

*Addendum—On mending cracks and splits:
further remarks on
khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-saṃskāra and the
Śivadharma’s encounter with Buddhism*

Florinda De Simini
L’Orientale University of Naples

In her contribution to this volume, Schmiedchen brings the focus, among other things, to the ‘provisions for repairs’ formula of the Bhauma-Kara grants, that is *khaṇḍa-sphuṭitādy-abhisamskārārtham*, ‘for restoring [those parts of a building] such as the cracked and split ones.’ This is an expression that is commonly attested in the epigraphic corpus of the Bhauma-Karas that she examines, and of which several variants exist in early and medieval South Asian grants. Referring to a famous study by von Hinüber (2013), Schmiedchen lists this among other expressions pertaining to the field of *maṭha*-administration that have demonstrably originated in a Buddhist context, before their use spread quite ubiquitously to grants of other religious institutions. This trajectory replicates one of the general trends of South Asian medieval religious history, which is the growth of public support for organised Brahmanical religions focussed on the foundation of places of worship and monastic institutions. As recent research has shown and continues to evidence, early Śivadharma literature tells us this story from a Śaiva viewpoint. For the *Śivadharmaśāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara*, whose composition we tend to date to the sixth–seventh century,¹ strive to secure lay sponsorship

¹ For a discussion on the dating of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, see Bisschop 2018, 9ff.

for the building of *āyatana*s and *āśrama*s, for the composition and protection of scriptural manuscripts, as well as for the support of a group of professionals devoted to the *śivajñāna* and the *śivayoga*.² The composition of our texts thus reflects the preoccupations of a community that was actively trying to secure patronage at a time in history when organised Śaivism was growing exponentially; and it was doing so, as many articles in our book point out also on the basis of previous research, in areas that already attested to the rich presence of other deeply institutionalised religions, among which Buddhism was prominent.

Tracing possible links with competing traditions is therefore a crucial point in our knowledge of the Śivadharmā and the type of Śaivism it portrays, as it would add depth to our understanding of the texts and historicise their composition and spread. However, it is at the same time a rather elusive point, its elusiveness resting on the absence of any explicit or unequivocal references to a religious other both in the *Śivadharmāśāstra* and in the *Śivadharmottara*. Moreover, while it is proven that the Śivadharmā texts were reusing materials from the Dharmāśāstra and the *Mahābhārata*,³ no large textual borrowings from or to Buddhist texts have been identified, nor should perhaps be expected, as we noted in the introduction.

In my first overall assessment of the Śivadharmā (De Simini 2016a), I suggested that a possible common thread between this tradition and Buddhism could have been identified in the institutionalised cult of the book, which is firstly attested and made popular in Buddhist literature, and which becomes a dominant, almost defining theme for the Śivadharmā, especially in the *Śivadharmottara* (De Simini 2016a, 2ff). While this suggestion was mainly a working hypothesis, meant to put forward a possible direction to look at, we now have the opportunity to rethink the topic of the Śivadharmā's encounter with Buddhism, and see if

² These aspects have already been highlighted in some of my previous publications, such as De Simini (2016a, 2022). Alexis Sanderson (2019) has further emphasised the 'public' dimension of these texts, with special reference to the *Śivadharmottara*.

³ As exemplary cases, see the reuse of Dharmāśāstra in the *Śivadharmāśāstra* (Bisschop, Kafle and Lubin 2021) and the *Śivadharmottara* (De Simini 2022), which also reuses some crucial doctrines from the *Bhagavadgītā*. Generative links with the Dharmāśāstra and the *Mahābhārata* are also provable for the texts of the Nepalese corpus, as per De Simini and Mirnig 2017, Kafle 2021, and Kiss 2021.

we can add a few more thoughts to corroborate the hypothesis that the two traditions have, in fact, met, and that the Śivadharma might have derived inspiration from Buddhist institutions and practice. I suggest that this can be done exactly through the case-study of the ‘provisions for repairs’ formula: following Schmiedchen’s insight and von Hinüber’s pivotal study, the technical language of *maṭha*- and temple-administration can be examined as a means for tracing interactions between organised religious groups. For the Śivadharma texts have indeed something to say on the topic of repairing buildings, which is specifically tied to the patronage of religious groups and the grants provided for the maintenance of their cultic or residential structures—one of the main priorities of the authors of the Śivadharma.

Our reconstruction must take as its starting point the study that von Hinüber devoted in 2013 to the expression *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-pratisaṃskaraṇa* and its variants, highlighting its ties to early Buddhist literature and inscriptions, and thus to the administrative language of Buddhist chancelleries, even in contexts in which kings were publicly supporting Śaivism. In this regard, von Hinüber argues that there are cases, such as that of the corpus of Maitraka inscriptions, in which the use of *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-pratisaṃskaraṇa* can demonstrably be connected to the activity of Buddhist chancellors under the rulership of Śaiva kings. In his examination, he focuses on the twenty-five Maitraka grants devoted to the Buddhist *saṅgha*, issued between 530 CE and 680 CE, and further limits his scope to those specific cases in which a non-Buddhist ruler finances a Buddhist institution. He observes that the ‘neatly Buddhist formula’ *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-pratisaṃskaraṇārtham*, with the variants *°saṃskaraṇāya* or *°saṃskārāya*, is only attested under Śīlāditya I (595–612 CE) and Dhruvasena II (625–643 CE), where he can prove the activity of Buddhist chancellors.⁴ At the same time, he observes that, since the expression is used in early epigraphy also in non-Buddhist contexts, ‘it

⁴ Before the reign of these kings, the expression is always used in what von Hinüber considers a ‘hybrid’ form due to the use of extra words, such as in *vihārasya ca khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-patita-viśiṣṇa-pratisaṃskaraṇārtham* in an inscription of Dhruvasena I, dated 537 CE; or the replacement of *khaṇḍa°* with *bhagna°*, such as in *bhagna-sphuṭita-pratisaṃskaraṇārtham*, attested in a Dhruvasena I inscription dated 538 CE (von Hinüber 2013, 371–372); in both cases, also note the use of *°pratisaṃskaraṇa* with long *ā*, a form attested in ‘Buddhist Sanskrit,’ as noted below.

is impossible to reverse the argument and to conclude that wherever the expression *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-pratisaṃskāraṇa* is used, Buddhism must be involved' (von Hinüber 2013, 374). Note that the form °*pratisaṃskāraṇa*, with a long *ā*, is sometimes attested in inscriptions and texts alike, and can be considered a form of 'Buddhist Sanskrit' (see Edgerton 1953, s.v.) Early Buddhist literature knew of the 'provisions for repairs' formula either as *khaṇḍa-phulla-paṭisaṃkharāṇa* in Pāli,⁵ or as *khaṇḍa-phuṭṭa-pratisaṃskaraṇa* and *khaṇḍa-sphuṭa-pratisaṃskāra* in Sanskrit texts, such as the *Divyāvadāna* or the *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya*.⁶ A very telling instance from the latter is the one that von Hinüber identifies in the *Cīvaravastu* from the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins,⁷ where he suggests correcting the reading *khaṇḍachuṭṭam pratisaṃskartavyam* of the first edition into *khaṇḍaphuṭṭam pratisaṃskartavyam* (von Hinüber 2013, 368, fn9). His emendation reintroduces the repairs of building into the picture, highlighting how the maintenance of buildings and the copying of manuscripts equally fell into the range of those activities for which a religious institution had to depend on external financial support.

Exactly this point of the *Cīvaravastu*, where the text prescribes what the *saṅgha* can finance through inheritance proceeds, was the object of a tentative parallel reading that I proposed between this Buddhist text and the prescriptions of *Śivadharmaṃmottara*'s chapter two on the use of manuscripts of Śaiva scriptures (De Simini 2016a, 94ff). The fact that both texts portray early religious communities dealing with the copying and preservation of manuscripts of their own scriptures, and exhibit some

⁵ For the expression *khaṇḍa-phulla-paṭisaṃkharāṇa* in Pāli literature and inscriptions, see Silk 2008, 75ff.

⁶ The *Divyāvadāna* presents several instances of *khaṇḍa-sphuṭa-pratisaṃskaraṇa* or °*pratisaṃskāra* in a text that is also available in the *Carmavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya* from Gilgit (on the relationships between the two texts, see Hiraoka 1998) and that recounts a story highlighting the importance of the direct intervention of lay devotees in the management of a Buddhist stupa. This is the narrative of the wealthy merchant Śroṇa Koṭīkarṇa (the *Koṭīkarṇāvadāna*), and the use of the expression *khaṇḍa-sphuṭa-pratisaṃskāra* occurs in the passage in which the Buddha recounts the story of Śroṇa Koṭīkarṇa's past life, to illustrate the good deeds that had earned him the achievement of arhantship in this life. This consisted exactly in the renovation of a stupa that had been built by king Kṛkin for Kāśyapa, but that was going to ruin because the ministries of the king's son had stopped collecting the tax meant for its repairs.

⁷ Dutt 1942, 143 = GM III.143.3–14 = NAI 1.7 (Gilgit), fol. 274v.

lexical connections, makes it possible to draw some parallels between the two works even in the absence of direct historical links. Also the *Śivadharmottara* is very explicit in calling for lay supporters to build new buildings for Śiva and the Śivayogins in connection to the activities of copying, teaching, worship and preservation of Śaiva scriptures. In its chapter two, on the ‘gift of knowledge,’ the manuscripts of Śaiva scriptures, their ritual uses and magic powers, were employed as a strategy both to attract kings to the Śaiva religion and to have them and other wealthy donors build grand and small buildings for the different needs of the community of Śaiva initiates. However, and despite the details that *Śivadharmottara* chapter two provides on the structure and functions of the *śivāśrama*, no references are made here to financing the repairs of buildings.

The situation changes once we turn our attention to the earlier *Śivadharmaśāstra*. This text, besides dealing extensively with topics such as *liṅga*-worship, the *mahāsānti* mantra and the *vratas* of the Śivabhaktas,⁸ also gives in a more concise form some of the teachings on which the *Śivadharmottara* will expand. One of these is the ritual donation of manuscripts, to which the *Śivadharmaśāstra* refers in chapter twelve almost in passing, but also the construction of buildings for Śaiva worship, which is one of the main topics of *Śivadharmaśāstra* chapter four. Here the *Śivadharmaśāstra* shows several points of convergence with the *Śivadharmottara*, as its starting point is the ideal Śaiva recipient of gifts (4.1–14), which is also the main subject of *Śivadharmottara*’s chapter four (De Simini 2022). Furthermore, the prescriptions of *Śivadharmaśāstra*’s chapter four on donations and provisions to a monastery as acts of devotion by laypeople (4.15–52) align with those of the more extended chapter two of the *Śivadharmottara*. In both cases, such prescriptions reveal details of historical relevance, such as those on the construction materials or the structure of a building, as well as its

⁸ On these topics in the *Śivadharmaśāstra* see Bisschop 2018, Mirnig 2019, Bisschop, Kafle and Kiss 2025.

decoration, maintenance, and the religious practices they should host. In this context, the *Śivadharmaśāstra* also gives the following prescriptions:⁹

*kārayec citraśāstrajñair yatnāc citram śivālaye |
rudrāvatāraḥkrīḍādyaiḥ prayogair āgamoditaiḥ || 49 ||
yāvat sa rudrarūpāṇi surūpāṇy atra lekhaḥyet |
tāvad yugasahasrāṇi rudraloke mahīyate || 50 ||
khaṇḍasphuṭitasamskāraṁ yaḥ kuryāt tu śivālaye |
ārāmāvasathādyeṣu labhate maulikam phalam || 51 ||*

One should entrust experts in the pictorial arts with the decoration of a Śaiva temple, by employing themes such as the adventures of the descents of Rudra upon earth and similar stories¹⁰ taught in the scriptures. As many beautiful images of Rudra as he paints there, for that many thousands of *yugas* he shall enjoy bliss in the Rudraloka. Furthermore, someone who repairs the split and torn parts in a Śaiva temple, in [its] gardens, buildings, and the like, will attain the highest reward.

The compound *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-samskāra* used here by the *Śivadharmaśāstra* is a close variant of those examined by von Hinüber, and is identical or almost identical to those attested in early medieval inscriptions. As it is, this attestation might be the earliest non-Buddhist literary occurrence of the ‘provisions for repairs’ formula, the first one in a text to show the fully Sanskritised form °*sphuṭita*°, followed by °*samskāra* without the prefix *prati*°—a choice that in this context might even have been simply dictated by the need to adapt the compound to the *anuṣṭubh* metre.

The expression *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-samskāra* is technical enough to presuppose that its use, especially in a context such as that of chapter

⁹ The following text has been reconstructed on the basis of the manuscript noted in the edition as N₈₂^K, corresponding to National Archives of Kathmandu 1–1075/ NGMPP B 7/3 = A 1082/2, dated to NS 290 (1169-70 CE).

¹⁰ The expression *rudrāvatāraḥkrīḍādyaiḥ* is found in *Sarvajñānottara* 23.10c to describe the decoration of a *japālaya* (23.9), which is a temporary construction in which the practitioner should practice *mantra*-recitation. The compound *rudrāvatāraḥkrīḍā* is also frequently attested in the *Śivarahasya* to describe a type of decorations in a building. For instance, in 15.23 *rudrāvatāraḥkrīḍās* are said to decorate a *gopura*; in *Śivarahasya* 31.9 we find, again with reference to the embellishment of a *gopura*, the compound *rudrāvatāracarita*, probably a synonym of *rudrāvatāraḥkrīḍā*.

four of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, reveals awareness of the administrative jargon, which the authors of our work might have derived from other texts or from inscriptions. Given the attestations of the ‘provisions for repairs’ formula, this is thus one of the points in the text that lends itself to an examination vis-à-vis epigraphical documents, which offer a firmer chronology and more secure localisation. This attempt must come with some caveats, as the use of a single expression is not sufficient evidence of a contact with the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, just like one cannot entirely rule out the possibility that parallel developments happen in different contexts without a generative link. Moreover, even if von Hinüber rightly warns against establishing a straightforward connection between the use of this expression and the influence of Buddhist environments, it is still worth considering whether this specific attestation of *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-saṃskāra* has anything to do with the same Buddhist traditions that promoted the ‘cult of the book,’ which the *Śivadharmottara* reframed as a more Brahmanical ‘gift of knowledge.’

If we restrict our focus to the epigraphic production of the fifth to the early seventh century, which is the period in which Śaivism grows as an organised religion and the *Śivadharmaśāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara* are composed, we can observe the emergence and crystallisation of the ‘provisions for repairs’ formula in the exact same form attested in the *Śivadharmaśāstra* in specific cultural contexts. As it turns out, the early history of our formula follows recognisable patterns that speak of the intentionality in the use of a certain administrative language, as well as of its conservatism. For instance, Gupta grants uniformly use the expression *khaṇḍa-phuṭṭa-pratisaṃskāra*^o, often followed by ^o*karaṇāya*. The use of the more archaic *phuṭṭa* instead of *sphuṭita* sets these attestations in line with those found in the Mūlasarvāstivāda canon and other early Buddhist texts, as mentioned above. This ‘provisions for repairs’ formula is solely attested in Gupta grants from Eastern India, and is used for institutions of various affiliations, such as Vaiṣṇava, Buddhist, Jaina and Ājīvika. Its earliest direct attestations are in the grants discovered at Baigram and Jagadispur (East Bengal), both dated 128 Gupta Era (henceforth: GE)—corresponding to c. 447-448 CE, during the reign of Kumāragupta I.¹¹

¹¹ The Baigram grant was made in favour of the temple of Govindasvāmin, to which the ‘provisions for repairs’ formula is addressed. It was first published by Basak 1931–

However, an ‘indirect’ attestation found in a copperplate issued by *mahārāja* Vainyagupta in 184 GE (c. 503-504 CE), which reports the text of the grant of a certain *mahārāja-maheśvara* Nāthacandra in favour of the Ājīvikas, might enable us to date the earliest epigraphic occurrence of *khaṇḍa-phuṭṭa-pratisaṃskāraṇa* (with long *ā*, as in ‘Buddhist Sanskrit’) to 409-410 CE, i.e. under the reign of Candragupta II.¹² The latest inscrip-

1932; a revised edition is available on Dharmalekha at the following URL: https://dharmalekha.info/texts/DHARMA_INSBengalCharters00049. See pl. 1, l. 7: *bhagavato govindasvāmīno deva-kule khaṇḍa-phuṭṭa-pratisaṃskāra-karaṇāya*. The Jagadisipur charter records a petition made by local officers and householders from Gulmagandhikā, who made an endowment in favour of Jaina monasteries and a Saura temple in the same area. It was published by Sircar 1969–1970; a revised edition is available on Dharmalekha at the following URL: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSBengalCharters00034>. The relevant expression is at l. 11 of pl. 1r and is preceded by a compound exhorting the practice of *bali*, *caru* and *sattra* (pl. 1r, ll. 10–11): *bali-caru-sa*[*ttra*]-[l. 11]-*pravarttanāya khaṇḍa-phuṭṭa-pratisaṃskāra-karaṇāya*.

From eastern Bengal also comes a recently discovered copperplate inscription dated 198 GE (c. 517-518 CE), which records a donation in favour of monasteries at Śiṣīpuñja, Madhyamaṣṭgālikā and Grāmakūṭāgohālī, again connected to the Jain community. The grant depicts anonymous officials enjoining local householders to execute a donation in favour of monasteries in the above-mentioned locations, for the maintenance of the buildings and their repairs, for the worship, and for the welfare of the ascetics. This copperplate was first published by Griffiths 2018. Its text is also available at the following URL: https://dharmalekha.info/texts/DHARMA_INSBengalCharters00055. The expression *khaṇḍa-phuṭṭa-pratisaṃskāra* is here attested twice, at l. 10 of pl. 1r, and at ll. 19–20 of pl. 1v, in both cases within a longer compound (pl. 1v, ll. 19–20): *cānyādyapiṇḍa-pānīpātrikādi-bhojya-khaṇḍa*-[l. 20]*phuṭṭa-pratisaṃskārādyarttham*.

¹² Two copperplate grants issued under *mahārāja* Vainyagupta were discovered in present-day Bangladesh and are dated 184 GE (c. 503-504 CE) and 188 GE (c. 507-508 CE). Both of them attest the use of *khaṇḍa-phuṭṭa-pratisaṃskāra*. Vainyagupta’s copperplate of 184 GE is a recent discovery, published by Furui 2016, and records a grant in favour of the Ājīvikas; Vainyagupta’s copperplate of 188 GE (the ‘Gunaighar copperplate’), recording a grant in favour of Buddhists, is published in Bhattacharyya 1930, and its text is also available at the following URL: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSBengalCharters00001>.

In the grant of 184 GE Vainyagupta approves a grant made in the year 91 by *mahārāja-maheśvara* Nāthacandra in favour of the Ājīvikas residing at the shrine of Mañibhadra at Jayanāṭana. From line 10 onwards, Vainyagupta’s copperplate allegedly cites ‘literally’ (*yathākṣaraiva*) the grant of Nāthacandra, from a copperplate that ‘was given as a gift by a previous king’ (*pūrvvarāja-datti-datta*^o). It is in this quoted passage, which is supposed to reproduce an earlier text dating to c. 409-410 CE, that we find the expression *khaṇḍa-phuṭṭa-pratisa[m]skāraṇāya* at line 13, referring to the repairs of the Mañibhadra

tion dated to the Gupta Era that attests the use of the expression *khaṇḍa-phuṭṭa-pratisaṃskāra-karaṇāya* is the grant issued under a Gupta king whose name is not extant—and whom the editors of the CII take to be Viṣṇugupta—dated to the year 224 (c. 542-543 CE).¹³ This records the purchase of land to make provisions for the maintenance and repair of the temple Śvetavarāhasvāmin, as well as for supplying materials for ritual and daily worship. Gupta grants thus never update their choice of terminology in the case of the ‘provisions for repairs’ formula, even though other areas of South Asia knew of slightly different versions of it.

An early example are the so called ‘Sanjeli Charters’ from Gujarat, three copper-plates that are dateable between the tail end of the fifth century and the onset of the sixth, and which attest the formula in the form *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-pratisaṃskāraṇa*.¹⁴ This reflects, on one hand, the Sanskritisation of *phuṭṭa* into *sphuṭita*, but on the other the use of a long

shrine as one of the scopes of the donation made to the *saṃgha* of the Ājīvikas. See Pl. 1r, ll. 12–13 (note that I quote these lines from the edition in Furui 2016, 660; hence, I do not apply here the Dharma Project orthographical conventions): *jayanātane bhagavatas caturmmukhamūrter mmaṇibhadrasya nāthameṭayatanani kārītan tasya bhagavataḥ s[uma]nogandhadbūpava* [l. 13] *licarusattrapravarttanāya tannivāsyājīva-kabadantasamghasya ca tasyāyanasya khaṇḍaphuṭṭapratīsa[m]skāra-karaṇāya*.

¹³ This is the ‘Damodarpur Copperplate Inscription of Viṣṇugupta,’ published in Bhandarkar 1981 (CII 3, revised edition), 360ff. The earliest edition is in Basak 1919–1920; its text is available at the following URL: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSSiddham00056>.

¹⁴ The ‘Sanjeli Charters’ are published in Ramesh 1973–1974. A revised edition of the texts is available on Dharmalekha: the ‘charter of the merchant’, dated to year 3, at the following URL: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSSiddham00103>; the grant of Mahārāja Bhūta, dated to year 6, at the following link: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSSiddham00104>; and the grant of Mahārāja Mātṛdāsa, son of Bhūta, dated to year 19, at the following link: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSSiddham00105>. These revised texts are published in Balogh 2020, accompanied by a translation and commentary by Bakker.

The earliest of these three copper-plates is dated to year 3 of the *paramabhaṭṭāraka mahārājādhirāja* Toramāṇa; the remaining two are attributed to a king Bhūta and to his son Mātṛdāsa, respectively, probably feudatories of Toramāṇa, and are dated to the years 6 and 19. The editors of the texts agree that these years, too, should refer to Toramāṇa’s chronology; since we know that he is defeated by Prakāśadharman of Daśapura in 515 CE, and his reign spanned about 19 years, then the beginning of his rulership (and his chronology) would fall in c. 495-496 CE (for the reconstruction of Toramāṇa’s chronology on the basis of epigraphical evidence, see Bakker’s considerations in Balogh 2020, 337).

ā in *pratisaṃskāraṇa*, as reported in Maitraka grants, which are attested in a close geographical area. All three charters record donations in favour of Vaiṣṇava institutions, and here the ‘provisions for repairs’ formula is found at the end of long compounds that list other activities and materials that have to be financed through the donation.¹⁵

While these two corpora show consistency in their approach to this terminology, a further small epigraphic corpus dated to the Gupta Era and associated with the so-called ‘Mahārājas of Uccakalpa’ exhibits the shift from °*phuṭṭa*° to °*sphuṭita*°. This corpus consists of copperplates found in Khoh and Sohawal, in modern-day Madhya Pradesh, issued under *mahārāja* Jayanātha and his son Śarvanātha. The expression *khaṇḍa-phuṭṭa-pratisaṃskāra* is used since the Khoh copperplate inscription of Jayanātha, dated 177 GE (c. 496-497 CE), recording the grant of a village as an *agrahāra* so that the Brahmins can provide for the rituals and maintenance of a temple of Bhagavat.¹⁶ Followed by °*karaṇāya*, the formula is then attested in all the grants of Śarvanātha dated between 191 GE (c.

¹⁵ The earliest charter has it in the compound: [l. 3] *bali-caru-satra-dhūpa-gandhapuṣpa-dīpa-taila-khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-pratisaṃskāraṇopayogyam*, while the charter of year 6 reads: [l. 3] *bali-caru-gandha-dhūpa-mālyā-dīpa-taila-cchādya-lepya-khaṇḍa-sphuṭita*-[l. 4]*pratisaṃskāraṇāya*. Charter of year 19 does not include the expression in a compound.

Out of these three grants, very similar to each other in scope and language, the earliest is the most notable, as it was promoted by ‘foreign traders’ (*vaideśavāṇijakāḥ*) who have converged on Vadrāpālī ‘from all the four quarters’—meaning, as we read in the text, mostly from other towns of the Gangetic plain, such as Kanyakubja and Mathurā—along with local merchants.

¹⁶ The text is published, with translation and commentary, by Fleet 1888, 121–125; it is also available on Dharmalekha at the following URL: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSSiddham00083>. In this case, the ‘provisions for repairs’ formula is in composition with other aims of the donation—just like in the Sanjeli grants, but with a different formulation—in the instrumental case, as it denotes the way through which the beneficiaries of the grant can accrue their own merits: [Pl. 1, l. 9] *ebhiś cātra pratiṣṭhāpitaka-bhagavat-pādānām putra-prapautra-tat-putrātikkramena khaṇḍa*-[l. 10]-*phuṭṭa-pratisaṃskāra-vali-caru-satra-pravarttanādy-anuṣṭhānena ca sva-punyābhivṛddhiḥ* [l. 11] *kartavyā*. Note that here and in other grants of this corpus we do not find an explicit reference to a building such as a shrine, but only the honorific mention of the god (here *bhagavat-pādānām*) for whom all the actions must be performed.

510-511 CE) and 197 GE (c. 516-517 CE).¹⁷ However, one of Śarvanātha's later grants from Khoh, dated 214 GE (c. 533-534 CE), uses the Sanskritised form *sphuṭita* in the expression *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-pratisaṃskaraṇāya*—which is, ultimately, the same expression used in the Maitraka grants examined by von Hinüber.¹⁸ In this document, Śarvanātha commands the transfer of a grant of two villages from Pulindabhaṭa to Kumārasvāmin, for the worship of the local goddess Piṣṭapurikā at a temple that he had caused to be built in Mānapura, and for the repairs of such temple.¹⁹

Two aspects must be considered that could have had an impact on this update in the technical terminology of the grant. One is that, while Śarvanātha's earlier grants were all composed and distributed by the same officials, in the grant of 214 GE these were replaced by the following generation of administrators.²⁰ The other is that the use of °*sphuṭita*° is

¹⁷ The earliest of such grants, dated 191 GE (c. 510-511 CE), was found in Sohawal; here, the king makes a grant of an *agrahāra* with the aim of providing for ritual activities as well as repairs of a temple of Kārttikeya that he himself had established. An edition of the Sohawal grant of Śarvanātha can be found in Halder 1927–1928, 127–131. The text is also available on Dharmalekha at the following URL: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSSiddham00089>. See pl. 1, ll. 13–14: *sva-puṇyābhivṛddhaye sva-pratiṣṭhāpitaka-bhagavata-* [l. 14] *svāmi-kārttikeya-svāmi-pādānām khaṇḍa-phuṭta-pratisaṃskāra-karaṇāya* [l. 15] *vali-caru-sattra-gandha-dhūpa-dīpa-taila-pravarttanāya cātisṛṣṭaḥ*.

The Khoh copperplate inscription of Śarvanātha dated 193 GE records the grant of a village for the purpose of the maintenance of buildings and the performance of rituals at a temple of Bhagavan and one of Āditya. It is published and translated by Fleet 1888, 125–129, and available on at the following URL: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSSiddham00084>. As for the second inscription I refer to in the text (Fleet 1888, 129–132, online at <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSSiddham00086>), note that this is technically a fragment with no date, due to the loss of the second plate. However, as noted by Balogh, following Fleet, another fragment missing the first plate (edited in Fleet 1888, 133–134) seems to be the exact continuation of that; this plate bears the date of 197 GE (See Balogh's notes at the following URL: <https://siddham.network/inscription/in00087/?section=metadata>). Despite this, Fleet prefers to treat them as two separate inscriptions, due to technical and material differences in the plates and in the script (Fleet 1888, 132, fn3). The Khoh fragmentary inscription records a grant made to finance rituals and repairs concerning the local goddess Piṣṭapurikā.

¹⁸ Edition and translation of this text are in Fleet 1888, 135–139; a revised version of the text is online at: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSSiddham00088>.

¹⁹ Pl. 1, l. 11: *tenāpi mānapure kārītaka-deva-kul(e) bhagavatyaḥ piṣṭapurikā-devyaḥ pūjā-ni* [l. 12] *mittam khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-pratisaṃskaraṇāya ca*.

²⁰ The grants dated to 191, 193 and 197 GE were all written (*likhitam*) by the *mahāsāndhivigrahika* Manoratha, the son of Varāhadinna and grandson of an *āmātya*

already attested in a slightly earlier grant (dated 209 GE, c. 528-529 CE) found in the same area and ascribed to the Parivrājaka king Saṃkṣobha, recording the donation of a village for the purpose of financing rituals and *sattras*, as well as the repairs at the temple of the goddess Piṣṭapurī,²¹ most likely corresponding to the Piṣṭapurikā mentioned in Śarvanātha's fragmentary grant (possibly dated 197 GE) and in his 214 GE grant. The documented relationship existing between the two families of *mahārājas*, who coexisted in the same territory²² and sponsored the worship of the same local gods, makes a direct influence between the language of the two chancelleries very likely. However, Saṃkṣobha's inscription exhibits a further lexical change that is not reflected in Śarvanātha's Khoh grant, namely the use of *saṃskāra* instead of *pratisaṃskāra*. This makes his grant of 209 GE one of the earliest attestations—not the earliest, as we will see shortly—of *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-saṃskāra* as found in chapter four of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*.

named Phalgudatta. Manoratha was also the brother of Gulla, the *sāndbivigrahika* who had written Jayanātha's grant of 174 GE. The *dūtaka* of all three earlier grants of Śarvanātha was the *mahābalādhikṛta* Śivagupta, a *kṣatriya*. Śarvanātha's grant of 214 GE was written by Manorātha's son, the *sāndbivigrahika* Nātha, while the *dūtaka* was Dhṛtisvāmika.

²¹ Text and translation of Saṃkṣobha's inscription dated 209 GE are in Fleet 1888, 112–116. The text is also available on Dharmalekha at the following URL: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSSiddham00081>. The relevant section is at ll. 13–14 of the second plate: [l. 13] *bhagavatyaḥ piṣṭapuryāḥ kārītaka-deva-kule vali-caru-satropayo* [l. 14] *gārthbaḥ khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-saṃskārārthaṅ ca*. The grant was written (*likhitam*) by Īśvaradāsa, whose name is not accompanied by any other titles, but whose lineage is given up to his grandfather.

²² This connection is substantiated by the 'Bhumara stone pillar inscription,' a 'boundary-pillar' (*vala-yaṣṭhi*) set up by a certain Śivadāsa in a territory that, as per the text of the inscription, lies in the kingdom of both *mahārāja* Hastin of the Parivrājakas, 'worshipping the feet of Mahādeva,' (*mahādeva-pādānuddhyāta-mahārāja-basti-rājye*) and of *mahārāja* Śarvanātha of the Uccakalpas (Fleet 1888, 110–112; the text is also available on Dharmalekha at the following URL: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSSiddham00080>). As Fleet further observes, the presence of this stone inscription roughly in the same area where the copperplates were found proves beyond doubt that these kings did in fact belong to that area of present-day Madhya Pradesh—which, at the time these inscriptions were first edited, corresponded to the Nagod/Nagaudh state (Fleet 1888, 111). Fleet also remarks (1888, 112) that the seal of the Khoh grant of Saṃkṣobha dated to 209 GE resembles those of the Uccakalpa kings.

Inscriptions from Nepal also follow a similar pattern, gradually leading us to the form attested in the *Śivadharmasāstra*: while the expression *khaṇḍa-phuṭṭa-pratisamskāra*²³, referring to buildings or *liṅgas*, is consistently used until the first half of the sixth century,²³ after a significant temporal gap in the attestations, grants issued under the reign of Jiṣṇugupta (first half of the seventh century) and the Licchavi king Śivadeva (late seventh–early eighth century) use *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-samskāra*.²⁴ All attestations of the latter occur in inscriptions connected

²³ The earliest attestation of *khaṇḍa-phuṭṭa-pratisamskāra* in Licchavi epigraphy is found in the very damaged ‘Sitapaila Stone Inscription,’ (text in Regmi 1983a, 24, and Vajracharya 1973, 132; translation in Regmi 1983b, 12), dated to Saṁvat 435 (513 CE), under the kingdom of Vasantadeva, recording a grant of land in favour of the king’s sister, Jayasundarī. Two more attestations from sixth-century Nepal are on *śivaliṅga* bases: one is the ‘Bhasmeśvara *śivaliṅga*’ from Paśupatinath, dated Saṁvat 455 (533 CE), published in Regmi 1983a, 31–32, and Vajracharya 1973, 155, translated in Regmi 1983b, 21, while the other one is the ‘Paśupati *śivaliṅga* base of Ābhirī,’ dated to Saṁvat 462 (540 CE), published in Regmi 1983a, 33–34 (who erroneously gives the date as 402 in the introduction to the text), and Vajracharya 1973, 170, translated in Regmi 1983b, 23. In both cases, the expression *khaṇḍa-phuṭṭa-pratisamskāra* is used, along with other compounds referring to *pūjā*, with reference to the repairs (and worship) of the *liṅgas*, and not of buildings. The ‘Bhasmeśvara *śivaliṅga*’ inscription mentions five *liṅgas* installed by the *pratibhāra* Dhruvasaṅgha Vārta, who made a grant for the worship of the *liṅgas* and for the repair of their thorn and split parts—[. 2] *kāraṇa-pūjā-nimittam khaṇḍa-phuṭṭa-pratisamskāra-nimittam ca*. In the other grant, Ābhirī Gominī, wife of the son of Paramābhīmāni, records the installation of a *liṅga* named Anuparameśvara, after her deceased husband, and the donation of land for the daily worship and for repairs of the *liṅga*: [. 3] *ābhyaṅga-snapan-ārcana-gandha-dhūpa-bali-nivedan-ādi-pravarttan-ārttham khaṇḍa-phuṭṭa-pratisam[. 4]skārārttham ca*. For both inscriptions, see also Mirnig 2016, 323–326 and 347–348.

²⁴ Examples from late seventh-century Nepal are the ‘Pillar inscription of Caṇḍeśvara,’ from the reign of Jiṣṇugupta, recording a donation to members of a congregation of Paśupata *ācāryas* with the aim of providing for repairs of the Chatra-Caṇḍeśvara shrine (note that the expression used here is *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-samādhānārttham*, at ll. 13–14; see Regmi 1983a, 101–102, and Vajracharya 1973, 413; translation in Regmi 1983b, 62–63. A transcript of the Sanskrit text is also online at the URL: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSSiddham02065>). Further examples are two inscriptions from the reign of Śivadeva, such as the ‘Lagantol inscription,’ establishing an *agrahāra* again in favour of a congregation of Paśupatas (see line 8: *tad-deva-kula-khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-samskāra-kāraṇāya* in Regmi 1983a, 132, Vajracharya 1973, 514, or online at the URL: https://dharmalekha.info/texts/DHARMA_INSSiddham02083; translation in Regmi 1983b, 82); and the ‘Balambu stone inscription,’ recording the grant of a village to finance the rituals and repairs of the shrine of Paśupati (see line 8: *deva-kulasya khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-*

to Pāśupata communities, in an area where we know from manuscript attestations that the Śivadharma must have been introduced at an early time, certainly before the ninth century CE (see De Simini 2016b).

The earliest epigraphic attestations of the ‘provisions for repairs’ formula in the exact wording of the *Śivadharmaśāstra* can be traced to two fifth-century inscriptions. The earliest of the two comes from a Buddhist context, but corresponds only partially to our formula. I refer here to the expression *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-śīrṇṇa-samśkāradī*, attested in a grant from Tummalagudem, present-day Andhra Pradesh, dated to the thirty-seventh regnal year of the Viṣṇukundin king Govindavarman I (c. 425–450 CE).²⁵ The word °śīrṇṇa° (‘dilapidated’) used in inscriptions as *viśīrṇṇa* with reference to buildings since at least the time of the Kushan emperor Huviṣka,²⁶ aligns this attestation with similar ones found in the Maitraka grants.²⁷

Roughly at the same time as Govindavarman’s grant, the expression *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-samśkāra* is attested in a document of the fifth-century ‘kings of Śarabhapura,’ from Dakṣiṇa Kosala (present-day Chattisgarh)²⁸ and, later, in those of the Pāṇḍavas, who overtook control of Dakṣiṇa Kosala at the beginning of the sixth century.²⁹ The earliest case is that of the incomplete ‘Rawan Charter,’³⁰ attributed to the kingdom of *mahārāja* Narendra from Śarabhapura. According to Bakker (1994), he might have

sam[l. 9]skāra-kāraṇa-pūjādīkam, in Regmi 1983a, 137, Vajracharya 1973, 530, and online at the URL: https://dharmalekha.info/texts/DHARMA_INSSiddham02082; translation in Regmi 1983b, 60).

²⁵ On this inscription, see Griffiths and Tournier 2017, EIAD 174: <http://hisoma.huma-num.fr/exist/apps/EIAD/works/EIAD0174.xml?&odd=teipublisher.odd>, and Tournier 2018.

²⁶ See von Hinüber 2013, 369, referring to Lüders 1961, 138ff.

²⁷ See, for instance, the already mentioned case of the expression *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-patita-viśīrṇṇa-pratisamśkāraṇārtham*, attested in a grant of Dhruvasena I, dated to 537 CE; or *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-viśīrṇṇa-pratisamśkāraṇārtham* attested in a grant by Guhasena, dated to 550 CE (von Hinüber 2013, 371–372).

²⁸ Śarabhapura may be identified with Malhār, Bilaspur district, Chattisgarh (Bosma 2018, 10–13).

²⁹ The chronology of the so-called Śarabhapuriyas, just like that of the Pāṇḍavas, has been a matter of debate, since they only date their documents to regnal years and offer very few external references. In this article, I follow the reconstruction offered by Bosma (2018).

³⁰ This copper-plate is published in Shastri 1995, 2.12–13. A revised text is also online at the following URL: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSSiddham01006>.

reigned towards the end of the kingdom of Kumāragupta I (c. 415–454 CE). In this inscription, the ‘provisions for repairs’ formula is part of a longer compound, along with words expressing other activities to be financed through this donation, such as the practice of *bali*, *caru* and *sattra*, which are often associated with the repairs of buildings among the scopes of a donation both in contemporary and in later grants (see some examples from the Gupta and the Sañjeli grants cited above). The religious institution to which the grant is given is the shrine of Śrīdharasvāmin, a testimony to the Vaiṣṇava faith of the Śarabhapurīya kings, possibly on the model of their Gupta overlords. Most of the other charters of the Śarabhapurīyas are addressed to Vedic Brahmins, while an increase of donations to religious institutions is recorded under the Pāṇḍavas.

These took power at the beginning of the sixth century, and their historical evidence attest, especially under the long kingdom of Śivagupta Balārjuna (c. 590–650 CE), a growing support for the Śaiva religion, both in the form of the kings’ public affiliation and in the number of grants made to Śaiva institutions and teachers. Pāṇḍava grants to religious institutions keep attesting the use of *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-saṃskāra*, as evidenced in the Philadelphia Museum plates of Nannarāja I (c. 537 CE),³¹ as well as in five more grants of Śivagupta Balārjuna,³² a king

³¹ This is a copper-plate dated to the year 7 of Nannarāja I, recently discovered at the Philadelphia Museum of Art and published by Ali and Zhang (2022). The text is also available at the following URL: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSDaksinaKosala00024>. The king professes his adherence to the Śaiva religion by using the title *paramamāheśvara*, but this specific grant is not addressed to a religious institution, as the beneficiary is the *mahaṛṣi* Vaiśampāyana, a *koṣṭhaka* who receives the grant of a village for the usual formulaic scopes, namely the practice of repair works, *bali*, *caru*, and *sattra* (pl. 2v ll. 3–4): *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-saṃ*[l. 4]*skāra-karaṇa-bali-caru-sattra-pravarttanāya ca*.

³² The relevant grants are: the Sirpur Plates dated to year 46 (see a revised edition of the text at the following URL: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSDaksinaKosala00039>), where Śivagupta grants a village on the occasion of the installation of the Dayeśvara-bhaṭṭāraka temple within the *maṭhikā* of Bāleśvara-bhaṭṭāraka, in order to finance future repairs, maintain and protect the staff associated with the temple, sponsor *pūjā* to Hara and increase the merits of the king and his parents (Pl. 2r–2v): *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-saṃskārā*[l. 7]*rtham tadupayogi-parikara-pratipālanārtham hara-pūjā*-[Pl. 2v, l. 1]*saṃgītaka-pravarttanārtham ca mātā-pitror ātmanas ca puṇyābhivṛddha*[l. 2]*ye*. Furthermore, the undated Sirpur Plates (see a revised edition of the text at the following URL: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSDaksinaKosala00044>) record the donation of a village on petition of the queen Ammadevī to the temple of Ammeśvara-bhaṭṭāraka

whose name is associated with the foundation of the important Śaiva complex of Bāleśvara-bhaṭṭāraka in Sirpur (Śrīpura), that he and his queens kept expanding through a monastery and several other shrines (Bosma 2018, 75ff). The imposing epigraphic evidence of this site, jointly to its archaeological record and iconographic program, witnesses the co-existence, *in situ*, of Śaiva Siddhānta³³ officiants along with several

that she had erected. The donation was meant to finance the usual activities (Pl. 2v): *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-saṃskārārtham bali-caru-saṃgītaka-dbūpa-pūjā*-[l. 2]-*pravarttanāya sammārjjanopalepanārthaṃ ca mātā-pitror ātmanas ca*- [l. 3] *puṇyābhivṛddhaye*. Note that here the text also mentions *sammārjana* and *upalepana*, the ‘scrubbing’ and ‘anointing’ (of icons); the *Śivadharmasāstra* mentions them together in chapter two with reference to the cult of the *liṅga* and the foundation of a *śivālaya*: *yat puṇyam sthāpīte liṅge kṛte yac ca śivālaye | saṃmārjane ca yat puṇyam yat puṇyam upalepane || 2.2 ||*. Another grant that the king makes on petition, again undated, is the one recorded in the Malhār Plates (Sastri 1995, 2. 138–140; <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSDaksinKosala00050>). Here the petitioner is Śivanandin, who makes a grant to the temple of Kapāleśvara-bhaṭṭāraka that he himself had established, to provide for repairs, *bali*, and *caru* (Pl. 2r, ll. 5–6): *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-saṃskāra-karaṇāya bali-caru*-[l. 6]-*pravarttanāya*.

Two more grants from the time of this king attesting to the use of the *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-saṃskāra* formula are discussed in the following footnote.

³³ For the prevalence of the Śaiva Siddhānta tradition in Dakṣiṇa Kosala and the identification of local lineages of teachers, see Bosma 2018, 77ff and 88ff. One of the several inscriptions attesting to the presence of Śaiva Siddhānta teachers and the royal support granted to them are the Sirpur Plates, dated to year 55, recording the donation of a village on the occasion of the installation of the temple Ammeśvara-bhaṭṭāraka, on petition of the queen Ammādevī, to *ācārya* Astraśiva, pupil of Vyāpaśiva and *sthānaguru* of the Bāleśvara complex. Half of the profits from the donated village have to be used for the repair works and the *pūjā*, while another half constitutes the *gurudakṣiṇā* aimed at supporting ‘teaching and feeding students and students of students’ (Pl. 2r-2v): *śrībāle* [l. 5] *śvarabhaṭṭāraka-pratibaddhāmeśvarabhaṭṭāraka-pratiṣṭākāle devakula*-[l. 6]*khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-saṃskāraṇa-pūjādi-pravarttanārtham arddhena* | *apa* [l. 7]*rārdhena* | *gurudakṣiṇāyām śrī-bhagavad-vyāpaśivācāryya-pāda-si* [pl. 2v l. 1] *śya-śrīmad-astraśivācāryya-sthānagurubhyaḥ śiṣya-praśiṣyāṇām vyākhyānātra*-[l. 2]*sattra-pravarttanāya*. Note here the use of the odd *saṃskāraṇa*° in place of *saṃskaraṇa*°. For this grant, see Bosma 2013, as well as the text at the URL: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSDaksinaKosala00043>.

branches of the Pāśupata tradition,³⁴ in a territory that is at the same time dotted with the presence of Buddhist institutions.³⁵

The study of an individual expression, while it can be an important piece of a broader picture, can do little *per se* towards building an argument, and so it will be with our *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-saṃskāra*. Its distribution in epigraphy suggests us to be careful in putting forward any direct Buddhist connections past the mid-fifth century, but also points at other factors to consider, such as its geographical and chronological dissemination. As we noticed, the Sanskritisation of *phuṭṭa* into *sphuṭita*, or the use of *saṃskāra* with or without a prefix, are dictated both by a gradual update of the language, and by the choice of the chancelleries, which tended to prefer consistency over modernisation. The development and spread of *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-saṃskāra* should thus be studied in the broader context of the formation and transmission of administrative language in South Asian grants, across different courts and chancelleries. For what concerns our possible Śivadharmā connection, which is the reason that prompted this *excursus* into the history of a compound, what we can observe is that the effort of connecting our texts to the reality of South Asian polities can indeed be a fruitful way to point to possible research directions, if paired with the right amount of caution. In the present case, we cannot fail to observe that both the seventh–eighth

³⁴ As for the Pāśupata branches that were active in the region, epigraphic evidence seems to point to the presence of a lineage of the Somasiddhānta tradition (see Bakker 2000, and Bosma 2018, 84), as well as of the Kuru branch of Pāśupata Śaivism (Bosma 2018, 66–67). Evidence of the latter might be found in the Lodhiā Plates, dated to year 57. The text of these plates can be found in Shastri 1995, 2.128–133, as well as online at the following URL: <https://dharmalekha.info/texts/INSDaksinaKosala00046>. The Lodhiā Plates record the donation of a village in favour of Īśāneśvara-bhaṭṭāraka, to finance the temple's repairs (Pl. 2r, l. 6: *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-saṃskārārtham*), worship through dance and music, as well as the usual *bali*, *caru* and *sattra*. This donation was made on petition of Śūlapāṇi, pupil of the *ācārya* Pramatha, who is described as a 'constant wanderer' (*capalagocarin*) descending from the *tapovana* of the Dvaitavana forest. For the arguments connecting these and other local ascetics to the Kuru branch, which according to the tradition originated from the fourth disciple of Lakuliśa, born in the Kuru country, see Bosma 2018, 66–67 and 73–74.

³⁵ The presence of Buddhism in the area and the continued monarchical support to this religion is well attested in archaeological and epigraphical evidence, as shown in Bosma 2018, 91ff.

century Nepalese grants, as well as the grants of Śivagupta, both attesting *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-saṃskāra* in the same wording as the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, come from environments in which the Śivadharma has either certainly circulated (as in the case of Nepal, though we do not know how much earlier than the ninth century this happened), or is coherent with the local religious landscape, as in the case of the Pāṇḍava kingdom of Dakṣiṇa Kosala—where, just like in the case of Nepal, Buddhism was a strong presence. While it would be a mistake to build an argument solely on the basis of this, it would be equally misleading not to consider and assess this further piece of evidence in a more general discussion on the localisation of our texts in South Asia, and on the identification of the religious communities of which they were expressions.

One final consideration on this point should be reserved for the anonymous Sanskrit commentary on the *Śivadharmaśāstra*. Its remarks on stanzas 4.49–51 are very brief, but still convey a piece of information that can be relevant for a historical discussion, since we can crosscheck it with the epigraphical data:³⁶

*citrānirmāṇaphalam āha kārayed iti dvābhyām | jīrṇoddbāre
phalam āha khaṇḍeti | maulikam [em.; maulakam Ms] ālayā-
dinirmāṇanimittam phalam ity arthaḥ |*

With the two stanzas beginning with *kārayet* (4.49–50), he teaches the merit of setting up the decorations. With the stanza starting with *khaṇḍa*, he teaches the reward of restoring what is old. The highest reward is due to the construction of the temple and so on—this is the meaning.

The commentator glosses *khaṇḍasphuṭitasamskāram* with *jīrṇoddbāra*, an expression that is similarly found in texts and inscriptions alike, with the meaning of ‘removing what is old’ and damaged to replace it (as per *Tāntrikābhidhānaśāstra* 2, s.v.). As pointed out by Czerniak-Drożdżowicz (2014, 54–55), the topic of *jīrṇoddbāra* is widespread in Pāñcarātra literature, where the term is used not just in its literal sense of ‘removing’

³⁶ My reading is based on the commentary *ad loc.* transmitted in a manuscript in Malayalam script in the Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum, accession number 12766.

the old and damaged objects or parts of the temple, but also in a more extensive meaning of ‘repairing’ these damages. In this sense, the term is thus almost a synonym of *khaṇḍasphuṭitasamskāram*, coherently with the interpretation of our commentator.

As far as epigraphy is concerned, von Hinüber (2013, 372, fn 23) observes that this ‘combination is found in later South Indian inscriptions,’ and proceeds to refer to a few epigraphical examples of the compound *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-jīrṇoddhāra*. The attestations he refers to are chronologically coherent, being dated from the twelfth to the thirteenth century, but also geographically close, as they are all from central Deccan (present-day Maharashtra and Karnataka). I mention this for it seems to me that one could bring more evidence to corroborate the hypothesis that the expression *jīrṇoddhāra* (compounded or not with *khaṇḍasphuṭita*^o) may be less ubiquitous than the many variations of *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-samskāra*, and more connected to a specific regional area. For instance, a search through the epigraphic materials that the DHARMA Project has so far made available shows that the expression *jīrṇoddhāra* (with the orthography *jīrṇōddhāra*) is in fact standard in Kannada inscriptions from Medieval and Modern Karnataka addressing religious institutions of different affiliations, and as such is overwhelmingly attested in *Epigraphia Carnatica*. In this body of texts, it can be used as an independent compound, often in the dative case (and thus *jīrṇōddhāarakke* or *jīrṇōddhārakkam*), but it also occurs as one member of a longer compound, in which case it is often preceded exactly by *khaṇḍasphuṭita*^o. As a purely indicative example, a search for *jīrṇōddhāra* yields 19 occurrences in volume 5 of *Epigraphia Carnatica* (Rice 1902a and b), 34 in volume 7 (Rice 1902c), and 17 in volume 8 (Rice 1904). The expression is likewise widely attested in other volumes of the series. The occurrences in the three volumes that I have examined more closely are mostly dated to the twelfth century, with some being as early as the beginning of the eleventh century (EC 7, Shikarpur Taluk no. 125, dated to 1019 CE, where the expression is available both as an independent noun and in composition with *khaṇḍasphuṭita*^o), while others date up to the seventeenth century (see EC 5, Belur Taluk no. 128, dated to 1638 CE). As for the religious affiliation of the grants, at a first overview all three main organised religions of the area seem to have made equal use of the expression, with

attestations both in Jaina, Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava grants—proving, also in this case, that boundaries are indeed very blurred.

References

Ali, Daud, and Diana Shuheng Zhang

2022. “A New Inscription of the Pāṇḍuvarṁśins of Dakṣiṇa Kosala: Philadelphia Museum of Art Copper-Plates of Nannarāja I, Year 7.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 65: 305–39.

Bakker, Hans T.

1994. “Observations on the History of Dakṣiṇa Kosala.” In *Festschrift Klaus Bruhn Zur Vollendung Des 65. Lebensjahres Dargebracht von Schülern, Freunden Und Kollegen*. Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen.

2000. “Somaśarman, Somavarṁśa and Somasiddhānta: A Pāśupata Tradition in Seventh-Century Dakṣiṇa Kosala—Studies in de Skandapurāṇa III.” In *Harānandalabarī: Volume in Honour of Professor Minoru Hara on His Seventieth Birthday*. Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikationen: 1–19.

Balogh, Dániel

2020. *Hunnic Peoples in Central and South Asia: Sources for Their Origin and History*. Barkhuis.

Basak, Radhagovinda

1919. “The Five Damodarpur Copper-Plate Inscriptions of the Gupta Period.” *Epigraphia Indica* 15: 113–45.

1931. “Baigram Copper-Plate Inscription of the [Gupta-]Year 128.” *Epigraphia Indica* 21: 78–83.

Bhandarkar, Devadatta Ramakrishna

1981. *Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings*. Edited by Bahadur Chand Chhabra and Govind Swamirao Gai. *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* 3, revised edition. Archaeological survey of India.

Bhattacharyya, Dinesh Chandra

1930. “A Newly Discovered Copperplate from Tippera: The Gunaighar Grant of Vainyagupta: The Year 188 Current (Gupta Era).” *Indian Historical Quarterly* 6: 45–60.

Bisschop, Peter C.

2018. *Universal Śaivism: The Appeasement of All Gods and Powers in the Śāntiyadhyāya of the Śivadharmaśāstra*. Gonda Indological Studies 18. Brill.

Bisschop, Peter C., Nirajan Kafle, and Timothy Lubin

2021. *Śaiva Utopia. The Śivadharma’s Revision of Brahmanical Varṇāśramadharmā. Critical Edition, Translation & Study of the Śivāśramādhyāya of the Śivadharmaśāstra*. Studies in the History of Śaivism, I. Università degli Studi di Napoli L’Orientale, Dipartimento Asia, Africa e Mediterraneo.

Bisschop, Peter Christiaan, Nirajan Kafle, and Csaba Kiss.

2025. *Śaiva Rites of Fasting and the Gift of Cattle: A Study in Purāṇic and Tantric Appropriation: A Critical Edition with Translation of Śivadharmaśāstra 10*. Studies on the History of Śaivism 3. UniorPress.

Bosma, Natasja

2013. “The Bāleśvara Temple Complex of Śivagupta: Epigraphical Evidence for the Śaiva Siddhānta and Soma Siddhānta Traditions in Dakṣiṇa Kosala.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 56 (3–4): 245–61.

2018. *Dakṣiṇa Kosala: A Rich Centre of Early Śaivism*. Barkhuis.

Chhabra, Bahadurchand, and Govind Swamirao Gai

1981. “Dāmōdarpur Copper-Plate Inscription of Vishnugupta: The Year 224.” In *Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings, revised edition*. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, III. Archaeological Survey of India.

Czerniak-Drożdżowicz, Marzenna

2014. “When Gods Get Broken—the Theory and Practice of the Jirṇoddhāra and Navikaraṇa in the Pāñcarātrika Sources.” *Cracow Indological Studies* XVI: 51–86.

De Simini, Florinda

2016a. *Of Gods and Books: Ritual and Knowledge Transmission in the Manuscript Cultures of Premodern India*. Studies in Manuscript Cultures 8. De Gruyter.

2016b. "Śivadharmā Manuscripts from Nepal and the Making of a Śaiva Corpus." In *One-Volume Libraries: Composite and Multiple-Text Manuscripts*, edited by Michael Friedrich and Cosima Schwarke, vol. 9. Studies in Manuscript Cultures. De Gruyter: 233–86.

2022. "Rules of Conduct for the Śaivas. The Intersection of Dharmasāstra and Śaiva Devotion in the Śivadharmottara." In *"Verità e Bellezza" Essays in Honour of Raffaele Torella*. Series Minor 97. UniorPress: 291–336.

De Simini, Florinda, and Nina Mirnig

2017. "Umā and Śiva's Playful Talks in Detail (Lalitavistara): On the Production of Śaiva Works and Their Manuscripts in Medieval Nepal. Studies on the Śivadharmā and the Mahābhārata 1." In *Indic Manuscript Cultures through the Ages. Material, Textual, and Historical Investigations*, edited by Vincenzo Vergiani, Daniele Cuneo, and Camillo Alessio Formigatti. Studies in Manuscript Cultures 14. De Gruyter: 587–653.

Dutt, Nalinaksha

1942. *Gilgit Manuscripts Vol III Part 2. Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya-vastu. Vol. 3*. Calcutta Oriental Press.

Edgerton, Franklin

1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. 2 vols. William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series. Yale University Press.

Fleet, John Faithfull

1888. *Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings and Their Successors*. First edition. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum 3. Superintendent of Government Printing.

Furui, Ryosuke

2016. "Ājīvikas, Mañibhadra and Early History of Eastern Bengal: A New Copperplate Inscription of Vainyagupta and Its Implications." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 26 (4): 657–81.

Griffiths, Arlo

2018. “Four More Gupta-Period Copperplate Grants from Bengal.” *Pratna Samiksha: A Journal of Archaeology* New Series 9: 15–57.

Griffiths, Arlo, and Vincent Tournier

2017. “Copper Plates from Tummalagudem (Set I) — Reign of Govindavarman I, Year 37.” EIAD 174. Early Inscriptions of Āndhradeśa.

Halder, R. R.

1927. “The Sohawal Copper-Plate Inscription of Maharaja Sarvanatha – the Year 191.” *Epigraphia Indica* 19: 127–31.

Hinüber, Oskar von

2013. “Behind the Scenes: The Struggle of Political Groups for Influence as Reflected in Inscriptions.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 56 (3–4): 365–79.

Hiraoka, Satoshi

1998. “The Relation between the Divyāvādāna and the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 26: 419–34.

Kafle, Nirajan

2021. “The Umāmaheśvarasāmvāda of the Śivadharmā and Its Network.” In *Śivadharmāmṛta. Essays on the Śivadharmā and Its Network*. Studies on the History of Śaivism 2. UniorPress.

Katti, Madhav N.

1995. “Epigraphical Evidence about Repairs to Ancient Edifices.” *Journal of the Epigraphical Society of India (Bharatiya Purabhilekha Patrika)* (Mysore), Studies in Indian Epigraphy, vol. 21: 37–46.

Kiss, Csaba

2021. “‘...not satisfied with the Mahābhārata...’ (śrutvā bhāratasaṃhitām atṛptaḥ): The Function of the Vṛṣasārasaṃgraha in the Śivadharmā Corpus.” In *Śivadharmāmṛta. Essays on the Śivadharmā and Its Network*, edited by Florinda De Simini and Csaba Kiss. Studies on the History of Śaivism 2. UniorPress: 183–201.

Lüders, Heinrich

1961. *Mathurā Inscriptions: Unpublished Papers*. Edited by Klaus Ludwig Janert. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Majumdar, Nani Gopal

1929. *Inscriptions of Bengal: Containing Inscriptions of the Chandras, the Varmans and the Senas, and of Ísvaraghosha and Dāmodara; Edited with Translations and Notes*. Vol. 3. Varendra Research Museum.

Mirnig, Nina

2016. “Early Strata of Śaivism in the Kathmandu Valley: Śivaliṅga Pedestal Inscriptions from 466–645ce.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 59: 309–62.

2019. “‘Rudras on Earth’ on the Eve of the Tantric Age: The Śivadharmasāstra and the Making of Śaiva Lay and Initiatory Communities.” In *Tantric Communities in Context*, edited by Nina Mirnig, Marion Rastelli, and Vincent Eltschinger. *Sitzungsberichte Der Philosophisch-Historischen Klasse, 899 — Beiträge Zur Kultur- Und Geistesgeschichte Asiens*, 99. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: 471–510.

Ramesh, K. V.

(1986) 1973. “Three Early Charters from Sanjeli in Gujarat.” *Epigraphia Indica* 40: 175–86.

Regmi, Dilli Raman

1983a. *Inscriptions of Ancient Nepal, Vol. 1*. Abhinav Publications.

1983b. *Inscriptions of Ancient Nepal, Vol. 2*. Abhinav Publications.

Rice, Benjamin Lewis

1902a. *Inscriptions in the Hassan District*. *Epigraphia Carnatica*, 5.1. Mysore Government Central Press.

1902b. *Inscriptions in the Hassan District*. *Epigraphia Carnatica*, 5.2. Mysore Government Central Press.

1902c. *Inscriptions in the Shimoga District (Part I)*. *Epigraphia Carnatica* 7. Mysore Government Central Press.

1904. *Inscriptions in the Shimoga District (Part II)*. *Epigraphia Carnatica* 8. Mysore Government Central Press.

Sanderson, Alexis

2019. “How Public Was Śaivism?” In *Tantric Communities in Context*, edited by Nina Mirnig, Marion Rastelli, and Vincent Eltschinger. Sitzungsberichte Der Philosophisch-Historischen Klasse, 899 — Beiträge Zur Kultur- Und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, 99. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: 1–46.

Shastri, Ajay Mitra

1995. *Inscriptions of the Śarabhapurīyas, Pāṇḍuvarṣins and Somavarṣins, Part II: Inscriptions*. Indian Council of Historical Research; Motilal Bandarsidass.

Silk, Jonathan A.

2008. *Managing Monks: Administrators and Administrative Roles in Indian Buddhist Monasticism*. Oxford University Press.

Sircar, Dines Chandra

1969. “Jagdishpur Plate of the Gupta Year 128.” *Epigraphia Indica* 38: 248–52.

Tournier, Vincent

2018. “A Tide of Merit: Royal Donors, Tāmraparṇīya Monks, and the Buddha’s Awakening in 5th–6th-Century Āndhradeśa.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 61 (1): 20–96.

Vajracharya, D.

1973. *Licchavikālakā Abhilekha [Inscriptions of the Licchavi Period]*. Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies.