CHAPTER I

GURU NANAK AND HIS TIMES : AN OVERVIEW

Very few scholars of medieval Indian history have cared to study the Bani of Guru Nanak as an authentic source material of socio-economic conditions of the people of Hindustan of the later half of the fifteenth and the first forty years of the sixteenth century - a period, in which the Guru lived. No doubt, such conditions are not fully described in any single chapter of the Adi Granth, which contains the Bani of Guru Nanak, besides that of five other gurus and various Hindu and Muslim bhaktas of medieval period. These conditions have to be studied through careful research, from the idioms, metaphors and similies frequently used by Guru Nanak to convey his message to the people of his age. Occasionally, there are references pertaining to the character of the ruling class, political condition of the times and the law and order situation in the country. In order to understand the society as reflected in the Bani of Guru Nanak it is essential to have a look at the period in which he lived and the situations he responded to.

Guru Nanak (1469-1539) lived in an age of political turmoil. In fact, the process of disintegration had commenced during the reign of Firoz Tughluq (1351-1388). Firoz Tughluq had failed to reclaim the deccan and frittered away his energies in fruitless campaigns in far-off-
regions - Orissa, Nagarkot and Thatta - without being able to add any territory to his shrunken empire. His revival of the jagirs, enrolment of an army of slaves and an extra importance given to the Ulama destroyed the merits of the reforms of the Khaljis and strengthened the forces of disorder. In his zeal for piety he tightened punishments and thereby encouraged corruption in administration and inefficiency in the army.4

The sultanate of Delhi lost its all-India character during the reigns of his weak successors and became like a provincial kingdom. On Firoz's death in September 1388, throne of Delhi passed to his grandson, Tughluq Shah, son of Fateh Khan, who assumed the title of Ghias-ud-din Tughluq II. He was an inexperienced and pleasure loving youth. His conduct gave offence to the maliks and amris who deposed him and placed Abu Bakr (another grandson of Firoz Tughluq) son of Zafar Khan, on the throne of Delhi on February 19, 1389. But prince Muhammad, who had acted as Firoz's deputy and had been driven out of capital by a party of nobles, asserted his claim to the throne and with the help of certain powerful officials he proclaimed himself king at Samana on April 24, 1389.5

Then followed a contest between the two rival monarchs as a result of which Abu Bakar was forced to quit the throne in 1390. But Muhammad too could not rule for long. Owing to intemperance and excessive indulgence his
health was greatly impaired and he died in January 1394. He was succeeded by Humayun, entitled Ala-ud-din Sikandar Shah who died on March 8, 1395. Then came to the throne Nasir-ud-din Mahmud, the youngest son of Muhammad. This prince was destined to be the last ruler of the Tughluq dynasty. His claim to sovereignty was disputed by Nusrat Shah, son of Fateh Khan. For some time there were, thus, two kings ruling at one and the same time - one at Delhi and the other at Firozabad. Among the supporters of the latter were the amirs of the neighbouring areas in the Punjab (Panipat, Sonepat, Rohtak and Jhajjar) but they were much more interested in furthering their own interests than in serving those of their nominal suzrain. Sultan Mahmud controlled only the two forts in the capital, old Delhi and Siri. Farishta recalls the scene of decay in the following words:

"The government fell into anarchy, civil war raged everywhere, and a scene was exhibited, unheard of before, of two kings in arms against each other residing in the same capital". The amirs and maliks, writes Yahya-bin-Ahmad Sirhandi in Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, 'of the great provinces of the empire had become kings and spent their income as they liked'. To quote Farishta again, 'The warfare ... continued as if it were one battle between the two cities, wherein thousands were sometimes killed in a day, and the casualities occasioned by the slain were supplied
by fresh reinforcements from different parts of the country. Some of the governors of the provinces took little part in these civil dissensions, hoping to take advantage of them by becoming independent in the end. This politically disastrous contest continued for three years and served - quite naturally - as a prelude to foreign invasions.

Timur who had ascended the throne of Samarqand in 1369, crossed the Indus on 21 September 1398 to wage a war against the infidels and to lay his hands on the immense wealth and valuables of the country. Travelling via Pak Patan, Dipalpur, Bhatnir, Sirsa and Kaithal, plundering and burning the country and massacring the people on the way. What followed at Bhatnir on 7 November, 1398 is best described in his own words:

'... in the course of one hour the heads of 10,000 infidels were cut off. The sword of Islam was washed in the blood of the infidels, and all the goods and effects, the treasure - and the grain which for many a long year had been stored in the fort, became the spoil of my soldiers. They set fire to the houses and reduced them to ashes, and they razed the buildings and the fort to the ground'.

He crossed the Jamuna on 11 December, 1398 and entered the Jahan-Panah palace. At Loni near Delhi, the capture of the fort was followed by Timur's order that
'the Musalman prisoners should be separated and saved, but the infidels should all be despatched to hell with the proselytizing sword'. There were about 100,000 Hindu prisoners in his camp. Timur who wanted to get rid of the embarrassing presence of these prisoners, butchered them in cold blood before fighting a war against sultan Nasir-ud-din Mahmud Tughluq and his prime-minister Mallu-Iqbal, who put a feeble resistance to the invader. After inevitable defeat Mallu-Iqbal retreated, leaving the sultan's unfortunate subjects to Timur's fury. The carnage and loot continued for four days. Even the body in human flesh and blood was enormous, for each soldiers had secured a large number of prisoners.

Timur occupied Delhi on December 18, 1398 and remained there for fifteen days. He had no desire to stay in India and to rule over it. He quit Delhi on January 1, 1399 on a return march to Samarqand. Before leaving the borders of India, Timur appointed Khizar Khan, who had been expelled by a rival (Sarang Khan) from the governorship of Multan, to the government of Multan, Lahore and Dipalpur. He crossed back the Indus on March 19, 1399 after inflicting on India more misery than had ever before been inflicted by any conqueror in a single campaign. He left India prostrate and bleeding.

After Timur's invasion the sultanate of Delhi which had already been broken into fragments, now shrunk to the
dimensions of a petty principality comprising the capital city and a few districts around it. It became a very pale shadow of its former self.\footnote{17}

Khizar Khan, who had been appointed governor of Multan, Lahore and Dipalpur, by Timur, founded the Sayyid dynasty in 1414. The rule of the Sayyid sultans remained limited only to 37 years. During their rule, neither a bold policy of wars and conquests like the Khiljis was pursued nor measures for administrative reforms were attempted. Sayyid sultans failed to put forth any inspiring ideal before their followers and subjects and thereby the process of division and dis-integration of the empire, which had persisted during the reign of the later Tughluqs, continued unabated during the rule of the Sayyids. The Sayyids restricted their political vision and activities within a circumference of 200 miles around (Delhi) and finally, failed to defend even that circle and lost the empire to another dynasty - the Lodis.\footnote{18}

Bahlul, the first ruler of the Lodi dynasty, ascended the throne of Delhi on 19th April, 1451. When Guru Nanak was born in A.D. 1469, Bahlul Lodi (A.D. 1451-1489) had been the ruler of Delhi for about 18 years. Before occupying the throne of Delhi in AD 1451 he had Sarhind, Samana, Sunam, Hissar-Feroza, Lahore, Dipalpur and perhaps some parganas of Multan under his control.

Bahlul had to tackle many baffling problems. His
primary task was to restore the lost prestige of the sultanate of Delhi and to establish the supremacy of the Afghans in the kingdom. Besides he had to suppress the rebellious nobles and jagirdars and to safeguard his kingdom from jealous neighbours who were trying to extend their territories towards the capital. Bahlul faced all these problems boldly and tactfully. By the end of 1451 AD, he had not only occupied Panipat, Hansi and Delhi but also added Sambhal, Mewat, Rapri, Etawah, Kol, Kampila, Patiali and Bhogaou to his dominions. He had considerably revived the power and prestige of the sultanate of Delhi. The most important event of his career as a sultan was his 'life and death struggle' against the Sharqi ruler of Jaunpur. It was only by AD 1486 that he had been able to capture the western territories of the Sharqis.19

He tried to please his Afghan nobles by giving them extensive jagirs and high offices. Even Afghans from outside India were invited to share power and given important positions in the empire.20 In keeping with the sentiments of the Afghans and the traditions of his father, Bahlul Lodi claimed to be nothing more than one among the peers. The idea of kingship had little affinity with that of his Turkish predecessors. It was a complete negation of the conception of Balban and Ala-u-din Khilji and was quite different from that of even Iltutmish.21 The author of Tarikh-i-Daudi describes the way of his functioning in these words:
'In his social meetings he never sat on a throne and would not allow his nobles to stand, and even during public audiences he did not occupy the throne but seated himself upon a carpet. Whenever he wrote a firman to his nobles he addressed them as 'Masnad-i-Alī' (exalted Lordship). Indeed so much regard did he evince for them that if any one of the great leaders felt displeased he would go to his house ungirt his sword and sometimes even put off the sash of his turban, soliciting forgiveness, saying, 'If you think me unworthy of the station I occupy, choose some one else and bestow on me some other office.' He maintained a brotherly intercourse with all his chiefs and soldiers. If any one was ill he would himself go and attend on him. He did not, however, use his powers in an autocratic manner and was anxious to make the Afghan leaders believe that he drew his power and authority from their goodwill. But in doing so, he reduced the sovereign to the position of primus inter pares (first among equals) vis-à-vis the nobles. He raised the power and prestige of the nobles at the expense of the sultan. He lowered the dignity of the crown and reduced kingship to the position of exalted peerage. One good advantage of his policy of primus-inter pares was that it earned him the loyalty and goodwill of the afghan tribal leaders who helped him fight his wars and worked with him ungrudgingly through thick and thin.

Bahlul's achievements as an administrator were
neither commendable nor mean. He was a moderately successful king. When he died in 1489, Guru Nanak was twenty years old and was living at his home town Talwandi near Lahore with his wife and parents.

After Bahlul's death his third son Nizam Khan, with the help and support of Khan-i-Jahan, Khan-i-Khanan Farmuli and the majority of the nobles, ascended the throne on 17 July, 1489 with the title Sikandar Shah. His succession was opposed by many on the ground that his mother was the daughter of a Hindu goldsmith. But Sikandar overcame all these hurdles to claim sovereignty for himself. Bahlul had kept his afghan nobles under his control but had compromised the position of the sultan with the rights of the nobles. But Sikandar was aware of the dangers of a divided authority and allegiance, and was not prepared to share power with anybody. He, therefore, gradually introduced a change in the conception of kingship and destroyed the powers of nobility, finished all rebellious nobles and forced others to obey and respect him as the sultan.

Sikandar who is considered to be the greatest king of the Lodi dynasty, however, behaved as a fanatic in religious matters and was intolerant to other faiths. Nizam-ud-din Ahmed writes, 'His bigotry in Islam was so great that in this regard he went beyond the bounds even of excess'. He had given the proof of his bigotry even as a prince when he had desired to prohibit the Hindus from bathing in the sacred tank at Thaneswar. When he became
the king, he indulged in policy of destroying temples and images, and building mosques, serais and colleges in their place. Farishta says that he made it a point to destroy all Hindu temples. According to Tarikh-i-Daudi, he utterly destroyed diverse places of worship of the infidels and left not a vestige remaining of them. Sacred places of the Hindus of Mathura, Narwar, Chanderi and the Jawalamukhi temple at Nagarkot were destroyed under his orders.

During the times of Sikandar Lodi jizya and pilgrims tax were collected from the Hindus with severity. He did not permit them to bathe in the Jamuna at bathing ghats and prohibited barbers from shaving their heads nor could the rituals of Hindus be publically performed. Like Firuz Tugluq, he made an attempt to reduce Hindus and convert them to Islam. The prevailing atmosphere and the harsh policies adopted by the state compelled the people to adopt the language and garbs of the Muslims to avoid persecution. Except for his fanaticism, Sikandar was a strong and a capable ruler.

Guru Nanak who had spent several years at Sultanpur Lodi - (a town where Daulat Khan Lodi resided before he was made the governor of Lahore by Sikandar Lodi in 1500 AD) came into contact with the working of the administrative machinery of the Lodis and their policies towards their subjects. He had served as a modi (storekeeper) of Daulat Khan Lodi's grain stores at Sultanpur and it gave him personal experience which is reflected in his compositions.
It is a pity that students of medieval Indian history have not made full use of these compositions while dealing with the pre-mughal period of the Lodi sultans.

Daulat Khan Lodi was the son of Tatar Khan, who had been among the most important governors of sultan Bahlul Lodi, holding in his charge not only the iqta of Lahore but also of Dipalpur and of Sarhind. He was a powerful and an efficient governor. In the early 1480s he seized some parganas of the sultan's khalisa land and prince Nizam Khan (later Sikandar Lodi) marched against him from Panipat. Tatar Khan was killed in a battle near Ambala in 1485 AD and his iqtas were given to Umar Khan Sarwani (one of his nobles). However, Tatar Khan's son, Daulat Khan, was allowed to retain Sultanpur which was the personal jagir of his father. In AD 1500, Daulat Khan was made the governor of Lahore. He remained loyal to the Lodi Sultan for over twenty years.38

It may be safely assumed that Daulat Khan Lodi at Sultanpur was assisted by some important officials. The office of the amils or the amin would be there in Sultanpur itself and so would be the office of the qannungo. There would also be, the Persian and Hindvi navisandar or writer. The department of justice would have been represented by the qazi who was perhaps assisted by a 'mufti' (the expounder of the shariat). They were the representatives of Muslim orthodoxy also and they were paid by the state.
through grants of revenue free land or Madad-i-Ma-ash-grant. On the whole, therefore, Guru Nanak at Sultanpur had first hand knowledge of Lodi administration at the pargana level and also that of the justice department. He had also observed the high handedness of the shiqdars and the corrupt lives of the qazis to extort money from the people. Hence, Guru Nanak's references to the contemporary society become all the more important for whatever he wrote, he wrote from his close and personal experience of the contemporary institutions.

It is not generally realized that in Guru Nanak's compositions, references to one or the other aspect of the government and administration of his times were quite frequent. In fact, the entire government structure is covered by the phrases used by Guru Nanak in one context or another. We need not insist that this familiarity with contemporary government and administration would inevitably result from his stay in Sultanpur.

The importance of Sultanpur as a town with considerable proportion of Muslim population must be taken into account to appreciate the significance of Guru Nanak's experience. It is quite certain that his deep understanding of contemporary Islam had much to do with this town where he spent a number of years of his life in the service of Daulat Khan Lodi. It is true that he had come in contact with a few representatives of Islam even before
he came to Sultanpur. But at Sultanpur for the first time he could meet the learned and also probably the mystics of Islam. With his inclination towards religion, he would certainly take interest in the religious beliefs and practices of the inhabitants of the town and meet the leaders of religious opinion. In his compositions Guru Nanak reveals his familiarity with Islam in its orthodox and sufi forms. His earlier association with itinerant sadhus and saints around his village Talwandi (Nankana Sahib, district Shaikhupura, Pakistan), had been the richest experience before he came into contact with the Muslims in Sultanpur. It is this aspect of his experience which adds deeper meaning and historical value to the references made by Guru Nanak in his Bani.

During the first three decades of his life - the period before his travels - Guru Nanak lived at Talwandi and Sultanpur. The rulers of Delhi then were Bahlul Lodi and Sikandar Lodi. Sikandar died on 21 November, 1517. After his death his eldest son, Ibrahim was elevated to the throne with the unanimous approval of the afghan peers. He assumed the title of Ibrahim shah. Though not devoid of ability and intelligence, Ibrahim Lodi proved a sad failure. He foolishly abandoned the sagacious policy of his father and grandfather and tried to impose a rigorous discipline and strict court ceremonial on his peers who were fierce democrats and treated the king as nothing more than the noble among the nobles. By his policy of playing
the king and insolently punishing those who disregarded his orders, he drove them into rebellion. He, thus, dug the very foundation of the state and lost his throne and life.42

The Lodi regime lacked the military strength, administrative consolidations and political wisdom which were needed to initiate a new era of peace, stability and progress in the country. The political uncertainties during the reign of Ibrahim Lodi and the early years of the Mughal regime had their repercussions on the life of the people, and of these Guru Nanak was not merely a casual witness.43 Although Guru Nanak kept himself aloof from politics, he did not, at least in his mature years ignore the political trends which effected the people's lives. Indeed, he was fully alive to the impact of political turmoil on society and religion. This was quite natural in view of the fact that he was not an ascetic in the traditional Indian sense. He lived the life of a normal householder.44

The most dramatic events in the politics of Hindustan during Guru Nanak's life time were connected with the political activities of Babur. From 1519 AD to 1526 AD, he was actively concerned with the affairs of Hindustan. He invaded India five times. But the first four invasions were more or less in the nature of exploratory raids. During his first invasion (1519 AD) he simply conquered
Bajour and Bhera and returned to Kabul. Both the places were lost by him as soon as he was back. In the same year (1519 AD) in September, Babur crossed the Khyber and went up to Peshawar subduing the Yusufzai afghans on the way, but he had to rush back to Kabul because of trouble there. During the course of his third invasion in 1520 AD, he crossed the river Chenab and occupied Sialkot without much resistance. Then he marched on Saidpur (Eminabad) which was taken by assault and put to sword.

This invasion in Guru Nanak's own words took place in 1578 bikarmi, i.e. 1521 AD. Guru Nanak was an eye witness to the sack of Saidpur and the whole massacre of its inhabitants. According to the memoirs of Babur 'the inhabitants of Saidpur, who resisted were put to the sword, their wives and children were carried into captivity, and all their property plundered'. Guru Nanak seems to have been close to the scene of atrocities perpetrated by him on the people of Saidpur. He may be said to have been the first medieval Indian saint to condemn war and to denounce exploitation as grave social maladies which seriously hinder the evolution of people's personality. In Guru Nanak's reaction to the political events of his time Babur's invasion of India figures prominently. Active politics was not his field. He, however, observed with keen interest the functioning of the government in the country and felt deeply concerned about the political disabilities of the people. The suffering of the people during
Babur's invasion (1520-21) has been described by him with deep emotion and he uttered some of the most touching verses which are collectively known as Babar-Vani.\(^{50}\)

God took khurasan under His wing,
and exposed India to the terrorism of Babur,
The creator takes no blame to Himself,
It was death disguised as a Mughal that made war on us.
Where there was such slaughter,
such groaning, did'st Thou not feel pain?
Creator, Thou belongest to all
If a powerful party beat another powerful party,
It is no matter for anger,
But if a ravenous lion fall upon a herd,
then the master of the herd should
Show his manliness.\(^{51}\)

Guru Nanak was very bitter about the fact that:

The dogs of Lodi have spoiled
the priceless inheritance (i.e. India)
When they are dead no one will regard them.\(^{52}\)

In the defeat and punishment of the Lodis Guru Nanak saw the operation of the Divine Order (Hukam), the inescapable consequence of moral depravity and unrighteousness.\(^{53}\)
The wealth and beauty which afforded them pleasure, have now become their bane.
The order was given to the soldiers to take and dishonour them. 
If it please God, He giveth greatness; and if it please Him, he giveth punishment. 
If they had thought of Him before, Why should they have received punishment? 
But they had lost all thought of God in joys, in spectacles, and in pleasures. 
When Babar's rule was proclaimed no pathan prince ate his food. 

Guru Nanak reacted against the atrocities committed by the army of Babur against the innocent people of the town. While addressing Bhai Lalo (a disciple of Guru Nanak) he writes:

As the word of the lord comes to me, so do I utter, O Lalo, 
Bringing the marriage party of sin, 
Babar has hastened from Kabul and demands perforce the gift of wealth etc. O. Lalo. 
Modesty and righteousness both have vanished, and falsehood marches in the van, O Lalo. 
The function of the qazis and the bralmins is over and the satan now reads the marriage rites.
The Muslim women read the Quran and in suffering call upon God, O Lalo.
The Hindu women of high caste and Low caste, put these too in the same account.
Nanak, the paeans of murder are sung, and the saffron of blood is sprinkled, O Lalo.
Nanak sings the glories of the Lord in the city of corpses and says this saying.
He, who has made the mortals and attached them to pleasures, sits apart, and alone, and beholds them.  

There appears to have been a general massacre and even the women were not spared.

Hindu, Muslim, Bhatti and Thakur women (Suffered),

Some having their burqas torn from head to toe, others being slain.

The unequal character of the contest also appears to have grieved the Guru. On the one side fought a trained, organised army under the leadership of an experienced general - Babur and on the other, an extemporised defence - force mostly composed of the non-combatants of a peaceful city.
Finding Ibrahim (the sultan of Delhi), to be weak and an inefficient ruler, Daulat Khan, the governor of Lahore, planned to become independent. In 1524, Daulat Khan Lodi sought Babur's help and the latter lost no time in reaching Lahore. No terms of the alliance seem to have been settled between Daulat Khan and Babur. 'As political justice was not the virtue of the age, Babur probably calculated that if affairs turned out prosperously, it would be an easy matter to cast down the puppet king when he would set up'.

When Daulat Khan came to know about the designs of Babur, he tried to oppose him, but was defeated. Babur assigned Jalandhar to Daulat Khan, Sultanpur to his son Dilawar Khan and Dipalpur to Ibrahim's uncle, Alam Khan while keeping Lahore under his own control. Daulat Khan considered this to be a slight to him and went off in a huff. He had made up his mind to recover his lost territories. After this Babur decided to return, for he found he needed a bigger army to proceed further in his designs.

On 17 November, 1525 Babur set out 'to invade Hindustan' for the last time. A month later he crossed the Indus at the head of 12,000 men. After crossing the Bias river, he secured the submission of Daulat Khan, whose army broke up at the invader's approach. This was followed by the submission of Alam Khan Lodi. It was about this
time that Babur received proposals for cooperation from Rana Sangram Singh of Mewar. However, he proceeded towards Delhi to meet the forces of Ibrahim Lodi. At Panipat, the sultan displayed no quality of generalship but that of personal bravery, unable to win, he died as an afghan was expected to die (21 April, 1926).  

After his victory at Panipat Babur marched triumphantly to Delhi. On April 27, 1526 the khutba was read in his name in the Jami Mosque. According to Ishwari Prasad, "The victory at Panipat destroyed the power of the Lodi dynasty and transferred the empire of Hindustan from the Afghans to the Timurids".

Mughal rule established by Babur in its first phase lasted up to 1540 when after defeating Humayun at the battle of Bilgram Sher Shah ascended the throne of Delhi in August, 1540. Since Guru Nanak died in 1539 AD, his Bani (compositions) remains the major source of the study of this period (1451-1540) on which the author has based the findings and drawn a picture of the socio-economic life of the people of Hindustan of that era. Other contemporary or semi-contemporary sources like the Persian Chronicles of the times, accounts of the foreign travellers (mostly translated), Varan Bhai Gurdas and several literary works including Kafian Shah Hussain and Kissa Heer Damodar etc. have been used to corroborate the evidence found in the Adi Granth.
NOTES

1. Guru Nanak composed his Bani in 19 Rags:
Sri Rag, Majh, Gauri, Asa, Gujri, Vadhans, Sorath, Dhanasri, Tilang, Suki, Bilawal, Ramkali, Maru, Tukharti, Bhairao, Basant, Sarang, Malhar and Parbhati.
There are two Shalokas in Rag Bihagria and he has written three Vars in Rag Majh, Asa and Malhar.
Other important Bani of Guru Nanak are Japji, Pehre, Patti, Alahrian, Aarti, Suchaji, Kuchaji, Thiti, Dakhni Onkar, Sidh Gosht, Sohile and Baran Mahan.
For details, see, Singh Taran, Sri Guru Granth Ji Da Sahitak Itihas, pp. 244-45. Also see, Jaggi Ratan Singh, Guru Nanak Banj, pp. 29-32.

2. The other five Gurus whose Bani covers a major part of the Adi Granth are, Guru Angad Dev, Guru Amardas, Guru Ram Dass, Guru Arjan and Guru Tegh Bahadur.

3. The names of the Hindu and Muslim Bhaktas are as under:
13. Quoted by Banerjee, A.C., *op. cit.*., p. 3.


32. Srivastava, A.L., op. cit., p. 239.


34. Elliot, H.M. and Dowson, John, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 477.


40. *Ibid*, p. 13. References to the court, the throne, the army, the palaces, royal canopy, elephants, armour, cavalry, trumpets, salary, mint, taxes, grants of revenue free land, sultan, hukam or amar, wazir, diwan, naib, umra, khan malik, shiqdari, qazi, chaudhary and muqqdam etc.


44. *Ibid*, p. 44.


47. Teja Singh and Ganda Singh, *A Short History of the Sikhs*, Bombay, 1950, p. 13. Gave the following explanation in footnote 1, 'Referring to the coming of the Mughals, he (Guru Nanak) says in *Rag Tilang*, 'They come in 78 and shall depart in 97 and then shall arise another brave man'. The first date refers to the coming of the Mughals in 1521 and the later date refers to the departure of Humayun from India in 1540 AD and the 'brave man' is understood to be Shershah Suri, who dispossessed him.


50. Banerjee, A.C., *op. cit.*, p. 45. He lists four verses (*Asa 39, Asa Ashtpadi 11, Asa Ashtpadi 12 and Tilang 5*) in *Baburvani* in which Guru Nanak expressed his agony and described the destruction of the city and the misery of the people with a depth of personal feeling for he must have witnessed the whole drama at Saidpur before his own eyes. Some doubts may be raised whether the Guru actually referred to the siege of Saidpur or of a bigger place like Lahore. But one thing is certain that it was the experience of a warm hearted human being whose eyes were fixed on heaven as also on earth.

Adi Granth, p. 360:

52. Macauliffe, M.A., op. cit., p. 119,

Adi Granth, p. 360:


Adi Granth, p. 417:

नना नैकि देनें देनें कही सिसी सो हर समझी॥

उत्तर मे दुलभन्दियाँ से जिते पहें दलली॥

जै जिस मे जी दलली ने जीते दलली मार ली॥

नम नम मार जाने ने जाने मार जाने मार ली॥

धर्मजन्तु दिवें जिते जैतु देने देने समझी॥

*Adi Granth*, pp. 722-23:

\begin{quote}


*Adi Granth*, pp. 722-23:

\end{quote}


*Adi Granth*, p. 418:

\begin{quote}


*Adi Granth*, p. 418:

\end{quote}


60. Banerjee, A.C., *Guru Nanak and His Times*, p. 21. The historian Niamat-Ullah pays him a well deserved compliment. "No sultan of India except sultan Ibrahim has been killed on the battlefield and has won the glory of martyrdom", see Nirodbhusan Roy, *op. cit.*, p. 169.


63. The word *Hindustan* has been used for India, because this name for our country was prevalent during medieval times and even Guru Nanak used this word in his compositions; see *Adi Granth*, p. 360:

H'giR'k mrHi&r wfenFil