

UDC 233-23

## DETERMINING THE DATE AND THE PLACE OF ORIGIN OF THE *HAYAŚĪRṢA PAÑCARĀTRA*

*Elisabeth Raddock*

PhD (South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of California at Berkeley), Associate Professor

Department of Historical, Philosophical and Religious Studies

Umeå University

901 87 Umeå, Sweden

[elisabeth.raddock@umu.se](mailto:elisabeth.raddock@umu.se)

This paper discusses the dating and the place of origin of the text *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra*, a compilation that sets down the rules and rituals governing the construction of that most dramatic, physical representation of religion in South Asia, the Hindu temple. The *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* is, as it states itself, a compendium. It gathers material from previous sources. The oldest known manuscript is from the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

Texts that cite the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* date from between the 9<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> century to the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* must be older than these texts. Previous scholars have suggested dates ranging from c. 500–1600 CE in respect to the dating of the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra*, which is a very wide window indeed. The general scholarly consensus, however, is that the text was produced around 800 CE. Some details in the text, like the descriptions of circumambulatory paths, can be used to date the text as well as identify its place of origin. References to north Indian scripts in the text indicate that the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* was produced shortly before the 10<sup>th</sup> century. Since the text has borrowed sections from the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāna*, it must be younger than that text, i.e. it was compiled after the 7<sup>th</sup> century CE. The ways that *vyūhas* and *lokeśas* are described in the text suggest an earlier rather than later date. Thus, the 8<sup>th</sup>–9<sup>th</sup> century CE seems to be an acceptable working hypothesis. The references to scripts may suggest a date later rather than earlier in that period.

All the extant manuscripts of the text have been found in Bengal and Orissa, which makes them the best candidates in respect to the text's place of origin. References in the text, like names of kings, which can be connected to a place, are either north Indian or specifically Bengali. The text is, therefore, of a north Indian origin and most likely was compiled in northeast India, probably Bengal or Orissa.

**Keywords:** *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra*, Hindu temple, dating and localizing Sanskrit texts

### *Dating and placing the Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra*

This paper discusses the dating and placing of the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra*, a Vaiṣṇava Pāñcarātra text that focuses on both the construction of temples and sculpting of the images, which are to be placed inside. Pāñcarātra literature discusses four steps or phases in the construction of the temple: the planning and construction of the *prāsāda* (temple), the design and sculpting of the *pratimā* (image), *pratiṣṭhā* (installation) and *pūjā* (institution of worship performed daily and occasionally within the temple after its completion). The first three steps are discussed in the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra*. As it focuses on these particular

topics, the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* is part of the large corpus of texts in the Hindu tradition called *śilpa śāstras*, i.e. manuals focusing on temple architecture and sculpture.

Dating early South Asian texts is extremely difficult. This is especially so with Sanskrit texts in general, and *śilpa śāstras* in particular. There are some exceptions to this rule, as Śāstrī<sup>1</sup> [Samarāṅgaṇa-sūtradhāra of Mahārājadhīrāja Bhoja... 1966] and Malaya [Mallaya 1949, ii–iii] have discussed. The *Samarāṅgaṇa Sūtradhāra* and the *Tantrasamuccaya* are texts written or compiled by individuals whom we can place in history. The *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* however seems to be gathering material from previous sources and there is no way of knowing who might have started or finished the compilation.

### *The Relationship to Other Texts*

The oldest known manuscript of the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* is from the 16<sup>th</sup> century<sup>2</sup>. Other manuscripts are also available, most of which are from Bengal (see discussion on place below). This does not, however, tell us much about the date of the text, except that it must have been finalized by no later than the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

The most common way to date a text is place it in relationship to other texts. A few texts either mention the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* or in other ways have a connection to the text. The *Agni Purāṇa*, one of the major Purāṇas (or Mahāpurāṇas), contains descriptions and details of various topics, including the *avatāras* of Viṣṇu, ritual, sculpture, architecture, cosmology, astrology, law, grammar, meter and medicine etc. The *Agni Purāṇa*'s chapters on *śilpa śāstra* can be divided in two sections: one consisting of chapters 31–70 and the other of 71–106. The former primarily consists of borrowed quotes or summaries of the material found in the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra*<sup>3</sup>. The *Agni Purāṇa* is usually dated to the late 9<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> century<sup>4</sup>. Assuming that the dating of the *Agni Purāṇa* is correct we have a first approximate latest date for the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra*.

The tantric material incorporated in the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* in combination with the Brahmāṇical iconography presented shows that it is a late tantric text (as early tantric streams were non-Brahmāṇical and anti-Vedic [Hazra 1975, 203]). A good analogue for the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* is, therefore, the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*, another tantric text that incorporates Brahmāṇical iconography and Vedic rituals. It is possible that the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* borrowed the story of the *Hayaśīrṣa avatāra* of Viṣṇu from the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*. The two texts have several verses, which are identical (*Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* 1, *Viṣṇudharmottara* 1.1). However, the section dealing with temple architecture and ritual in the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* is brief, and lacks much of the details provided in the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra*. While the two texts follow a similar structure<sup>5</sup>, the only clear borrowing is the initial story of Madhu and Kaiṭabha and it is, of course, possible that both texts obtained the story from another source<sup>6</sup>. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* is usually dated to the 7<sup>th</sup> century<sup>7</sup>. Based on that we can assume that the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* might be close to the *Viṣṇudharmottara* in time or perhaps later.

The *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa* takes a large portion of its section on temple construction and sculpting from the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra*. The *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa* is a ritual compilation (*nibandha*) written around 1534. The author was Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmin (1501–1586), a Brāhmaṇa from Sri Rangam in modern Tamil Nadu. Gosvāmin was one of the “Six Gosvamins of Vrindavana”, the group of learned and ascetic followers of Caitanya (1486–1533) that gave the Gaudiya Vaiṣṇava *saṃpradāya* its theological basis [Broo 2005]<sup>8</sup>. The *Hari Bhakti Vilāsa* discusses the rituals connected to temple construction in *vilāsas* (parts) 18–20. Here the compiler has quoted large sections from the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra*, rearranging them together with large portions from primarily the *Matsya* and *Devī Purāṇas*. It is clear that the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* is the main text for the compiler and that the other texts are used to substantiate, give alternatives or fill in where the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* is vague or provides no information. Thus, the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* must have been authoritative by the time Gosvāmin wrote his work. The authority

of the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* at the time of the *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa* is independently confirmed by the fact that the text is also, as mentioned above, quoted, and summarized in the *Agni Purāṇa*. Since the *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa* is a significantly later text than the *Agni Purāṇa*, from it we learn that the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* was an important text for a long period.

Lists of important texts like the one found in chapter two (verses 1–10) of the *Ādikāṇḍa* of the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra*, are found in the *Mantrakaumudī* composed in the second decade of the 16<sup>th</sup> c. A.D. by the Maithila scholar Devanātha Tarkapañcānana [Bhattacharya 1952]. However, the identity of several texts to which the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* refers is not clear.

In the world the sages contemplated the exposition of the [following] twenty-five texts one by one<sup>9</sup>. The (1) *Hayaśīrṣa* is said to be the foremost of the collected *tantras*. 2<sup>10</sup>

Then (2) *Trailokyamohana tantra*<sup>11</sup>, (3) *Vaibhava* and (4) *Pauṣkara*, (5) *Nārādīya tantra* and (6) *Prāhrāda* and (7) *Gārgyagālava*. 3

(8) *Śrīpraśna tantra*, (9) *Śāṅḍila tantra* and (10) *Īśvarasaṃhitā*, (11) the most excellent (*satyokta*) *tantra* and the (12) *Vāsiṣṭha* and also the (13) *Śaunaka*. 4

And another *tantra* is the (14) *Nārāyaṇīya*, and also the (15) *Jñānārṇava*, the (16) *Svāyambhuva*, and the (17) *Kāpila*, (18) *Vihagendra* and the others. 5

(19) *Ātreya*, (20) *Nārasimhākhyā*, (21) *Ānandākhyā* and (22) *Ārūṇa*, (23) *Baudhānya* and (24) *Baudhāyana tantra* and also (25) *Vaiśvāvatārīta*. 6<sup>12</sup>

And also they mention that great *tantra* which establishes the eight syllables (*aṣṭākṣa*<sup>13</sup>). These having pervaded the surface of the earth are established by this large collection. 7

These are the ancient *tantras*: the *Bhāgavata*, the one spoken by *Śiva*, the one revealed by *Viṣṇu*, the one that originates from *Padma* (*Brahmā*), the *Vārāha Purāṇa*, and others. 8

There are also the general *saṃhitās* of the *Bhāgavatas*, the other<sup>14</sup> *saṃhitā* spoken by *Vyāsa*<sup>15</sup> and the great *saṃhitā* as well. 9

Whatever else was recited by the sages [this text] has recourse to, and the portion [relating to] the temple etc., all that, *Viṣṇu* told<sup>16</sup>. 10

The few texts that we with some certainty can identify are *Pauṣkara*<sup>17</sup>, *Nārādīya tantra*<sup>18</sup>, *Śrīpraśna tantra*<sup>19</sup>, *Īśvarasaṃhitā*<sup>20</sup>, *Nārāyaṇīya*<sup>21</sup>, *Svāyambhuva*<sup>22</sup>, *Vihagendra*<sup>23</sup>, *Baudhānyā*<sup>24</sup>. However, the most securely dated of these texts is the *Nārāyaṇīya*, a section of the *Mahābhārata*, which is generally agreed to appear in its present form around 400 CE. The *Pauṣkara saṃhitā*, if we follow Sandersson, might be one of the later of the early *Pañcarātra* text, but which it seems that he means somewhere around 700 CE (or possibly slightly later). *Īśvarasaṃhitā* is an 8<sup>th</sup>–9<sup>th</sup> century text. The other texts are not easily dated.

Raghunandana cites a long passage from the second part of the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* in his *Maṭha-pratiṣṭhā-tattva*, stating that it was transcribed from an ancient copy in “bifurcated” letters originally procured by king Ballāsenā and then came to Raghunandana’s hands<sup>25</sup>. King Ballāsenā, or Vallāsenā, ruled in the second half of the 12<sup>th</sup> century [Chowdhury 1967, 220, 279; Majumdar 2003, 210–233, esp. 231, 223–243, esp. 242]. As noted above, the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* is also quoted extensively in the *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa*, a 17<sup>th</sup> century compendium on *Viṣṇu* worship by *Gopāla Bhaṭṭa*. Thus, the text has, for a fairly long time, been authoritative: it was quoted by the authors of the *Agni Purāṇa* in the 9<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> century and still deemed quoting in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. To summarize, we can conclude that the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* was probably compiled before the *Agni Purāṇa* (i.e. 9<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> century) but probably not much earlier.

### Earlier Scholarship

Daniel Smith thinks that the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* originated in the North, though he does not give any reasons for this assumption. He is not any more precise in regards to the dating of the text. He says, “there are many clues in it [the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra*] which suggest an early date; yet other details indicate that, albeit written early, it passed through the hands of late redactors” [Smith 1978, 166]. Smith also mentions that one can find quotations in texts datable to the 12<sup>th</sup> through the 17<sup>th</sup> centuries from a text referred to as *Hayagrīvasamhitā*, for example in Vedānta Deśika’s opening chapter of the *Pāñcarātrarakṣā*. However, the quotes are so brief that it is hard to trace them to the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* unambiguously. Smith feels certain that the text cannot be as old as is mentioned in the “preface” to the printed edition (i.e. “800 A.D.” [Bhattacharya 1952]). He mentions that the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* is not listed in any canonical texts besides its own, and the ones that are derived from it. Smith’s example of a derivative text is the *Agni Purāṇa* [Smith 1978, 166]<sup>26</sup>. Ramachandra S. K. Rao has a similar discussion and mentions that the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* is also in the *Viṣṇu Saṃhitā*’s list of *Pañcarātra* texts as number 44 of 141 texts [Ramachandra 1989, 168].

Dines Chandra Bhattacharya, who wrote the introduction to the 1952 edition of the text [Das Gupta 1989, 76], places the date “tentatively” to about 800 A.D. Bhattacharya bases this on both internal evidence such as the outburst in the text against other philosophical systems such as jaimini, Buddha and Jaina and mentions of kings and courts as well as citations in other texts. Bhattacharya also concludes that the text is of a north Indian origin and not in an area with predominant Śākta or Śaiva systems. The later he bases on the list in the text itself (*ādikāṇḍa* 3.3–4) that lists places from which a ācārya should not come.

In an article called “The Pāñcarātra tradition and Brahmānical iconography”, Das Gupta discusses the date of one chapter (*ādikāṇḍa* 22) of the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra*, which deals with the manifestations of Viṣṇu and their characteristics. He assigns this chapter to sometime before the 9<sup>th</sup> century. Das Gupta bases his assumption mainly on *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra ādikāṇḍa* 22.2, which states that *Ādimūrti Vāsudeva* creates *Samkarṣaṇa*, who in turn creates *Pradyumna* and the latter in turn *Aniruddha*<sup>27</sup>. The text further confines itself to 12 of the 24 *vyūhas*. These two facts, according to Das Gupta, indicate an early stage in the development of the *vyūhas*, which, by the time of the *Agni Purāṇa*, the *Devatāmūrtiprakaraṇa* and the *Caturvarga Cintāmaṇi*, are enumerated as 24. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* refers only to the *caturvyūha* forms (3.xliv.11–12, 3.lxxxv.43–45). Das Gupta concludes, “the chapter (*ādikāṇḍa* 22) embodying these descriptions were composed before the appearance of the group of *caturviṃśati mūrti*-s which are described in the aforesaid works [*Agni Purāṇa*, *Devatāmūrti prakaraṇa* and *Caturvarga Cintāmaṇi*]” [Das Gupta 1989, 75–76].

Sastri’s 1975/76 edition [Sastri 1976] of our text is the closest we come to a critical edition of the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* as it is based on all the then known manuscripts (a total of 12 manuscripts<sup>28</sup>). In his edition of the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra*, Sastri assigns it to the 6<sup>th</sup> century but states that it continued to expand during the 7<sup>th</sup> century. He bases this assumption on various details within the text’s description of sculptures [Sastri 1976, vii]. In the same volume, Das Gupta explains, “the text gives the features of some of the deities that belong to the earlier periods side by side with some of them belonging to later periods”. To the earlier period, he assigns the treatment of the *vyūhas*, which, as mentioned above, are only twelve in our text [Das Gupta in Sastri 1976, 146–147].

Winternitz states that the text is “a very important treatise on Vaiṣṇava architecture and consecration of images [...] tentatively assumed to have been written in about 800 A.D.” [Winternitz and Subhadra 2008, 614]<sup>29</sup>. He does not mention any reason for that dating.

Raghunath Purushottam Kulkarni has used the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* as a basis for comparison in his book *Prāsāda Maṇḍana of Sūtradhāra Maṇḍana*. He dates the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* to the fourth century AD. He does not discuss the reason for this, but he has a note referring to chapter 8, verses 18–30 of the text. These are the verses that describe the location of deities in the *vāstupuruṣamaṇḍala*. The date may be attributed to Kulkarni's nationalist agenda in so far as he is trying to establish an early dating of architectural science in India.

Corinna Wessels-Mevissen in her book *The Gods of the Directions* states, “the *Hayaśīrṣapañcarātra* is a religious text which probably dates from c. 800. A.D”. She bases this assumption on the description of the *lokeśas* (directional guardians) found in the *ādikāṇḍa paṭala* 28. Wessels-Mevissen asserts that, “it [the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra*] does not mention the respective directions, as is generally the case in the early texts” [Wessels-Mevissen 2001, 17]. With regard to the *lokeśas*, the text is similar to the Purāṇas except for two facts: the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* depicts Īśāna as four-armed, while all other *lokeśas* are two armed; the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* identifies Nairṛta's vehicle (*vāhana*) as a bear<sup>30</sup>. Wessels-Mevissen considers both these facts to be extremely important and rare variations within the tradition of iconography. Wessels-Mevissen further states that the bear identification may explain some “peculiar forms of Nairṛta's vehicle in Central India” [Wessels-Mevissen 2001, 17, 100].

Mukherji, in *A Study of Vaiṣṇavism in Ancient and Medieval Bengal*, expresses his certainty that the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* (and some other *Pañcarātra* texts) are post-Gupta, approximately the 9<sup>th</sup> century CE according to him [Mukherji 1966, 26]. However, he does not state the reason for this view. (Besides his lack of evidence, the 9<sup>th</sup> century CE is quite late to call post-Gupta).

Based on existing scholarship, the widest window for compilation of the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* is c. 500–1600. The general scholarly consensus, however, is that the text was produced around the 800 CE. However, it bears mentioning that dating early Indian texts is often compared to “a house of cards”. There are relatively few events or lives in ancient Indian chronology that are confirmed by additional Indian sources.

### ***Speculations on the date based on things mentioned in the text***

There are a few features in the text that can help us date the text besides the *lokeśas* and *vyūhas* mentioned above. The *pradakṣina* (circumambulatory) path, mentioned in chapter 13 v. 1–4, may be used to help establish a date and locale for the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra*. Though not elaborated upon in the text, it is a feature that was clearly required by the temple plan. Thus, we can be certain that the text was produced at a time when circumambulatory paths were constructed around temples and that this pathway should have walls. It is not clear from the text if the circumambulatory should have a roof or not. Unfortunately, few temples survive from the area where the text was most likely in use or originated (Bengal). However, if we look at north central, in addition to north-east India, we get the impression that *pradakṣina* pathways were optional. For example, at Khajuraho (temples built between 885 CE and 1000 CE) all temples have space for someone to circumambulate, but the circumambulatory pathway is part of the architectural structure only in some temples.

*Pradakṣina* pathways are known from at least as early as Nāchnā (5<sup>th</sup>–6<sup>th</sup> century). In Nāchnā, a Śiva shrine, known as the Pārvatā Temple, “originally comprised a cella surrounded by a *pradakṣina patha* or passage for circumambulation. To include a passage of this kind does not seem like a startling innovation because circumambulation had long been the basic Indian pattern for worship” [Williams 1982, 105–106]. Including a circumambulatory pathway in the plan of a temple, which in later texts is called the *sandhara* type of temples, becomes so common in medieval temples one might call it standard.

For dating and placing the *Hayasīrṣa Pañcarātra* the reference to *pradakṣina* pathways tells us that by the time the text was written the *sandhara* type of temple was probably fairly common.

Gonda [Gonda 1977, 55] as well as Bhattacharya [Bhattacharya 1952, no page nrs] notes that the *Hayasīrṣa Pañcarātra* enumerates the northern regions of India and mentions the *nāgarī* script (*saṅkarsaṇa kāṇḍa*, chapter 31) but does not mention the southern regions or any South Indian scripts. The regions are enumerated when the *Hayasīrṣa Pañcarātra* forbids *brāhmaṇas* from Kacchadeśa, Kāverī, Konkaṇa, Kāmarūpa, Kaliṅga, Kāñchī, Kāsmīra, Kośala<sup>31</sup> and Mahārāṣṭra from officiating in consecration (*Hayasīrṣa Pañcarātra ādikāṇḍa* 3.3–4). Mishra refers to an identical list in the *Pīṅgalamata*. Mishra also notes that the *Hayasīrṣa Pañcarātra* says that the manuscripts of the *Pañcarātras*, the *Purāṇas* and the *Mahābhārata*, etc. should be transcribed in the *Nāgara* and *Śāradā* scripts. In the light of the discussion of these two scripts, Mishra dates the *Hayasīrṣa Pañcarātra* to the first half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century [Mishra 1965, 12].

Singh examines at inscriptions from all over northern India in order to identify the origin of the *Nāgarī* script and a date by which it was definitely formed. Singh believes that a plate from Bharat Kala Bhavan by Harirāja (983 A.D.) contains “the earliest dated record of *Nāgarī*” as it is consistently close to the modern *Nāgarī* [Singh 1991, 78, 82]. This plate, together with several other inscriptions, gives Singh reason to see a strong development of *Nāgarī* during the period of the Pratihāras of north-central India [Singh 1991, 76–78]. Thus, the mention of the scripts in the *Hayasīrṣa Pañcarātra* indicates that the text was not finalized much earlier than the 10<sup>th</sup> century, though it is always possible that the reference to *Nāgarī* is a latter addition to the text.

To conclude the discussion on the date of the *Hayasīrṣa Pañcarātra*, I will summarize the discussion briefly. First, the discussion on *Pradakṣina* pathways and script indicates that the text was produced before the 10<sup>th</sup> century. This also agrees with the date of the *Agni Purāṇa* (10<sup>th</sup> century). Second, the scholarly consensus points to 800 CE. Third, to establish a lower limit for the date I have looked at the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* as well as some “internal evidence”. If our text has borrowed sections from the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*, it must be younger than that text that is 7<sup>th</sup> century. The ideas of *vyūhas* discussed by Das Gupta and the *lokeśas* discussed by Wessels-Mevissen both argue for an earlier rather than later date. Thus, the 8<sup>th</sup>–9<sup>th</sup> century seems to be an acceptable working hypothesis. The reference to the scripts may suggest a date later, rather than earlier in that period.

### Place of Origin

Trying to find the place of origin for the *Hayasīrṣa Pañcarātra* is easier than dating it. First, all the extant manuscripts have been found in Bengal and Orissa<sup>32</sup>. The only complete manuscript is from Orissa. The Sena King Ballāsenā, mentioned above, ruled in Bengal [Huntington 1990]. On the other hand, the plants and trees mentioned in the texts are standard (north) Indian auspicious or inauspicious ones<sup>33</sup> and thus give no additional information on the actual area, besides confirming the north Indian origin of the text. The discussion regarding the *śikhara* at the end of the text is also rather vague and gives little idea of its style. The *kalaśa* is a typical north Indian superstructure finial. As mentioned above, the scripts discussed in the text are north Indian, and the regions excluded<sup>34</sup> are those surrounding central parts of North India [Gonda 1977, 55]<sup>35</sup>. Thus, we can assume that the text is of a north Indian origin and most likely was compiled in Northeast India, probably Bengal or Orissa.

<sup>1</sup> Śāstrī, Introduction in Samarāṅgaṇa-sūtradhāra of Mahārājadhīrāja Bhoja, the Parmāra ruler of Dhāra. Originally edited by Mahāmahopīdhyāya T. Gaṇapatiśāstrī. Revised and edited by

Vasudeva Saran Agrawala. [2<sup>nd</sup> rev. ed.], Baroda, Oriental Institute, 1966 (Gaekwad's oriental series, no. 25, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1945, iii).

<sup>2</sup> Dated 1453 Śakābda (1531 A.D.) [Das Gupta 1989, 73]. It is in the Biblioteque Nationale, Paris.

<sup>3</sup> In the notes to my translation of the Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra [see: Raddock 2011] the numbers of the corresponding verses in the Agni Purāṇa are provided. The large number of identical verses as well as summaries show the dependence of the Agni Purāṇa on the Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra. I have also included these references for the verses quoted in this article.

<sup>4</sup> For a further discussion in the relationship between the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* and *Agni Purāṇa* see chapter 6.3 in: [Raddock 2011].

<sup>5</sup> As mentioned earlier, in chapter 6.1 above with regards to the *Bṛhat Saṃhitā*, this is a structure followed by many *śilpa* texts.

<sup>6</sup> The story of Madhu and Kaiṭabha appears in many Pañcarātra texts, including the *Jayākya Saṃhitā*; it is also in the *Mahābhārata* as well as in the *Uttarakāṇḍa* of the Vālmiki *Rāmāyaṇa*. The development of the story has been traced by Andreas Bock in his “Die Madhu-Kaiṭhabha-Episode und ihre Bearbeitung in der Anonymliterature des Pāñcarātra” [Bock 1987, 78–109]. Bock traces the development of the story from what he sees as its first appearance in the *Mahābhārata* till its later development in various Pāñcarātra sources. The story appears in the following texts:

- I. *Mahābhārata* 6.63
- II. *Mahābhārata* 200.8–16
- III. *Harivaṃśa* 42.14–33
- IV. *Mahābhārata* 3.194
- V. *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* 1.15
- VI. *Mahābhārata* 12.335
- VII. *Jayākya Saṃhitā* ch 2
- VIII. *Ahīrbudhnya Saṃhitā* Adhyaya 41
- IX. *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* 1.1

With regards to the version told in the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* Bock sees it as directly dependent on the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* 1.15, The *Mahābhārata* 12. 335, *Jayākya Saṃhitā* 2 and *Ahīrbudhnya Saṃhitā* 41 [Bock 1987, 108]. The *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* has several verses in common with the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*, indicating that, perhaps, the former borrowed from the latter. It is possible that both obtained the story from a common source. For the importance of Hayaśīrṣa (or Hayagrīva) in the Indian tradition, with special references to iconography, see: [Nayar 2004].

<sup>7</sup> See chapter 6.2 on the relationship between the *Viṣṇudharmottara purāṇa* and *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra* in: [Raddock 2011].

<sup>8</sup> The term “ritual compilation” is from Teun Goudriaan [Goudriaan and Gupta 1981, 141–142] and indicates texts that are Tantric works of known authorship, which present material on ritual ceremonies, usually in the form of quotations from older authorities. Also [Broo 2003, 20–21]. For a discussion of the authorship of the text, see: [Dāsa 2001, xii–xvi].

<sup>9</sup> The text seems to distinguish two points of view. From a worldly point of view sages compose texts. From an esoteric point of view Viṣṇu declares the Pāñcarātra.

<sup>10</sup> ab = Agni 39.2ab. This list is also found in the *Agni* 39.2–5 with minor differences. See also appendix 3 Offerings to the Pāda deities and chapter 10 The vāstupuruṣamaṇḍala – ritual organization in: [Raddock 2011]. See also Schrader's *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra* [Schrader 1916, 5ff] for a comparison between several Pāñcarātra texts and the lists they contain.

<sup>11</sup> For possible identifications of this and the following texts see chapter 4.4 “Hayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra's sources” in: [Raddock 2011]. Dines Ch. Bhattacharya, in his foreword to the 1952 edition, says that he traced practically the same list in the Mantrakaumudi of the celebrated Maitihila scholar Devanātha Tarkapancāna (400 L.S i.e. second decade of the 16<sup>th</sup> c. A.D. [Bhattacharya 1952, pgs not numbered]).

<sup>12</sup> ab ½c = Agni 39.5ab, ½c.

<sup>13</sup> *Om Namō Narāyanaya*.

<sup>14</sup> *vyāsoktā saṃhitā cānyā tathā parmamasāṃhitā*/ lit., “the *saṃhitā* spoken by Vyāsa and the other as well [as] the great *saṃhitā*”. The question is where the *cānyā* construes, with the *saṃhitā* spoken by Vyāsa or with the *paramasaṃhitā*. I have chosen the first one given the pāda break.

One could also read “the one spoken by Vyāsa as well as the other, the paramasaṃhitā”, or one could even read the last section as, “the one spoken by Vyāsa as well as another great saṃhitā”, which, of course, makes it less specific. The variant reads *caiva*, which indicates that someone though the reading was a bit awkward.

<sup>15</sup> *Mahābhārata*.

<sup>16</sup> Again, the text emphasizes that Viṣṇu is the origin of the declaration.

<sup>17</sup> *Pauṣkara* – Presumably the *Pauṣkara saṃhitā*. It is one of the “three gems” of the *Pāñcarātra* corpus. According to Daniel Smith, it is probably one of the most ancient works of the canon [Smith 1963, 189]. Chapters 42–43 contain information relevant to temple construction. The text has been published twice: Yatiraja Sampathkumara, *Sree Poushkara Saṃhitā: one of three gems in Pancharatra*, Bangalore, 1934 and P. P. Āṭṭe, *Pausmkarasammhit*, Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Tirupati, 1991 republished 2006. For a further discussion of the *three gems in Pancharatra* see: [Leach 2012].

<sup>18</sup> *Nārādīya tantra* – Possibly the same text that Smith refers to as the *Nārādīyasaṃhitā*. His is a detailed work on temple-building in 31 chapters [Smith 1963, 187]. As far as I know this text has not been published, (there is a different text with the same name that does not deal with temple-building).

<sup>19</sup> Possibly the *Śrīpraśna saṃhitā*. This work, in 54 chapters, is closely associated with the worship in the temple at Kumbakonam. It contains several chapters relevant to temple construction [Smith 1963, 190]. The *Śrīpraśna Saṃhitā* has been published in a critical edition in the Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha Series nr 12 by Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Tirupati in 1969; it was edited by Seetha Padmanabhan, earlier published by Maṅgavilāsa Press, Kumbakonam, 1904, *grantha* script.

<sup>20</sup> *Īśvarasaṃhitā*, a work of 25 chapters, according to Smith closely associated with the worship at the temple in Melkoṭe, and perhaps dated to the 9<sup>th</sup> century. Traditionally associated with the *Sāttvatasāṃhitā* of the “three gems”. Several chapters, particularly 9, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20 and 23 contain information relevant to temple building activities [Smith 1963, 186]. Published by Sudarśana Press Conjeevaram, 1923, devanāgarī script, also Sadvidyā Press, Mysore 1890, Telugu script, recently published again: The text has been translated and edited as *Īśvarasaṃhitā; critically edited and translated in five volumes* by Em E. Lakṣmītātācārya; V. Varadachari; Gaya Charan Tripathi; Alaśiṅgabhāṭṭa and published by the Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts (in association with Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Delhi, 2009) in their *Kalāmūlāsāstra series (Kalāmūlāsāstra granthamālā)*, volumes 42–46. In the introduction to the translation Varadachari and Tripathi argues for dating the *Īśvarasaṃhitā* to the 8–9<sup>th</sup> century Melkoṭe [Lakṣmītātācārya Em E. et al. 2009].

<sup>21</sup> The *Nārayaṇīya* section of the *Mahābhārata*. See: [Grünendahl, Malinar... 2000, 155–161].

<sup>22</sup> Might refer to the Laws of Manu as the first Manu is called Svāyambhuva.

<sup>23</sup> *Vihagendra Saṃhitā* – published as *Śrīsudarśanaśatakam: sāvayahindībhāṣānuvādasahitam, tathā Vihagendrasaṃhitāntargatam Sudarśanakavacam* by Gaṅgāviṣṇu Śrīkr̥ṣṇadāsa Prakāśana (Kalyāṇa, Bambaī, 1990) is philosophical in character (see: Surendranath Dasgupta, *A History of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. III, Motilal Banarasidass, 2000, first edition 1922 by Cambridge, pgs 57ff).

<sup>24</sup> Possibly the *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, which is a Late Vedic text dealing with the solemn rituals of the Taittīrīya school of the Black Yajurveda. The text was, likely, composed in eastern Uttar Pradesh during the late Brahmana period. It was first published in 1904–1923 by the Asiatic Society of Bengal (edited by Willem Caland and translated by C. G. Kashikar) [Caland 1903; Dandekar and Kashikar 1958; Kashikar 2003].

<sup>25</sup> “*iti Ballāsena-devāhrta-dvikhaṇḍāyapaṭalaḥ*”, quoted in the foreword to the first printed edition of the text [Bhattacharya 1952].

<sup>26</sup> Smith does not give any other examples.

<sup>27</sup> Das Gupta and the 1976 edition reads

*ādimūrtir vāsudevaḥ saṃkarṣaṇam athāpi ca/  
saṃkarṣaṇo 'tha pradūyannaṃ so 'niruddham athāsrjat//* HP 22.2 [Das Gupta 1989, 76].

Whereas the 1952 edition reads

*ādimūrtir vāsudevaḥ saṅkarṣaṇamathāpi ca/  
caturmūrtiḥ paraṃ prokta ekaiko bhidyate tridhā//* HP 22.2



The second line of Das Gupta's verse is given as a variant of manuscript B and C in the 1952 edition.

<sup>28</sup> See: [Raddock 2011, pg 89–92] for a presentation and discussion of the manuscripts used by Shastri in ad.

<sup>29</sup> Originally published in German: *Geschichte der indischen litteratur*, 1909, translated by Shilavati Ketkar and revised by the author.

<sup>30</sup> See further discussion: [Raddock 2011, chapter 7].

<sup>31</sup> There is obviously something about the letter K here – see further discussion in note to *Hayaśirṣa Pañcarātra ādikāṇḍa* 3.3–4 [Raddock 2011].

<sup>32</sup> See discussion on the manuscripts in: [Raddock 2011, chapter 4.6].

<sup>33</sup> See discussions on individual trees and plants in the footnotes to the translation found in: [Raddock 2011, chapter 7].

<sup>34</sup> See above. The *Agni Purāṇa* 39.6f has a similar account “only a brāhmin of Madhyadeśa and such places should officiate in and perform the consecration ceremony...” Gonda explains Madhyadeśa as “the land between the Himālaya and the Vindhya, the confluence of the Ganges and the Jumnā and the place where the Sarasvatī river disappears” [Gonda 1977, 56, n121].

<sup>35</sup> Gonda refers to *Samkarṣaṇa kāṇḍa* 31; 1, 3, 1ff.

## REFERENCES

### *Primary sources*

- Agni Purāṇa* (1900), Ānandāśrama press edition, Poona.  
Āpṭe P. P. (2006), *Paṅkarasamhitā*, Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Tirupati.  
*Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra* (1904–1923), Willem Caland (ed.), Transl. by C. G. Kashikar, Asiatic Society of Bengal.  
Caland W. (1903), *Über das rituelle sūtra des Baudhāyana*, Brockhaus, Leipzig.  
Dandekar R. N. and Kashikar C. G. (1958), *Śrautakośa*, Poona.  
Dutt M. N. (transl.), Shastri K. L. Joshi (ed.) (2005), *Agnimahāpurāṇam*, Sanskrit Text and English Translation, Parimal Publications, Delhi.  
*Hari Bhakti Vilāsa* (2005), Sanātana Gosvāmī (com.), Bhumiapati Dāsa (transl.), Purnaprajña Dāsa (ed.), Rasbiharilal & Sons, Vrindavan.  
*Īśvarasamhitā* (1890), Sadvidyā Press, Mysore. (Telugu script).  
*Īśvarasamhitā* (1923), Sudarśana Press Conjeevaram. (Devanāgarī script).  
Kashikar C. G. (2003), *The Baudhayana Śrautasūtra*, Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts, New Delhi and Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Delhi.  
Kramrisch S. (1928), *The Vishnudharmottara Part III: A Treatise On Indian Painting And Image-Making*, Second Revised and Enlarged Edition, Calcutta University Press, Calcutta.  
Lakṣmītātācārya Em E. et al. (2009), *Īśvarasamhitā: Critically Edited and Translated in Five Volumes*, Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts Motilal Banarsidass, New Delhi.  
Mitra R. (ed.) (1873–1879), *Agni Purāṇa: a collection of Hindu mythology and traditions*, Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.  
Mukherji P. D. (2001), *The Citrasūtra of the Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*, Motilal Banarasidass Publishers, Delhi.  
Sastri K. K. D. (ed.) (1976), *Hayaśirṣapañcarātra (ādi-kāṇḍa)*, The Asiatic Society, Calcutta.  
Smith D. (1963), *Pañcarātraprādādaprasāadhanam, chapters 1–10 of the kriya-pada of the Pādma Samhitā, a Pañcarātra text on Temple Building*, Published by the author, Madras.  
*Samarāṅgaṇa-sūtradhāra of Mahārājadhīrāja Bhoja, the Parmāra ruler of Dhāra* (1966), Originally edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya T. Gaṇapatiśāstrī, Revised and edited by Vasudeva Saran Agrawala, 2<sup>nd</sup> rev. ed., Oriental Institute, Baroda.  
Sānkhyatīrtha B. M. (ed.), with a foreword by D. Ch. Bhattacharya and an introduction by Kshitis Ch. Sarkar (1952), *The Hayaśirṣa Pañcharātra (an ancient treatise on architecture and consecration of images)*, Vol. I, Ādikāṇḍa, paṭalāḥ 1–14, Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi, East Bengal.  
Śarmā S. (2007), *Samarāṅgaṇa sūtradhāra of Bhojadeva (Paramāra ruler of Dhārā): an ancient treatise on architecture: (an introduction, Sanskrit text, English translation, and notes)*, Parimal Publications, Delhi.  
Shah P. (2002), *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa, Third Khaṇḍa*, Vol. 3, Parimal Publications, Delhi.

Sugita M., digitalized version, October 20, 1998, based on the edition of Shah P. (ed.) (1958), *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa, Third Khaṇḍa*, Vol. 1, Gaekwad's Oriental Series No. 130, Oriental Institute, Baroda.

Yatiraja S. (1934), *Sree Poushkara Samhitā: one of three gems in Pancharatra*, Aiyangar, Bangalore. (In Sanskrit).

*Secondary sources*

Bhattacharya D. Ch. (1952), "Foreword", in Bhuban Mohan Sāṅkhyatīrtha (ed.), *The Hayaśirṣa Pāñcharātra (an ancient treatise on architecture and consecration of images)*, Vol. I, Ādikāṇḍa, paṭalāḥ 1–14, Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi, East Bengal.

Bock A. (1987), "Die Madhu-Kaiṭhabha-Episode und ihre Bearbeitung in der Anonymliteratur des Pāñcarātra", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Bd. 137, pp. 78–109, available at: <http://menadoc.bibliothek.uni-halle.de/dmg/periodical/titleinfo/150417?lang=de> (accessed September 20, 2022).

Broo M. R. (2003), *As Good as God – the Guru in Gauḍiya Vaiṣṇavism*, Åbo Akademi University Press, Åbo.

Broo M. R. (2005), "The Early Morning Rites According to the Hari-Bhakti-Vilasa", in *Chakra*, University of Lund.

Chowdhury A. M. (1967), *Dynastic history of Bengal (c. 750–1200 A.D.)*, The Asiatic Society of Pakistan, Dacca.

Das Gupta K. K. (1989), "The Pāñcarātra tradition and Brahmānical Iconography", in Anna L. Dallapiccola (ed.), *Shastric Traditions in Indian Arts*, Vol. I: Texts, Vol. II: References and Documentation, Steiner, Stuttgart, pp. 71–92.

Dāsa B. (Māns Broo) (2001), *Dearest to Viṣṇu. Ekādaśī and Dvādaśī According to the Hari-Bhakti-Vilāsa*, Absolute Truth Press, Borgā.

Gonda J. (1977), *Medieval Religious Literature in Sanskrit*, Harrassowitz, Weisbaden.

Goudriaan T. and Gupta S. (1981), *Hindu Tantric and Sakta literature*, O. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

Grünendahl R., Malinar A., Oberlies T. and Schreiner P. (2000), "Nārāyanīya-Studien", *Indo-Iranian Journal*, Vol. 43, Issue 2, pp. 155–161. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/000000000124993949>

Hazra R. C. (1975), *Studies in the Purāṇic records on Hindu rites and customs*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.

Huntington S. (1990), *Leaves from the Bodhi tree: the art of Pāla India (8<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> centuries) and its international legacy*, Dayton Art Institute in association with the University of Washington Press.

Nayar K. E. (2004), *Hayagrīva in South India*, Brill, Leiden. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047413042>

Leach R. (2012), *Textual Traditions and Religious Identities in the Pāñcarātra*, PhD dissertation, The University of Edinburgh.

Majumdar R. Ch. (2003), *The history of Bengal / 1 Hindu period*, B.R. Publications.

Mallaya N. V. (1949), *Studies in Sanskrit texts on temple architecture, with special reference to Tantrasamuccaya*, Annamalai University Chidambaram, India.

Mishra B. (1965), *Polity in the Agni Purāṇa*, Punthi Pustak, Calcutta.

Mukherji S. C. (1966), *A Study of Vaiṣṇavism in Ancient and Medieval Bengal, up to the Advent of Caitanya; Based on Archaeological & Literary Data*, Punthi Pustak, Calcutta.

Raddock E. (2011), *Listen how the wise one begins construction of a house for Viṣṇu: vijānatā yathārabhyaṃ grhaṃ vaiṣṇavaṃ śrṇv evaṃ Chapters 1–14 of the Hayaśirṣa Pañcarātra*, PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Ramachandra S. K. R. (1989), *Āgama-Kośa*, Vol. IV, *Pāñcharātrāgama*, Kalpatharu Research Academy, Bangalore.

Schrader O. (1916), *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra Ahirbudhnya Samhitā*, Adyar, Madras Adyar Library.

Singh A. K. (1991), *The Development of Nāgarī Script*, Parimal Publications, Delhi.

Smith D. (1978), *The Smith Āgama collection: Sanskrit books and manuscripts relating to Pañcarātra studies: a descriptive catalog*, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York.

Wessels-Mevissen C. (2001), *The Gods of the Directions in Ancient India: Origin and Early Development in Art and Literature (until c. 1000 A.D.)*, Dietrich Reimer Verlag, Berlin.

Williams J. (1982), *The Art of Gupta India: Empire and Province*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

Winternitz M. and Subhadra J. (2008), *History of Indian literature*, Vol. III, Part I: Classical Sanskrit literature, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.

*Е. Раддок*

**Визначення часу та місця створення “Гаяшірша-паньчаратри”**

У цій статті мова йде про визначення часу та місця створення “Гаяшірша-паньчаратри” (hayaśīrṣa-pañcarātra) – компіляції, якою впроваджуються правила та ритуали, що регулюють будівництво найскравішого фізичного втілення релігії Південної Азії – індуїстського храму. Як твердить сама “Гаяшірша-паньчаратра”, вона є компендіумом. У ній зібрано матеріал з більш ранніх джерел. Найдавніший відомий рукопис датований XVI століттям.

Тексти, у яких процитована “Гаяшірша-паньчаратра”, датуються періодом від IX–X ст. до XVII ст. “Гаяшірша-паньчаратра” має бути давнішою за них. Імовірний час її створення, запропонований ученими, охоплює період від 500-х рр. н. е. до 1600-х рр. н. е. Це, звісно, дуже широке вікно. Однак загальний науковий консенсус полягає в тому, що текст був написаний близько 800 року н. е. Для визначення часу та місця створення праці можна використати деякі подробиці тексту, як-от опис шляхів ритуального обходу святині. Посилання на письмо Північної Індії свідчить про те, що “Гаяшірша-паньчаратра” була створена незадовго до X століття. Оскільки текст запозичив розділи з “Вішнудгармоттара-пурани”, він мав бути молодшим за неї, тобто його було складено після VII ст. н. е. Характер опису в’юг (vyūha) та локеш (lokeśa) свідчить більше на користь раннього, а не пізнього датування. Отже, VIII–IX ст. н. е. видаються прийнятною робочою гіпотезою. Покликання на системи письма можуть свідчити на користь більш пізнього датування в межах цього періоду.

Усі збережені рукописи тексту були знайдені в Бенгалії та Оріссі, і це робить їх найкращими кандидатами на місце походження тексту. Такі подробиці тексту, що можуть бути пов’язані з місцем його створення, як-от імена князів, є або північноіндійськими, або суто бенгальськими. Отже, текст – північноіндійського походження і, найімовірніше, був складений у Північно-Східній Індії, імовірно в Бенгалії чи Оріссі.

**Ключові слова:** індуїстський храм, “Гаяшірша-паньчаратра”, датування та локалізація санскритських текстів

*Стаття надійшла до редакції 30.09.2022*