

# SIKHISM AND MIRACLES

## A Saga of Mythological Stories and Misinterpreting Gurbani

Karminder Singh, Phd.

A recent article titled *Sikhism and Miracles*<sup>[1]</sup> calls for a response. The basic argument by the author of that article Bhai Manjit Singh is that “*miracles abound in Sikhi; these miracles must be understood in the context of Gurbani, and for those with Nam, the laws of nature are changed by God.*”<sup>[2]</sup>

The basic argument of this response is that the foundation stone of Sikhi is *Hukm*. Guru Nanak’s command on page 1 of the SGGS establishes this. **ਹੁਕਮਿ ਰਜਾਈ ਚਲਣਾ ਨਾਨਕ ਲਿਖਿਆ ਨਾਲਿ** || ੧ || Hukm Rajayee Chalnaa, Nanak, Likhia Naal.<sup>[3]</sup>

*Naam* for a Sikh is to acquire the ability to understand His Hukm, Internalize His Hukm, to Abide by the Hukm and to Live His Hukm.

To say that “*for those with Nam, the laws of nature are changed by God*” is not only anti-Gurmat and anti-Gurbani; it is boloney propagated by our *dera sants* and *babey* who make false claims that their *sants* and *babey* can perform miracles because “they have *Nam* inside them.”

Bhai Manjit Singh says: *If the Sikh facing the crisis has Naam in him, God Himself appears to rescue him. The ordinary laws of physics do not apply to Him. He can do anything.* Strange logic this is. Didn’t Guru Nanak say Hukmey Ander Sabh Ko, Bahar Hukm Na Koye? Funny that first God *creates* a crisis, then God appears to *rescue* him? If the Sikh had “*Nam in him*” why was there a crisis in the first place?

Didn’t Guru Nanak tell us God is WITHIN us? So from which heaven up there does this God “*appear to rescue him.*”?

Guru Nanak says on Page 144 of the SGGS: **ਸਚਾ ਤੇਰਾ ਹੁਕਮੁ ਗੁਰਮੁਖਿ ਜਾਣਿਆ ॥ ਗੁਰਮਤੀ ਆਪੁ ਗਵਾਇ ਸਚੁ ਪਛਾਣਿਆ** || Sacha Tera Hukm Gurmukh Janeya. Gurmutte Aap Gvayey Sach Pehchaneya. The verse makes clear that Hukm is in permanent in existence – Sacha Tera Hukm. This means Hukm cannot be changed or violated. The entire notion of Miracles KRAMAAT is anti theis to Hukm at its core. The words “Gurmukh Janeya” establish that the Guru himself realized the permanence of Hukm. The words ਆਪੁ ਗਵਾਇ Aap Gvayey establish the fact that Guru Nanak is diminishing his own identity to come to this realization of the permanence of Hukm. All of these points collectively establish that the Gurus REALIZED the permanence and perpetuity of Hukm and thus did not venture to go against it under any circumstances.

## GURU NANAK AND MIRACLES

The Sidhs who had gathered at Shirvat da Mela at Achal Batala in March of 1539 asked Guru to perform a miracle. The request is recorded by Bhai Gurdas in Pauree 42 Vaar1 as follows:

ਸਿਧ ਬੋਲੇ ਸੁਨ ਨਾਨਕਾ ਤੁਹਿ ਜਗ ਨੂੰ ਕਰਾਮਾਤ ਦਿਖਲਾਈ। ਕੁਝ ਦਿਖਾਈ ਅਸਾਨੂੰ ਭੀ ਤੂੰ ਕਿਉਂ ਢਿਲ ਅਜੇਹੀ  
ਲਾਈ। *Sidh Boley Sun Nanaka Tuhe Jug Nu Kramaat Dikhlayee. Kujh Dikha(n)yee Asanu  
Bhee Tu Kion Dhil Ajehi Layee.*

Show us your ਕਰਾਮਾਤ *Kramaat* miracles – why are you causing delay?

Guru Nanak's response is in the next pauree of Bhai Gurdas – Pauree 43 of Var 1.

ਬਾਬਾ ਬੋਲੇ ਨਾਥ ਜੀ ਸ਼ਬਦ ਸੁਨਹੁ ਸਚ ਮੁਖਹੁ ਅਲਾਈ। ਬਾਜਹੁ ਸਚੇ ਨਾਮ ਦੇ ਹੋਰ ਕਰਾਮਾਤ ਅਸਾਥੇ ਨਾਹੀ।  
*Baba Boley Naath Ji Shabd Sunho Sach Mukho Alahee. Bajho Sachey Naam Dey Hor  
Kramaat Asathey Nahin.*

Guru Nanak makes it clear: “Listen O Nath, Beyond the Realization of Divine Virtues, I have no ਕਰਾਮਾਤ *Kramaat* miracles” and calls on the Sidhs to engage in a dialogue based on the Shabd (*Shabd Sunho*) pertaining to the Creator (*Sach*).

Since this event happened six months prior to Guru Nanak's demise in September of 1539, are we saying that till the very end of his life, Guru Nanak did not have *Nam* in him? -the kind of *Nam* that *causes God Himself to appear and rescue him?*

Are we saying that miracles did not “*abound in Guru Nanak*”? That God could not or would not “*change the laws of nature*” for Guru Nanak? That the *dera sants* and *babey* “with *Nam* inside them” are able to do what Guru Nanak could not?

But there in the second verse Bhai Gurdas is saying Guru Nanak replied *Bajho Sachey Naam Dey Hor Kramaat Asathey Nahin*. Meaning: Other than *NAM*, I have no *Kramaat*? So Guru Nanak DID have *NAM* in him, but no miracles?

This one single fact rubbishes the claim of Bhai Manjit Singh that *If the Sikh facing the crisis has Nam in him, God Himself appears to rescue him*. Why didn't God appear to rescue Guru Nanak from the Sidhs' demand then?

### (MIS) FITTING GURBANI INTO FALSE CLAIMS OF MIRACLES.

Of particular interest in Bhai Manjit Singh's article is the claim that “*miracles must be understood in the context of Gurbani*.” When someone says “statue worship must be understood in the context of Gurbani” or that “bathing of teeraths must be understood in the context of Gurbani” or that “cheating and lying must be understood in the context of Gurbani;” then one can rest assured that Gurbani is going to suffer a process that involves (i) being presented as half verses; (ii) misrepresented; (iii) twisted in meaning; (iv) jumbled with mythological stories; or (iv) plainly misunderstood.

How else does one use Gurbani to “prove the existence” of something that is rejected within the FIRST and most basic principles of Sikhi – Sacha Tera Hukm and Hukm Rajayi Chalna.

This part about the use (and misuse) of Gurbani needs elaboration. One principle worth knowing about how to understand and interpret Gurbani is known as ਪ੍ਰੋਢਾਵਾਦ Prordawad in Sanskrit (and Punjabi). Its English equivalent is “Speaking or Writing in the Vernacular.”

## ਪ੍ਰੋਢਾਵਾਦ PRORDAWAD OR VERNACULAR WRITING.

ਪ੍ਰੋਢਾਵਾਦ Prordawad is defined as the USE of prevalent language, idioms, mythological stories to make one’s OWN point. All 35 writers in Gurbani have used this technique.

The prevalent stuff is used by our Gurus and Bhagats because the stuff is popular, in common usage, and people identify with it. Our Gurus and Bhagats do NOT agree, accept or believe in the prevalent stuff. They are merely USING it to MAKE and deliver their OWN UNIQUE spiritual messages.

In other words, they are saying: You people believe that MYTH. Let us tell you WHAT we accept. You people have YOUR MYTH. But this is OUR SPIRITUAL MESSAGE.

Our task as Sikhs of Gurbani is to search, discover and LINK with the spiritual messages; NOT indulge in the prevalent mythological stories.

### THE MYTHOLOGY OF PREHLAD

The Sikhism and Miracles article begins with a *shabd* of Bhagat Namdev on page 1165 of the SGGS to “prove that miracles exist in Sikhi.”

The article quotes this one verse ਗਿਰਿ ਤਰ ਜਲ ਜੁਆਲਾ ਭੈ ਰਾਖਿਓ ਰਾਜਾ ਰਾਮਿ ਮਾਇਆ ਫੇਰੀ ॥੩॥ *Gir Tar Jal Juala Bhaey Rakheyo Raha Ram Maya Feri* and translates it as “He was thrown off a hill (gir), drowned in water (tar jal), hurled into fire (joala) and frightened (bhaey rakhiyo). But he survived.

Now this is the MYTH that Bhagat Namdev is USING. Mentioning the myth is NO proof of any miracle. It is not proof that Bhagat Namdev accepted the “miracle” of Prehlad. It is THE MYTH that is being stated.

Applying the principle of ਪ੍ਰੋਢਾਵਾਦ Prordawad or Writing in the Vernacular we know that Bhagat Namdev is using the PREVALENT MYTH to deliver his own unique message.

Where is that UNIQUE message of Namdev? In the Rahao Verse of course. AND in the FINAL verse too.

The Rahao verse is **ਰਾਮ ਨਾਮਾ ਜਪਿਬੋ ਕਰੈ ॥ ਹਿਰਦੈ ਹਰਿ ਜੀ ਕੇ ਸਿਮਰਨੁ**

**ਧਰੈ ॥੧॥ ਰਹਾਉ ॥** Ram Nama Japbo Karey. Hirdey Har Ji Ko Simran Dhrey.

The word NAMA in the Rahao verse refers to Namdev HIMSELF and indicates that this is WHAT NAMDEV did.

Bhagat Namdev is effectively saying: How Prehlad survived and what Prehlad went through is YOUR myth. YOUR story, YOUR belief, YOUR faith. YOUR miracle stuff. LET ME TELL YOU WHAT IS MINE.

And that's the Rahao Verse; translated it means" Namdev (*Nama*) Realized the Omnipresent Creator (*Ram*). I Keep (*Dhrey*) the Remembrance (*Simran*) of the Omnipresent Creator (*Har Ji*) in my Mind and Heart (*Hirdey*).

In the FINAL verse, Namdev says: ਕਹਿ ਨਾਮਦੇਉ ਹਮ ਨਰਹਰਿ ਧਿਆਵਹ ਰਾਮੁ ਅਭੈ ਪਦ ਦਾਤਾ ॥ Keh Namdeo Hum Narhar Dhiavey Ram Abety Pad Daata. Namdev says, I Contemplate on God (Narhar) the Omnipresent (Ram) WHO IS MY PROTECTOR.

### THE PREVALENT MYTH

ਗਿਰਿ ਤਰ ਜਲ ਜੁਆਲਾ ਭੈ ਰਾਖਿਓ ਰਾਜਾ ਰਾਮਿ  
ਮਾਇਆ ਫੇਰੀ ॥੩॥ *Gir Tar Jal Juala Bhaey*  
*Rakheyo Raha Ram Maya Feri*

He was thrown off a hill (gir), drowned in water (tar jal), hurled into fire (joala) and frightened (bhaye rakhiyo). He survived it all. What a miracle!

What we DON'T want to link with

### BHAGAT NAMDEV'S MESSAGE

ਰਾਮ ਨਾਮਾ ਜਪਿਬੋ ਕਰੈ ॥ ਹਿਰਦੈ ਹਰਿ ਜੀ ਕੇ ਸਿਮਰਨੁ ਧਰੈ  
॥੧॥ ਰਹਾਉ ॥ *Ram Nama Japbo Karey: Hirdey*  
*Har Ji Ko Simran Dhrey.*

Namdev (Nama) Realized the Omnipresent Creator (Ram). I Keep (*Dhrey*) the Remembrance (*Simran*) of the Omnipresent Creator (*Har Ji*) in my Mind and Heart (*Hirdey*).

ਕਹਿ ਨਾਮਦੇਉ ਹਮ ਨਰਹਰਿ ਧਿਆਵਹ ਰਾਮੁ ਅਭੈ ਪਦ  
ਦਾਤਾ ॥ Keh Namdeo Hum Narhar Dhiavey Ram  
Abety Pad Daata.

Namdev says, I Contemplate on God (Narhar) the Omnipresent (Ram) WHO IS MY PROTECTOR

**What we WANT / NEED to link with**

Bhai Manjit Singh wrongly translates the Rahao verse as “*Prehlah kept on reciting Ram’s Name; and in his heart he focussed upon the Lord. The Lord intervened and changed the laws of nature. Water could not drown, fire could not burn, falling off a mountain he was unhurt. Why? Because the Lord changed the nature of the elements. Is that not a miracle?*”

This is a clear case of confusing the MYTH and the MESSAGE to prove a false premise of Miracles.

The Rahao Verse CLEARLY says it was NAMDEV who Realized the Omnipresent Creator (Ram). I Keep (*Dhrey*) the Remembrance (Simran) of the Omnipresent Creator (*Har Ji*) in my Mind and Heart (*Hirdey*).

The MYTH says Prehlah was saved by the MIRACLE.

The MESSAGE of Bhagat Namdev is “I DON’T NEED NO MIRACLE.” I have the Creator’s Remembrance Within Me at All Times.

The MYTH says Prehlah was protected by the MIRACLE.

The message of Namdev in the FINAL verse is “My Omnipresent Creator is My Protector.

I need no miracle. I need no Kramaat. That is YOUR MYTH.

If each and every verse that is quoted in the Miracles and Sikhism article is put the test of proper interpretation (including applying the principle of ਪ੍ਰੋਢਾਵਾਦ Prordawad or Writing in the Vernacular – we will come to the following TWO conclusions

First, the miraculous stories being mentioned are PREVALENT MYTHS.

Second the MESSAGES being delivered WITHIN the same shabd tell us that those prevalent myths of miracles are REJECTED.

We cannot confuse the MYTH and the MESSAGE.

### **PROVING POINTS WITH WRONG CONCEPTS.**

Bhai Manjit Singh quotes this verse from Asa Di Vaar.

**ਏਹ ਕਿਨੇਹੀ ਦਾਤਿ ਆਪਸ ਤੇ ਜੇ ਪਾਈਐ ॥ ਨਾਨਕ ਸਾ ਕਰਮਾਤਿ ਸਾਹਿਬ ਤੁਠੈ ਜੇ ਮਿਲੈ**

॥੧॥ Eh Kinehi Daat Aapas Te Jo Paaiye. Nanak Sa Karmat Sahib Tuthe Jo Miley. SGGS

Page 474.

The translation that is provided is “*What great gift is there if we take it ourselves; O Nanak it is indeed a miraculous gift when the Lord gives as He is Pleased. The word “karmaat”, (miracle) is used here.*”

The verse is indeed correct, but the word is ਕਰਮਾਤਿ (Karmat); **NOT ਕਰਮਾਤ** (Kramat).

There is a world of difference between the two. Karmat (which is the word used in the verse) is a Persian word that originates from ਕਰਮ Karm – meaning GRACE or BLESSING, the Punjabi translation of which is ਕਿਰਪਾ Kirpa, ਮੇਹਰ Mehr, and ਬਖਸ਼ਿਸ਼ Bakshish. That is why the word ਦਾਤਿ Daat (Gift) is used in the first part of the couplet. That is why ਸਾਹਿਬ ਤੁਠੈ ਜੇ ਮਿਲੈ Sahib Tuthey Jo Miley is used in the second part to mean Grace is received (Jo Miley) when the Master (Sahib) is Gracious (Tuthey)

These two verses do not prove that Gurbani supports miracles, or that miracles happen in Gurbani. As a matter of fact, these two verses have NOTHING to do with miracles. The word MIRACLE is not even used in these verses.

### USING SIKH MYTHS.

There were PREVALENT MYTHS that the 35 writers of Gurbani roped in to deliver their UNIQUE Spiritual Messages. We were supposed to link with the Messages and to steer clear from the myths.

That we DIDN'T quite do. What's worse, we created additional myths of our own. Bhai Manjit Singh relies on a few of these home grown myths to establish the point that miracles exist in Sikhi. He says: *when we hear the sakhi of Vali Ghandari hurling a huge boulder at Guru Nanak, it is not surprising that the hard rock becomes soft like wax and the imprint of the hand gets set in the rock as it hardens again. Is that not a miracle in the context of what Gurbani says?*

This entire Vali Ghandari tale is a myth. Our myth. Someone carved out a palm print on a rock, created the myth in a sakhi, and built a structure around it. The Sikh world bought the fake tale lock, stock and barrel and donated well. What we got was one of the biggest and richest gurdwaras in Pakistan. And Sikhs bowing to that rock.

Sane people have asked – if the rock was hurled from the top of a mountain and stopped midway by the Guru's hand, then where is the mountain top now? Where is the mountain? Why isn't the stone stopped midway? Why is it lying flat on the ground? Why would people go up a mountain to get water when water always runs down on its own? A whole bunch of questions, but no answers.

The question at the end of the para by Bhai Manjit Singh is interesting: *the hard rock becomes soft like wax and the imprint of the hand gets set in the rock as it hardens again. Is that not a miracle in the context of what Gurbani says?* Certainly NOT, because Gurbani does not say anything about this rock turning into wax and hardening again against the Hukm of the Creator.

Then there is another Sikh Myth being used. Bhai Manjit Singh says: *In this context, when we look at Paunta Sahib, we notice the Yamuna river raging and flowing behind the Gurdwara. But Guru Gobind Singh Ji had declared "Yamuna, ethey shaant ho ke jaya kar" As you can*

*see for yourselves the river Yamuna flows quietly for the distance of the Gurdwara and gushes forth after that.*

The Guru commanding a river to flow quietly? Really? A Guru who was the tenth embodiment of the Guru who declared Hukm Rajayi Chalna, Nanak Likhya Nal and Scha Tera Hukm? Aren't we insulting our Guru's spirituality? How do we know the exact words: *Yamuna, ethey shaant ho ke jaya kar* were uttered by the Guru? Were they recorded in the SGGS?

Aren't we unknowingly putting down our Guru to the level of the mindless Don Quixote who ordered the windmills of Holland to calm down?

The one river that needed to be calmed was Sarsa. Guru Gobind Singh, his family and thousands of Sikhs crossed it in the middle of the night on 6<sup>th</sup> December 1704. The wild and rough waters of the river took the lives of thousands of Sikhs, swallowed up tons of Sikh literature and treasure that was being transported, and caused the family of Guru Gobind Singh to be separated and eventually sacrificed. Why didn't the Guru say *Sarsa, Tu ethey shaant ho ke jaya kar*? Sarsa, flow calmly and let us all cross?

Bhai Manjit Singh also says *The turning of the mandir in Bhagat Namdev Ji's case and so many other miraculous events are stated in Gurbani.*

The Bhagats of Gurbani were revolutionary spiritual seekers. This are the four things they stood for. (i) The total rejection of the then existing clergy. (ii) The complete discarding of all clergy-sanctioned ritual. (iii) Repudiation of the clergy-sanctioned idol worship, and (iv) The wholesome rejection of the primary institution of the clergy – the mandir, dehora, maseet and temple as the “pathway to spirituality”.

In any case, the mandir was out of bounds to the bhagats on account of their ‘low’ caste. The mandir's doors were secured shut to the “castes” of weaver, cobbler, tailor and other shudras that our Bhagats were. The doors did not open for those bhagats who were not shudras either – the mandirs were shut to them as well – as pay back for their stinging criticism of the custodians of these places as frauds and pretentious beings.

So what was Bhagat Namdev (a Shudar by brahmin standards) doing in a Mandir?

Let's ask Namdev himself. He says on page 875 of the SGGS as follows: **ਗਿੰਦੂ ਪੂਜੇ ਦੇਹੁਰਾ**

**ਮੁਸਲਮਾਣੁ ਮਸੀਤਿ ॥ ਨਾਮੇ ਸੇਈ ਸੇਵਿਆ ਜਹ ਦੇਹੁਰਾ ਨ ਮਸੀਤਿ ॥** Hindu Pujey Dehora Musalman Maseet. Namey Soee Seyvia Jeh Dehora Na Maseet. Meaning. The Hindu Seeks Him through the Worship at the Dehora and the Musalman in the Maseet. Namdev Has Realized the One Who Is Neither in The Dehora Nor Maseet.

The inference is clear. Namdev NEVER went to the Dehora (Mandir) nor the Maseet. Why would he go someplace where he says he KNEW God did NOT reside?

So what is left of this fictitious tale of Namdev going to a mandir to pray and the idols in the mandir all miraculously turned 180 degrees to face him?

The MYTH is created by writers of Bhagat Maal. The primary objective of *Bhagat Maal* is to corrupt the legacy of the *bhagats*. Its method is to embroil the *bhagats* in *brahminwaad* and portray them part and parcel of the *bippar* clergy.

If the *bhagats* undertook a damning denunciation of the existing clergy, the *Bhagat Maal* portrays the *bhagats* as relying on the clergy for their enlightenment. If the *bhagats* enunciated a total rejection of all clergy sanctioned ritual, the *Bhagat Maal* shows the *bhagats* as having reached God through ritual. If the *bhagats* repudiated the clergy sanctioned idol worship, the *Bhagat Maal* portrays *bhagats* worshipping idols; albeit with full faith and love. (The fake story of *Bhagat Dhanna* extricating God out of a stone is case in point).

And if the *bhagats* announced their wholesome rejection of the primary institution of the clergy – the *mandir*, *dehora*, *maseet* and temple as the “pathway to spirituality” the *Bhagat Maal* narrates stories of *bhagats* praying at *mandirs*. The fake story of *bhagat* Namdev ji going to a *mandir* to pray, being ejected by the Brahmins there, and causing the *mandir* to spin around miraculously to face the *bhagats* is case in point.

### APPLY ਪ੍ਰੋਫਾਵਾਦ PRORDAWAD OR VERNACULAR WRITING, AGAIN.

When we apply the principle of Vernacular Writing then we know the “spinning” that Namdev is talking about IS A PROCESS THAT HAPPENS WITHIN OUR MIND-SETS – not to some statutes in some *mandir*.

When we apply the principle of Vernacular Writing then we know the “dead cow that Namdev revived upon being put under torture by a cruel king was not a “four legged milk-providing cow.” But a “cow” that is defined in *Gurbani* by Guru Nanak on page 1329 of the

SGGS. ਦੂਧੁ ਕਰਮੁ ਸੰਤੋਖੁ ਘੀਉ ਕਰਿ ਐਸਾ ਮਾਂਗਉ ਦਾਨੁ ॥ 3 ॥ ਖਿਮਾ ਧੀਰਜੁ ਕਰਿ ਗਉ

ਲਵੇਰੀ ਸਹਜੇ ਬਛਰਾ ਖੀਰੁ ਪੀਐ ॥ *Dudh Karm Santokh Ghio Kar Aisa Mango Dan.*

*Khima Dhiraj Kar Gao Laveyri Shejey Bhachra Kheer Piyey.*

Namdev brought to life the Cow of forgiveness and Compassion (*Khima Dheeraj Kar Gao Laveyri*). This was the “Cow” that was dead in the cruel king’s heart and mind.

This “Cow of forgiveness and compassion is *Laveyri* – meaning it gives milk aplenty. But not the milk that we drink. The milk of Grace (*Dudh Karm*). This was the milk that came out of the cow of forgiveness and compassion that came to life in the king’s mind. He was full of grace for the same Namdev that he wanted tortured and killed.

And from the Milk of Grace came the butter of Contentment (*Santokh Ghio*).

All the above happened not by any miracle, but by Namdev’s discourse with the King.

You see *Pyareo*. The miracle is truly in the way both Guru Nanak and Bhagat Namdev are teaching us such superior spiritual messages pertaining to Divine Virtues.



It would be sad indeed, if we were going to MISS these messages and hold on instead to myths and so called meaningless miraculous tales that Gurbani is trying to reject in the first place.

### **WHAT THEN IS THE POSITION OF MIRACLE IN SIKHI?**

Gurbani's position on "miracles" can be distilled from the following verse on page 1103 of the SGGS. **ਰਿਧਿ ਸਿਧਿ ਜਾ ਕਉ ਫੁਰੀ ਤਬ ਕਾਹੂ ਸਿਉ ਕਿਆ ਕਾਜ ॥ ਤੇਰੇ ਕਹਨੇ ਕੀ**

**ਗਤਿ ਕਿਆ ਕਹਉ ਮੈ ਬੋਲਤ ਹੀ ਬਡ ਲਾਜ ॥ ੧ ॥** Ridh Sidh Ja Kao Furee, Tab Kahun Sio Kya Kaaj. Terey Kehney Kee Gutt Kya Kho, Mein Bolat He Budd Laaj.

Ridh Sidh is the term for miracles. The damning critique in the second verse is worth pondering – "The claim about miracles is absolutely embarrassing and shameful (Budd Laaj) within the parameters of genuine spirituality."

Sikhi is not about waiting for miracles to happen. Sikhi is not about expecting miracles to take place.

Sikhi is about BECOMING the miracle. Being Divine in the ugly world we live in is to BECOME the miracle. Gurbani tells us repeatedly – acquire Divine Virtues. BECOME Divine Virtues.

Love is a Divine Virtue. Service to Humanity is another. Courage is yet another. Contentment yet another. The SGGS speaks of many other Divine Virtues.

The world we live in is full of hatred, animosity, and abhorrence. To live in such world with Love for Humanity is to LIVE the Miracle of Sikhi, to BECOME the Miracle of Divine Virtue.

Humanity – of which we are part of – is full of selfishness, self-centredness and self-regard. To live within such conditions with the Virtue of Service to Humanity is to LIVE the Miracle of Sikhi, to BECOME the Miracle.

Similarly, to SPEAK UP and STAND with the downtrodden within society WITH COURAGE; and to LIVE with CONTENTMENT in a world full of greed and self-indulgence is to LIVE the Miracle of Sikhi, to BECOME the Miracle that our Gurus and Bhagats within Gurbani teach and want us to become.

**END.**