmingham in England and he promised to pass on to me some interesting explanatory material concerning the *gul-shasatr*. I returned to my translation at once and realized that I had mistranslated the second and fourth sentences of the above. The second sentence should read: 'A commander of 2000 [men receives] one *gul-shasatr*.' In other words the reference to 'a weapon' should be omitted. The fourth sentence should then begin: 'It is those weapons which everyone wields.' I should also have given a translation for *gul-shasatr*. The first word means 'rose' and the second (which is normally spelled *shastar*) designates 'weapon'.

Gurpreet Singh's later communication, however, went further than a simple correction of my translation. He sent me the following statement by Nidar Singh Nihang, Jathedar of the Akali Nihang Baba Durbara Singh Akhara of Buddha Dal, United Kingdom. The footnotes attached to the statement are also derived from material supplied by Gurpreet Singh.

The Akali Nihang<sup>13</sup> Baba Durbara Singh Akhara of Buddha Dal traces its origins to 1661. An extensive oral tradition is spoken of within the Akhara. One tradition speaks of how when Guru Hargobind established the first Sikh Shastar Vidiya Akhara<sup>14</sup> in 1606 he began the practice of laying weapons out in a specific manner, facing Durbar Sahib, at Akal Takht in form of a kamal phool (lotus flower) for worshipping and saluting before training. The lotus flower represented the emergence of order and beauty out of chaos. Of all the weapons laid out the ones at the centre of the kamal-shastar are most important. At the centre is the double edged khanda sword representing nirguna Mahakal. On either side of the khanda is the curved tulwar sword representing sarguna Chandika. This symbol represents the ancient sanatan Ardhanarisvara (half male female Shiva combined with his female nature shakti) insignia from which is derived the Sikh national symbol khanda.<sup>15</sup> In similar manner in order to designate different ranks of Sikh chiefs in times of the Sikh kingdoms was the practice of Sikh Maharajas giving specific insignia designating their rank based upon number of men they commanded. Gul-shashtar was one such insignia. The weapons would be arranged in front of a gul (rose)<sup>16</sup> and stuck to a plaque mounted with idols of Chandi, Shiva, Hanuman, Karttikeya etc.<sup>17</sup> and when a Sikh chief of such rank would set up camp he would have the Gul-Shashtar set up in front of his camp designating his rank. Oral tradition also speaks of gardens and orchards being set in a specific manner housing idols of Bhavani (Chandi) to designate rank.

This statement was accompanied by a photograph of the gul-shasatr prepared by Gurpreet Singh. The meaning of this section of *Prem Sumārag* is at once clear. I regret only that it had not become clear to me before the translation was published.

### 3. Leyden's translation

The third issue concerns an old translation of a portion of *Prem Sumārag* that previously I had not known about. Following the publication of the book my attention was drawn to the fact that the British Library possesses a composite manuscript Add.26588 which includes a translation into English of a portion of the 'Prem Shumar Grunth'. I was informed of its existence by Gurinder Singh Mann of Leicester in the United Kingdom who also provided me with a photocopy of the relevant portions of the manuscript. According to the British Library the handwriting of a part of the translation is that of Dr John Leyden, well known as a collector and a translator of Indian works. A date recorded in Leyden's own hand in the manuscript records that he made or checked the translation in 1809.<sup>18</sup>

The relevant portions of the manuscript Add.26588 comprise folios 2a-8a, being Leyden's translation of a small part of the whole *Prem Sumārag*; and folios 15a-28b which is a repetition of the same material more carefully executed by a different hand. Between the two parts Leyden has inserted his own translation of the Mul Mantra and the introductory verse of *Japji' Sāhib*, followed by *Jāp Paramārath or Commentary on the Jap[ji']*.<sup>19</sup> The portion of *Prem Sumārag* translated in the first part and repeated in the second comprises the first chapter (*dhiai*) and sections 5 and 6 of the fourth chapter.<sup>20</sup>

Some of Leyden's translation is difficult to read because the translator's handwriting is not always clear. A person called Santa Sing[h] has crossed out certain parts of the text 'because,' Leyden tells the reader, 'he did not understand the words'.<sup>21</sup> It is not clear whether he was actually correcting the text. The author of 'Prem Shumar Grunth' is said to be Bhai Gurdas.<sup>22</sup> This identification would surely have been difficult to maintain, for according to the text 'the Guru ..... has been clothed in ten incarnations'.<sup>23</sup> Reference is also made to the Khalsa.<sup>24</sup> It is of course possible that Leyden was unaware of the importance of Bhai Gurdas or known when he lived.

Leyden's translation is can be illustrated by comparing a particular passage with the corresponding passage from my own translation. In Leyden's version the latter portion of the first precept of the Rahit in chapter 1 appears as follows:

Perform this rite in the *Amrat vele* while one Pahar of the night remains. Recite both the Jup and the Jap the first of which is by Nanuk, (the second, by Guru Govind). Recite the Anand seven times. When any worldly business occurs then recite the *Chirren Kummal Arti* & bend the forehead to the earth. Confess your own inability saying save me a sinner. Reflect on the Guru (God)

with joy. Having performed this & retaining possession perform a sacred duty by exalting the True - Then adore with affection the Akal Purakh Parameswari, the true Guru of all. He who with the full bent of his mind reflects on the Sut-Guru, he shall be saved.<sup>25</sup>

This portion I translate as follows:

Perform this bodily discipline during the tranquil hours of the last watch of the night. Recite *Japu[ji']* and *Jāp* five times [each], and likewise *Anand*. If there should happen to be any purpose relating to your ordinary everyday life which you wish to achieve recite [the couplet] from *A'rati'* which refers to the lotus feet [of Sri Akal Purakh] and touch the ground with your forehead.

Having thus prostrated yourself stand up and repeat Ardas. After completing Ardas [you will find that] the objective which you wished to achieve will be completely fulfilled, regardless of how difficult or simple it may have been. If [on the other hand] you are thoroughly at ease and have no such purposes to pursue then read from the Pothi Granth [a selection of] the *bāni'* delivered for our instruction by the Gurus, from the first Master to the ninth. [Having done this] recite the lotus-feet [couplet] from *ārati'* and touch the ground with your forehead. Let your humble petition be:

Grant to me, a [miserable] renegade, the blessing of the  
divine Name,  
That effortlessly, with every breath, I may recall the  
Guru.

Having offered this petition and attained peace of mind arise and proceed to [the day's] labours. But keep the beloved words of the Guru (*bāni' shabad*) ever with you. The Word is the Guru, [your] intelligence (*surati*) its disciple. Recite it with undivided devotion.<sup>26</sup>

Judging by the difference in the length of these two extracts it appears that Leyden may have been translating an earlier version. It also appears that occasionally he added material. The reference to Guru Nanak and Guru Gobind Singh would surely not have been necessary in the original Punjabi.

Leyden could be astray in references to Indian society, as for example in the portion of chapter 4 which details the qualifications of the groom during the marriage ceremony.

Such a person by name (the bridegroom) whose father's and grandfather's is such, whose cast[e] and sect (varna) and colour is such, and whose age is such as to be a Khalsa of the Sri Akal Purukh according to the order of the Sri Akal Purukh has come for the purpose of being connected with you and is sitting on the northern side.<sup>27</sup>

He was also mystified by the reference to *karah prasad*, describing it as 'Guru Baba's *carry* (a mixed dish)',<sup>28</sup> and he is clearly ill-acquainted with the Khalsa initiation ritual. Of the bride and bridegroom he writes: 'If they have not drunk the water of the sword (*pahul-kandna*) then give it to them.'<sup>29</sup>

Had Leyden's version concerned only chapter 1 it would have further strengthened the possibility that this chapter was added to the complete work at some date after the *Prem Sumārag* had been composed.<sup>30</sup> The inclusion of a portion of chapter 4 means, however, that this possibility does not apply to it. Leyden's version adds nothing to our understanding of the *Prem Sumārag* except to indicate that the work warranted sufficient importance to persuade an Englishman to translate a portion of it at the beginning of the nineteenth century. This view was confirmed by Leech's own translation of a larger selection which he reported in 1844 and published in 1845.<sup>31</sup> Leyden's translations were certainly of great use to Malcolm in writing his *Sketch of the Sikhs*. While serving in the Company army in the Punjab he had collected only a few materials, adding to them instruction received in Calcutta from a Nirmala Sikh.

This slender stock of materials was subsequently much enriched by my friend Dr. Leyden, who has favoured me with a translation of several tracts written by Sikh authors in the *Penjābi*' and *Du'ggar* dialects, treating of their history and religion, which though full of that warm imagery which marks all oriental works, and particularly those whose authors enter on the boundless field of *Hindu*' mythology, contain the most valuable verifications of the different religious institutions of the *Sikh* nation.<sup>32</sup>

#### 4. The difference between Sanatan and Tat Khalsa historiography

The differences between the Sanatan Sikhs and the Tat Khalsa leads to a final issue. Sanatan or 'Traditional' Sikhs were dominant during the eighteenth and almost all of the nineteenth centuries. The founding of the Singh Sabha in Amritsar in 1873 did not significantly alter this dominance, for many foundation members could be strictly described as Sanatan. The Sanatan faith included features of Hindu belief such as acceptance of the Vedas, belief in the gods and goddesses of Hindu epics, and the practice of idolatry.

The ideals of the Amritsar Singh Sabha proved to be much too conservative for those of distinctly radical views and the Lahore branch, founded in 1879, soon gave expression to these views. As we have already noted this segment of

the Singh Sabha came to be known as the Tat Khalsa (the 'Pure' Khalsa). The term was originally applied to those who opposed the changes brought about by Banda during the early eighteenth century. Now it came to be applied to those Sikhs who adopted a wholly independent interpretation of the Sikh faith. *Ham Hindu nahin* ('We are not Hindus') was their forthright message.

The influence of the Sanatan interpretation of Sikh history contrasted markedly with the widely divergent Tat Khalsa historiography. This Sanatan understanding of Sikh history has now virtually disappeared, such has been the effectiveness of the interpretation promoted by the Tat Khalsa during the early decades of the twentieth century. The Tat Khalsa interpretation is today overwhelmingly dominant in Sikh Studies, so much so that most historians who research the Sikh past adopt it or at least are strongly influenced by it. Those who do not accept it are regarded as historians who are unsympathetic to Sikh ideals or who have a particular agenda to pursue. On page 9 of the *Prem Sumārag* introduction I briefly summarized this difference, but I did so much too briefly for a subject which is so important.

In spite of the criticisms levelled against my work I too have been powerfully influenced by Tat Khalsa historiography. I approached the study of Sikh history along Tat Khalsa paths and I developed a pattern that essentially reflected its principles. Two men were particularly influential in this respect. Dr Ganda Singh was one of these, a splendid person who resolutely stood up for what he believed to be right. The other was Professor Harbans Singh, equally admirable. Both were true friends and I owe them debts which I never can repay. They were, however, historians whose whole approach was firmly set in the Tat Khalsa mould, conducting their research and expressing their findings in a manner which was entirely congenial to its principles. Implicitly yet steadfastly they assumed an interpretation that the Tat Khalsa view of the history of the Sikhs differed fundamentally from that of all other social groups. Sanatan views which preceded the Singh Sabha movement were clearly wrong and should be labelled as such or (more commonly in their case) simply ignored.

If one accepts a Tat Khalsa interpretation the history of the Sikhs is presented in a particular way. Features are heightened, others are played down or opposed or ignored. Some are coloured favourably while others are painted in drab or threatening hues. Sanatan practices are frequently opposed, as for example the presence of idols in the precincts of Harimandir. Obviously this represented Hindu influence and it was something that no true Sikh could ever contemplate. This judgement is, however, a question of interpretation and should have no place in a history of nineteenth-century Darbar Sahib, whether Tat Khalsa or Sanatan. The idols should certainly be mentioned and the opposition to their presence by certain Sikhs is also mandatory. What is not required is the notion that such a practice is right or wrong in principle. To Tat Khalsa agitators it may be wrong and the Sanatan defenders it may be right. That, however, is not the same thing as saying that it is right or wrong in principle.

Another example is provided by the Tat Khalsa use of the word *sahaj* as it appears in the meaning attached to Sahaj-dhari. To me it seems that the meaning when attached to *dhāri* signals the same meaning as it does when standing



alone. This is the condition of ineffable bliss which climaxes the discipline of *nām simaran* and initially it was applied to those who sought that bliss without necessarily adopting the Khalsa form. Tat Khalsa scholars maintained, however, that the hyphenated term means ‘slow-adopter’, with *sahaj* taken to mean *sahij* or (more precisely) *sahije sahije* which certainly means ‘slowly’. The issue is not who is right or wrong in this particular case. It is rather that those who accept the Tat Khalsa meaning are thereby constrained to adopt the Tat Khalsa view that Sahaj-dhari Sikhs are on their way to being a Kesh-dhari Sikh and then eventually an Amrit-dhari Sikh. Most Sahaj-dharis would reject this interpretation. Kesh-dhari and Amrit-dhari Sikhs were certainly numerous among the Sanatan Sikhs, but there was no understanding that the Sahaj-dhari Sikh was striving to join them.<sup>33</sup>

*Prem Sumārag* had convinced me that the reading of history prior to the days of the Singh Sabha movement should not be dictated by Tat Khalsa conventions, yet even so I hesitated to spell this out clearly and unambiguously. A lengthier statement than my single paragraph at the conclusion of the introduction to *Prem Sumārag* was necessary because the essential point is, after all, a revolutionary one. Tat Khalsa historiography can be radically divergent from the Sanatan interpretation and the historian must be ever alert to those differences which distinguish them as the attempt is made to understand any period of Sikh history.

### Notes

- <sup>1</sup> *Prem Sumārag*. (New Delhi: OUP, 2006). Hereafter *PrS*.
- <sup>2</sup> *The Chaupa Singh Rahit-nama*, trans. and ed. W. H. McLeod, Dunedin: University of Otago Press, 1987. For a general study of the rahit-namas see W. H. McLeod, *Sikhs of the Khalsa: a History of the Khalsa Rahit*. New Delhi: OUP, 2003. A brief treatment of *Prem Sumārag* appears on pp.148-51.
- <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 150.
- <sup>4</sup> *PrS*, pp. 3-4, 6.
- <sup>5</sup> *PrS*, p. 5.
- <sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>7</sup> A girah equals approximately 1/16<sup>th</sup> of a yard or a metre.
- <sup>8</sup> *gaz*: a measurement of varying length, approximately a yard or a metre long. The British fixed the length of a gaz at 33 inches.
- <sup>9</sup> The goddess Bhavani Devi is the consort of Shiv.
- <sup>10</sup> A spear with a dagger as its blade.
- <sup>11</sup> A complicated lance bearing several swords on a single spear.
- <sup>12</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 97-98.
- <sup>13</sup> Sikh written tradition in general usually traces the origins of Akali Nihangs to the 18th century. The present Akali Nihang oral tradition traces their origins in Akali form to the 17th century linked with emergence of Akal Takht/Bunga in 1606. It is to be noted prior to Gurbilas Shemi, an 18th century text, there is no mention of Akal Takht. The Buddha Dal oral tradition believes its origins can be proven to have been established for at least 80-100 years. The Tat Khalsa revisionist writer Bhai Vir Singh,

---

writing in early part of 20th century, is the first writer to connect the origins of Akalis with Akal Takht: The Akal Bunga was constructed by the sixth Sikh Guru and at that time, the foundation of the Akalis was laid. Bhai Vir Singh, *Satwant Kaur*, New Delhi: Bhai Vir Singh Sahit Sadan (1992), 227. An gold engraving, most likely at one time from Baba Atal, now in the possession of a private owner in the United Kingdom, dated from late 19<sup>th</sup> century to early 20th century, is found showing a Akali Nihang sitting in the court of Baba Mohan.

- <sup>14</sup> Shashtar Vidiya is the traditional Sikh martial arts incorporating Platha (unarmed) and Shashtar (weapons) combat. At present the Sikh exhibitionist martial art Gatka is generally mistaken for Shashtar Vidiya.
- <sup>15</sup> See [www.shashtarvidiya.org](http://www.shashtarvidiya.org). front page for image of Ardhanarisvara.
- <sup>16</sup> Gul is a Persian word for rose. Persian was the official court language of the Sikh kingdoms.
- <sup>17</sup> It was common practice in the 19<sup>th</sup> century for Sikh flags to bear images of Chandī, Shiva, Hanuman, Kartikya. One such standard captured from the battle of Gujrat is still extant in the United Kingdom with a private collector.
- <sup>18</sup> Add.26588, f. 8b. Dr Leyden died in 1811.
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid., f. 9a. Leyden appears to be confused in calling this work both the *Ja'p Parama'rath* (i.e. the *Ja'p* of Guru Gobind Singh) and the *Jap[ji']* of Guru Nanak. Alternatively this identification may be due to Leyden's hand-writing which commonly is very difficult to read.
- <sup>20</sup> *PrS*, pp. 10-21, 36-41.
- <sup>21</sup> Add.26588, f. 8b.
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid., f. 2a.
- <sup>23</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>24</sup> Ibid., f. 2b.
- <sup>25</sup> Ibid., ff. 3a-b.
- <sup>26</sup> *PrS*, pp.14-15.
- <sup>27</sup> Add.26588, f. 6. *PrS*, p.36.
- <sup>28</sup> Add.26588, f.7b. *PrS*, p.39.
- <sup>29</sup> Add.26588, f.7b.
- <sup>30</sup> *PrS*, p.7.
- <sup>31</sup> Ibid., p.3n.
- <sup>32</sup> John Malcolm, *Sketch of the Sikhs* (Calcutta: Asiatic Researches, 1810), p. 198.
- <sup>33</sup> This of course concerns only the true Sahaj-dharis. It does not include those from Khalsa families who have cut their hair and for that reason are loosely called Sahaj-dharis. See W. H. McLeod, *Who is a Sikh?* (Oxford: the Clarendon Press, 1989), pp.114-15. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Sahaj-dharis were also called Khalsa Sikhs, a term which the Tat Khalsa must have found too close to the title of orthodox Khalsa Sikhs.