

3 Textual Production

The *Puṣpacintāmaṇi* is a digest (*nibandha*). Within the field of Dharmasāstra, the teaching of the cosmic, social, and political order, *nibandhas* were written from the 12th century onwards and were produced in large quantities thereafter. Each and every aspect of the world as ruled by *dharma* was considered a potential subject of such digests.⁴⁶ Comprehensive works, including Lakṣmīdhara's *Kṛtya-kalpataru* (12th cent.) and Hemādri's *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* (14th cent.), aimed at covering the field of Dharmasāstra in its entirety. Smaller treatises limited themselves to certain areas or specialized in particular topics. The *nibandhakāras'* general working procedure was to collect quotations considered authoritative (including primarily Dharmasūtras and -śāstras, but also Purāṇas, and later on the *nibandhas* themselves and even Tantric sources),⁴⁷ to arrange them according to their own purposes, and to reproduce them together with more or less extensive comments. *Nibandhas* were produced in the Tantric traditions, too, mainly focusing on ritual matters.⁴⁸ Tantric authors mostly relied on the textual revelations of their own traditions, but also consulted Purāṇas and the Dharmasāstra literature.

This branch of normative Sanskrit literature associated with historical authors, but often depending on texts that had the status of revelation, thrived first and foremost at royal courts. Digests were authored by (or at least ascribed to) scholars in royal service, ministers, or kings themselves (Derrett 1973: 52–53; Pollock 1993: 98). The shift towards *nibandha* production has been seen as related to the need of royals to express and assert themselves as dharmic rulers, and has been interpreted as a reaction to the advent and consolidation of Muslim rule in Northern India after the 11th century (Aiyangar 1941: 7–8; Heim 2004: 7; Pollock 1993: 105–106). More cautious interpretations see the *nibandha* genre as being part of a growing self-assertion along with a need for systematization on the

46 On *dharmanibandhas*, see Cubelic (2021: 30–49), Brick (2015), Davis and Brick (2018), De Simini (2015), Kane (1968–77: I, 545–981), Lingat (1973: 107–122); concerning authors of the Mithila school, see Ganguly (1972).

47 For the types of texts regarded as authoritative by authors of the Dharmasāstra, see Ganguly (1972: 273–304), Hazra (1955), Pollock (1985: 506); concerning the acceptance of Tantric sources, see Hazra (1934, 1935).

48 For Tantric *nibandhas*, see Chakravarti (1999: 66–79), Goudriaan and Gupta (1981: 141–156).

3 Textual Production

part of the Dharmaśāstric tradition, and in the context of a general increase in textual production and circulation (Brick 2015: 11–21; Cubelic 2021: 33–35). The digests as an autonomous literary genre have so far received relatively little, but fortunately recently growing, attention from Indologists.⁴⁹ It would enhance the comprehension of Brahmanical thought immensely if the *nibandhas* were looked at as “ideological expressions in their own right” (Heim 2004: 2) and D. Brick’s (2015) work on the *dānakhaṇḍa* of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* certainly is a milestone in this regard.

The use of flowers in the worship of deities is dealt with in many *nibandhas*. If a digest has an elaborate section on *pūjā*, it is likely to have a passage on the *upacāras*, the *upacāra* flower (*puṣpa*) usually figuring prominently among them. For example, the voluminous *Pūjāprakāśā* of the *Vīramitrodaya*, dating from the first half of the 17th century, describes the worship of the five deities Viṣṇu, Śiva, Sūrya, Durgā, and Brahmā according to the *smārta* tradition.⁵⁰ For the first four deities, there are extensive rules for the use of flowers.⁵¹ Flowers appropriate for the same group of deities are treated in the *Ācāracintāmaṇi* (see below) and *Pūjāpaṅkajabhāskara* (1996: 54–56, 63–64, 70–71, 79–80). The treatment of *pūjā* flowers in the *Dharmasindhu* (1986: 269–271, 316–317) is comparatively short. As for Tantric *nibandhas*, the passages from both the extensive *Prāṇatoṣiṇī* (2000: 645–658) and such smaller works as the *Śāktānandatarāṅgini*⁵² (*puṣpaprakaraṇa* 14.22–79) or the *Nityotsava* (1948: 168–172) may serve as random examples. It would be interesting to compare such passages more closely and examine them in terms of historical developments, but this is beyond the scope of the present study.

There are several texts dealing exclusively with *pūjā* flowers. In addition to the Nepalese textual tradition, introduced in more detail in chapter four below, the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* lists e.g. the *Puṣpanāmapraśnavidhi*, *Puṣpanirṇaya*, *Puṣpapradīpa* and *Puṣpādhyāya* (Veezhinathan et al. 1988: 159–165). In many cases, these texts constitute chapters of larger texts. To my knowledge, among the flower texts, apart from the PuCi, only the *Puṣparatnākara* (see pp. 61–65 below) has been printed.

49 Already in 1941 Aiyangar (1941: 1–2) noted the general neglect of *nibandhas*, and not much had changed 60 years later (Heim 2004: 1–2). Digests have mostly been used by Indologists as a way to date and reconstruct other texts (Hazra 1975: 265–339; Lingat 1973: 108; Rocher 1953: 6).

50 As stated by Bühnemann (1988: 49 n. 116), the *Pūjāprakāśā* is not the only text to describe a *smārtapūjā* for Brahmā. Still, in the more common *pañcāyatana* configuration that is considered the hallmark of *smārta* worship, Gaṇeśa takes the place of Brahmā.

51 Bühnemann (1988: 37–42) provides a summary of the contents.

52 This text was written by Brahmānanda Giri (16th cent.) in Bengal (Goudriaan and Gupta 1981: 145).

In the following section, the PuCi will be submitted to a formal analysis. In *nibandhas*, two textual layers can be distinguished:

on the one side an unchangeable element, viz. the quotations ..., and on the other hand a changeable portion, viz. the way in which the author arranges these quotations, how he explains each of them, and how he makes them subservient to one great unity. (Rocher 1953: 2)

My first focus will be on the “changeable” side of the PuCi: how the compiler arranged his material, and how he structured it with the help of introductory passages and comments. Secondly, the “unchangeable portion” will be analyzed, that is, the way the quotations were fitted into this scheme. Lastly, I will discuss the extent to which the arrangement of the material and the sources quoted in the PuCi reflect the time and place of its composition.

3.1 Textual Structure

The PuCi consists of 378 ½ verses, almost all of which are cited from texts identified by their names.⁵³ The lyric contribution of the author is limited to three verses. According to a common convention, the text opens with a benedictory verse.⁵⁴ Such a verse not only discloses the affiliation of an author to a particular deity and names a beneficiary; it can also be regarded as his “visiting-card as a Sanskrit scholar” (Goudriaan and Gupta 1981: 143). In the case of the PuCi, the “wish-fulfilling jewel of flowers”, Śiva as “wish-fulfiller” (*kāmada*) is addressed and the text is designated as an “abode of desired objects” (*vāñchitārthaniketana*). Another allusion to the title of the text is found in the penultimate verse, where again the fulfilment of the wishes of good people is stated as the express objective. Moreover this latter verse describes the place of composition and the ruling king. One might draw a parallel between the verbal frame of the text and the verbal frames of rituals. In style, position and function, the opening *maṅgalaśloka* can be compared to the ritual commitment (*saṃkalpa*) and other formulas employed

53 Only 4 ½ verses have unspecific attributions (+1.19 *ity abhidhānāt*, –1.20 *kiñca*, –1.126c *anyatrāpi*, +2.88b *iti vacanāt*, –3.35 *anyatrāpi*). Here and in the following a “plus” (+) before a reference from the PuCi refers to a commentary passage after the given verse, whereas a “minus” (–) to an introductory statement before it.

54 For *maṅgalaślokas*, see Sanderson (2005).

3 Textual Production

at the beginning of rituals.⁵⁵ At the end (PuCi 4.97), a petition for the forgiveness of mistakes is formulated, as would be done in rituals as well.⁵⁶

These three verses, then, represent the PuCi author's own comparatively meager contribution to his composition. Other *nibandhas* contain at their beginning more or less elaborate expositions on contents and authorities cited. Closing passages are often used to extensively praise the author or his royal patron. The writer of the PuCi was more a compiler or a redactor than an author. Beyond occasional comments and short statements introducing his chosen rubrics, he left his imprint most obviously on the arrangement of authoritative quotations in a way that, as will become apparent, bespeaks a well-designed scheme.

The four chapters of the text cover directions for the use of flowers in the worship of various revered beings. In the first chapter, flowers for Śiva are dealt with, in the second those for Viṣṇu, the Sun (Sūrya) and the other eight planetary deities (*graha*), as well as for ancestor worship (*śrāddha*), and in the third those for Durgā. The fourth chapter is dedicated to flowers according to the different *āmnāyas*, here the lines of transmission of Kaula traditions headed by female deities, in the forms popular in Nepal.⁵⁷ After the western (*paścimāmnāya*) the northern tradition (*uttarāmnāya*) is treated, then the goddesses Dakṣiṇakālī and Nilasarasvatī, and finally the tradition facing upwards (*ūrdhvāmnāya*).

Prior to the treatment of Śiva, the first chapter of the PuCi (1.1–16) provides general information on *pūjā* flowers. PuCi 1.16cd describes a bipartite classification of flowers into prescribed (*vihiṭa*) and prohibited (*niṣiddha*). A third category referred to, but not further elaborated, is called “prohibited and prescribed” (*niṣiddhavihiṭa*).⁵⁸ In other sources, this class of flowers is called *vihitaniṣiddha* or *vihitapraṭiṣiddha* and is defined as comprising flowers about which

55 For standard formulas at the beginning of rituals, see C. Zotter (2018: 66–75). The parallel is limited, though. Even if the opening verse of the PuCi invokes a deity, is phrased in the first person singular and states the purpose (*artha*) of the text; other standard elements of the *saṃkalpa*, such as the declaration of time and place, are mentioned only at the end of the text.

56 The *kṣamāprārthanā* is a standard feature of any extensive ritual; see Bühnemann (1988: 178–180, *prārthanā*). Some manuscripts of the PuCi (AA₂F₁) exemplify more such formulas as commonly used by Nepalese scribes.

57 The literature and practice of the Kaulas are special developments within the Śaivite tantric tradition (Sanderson 1988: 679–690; for further discussion, see pp. 47–49 below). In texts, Kaula practice, *kaulācāra*, is sometimes distinguished from the Tantric practice, *tantrācāra* (Dyczkowski 2004: 93 n. 1). In accordance with its use in the fourth chapter of the PuCi itself (PuCi –4.1 *tanroktapuṣpavidhāna*), however, I will be using “Tantra” and “Tantric” as generic terms, under which a heterogeneous field of religious traditions and practices is subsumed.

58 +PuCi 1.16: *niṣiddhavihiṭam iti kecit*. In PuCi +2.62b, +2.87, 2.88a this category is mentioned in passing.

contradictory statements exist in the Śāstras. If flowers that are unequivocally prescribed (*vihita*) are not available, they may be used as an alternative.⁵⁹ All common statements, including those general rules explained in relation to Śiva in PuCi 1.17–141 in passing,⁶⁰ constitute the text’s basics, which, according to the śāstric principle of *anuvṛtti*, once introduced must be considered applicable to all that follows.

The treatment of flowers for individual deities follows a common pattern that is observed throughout the text more or less to a tee. In the case of planetary deities (PuCi 2.88c–90) and Dakṣiṇakālī (4.52–62b),⁶¹ only rules for prescribed (*vihita*) flowers are set forth. In all other cases the passages on prohibited (*niṣiddha*) flowers follow those on the prescribed ones. Such a simple bipartite treatment of flowers is seen in the expositions of ancestor worship (2.91–93), the *paścimāmnāya* (4.1–16), Nīlasarasvatī (4.62c–69) and the *ūrdhvāmnāya* (4.70–95). In the more extensive treatments, the category of *vihita* flowers undergoes a more detailed treatment. In it the rules are usually arranged starting from the general and proceeding to the particular. Another principle observable is to arrange the rules sequentially according to their application in the daily and compulsory (*nitya*), the occasional (*naimittika*), and the optional and wish-bound (*kāmya*) ritual. Only in one case, namely in the *uttarāmnāya*, is this sequence explicitly preceded by introductory statements (4.17–23 *nitya*; 4.24–32b *naimittika*; 4.32c–50 *kāmya*⁶²). For Śiva (1.17–141), directions for *kāmyapūjā* labelled as such are found at the end of the *vihita* section (1.88–117), whereas *naimittika* rules (1.30c–44) are not treated as a separate category. As will be discussed in more detail in chapter 5.2 below, there are passages in which *nitya* and *naimittika* rules are not neatly distinguished.

59 *vihita-pratiṣiddha haim̐ arthāt ye śāstromse vihita bhī haim̐ aura niṣiddha bhī haim̐ | vihita-pratiṣiddhake sambandha meṃ tattvasāgarasamhitā kā kathana hai ki jaba śāstrom se vihita phūla na mila pāyeṃ to vihita-pratiṣiddha phūlomse pūjā kara lenī cāhiye* (Cittauriyā et al. undated: 68). As the next acceptable alternative, the ĀC recommends the flower that is neither prescribed nor prohibited (*avihitāniṣiddha*), but considers the prohibited (*niṣiddha*) flower to be under no circumstances acceptable: *atra cādaṃ vihitaṃ | tad abhāve vihitanīṣiddhaṃ tad abhāve ’vihitanīṣiddham upādeyam, niṣiddhaṃ tu sarvathā nopādeyam iti śāstrārthaḥ* (ĀC 1983: 144₈₋₉).

60 Topics treated include the procurement of flowers (1.17–21), the method of presenting them (1.85–86b), times of the day allocated for different species (1.86c–87), circumstances under which flowers are considered afflicted (*upahata*, 1.127b–134b), and exceptions to the common rules (1.125c–126b, 134c–141); for more, see chapter 5.1.

61 In PuCi 4.53ab a prohibition is mentioned within a verse otherwise prescribing flowers.

62 The passage 4.45–50 bursts the frame of these categories (see pp. 133–137). Though it is not specially rubricized, it should more appropriately be conceived of as featuring special rules at the end of the treatment of prescribed flowers, just as the verses PuCi 2.83c–84b or 3.41 do.

3 Textual Production

Occasionally, *nitya* and *kāmya* rules are mixed up, too. The category of *kāmya* rules is altogether lacking in the cases of Durgā (PuCi 3) and Viṣṇu (2.1–65).

It is clear, then, that the compiler had devised a well-defined framework for his text. But along with the scheme conceived by him, the order in which the facts are presented was certainly influenced by the way the quotations appeared in their original contexts.

3.2 Citation Techniques

The PuCi cites 47 different Dharmasāstric, Puranic, and Tantric texts. Most of the citations can be traced to their sources. Still, not all of them appear to be quoted from the original text to which they are attributed, but rather seem to be indirect quotations mediated by earlier collections of verses.⁶³ My attempt to reconstruct the process of the assemblage of the text aims at answering the questions of what could have been the actual texts or manuscripts at the compiler's disposal, and what might have been the principles underlying the compiler's decisions to adopt certain passages and reject others. It should be noted that the following, more than a reconstruction with a claim to facticity, is a sketch of a scenario as it seems conceivable on account of the available sources.

First-hand Quotations

More than half of the verses of the first chapter of the PuCi, 77 out of 141, are quoted from two texts, the *Śivadharma(śāstra)* (ŚDh) and the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* (ŚDhS).⁶⁴ Both texts are found in Nepalese manuscripts, having been copied together with other texts of the so-called Śivadharma text corpus. A third source of the first chapter of the PuCi, the *Uttarottara*, can be located in these same manuscripts. With minor variants, the quotations from all three texts are traceable in the codices. Therefore, it is very probable that the compiler of the PuCi had access to one of these composite manuscripts, which provided him with 110 of 141 verses for the first chapter of his text.

63 For a tabular overview, see A. Zotter (2013: 254–256).

64 I must thank the late Reinhold Grünendahl (Göttingen) for identifying the verses from the *Śivadharmaśāstra* and Anilkumar Acharya (Pondicherry) for localizing the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* passage. Both were so kind to send me the parallels, which I later also verified in the Nepalese edition of the Śivadharma corpus (Naraharinātha 1998).

Table 3.1 Material on *pūjā* flowers from the Śivadharma as rearranged in the PuCi.

Śivadharma (śivārcanadravyavidhi, 5.71–118)	Puṣpacintāmaṇi
prescribed flowers 5.71–86	
5.71–72b	1.17–18b
5.72c–73	–
5.74–86	1.45–57
prohibited flowers 5.87–88	1.118–119
general rules 5.89–96	
5.89–90	–
5.91–92	1.86c–87
5.93–96	–
flower garlands 5.97–117	
5.97	1.13
5.98–114	1.59–74
5.115–117	–
concluding statement 5.118	1.12

In the case of the *Uttarottara*, 23 verses relating to *pūjā* flowers were simply taken over as PuCi 1.22–44 without any introductory statements to distinguish *nitya* (1.22–30b) from *naimittika* (1.30c–44) rules. For the other two texts, actual adjustments to the new context are observable. The *Śivadharma*(śāstra) can serve to exemplify these adaptations. As can be grasped from Table 3.1, the section on *pūjā* flowers—there called *śivārcanadravyavidhi*, “rules applying to material for honouring Śiva”—was rearranged according to the structure of the PuCi. Common statements (ŚDh 5.97, 118) were transposed to the general section of the PuCi, rules for prohibited flowers incorporated in their respective thematic settings (ŚDh 5.87–88), and so on. Only very few lines were not taken over. This concerns ŚDh 5.73, which is the same verse that is quoted in PuCi 1.7 from the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*. The compiler here seems to have preferred another source and accordingly also relinquished the line ŚDh 5.72cd, whose informative value is negligible. From the passage ŚDh 5.89–96, general statements on circumstances that pollute flowers and on substitutes, only two verses were adopted. The rest of it partly overlaps in content with verses cited from Hārīta (PuCi 1.129c–134b) and

3 Textual Production

the *Devīpurāṇa* (PuCi 3.8–9). The case may be different with ŚDh 5.89–90, where two classes of flowers are distinguished, purifying (*pavitra*) ones that can be offered under all circumstances and polluting (*apavitra*) ones that should not be offered under any. As will be discussed in more detail later (pp. 83–85), this rule possibly ran counter to the compiler's own conception of *pūjā* flowers. Finally, the verses ŚDh 5.115–117, which contain explanations of *pūjā* and do not mention flower names, were probably considered too general in character for the PuCi. Adjustments similar to the ones described in the case of the ŚDh can be observed in taking over verses from the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*.⁶⁵

In addition to the three Śivadharmas texts being the major sources for the first chapter of the PuCi, there are other quotations that are likely to have entered the text directly from the original. The texts considered here are, in the first place, either quoted over a long passage or more than once, and with only slight deviations from the original. One such is the *Vaiṣṇavāmrta*, cited in the second chapter of the PuCi (2.36c–60). The choice of verses from passages found in chapters five and seven of a compilation of Puranic chapters called *Vaiṣṇavāmrtaśāroddhāra* in Nepalese manuscripts⁶⁶ attests to a rather selective quoting method. The text as it stands in the PuCi excerpts fairly long passages in the source text. The compiler avoided additions to the pure statement of rules, most of the extensive praise of the merits of presenting individual flowers being left out. Only in the cases of *kadamba* and *tulasī* were more elaborate treatments allowed for, maybe given the prominence these plants have in worshipping Viṣṇu. These two instances help to explain the placement of verses, as all verses from chapter five that were chosen for *tulasī* are placed at the end of the passage (PuCi 2.56c–60) and the ones on *kadamba* that were chosen from the fifth and seventh chapters are put together in one place as PuCi 2.37c–41b.

Apart from the *Vaiṣṇavāmrta*, it seems likely that the *Mahākālasaṅhitā* (MKS), a text that possibly came into vogue in Nepal at the same time as the PuCi was being written (see p. 51 below), was at the compilers' disposal in the original. All 24 verses cited are found in its *Guhyakālikhaṇḍa*. In keeping with the deity concerned, Guhyakālī, most of the citations are incorporated into the PuCi's

65 ŚDhS 5.70–72 ≈ PuCi 1.8–10, ŚDhS 5.76 ≈ PuCi 1.88, ŚDhS 5.83–111 ≈ PuCi 1.89–117, ŚDhS 5.112 ≈ PuCi 1.11, ŚDhS 5.113 ≈ PuCi 1.58, ŚDhS 5.114c–115 ≈ PuCi 1.139c–140, ŚDhS 5.116–119 ≈ PuCi 1.75–78. ŚDhS 5.73–75, where general merits for giving flowers are enumerated, is passed over, as is 5.77–82, where four species (*arka*, *karavīra*, *buka*, *unmatta*) are praised as particularly meritorious gifts, and flowers are graded in terms of merit (see also PuCi 1.45–54). Moreover, line ŚDhS 5.114ab, which makes the same point as PuCi 1.89a, is not quoted.

66 For a transcript of the *Vaiṣṇavāmrtaśāroddhāra* as quoted in the PuCi, see A. Zotter (2013: 388–390).

treatment of the *uttarāmnāya*,⁶⁷ a more general section on the classification of garlands (MKS 6.360c–368) is into the third chapter (3.17c–25).⁶⁸

In the case of the *Manthānabhairava[tantra]* (PuCi 4.1–16), it is difficult to decide whether the passage in question is a first-hand quotation. A comparison with the original⁶⁹ reveals considerable formal differences, although in terms of content the two texts largely agree. It is as if the individual verses and *pādas* of the MBhT were reordered at random.⁷⁰ Moreover, the passage in the PuCi has many deficiencies in terms of language. Therefore, it must either go back to a distorted manuscript of the MBhT or must have entered the PuCi by way of an earlier compilation.

The *Puṣpamālā*, too, may have been available in the original, as all verses quoted are found in it, but it may also have been present in the form of quotations (see below). More passages quoted in the PuCi are traceable in the texts they are attributed to, including the ones from *Jñānārṇavatāntra*, *Narasimhapurāṇa*, *Nīlātāntra*,⁷¹ *Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi*,⁷² *Muṇḍamālātāntra* and *Vāmanapurāṇa*. There is, however, good reason to believe that they entered the PuCi over a circuitous route.

Secondary Borrowings

Only rarely does the PuCi itself refer to secondary sources. All of these references are found in commentarial passages. The *Ācāracintāmaṇi* turns up comparatively often (PuCi +1.87, +1.120, +2.63b, +2.87, +3.43). In the comments following PuCi 4.95, the *Tantrasāra* and the *Tārābhaktisudhārṇava* are mentioned. Further, one instance each of a *Ratnākara* (+2.63b) and a *Sāgara* (+1.87) are referred to, both terms being widely used as last members of names of *nibandhas*. A comparison with editions of the first three mentioned texts discloses that the PuCi is not only based on them where acknowledged, but that they were actually used as virtual

67 MKS 6.235 ≈ PuCi 4.51; MKS 6.236–242 ≈ PuCi 4.17–23; MKS 12.202c–210 ≈ PuCi 4.24–32b.

68 The first line of this passage, MKS 6.360ab, connecting the topic of garlands to the previous one (*ārātrika*, in MKS 6.354c termed the “tree of light”, *dīpavṛkṣa*), was not, however, copied.

69 An edition had been prepared by the late M. Dyczkowski, whom I would like to thank for providing me with the text of the parallel passage (MBhT, *Yogakhaṇḍa*, chapter 22).

70 For example, the parallel for PuCi 4.6–7b (*bhuktimuktipradā jāti campakai stambhane hitam | uccāṭe ketakī yūthī śvetam utpalam āyudam || lābhārthe hemajāti ca bālī balavivardhanī*; see also PuCi 4.8cd *bandhūkaṃ vaśyadaṃ proktaṃ tathā raktāśvamārakaṃ* and 11b *nīlaṃ kṛṣṇaṃ ca mārāṇe*) in *Manthānabhairavatāntra* (*Yogakhaṇḍa*, chapter 22.6c–7) reads: *muktidā siddhidā jāti campakaṃ stambhane hitam || hemajāti ca lābhārthe nīlaiḥ kṛṣṇaiś ca mārāṇe | uccāṭe ketakī yūthī vaśye karavīrabandhukaiḥ*.

71 Except for PuCi 4.64ab.

72 Except for PuCi 4.50cd.

3 Textual Production

quarries for the compilation of the new *nibandha*. Quotations were borrowed together with their textual ascriptions, and at times even introductory statements and commentarial passages.

For the *Ācārācintāmaṇi* (ĀC), I will discuss now in more detail how one may conceive of the actual procedure of adaptation (see Table 3.2). In addition to sections covering the treatment of *pūjā* flowers for individual deities, the PuCi appears to have borrowed from the ĀC's general discussion of *upacāras*. Parts of the commentarial passage after PuCi 1.19b and the following half verse, together with its unspecific attribution (*tad abhāve cauryaṃ apy adoṣaḥ || devatārtham ca kusumam asteyaṃ manur abravīd*⁷³ *ity abhidhānāt*) and the comment on PuCi 1.141⁷⁴, can be traced back to the same passage. Like another common statement (ĀC 1983: 143₁₃₋₁₅), these lines were confined to the first chapter of the PuCi. Particularly striking are the parallels in the treatment of flowers for Sūrya. A long quotation in the ĀC, attributed to the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, provided all that was needed to compile the verses PuCi 2.66–81b. The incorporation of a verse attributed to the *Śātātapiya* (ĀC 1983: 144₁₋₂) seems more complex. It is found in PuCi 3.43 and towards the end of the passage on Sūrya in PuCi 2.87, with a diverging third *pāda* that reads *na durvayā yajed durgāṃ* for *devīnāṃ cārkaṃdārau*. Despite this variation, it is quite likely that in the latter instance, too, the PuCi borrowed the verse from the ĀC. The subsequent commentarial passage goes back to the ĀC's remarks on the same verse,⁷⁵ and on closer inspection the reason for the variation becomes obvious. The third *pāda* altered in PuCi 2.87 provides an occasion for a longer discussion at the second quotation of it in PuCi 3.43. Hence it is likely that in order to postpone this argument to its proper place, the compiler removed the third quarter from PuCi 2.87 and filled the ensuing lacuna by simply repeating the third quarter of PuCi 2.86. Thus, with the exception of two verses from the *Puṣpamālā* (2.81c–83b) and one attributed to a *Yāmala*, the whole discussion on Sūrya in the PuCi seems to be grounded in the ĀC. Except for PuCi 2.28c–32, the

73 This statement occurs more often in passages on *pūjā* flowers (e.g. *Nityotsava* 1948: 168₂₀₋₂₂; *Pūjāpaṅkajabhāskara* 1996: 29₉₋₁₀; *Śāktānandatarāṅginī* +17.42). The unspecific ascriptions (*ity abhidhānāt* in ĀC and PuCi; *iti vacanāt* in the *Nityotsava*, *Pūjāpaṅkajabhāskara* and *Śāktānandatarāṅginī*) may hint at the fact that they are not direct citations of the *Mānavadharmasāstra* (MDh). Do they refer to MDh 8.339? There, roots and fruits of trees, firewood, and grass to feed cows are declared to be *asteya*. This rule may have been extended to *pūjā* flowers in oral teachings. MDh 3.330, however, sets a fine of five *kṣṇalas* for the theft of flowers.

74 Variant reading: *mālākāragrha*° ĀC : *mālākāragrhe* PuCi.

75 The passage in the ĀC: *iti śātātapiyo niṣedho vanatagaro viṣayaḥ | sāmānyata eva tagaraṃ vihitanīṣiddham iti kecit*. In the PuCi the ascription is shifted to the beginning of the quotation, the comment reading: *tagaraniṣedho vanatagarīyaviṣayam ity ācarācintāmaṇikāraḥ || niṣiddhavihitam iti kecit*.

3.2 Citation Techniques

Table 3.2 The *Ācāracintāmaṇi* (ĀC) as drawn upon by the PuCi: numbers given refer to page and line of the printed edition (ĀC 1983). In the case of the PuCi, ascriptions are only cited when differing from the ones given in ĀC.

Ācāracintāmaṇi	Puṣpacintāmaṇi
<i>upacāras</i> in general (ĀC 1983: 137–140)	
137 ₁₁₋₁₂ <i>ity abhidhānāt</i>	+1.19b–19cd
...	
137 ₁₉ <i>Śaivāgama</i>	+1.141
flowers for Sūrya (ĀC 1983: 141–144)	
141 ₉₋₂₃ <i>Bhaviṣyapurāṇa</i>	2.66–73
...	
142 ₆₋₈ <i>Bhaviṣyapurāṇa</i>	2.74–75
...	
142 ₁₉ –143 ₅ <i>Bhaviṣyapurāṇa</i>	2.75–80b
...	
143 ₇₋₉ <i>Bhaviṣyapurāṇa</i>	2.84b–85
143 ₁₀₋₁₁ <i>Bhaviṣyapurāṇa</i>	2.80c–81b
...	
143 ₁₃₋₁₅ <i>Bhaviṣyapurāṇa</i>	1.18c–19b
...	
144 ₁₋₂ <i>Śātātapiya</i>	3.43, *2.87
144 ₃ author's comment	+2.87 <i>ācāracintāmaṇikāra</i>
flowers for Durgā (ĀC 1983: 146–148)	
147 ₅₋₆ <i>Devīpurāṇa</i>	1.125c–126b <i>Puṣpādhyāya</i>
...	
148 ₄₋₇ <i>Devīpurāṇa</i>	3.44–46b
...	
148 ₁₃₋₁₈ <i>Bhaviṣyapurāṇa</i>	3.11–13
flowers for Śiva (ĀC 1983: 152–156)	

3 Textual Production

Table 3.2 (continued)

<i>Ācāracintāmaṇi</i>	<i>Puṣpacintāmaṇi</i>
152 ₁₄₋₁₅ <i>Śivapurāṇa</i>	(1.7 <i>Bhaviṣyapurāṇa</i>)
...	
153 ₁₅₋₁₆ author's comment	+1.120 <i>Ācāracintāmaṇi</i>
...	
155 ₂₃ -156 ₉ <i>Devīpurāṇa</i>	3.35c-40
flowers for Viṣṇu (ĀC 1983: 161-165)	
161 ₅₋₇ <i>Narasimhapurāṇa</i>	2.1-3b
...	
161 ₈ -163 ₁ <i>Narasimhapurāṇa</i>	2.10-28b
...	
163 ₃₋₆ <i>Narasimhapurāṇa</i>	2.3c-5b
...	
163 ₁₄₋₁₉ <i>Agnipurāṇa</i>	2.5c-8b <i>Viṣṇupurāṇa</i>
...	
164 ₁₋₃ <i>Agnipurāṇa</i>	2.8c-9 <i>Viṣṇupurāṇa</i>
...	
164 ₆₋₁₃ <i>Vāmanapurāṇa</i> (<i>balim prati prahlādavākyam</i>)	2.33-36b, 63ab
...	
165 ₂₋₃ <i>Ratnākara</i> , author's comment	+2.63b <i>Ratnākara</i> , <i>ācāracintāmaṇikāra</i>

first 36 ½ *śloka*s of the second chapter, too, appear to have been drawn from the ĀC. A longer citation from the *Narasimhapurāṇa* (ĀC 1983: 161-163₈) on flowers for Viṣṇu was split into two parts and quoted as PuCi 2.1-5b and 2.10-28b. In the case of the *Vāmanapurāṇa*, cited in PuCi 2.33-36b and 2.63ab, the PuCi's dependence on the ĀC is even more obvious because of a parallel introductory phrase⁷⁶ in the first instance and a similar commentarial passage⁷⁷ in the second. The latter

76 Both texts read: *vāmaṇapurāṇe || balim prati prahlādavākyam*.

77 *varjayitveti – ketakīkusumanīṣedho narasiṃhamūrṭiṃ vihāyeti ratnākaraḥ | vihitaniṣid-dham ity anye* (ĀC 1983 165₂₋₃).

must also be seen as the source for the attribution to a *Ratnākara*. In addition, it is likely that, in spite of divergent attributions—to the *Agnipurāna* in the ĀC and to the *Viṣṇupurāna* in the PuCi—the verses cited in PuCi 2.5c–9 are based on the ĀC as well. Firstly, the lines are found between two blocks surely borrowed from the ĀC. Secondly, before PuCi 28c an “as well as” (*tathā*) is inserted at exactly that place of the quotation where the ĀC has verses on the use of leaves. Thus it is more likely that the diverging ascription must either be a mistake on the part of the compiler of the PuCi, or else due to differences between the textual edition of the ĀC and the version of the text the Nepalese scholar(s) had access to, rather than that the PuCi was based on another source here.

Apart from the second chapter of PuCi, for which the ĀC provided the main building blocks, there are also other parallels between the two *nibandhas*. The ĀC’s material on flowers for Śiva, though similar to its Nepalese successor,⁷⁸ largely overlaps in content with passages that have entered the PuCi from the Śivadharmā corpus. The PuCi’s compiler seems to have preferred the latter over the former, maybe because the authority of the Śivadharmā texts weighed heavier. In light of that, I do not deem it too likely that PuCi 1.7. traces back to the ĀC. The verse carries different attributions—in the ĀC to the *Śivapurāna*, in the PuCi to the *Bhaviṣyapurāna*—and is also found in ŚDh 5.73. From the ĀC’s passage related to Śiva, in addition to the two commentarial passages that explicitly mention the ĀC,⁷⁹ the latter’s citation on *naimittika* worship from the *Devīpurāna* seems to have been the only other passage borrowed. But here again, the compiler of the PuCi appears to have felt free to transpose the passage to the third chapter, maybe on the erroneous assumption that the *Devīpurāna* regulates only the worship of the goddess.⁸⁰ What was said about the passage on Śiva holds good to a lesser extent

78 ĀC 1983: 152_{11–13} ≈ PuCi 1.17–18b; ĀC 1983: 152_{14–15} ≈ PuCi 1.7; ĀC 1983: 152_{16–17} ≈ PuCi 1.45; ĀC 1983: 152₁₈–153₄ ≈ PuCi 1.47–52b; ĀC 1983: 153_{9–11} ≈ PuCi 1.56c–57; ĀC 1983: 153_{13–14} ≈ PuCi 1.118; ĀC 1983: 153_{19–21} ≈ PuCi 1.86c–87; ĀC 1983: 154_{7–8} ≈ PuCi 1.13; ĀC 1983: 154_{9–14} ≈ PuCi 1.60–62; ĀC 1983: 154_{23–24} ≈ PuCi 1.63c–64b; ĀC 1983: 155_{1–3} ≈ PuCi 65–66b; ĀC 1983: 155₄ ≈ PuCi 1.68a, 69b; ĀC 1983: 155_{5–17} ≈ PuCi 1.24–30b.

79 *rātrau deyaṇi troṭāṇiyānti dānasāgaras tan na, pūjāprakaraṇāśnānavirodhāt, kiṃ ca, rātrāv avatritasya* (for *avatāritasya*) *taduttaram ahni viniyoge paryuṣitatayā bādhasāpekṣavidhyāpatte* (for *patteḥ*) (ĀC 1983: 154_{18–20}). Note the ascription to a *Dānasāgara* (in the PuCi, *Sāgara*). In the edition of that text, I could trace nothing that could have provided the basis for the quotation. The chapter on flowers (*Dānasāgara* 1953–56: 403–406) does not discuss the times of offering. Is the extension of the text’s name to *Dānasāgara* to be attributed to the editor of the ĀC rather than its shortening to *Sāgara* to the writer of the PuCi? The second comment: *kundaṃ tu varṣavyāpi śivapūjāyām vratarūpāyām ārabdhāyām māghamāse vihitam | anyathā tu māghe ’pi niṣiddham* (ĀC 1983: 153_{15–16}).

80 In fact, in the *Devīpurāna* (79.1–5) these verses refer to Śiva.

3 Textual Production

for the one on Durgā: there are parallels in content,⁸¹ yet, as will be demonstrated shortly, for the third chapter there was still another source available that supplied text even stronger in its resemblance. Real parallels with identical ascriptions and sequences are found for PuCi 3.11–13 and 3.44–46b only. Furthermore, the passage PuCi 1.125c–126b can be explained on the basis of the ĀC. In the ĀC, these lines are ascribed to the *Devīpurāṇa*. But the fact that they are marked as part of a teaching given by Brahmā to Śukra about flowers (*puṣpādhyāya*) might account for the PuCi's attribution to the *Puṣpādhyāya*.⁸²

So far all texts examined have provided material mainly for the first three chapters of the PuCi. For the last chapter, parts of its compilation can be elucidated with the aid of the *Tārābhaktisudhārṇava* and the *Tantrasāra*, the other two *nibandhas* mentioned in the PuCi. In the case of the *Tārābhaktisudhārṇava*, the acknowledged quote⁸³ stems from a passage that deals with flowers in connection with the arranging (*sādana*) of utensils for worship (TBhS 1940: 178₁₂–182₁₁). The same section may have served as the source for other verses of the PuCi, as ascriptions and word order are parallel.⁸⁴ Immediately preceding that passage, alternative items (*anukalpa*) for the performance of the *pañcamakāra*⁸⁵ are treated; there the verses cited as PuCi 4.47–50b occur (TBhS 1940: 178_{1–7}). The same verses from the *Bhāvacūḍamaṇi* are quoted once more in the TBhS (1940: 161_{12–25}) when describing the modes of worship suited for practitioners of different dispositions (*bhāva*). The lines under consideration, together with the preceding ones (PuCi 4.45–46b), are referred to as applicable to *sādhakas* of heroic disposition

81 ĀC 1983: 146₁₄–147₄ ≈ PuCi 3.2c–7d; ĀC 1983: 147_{14–16} ≈ PuCi 3.1–2b; ĀC 1983: 147₂₄ ≈ PuCi 3.14ab; ĀC 1983: 148₁ ≈ PuCi 3.16ab.

82 *brahmovāca – śṛṇu śukra pravakṣyāmi puṣpādhyāyaṃ samāsataḥ* (ĀC 1983: 146₁₃).

83 *tulasivṛjitaṛ itī divyavīraparam itī tārābhaktisudhārṇave* (PuCi +4.95) is based on: *tulasivṛjitaṛ itī divyavīraparam* (TBhS 1940: 181₁₈).

84 TBhS 1940: 179_{7–20} ≈ PuCi 4.55–61b (from the *Muṇḍamālātantra*); TBhS 1940: 179₂₅ ≈ PuCi 4.69ab (from the *Trīśaktiratna*); TBhS 1940: 180_{17, 19, 22–23} ≈ PuCi 1.134c–36b (from the *Gautamīyantra*); TBhS 1940: 180_{27–30} ≈ PuCi 2.63c–64 (from the *Puṣpamālā*) with the line TBhS 1940: 180₂₉ left out, probably because flowers are there classified as *niṣiddhavihita*, a category not entirely accepted by the compiler of the PuCi (see p. 28 above); TBhS 1940: 181_{2–3} ≈ PuCi 1.128c–129b (from the *Puṣpamālā*); TBhS 1940: 181₇ ≈ PuCi 3.42 (from the *Matsyasūkta*), only the first half of the verse being found in the edition of the TBhS; TBhS 1940: 181_{15–17} ≈ PuCi 4.52–53b (from the *Kālitantra*); TBhS 1940: 181_{21–22} ≈ PuCi 4.95 (from the *Kaulāvalīya*).

85 This is the well-known group of five, consumed in Tantric ritual beginning with the *akṣara ma-*, *madya* (intoxicating drink, usually alcohol), *māṃsa* (meat), *matsya* (fish), *mudrā* (“seal”) and *maithuna* (sexual intercourse). The term *mudrā*, commonly understood as a kind of cereal or parched grain, is variously reinterpreted (White 2006: 82–85). In an earlier stratum of Kaula texts, only three *ma-* words (*madya*, *māṃsa*, *maithuna*) are mentioned (ibid.: 83–84).

(*vīrabhāva*). Hence, from the whole citation from the *Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi*, only PuCi 4.46cd and 4.50cd cannot be accounted for in the TBhS; for 4.50cd not even in the manuscript of the *Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi* consulted.⁸⁶ There is no way to decide whether, in the process of compiling the PuCi, a manuscript of the TBhS covering these two additional lines was drawn upon, or whether they stem from another source or from scholarly creativity.

Still other quotes could be borrowed straight from the TBhS, namely from a passage explicitly dealing with flowers as an *upacāra*.⁸⁷ As was observed for other sources of the PuCi, some verses are attributed in the TBhS to some other text,⁸⁸ while others are parallel merely in content.⁸⁹ Yet what is noteworthy is the fact that the compiler seems to have refrained from adopting passages that either openly state or allow for esoteric interpretations. He quotes neither the commentarial passage on the *Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi* quotation (TBhS 1940: 178₈₋₁₂), in which the use of *karavīra* and *aparājitā* flowers is described as a substitute for *maithuna* and the term *laghu* (PuCi 4.48a) is interpreted as menstrual blood, nor other verses that deal with the concept of menstrual blood as a special type of flower.⁹⁰ A commentarial passage even appears to have been reformulated in order to screen out this line of exegesis.⁹¹ I will return to this point in chapter 5.3.

In comparison to the TBhS, the *Tantrasāra* (TS) appears to have been less often borrowed from. The quotations in the section on *pūjā* flowers of the TS (1985: 339–342₆) often coincide in content with verses found in other source texts of the PuCi, but only rarely come with textual attributions. This indicates the PuCi author's preference for attributed quotes. Along with the acknowledged citation

86 For a transcription of the parallel in Nepalese manuscripts, see A. Zotter (2013: 382–385).

87 TBhS 1940: 207₃₀–208₁ ≈ PuCi 4.91c–92b (from the *Jñānārṇavatāntra*); TBhS 1940: 208₃₋₆ ≈ PuCi 1.85–86b (from the *Jñānamālā*), inclusive of the intervening *tathā* and the following comment.

88 TBhS 1940: 178₂₄ ≈ (*kālikāpurāṇe*) PuCi 4.54cd (*kālītantre*); TBhS 1940: 178₂₇₋₂₈ (*matsyasūkte*) ≈ PuCi 4.53c–54b (*kālītantre*); TBhS 1940: 178₂₉–179₄ (*yāmāle*) ≈ PuCi 1.2–4 (*śivarahasye*); TBhS 1940: 179₂₄ (*haragaurīsamvāde*) ≈ PuCi 4.69cd (*kulacūḍāmaṇau*); TBhS 1940: 181_{11,13-14} (*puṣpādhyāye*) ≈ PuCi 1.136c–137 (*gautamīye*); TBhS 1940: 181₂₄₋₂₇ (*kriyasāre*) ≈ PuCi 3.46c–47b (*puṣpādhyāye*), 47c–48b (*iti rāghavabhaṭṭaḥ*); see also the discussion on the *Tantrasāra* below.

89 TBhS 1940: 179₂₉–180₈; 181_{8-10,23}; 181₂₆–182₂.

90 This concerns a passage on *vajrapuṣpa* from the *Muṇḍamālātāntra* (TBhS 1940: 182₆₋₁₀) and an originally three-line quotation in the TBhS (1940: 179₂₅₋₂₇) from the *Trīśaktiratna* that reappears, shortened, in PuCi 4.69ab.

91 Commenting on lines attributed to the *Matsyasūkta* (TBhS 1940: 178₂₇₋₂₈; see also PuCi 4.68cd), the author of the TBhS (1940: 179₇) interprets “*kulas*” as the “adamantine flower etc.” (*kulair vajrapuṣpādyaīḥ*), with connotations of menstrual blood. The PuCi (+4.68d *kulair iti gurugamyam*) refers the reader to his preceptor for an explanation.

3 Textual Production

at the end of the fourth chapter⁹² of the PuCi, a few other verses are paralleled in the TS.⁹³ On closer inspection, one of them turns out to be a mistaken attribution. The two verses PuCi 3.46c–48b on the importance of devotion (*bhakti*) appear in the TS (1985: 340₃₀–341₂) in the same order, but with divergent attributions. PuCi 3.46c–47b, there ascribed to the *Puṣpādhyāya*, is attributed to Rāghavabhaṭṭa in the TS, while 3.47c–48b is ascribed in the PuCi to Rāghavabhaṭṭa but is left unspecified (*tantrāntare*) in the TS. Rāghavabhaṭṭa’s commentary *Padārthādarśa* on the *Śāradātīlaka* (ad 4.100–106) proves the compiler of the TS to be right. Thus either the author of the PuCi or the scribe of the manuscript of the TS at his disposal seems to have muddled things. Nor is there any ready explanation for PuCi 3.46c–47b having been attributed to the *Puṣpādhyāya*, especially since the same verse had already been quoted in PuCi 1.126c–127b with an unspecific ascription (*anyatrāpi*). It may be, though, that *puṣpādhyāya* here could mean “an (unspecified) lesson on flowers” rather than the name of a specific text. This is all the more likely in view of the fact that, as shown above, the other verse attributed to the *Puṣpādhyāya* (i.e. PuCi 1.125c–126c) in all likelihood stems from a passage in the ĀC cited from the *Devīpurāṇa*. The term might have been chosen as a content marker within the dialogue structure of the Puranic passage. After all, the confusion over the two passages is understandable. They both deal with the same topic, are very similar and form part of the standard repertoire of references to *pūjā* flowers.⁹⁴ One last parallel between the TS and the PuCi is worth mentioning. The fifth chapter of the TS (1985: 447₁₄–448₂) contains the long citation from the *Jñānārṇavatāntra* found in PuCi 4.80–91b.⁹⁵ As this quotation is a very prominent reference to the worship of Tripurasundarī,⁹⁶ it cannot be ruled out that it entered the PuCi from another source. But why would the

92 *iti aviphalā saphalā ity arthaḥ | tena bhairavyādipūjāyām tulasī saidaiva tyajyā pūrvavacanāt | itarāsān tu[m] pūjāyām tadasattve sattve vā na doṣaḥ* (TS 1985: 341₂₀₋₂₂).

93 TS 1985: 339₁₉₋₂₀ ≈ PuCi 2.86 (from a *Yāmala*); TS 1985: 339₂₂₋₂₃ ≈ PuCi 2.61 (from the *Gautamīyatantra*); TS 1985: 339₂₄–340₁ ≈ PuCi 2.28c–31 (from the *Gautamīyatantra*); TS 1985: 340₁₈₋₁₉ ≈ PuCi 1.138ab (from the *Gautamīyatantra*); TS 1985: 340₂₁₋₂₂ ≈ PuCi 4.91c–92b (from the *Jñānārṇavatāntra*); TS 1985: 340₂₃₋₂₆ (*tripurām adhikṛtya vārāhīye*) ≈ PuCi 4.92c–94 (*vārāhītantre*); TS 1985: 341₁₁₋₁₆ ≈ PuCi 4.65–68 (from the *Matsyasūkta*).

94 See also e.g. PuCi 1.125c–127b; *Nityotsava* 1948: 172₂₀₋₂₃; *Pūjāprakāśa* 1913: 316₆₋₇; see also earlier remarks of my own (Krause 2005: 84–85).

95 In addition to some variant readings, the TS version covers four more verses standing between the ones cited as PuCi 4.80ab and 4.80cd.

96 The quotation is also found in the second appendix to the Baroda edition of the *Paraśurāmakaḥkṣārasūtra* (1999: 472–473) and in Dattātreyānandanātha’s *Upacāra mīmāṃsā* (2004: 47–50) accompanied by a commentary in Hindi. The 23rd chapter of the *Saubhāgyaratnākara* (2000: 322₁₄–323₆) contains a prose rendering of the passage.

author make an extra effort to consult two sources when everything could be found in one?

The explicit acknowledgment in the PuCi of the three *nibandhas* treated so far is incommensurate with the extent to which they were apparently used, but at least the debt due them is hinted at. Another source, which remains completely concealed, was discovered while exploring the immediate textual surrounding of the PuCi. A manuscript photographed by the NGMPP as E 1136/8 (fols. 9b–16) in Newari script, and other manuscripts to some extent too,⁹⁷ contain a treatment of flowers for *pūjā* attributed to the *Durgābhaktitarāṅginī* (DBhT). This content is apparently excerpted from two different places in the DBhT; the first part from the first chapter, which provides authoritative quotations as *pramāṇa* (DBhT 2001: 12–13), and the second from the chapter dealing with application, *prayoga* (DBhT 2001: 92–98). Almost all verses of the third chapter of the PuCi that have not been accounted for so far can be traced in the DBhT.⁹⁸ The material has been slightly rearranged to conform to the internal logic of the PuCi. Moreover, the comments and the *saṃkalpavākya*s given in the *prayoga* section of the DBhT were left out. Some divergent attributions, though, merit closer inspection. The verses corresponding to PuCi 3.8–9 are attributed to the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* in the DBhT (2001: 13₁₋₄) and are a half verse short. But as the compiler had access to direct parallels in the ŚDh (5.95–96) and ĀC (1983: 154₃₋₆), attributed to the *Śivapurāṇa*, I suspect that he either silently extended the quotation from the *Devīpurāṇa* starting in PuCi 3.1., dispensing with a textual ascription, or copied from a reproduction of the text where the ascription was missing. In quoting the lines PuCi 3.34–35ab, he seemingly made a mistake similar to the one described above regarding the verse from Rāghavabhaṭṭa’s commentary. But here not only the ascriptions but also the sequence is inverted. In the DBhT, first the line paralleling PuCi 3.35ab with the correct ascription to the *Kālikāpurāṇa* (69.71ab) is found, and then PuCi 3.34, attributed to the *Devīpurāṇa*. From the text as transmitted in the DBhT and the excerpts from it, no ready explanation can be given for the rearrangement in PuCi 3.44–46b, including the missing quarters 3.44c and 45b, the different second half of PuCi 3.34, and the diverging ascriptions for PuCi 3.14–16b and 3.41 (*Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* vs. *Devīpurāṇa* in the DBhT). But overall, on account of the large overlap between the texts, it seems highly probable that either a manuscript of the DBhT or one with the excerpts from that text was a source for the

97 Fragments in NGMPP E 2901/24 (fols. 76a–79b); partial versions in B 134/17 (fols. 8a–16a); G 52/11 (fols. 3a–5b); A 452/42. In the last of these it is accompanied by a translation into Newari.

98 The DBhT contains parallels for the third chapter in the following segments: PuCi 3.1–7, 3.8–9, 3.41, 3.44–46b, 3.11–13, 3.14–16b, 3.35ab, 3.34ab, 3.26–29, 3.16c–17b, 3.30–33.

3 Textual Production

PuCi. With a copy of the excerpts from the DBhT, the compiler of the PuCi possibly gained access to the *Puṣpamālā*, as some textual witnesses of these excerpts transmit this flower text too.⁹⁹

The Author's "Writing Table"

With the review of quoted sources, an attempt has been made to trace the actual process of compiling the PuCi. As stressed above, I do not claim to have reconstructed the historical facts; the aim, rather, is to present a reasonable scenario for the working procedure. According to what has been proposed here, it was possible to construct large parts of the PuCi on the basis of a mere eight manuscripts; among them two multi-text manuscripts, i.e. 1) one of the Śivadharmā corpus containing the *Śivadharmasāstra*, the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, the *Uttarottara* and other texts; and 2) a manuscript covering the *Puṣpamālā* and excerpts from the *Durgābhaktitarāṅginī*. Along with these, the following texts seem to have been present: 3) the *Ācāracintāmaṇi*, 4) the *Tārābhaktisudhārṇava*, 5) the *Tantrasāra*, 6) the *Mahākālasaṃhitā*, 7) the *Manthānabhairavatantra* and 8) the *Vaiṣṇavāmr̥ta*.

Additionally, the oral tradition may have played a role in fashioning the text. Short citations, especially those that are easy to remember—such as the verse from the popular *Śivagītā* (1.29) in PuCi 1.21, or the definition of common units of weight referred to in PuCi 1.14ab with the ascription *bhārata*, which, while not traceable in the critical text of the *Mahābhārata*, is found in the *Mānavadharmasāstra* (8.134cd)—may have been part of the orally transmitted repertoire of śāstric references.

Including the verses at the beginning and the end of the text, more than 85 % of the whole body of it could so far be accounted for. Untraced parts of quotations that were otherwise found in source texts, namely some verses from the *Gautamīyatantra* (PuCi 1.138c–139b, 2.32) and a half verse each from the *Nilatantra* (PuCi 4.64ab) and the *Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi* (PuCi 4.50cd), might stem from textual variations. For some citations from Purāṇas and Dharmasāstras, however, all proof is missing so far. This concerns verses from the *Liṅgapurāṇa* (PuCi 1.79–84, 1.121–125b),

99 In addition to the manuscript mainly consulted here (NGMPP E 1136/8), both texts are included in B 134/17 and G 52/11. The fragment microfilmed as E 2901/24—probably the oldest extant representative of that manuscript group—may originally have contained the *Puṣpamālā* as well. In any event, the pagination of the extant folios (76–85, 87–89, 97–99) hint at other texts having been copied prior to the excerpts from the DBhT. As noted before, some of the verses the PuCi quotes from the *Puṣpamālā* are also found in the TBhS, but not the ones on the worship of Sūrya and ancestors (PuCi 2.81c–83b, 2.90c–92b).

the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* (PuCi 1.7, 2.88c–90, 3.10), the *Śivapurāṇa* (PuCi 1.5–6), the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (PuCi 2.91), the *Kārtikamāhātmya* (PuCi 1.120, 2.65), the *Śivarahasya* (PuCi 1.2–4, 1.14c–16) and some with reference to one Hārīta (PuCi 1.129c–134b, 1.141).¹⁰⁰ From the fourth chapter, the origin of one verse from the *Śaktiyāmala* (PuCi 4.61c–62b), of a line from the *Kulacūḍāmaṇi* (PuCi 4.69cd) and of longer quotations from the *Vāmakeśvaratantra*¹⁰¹ (PuCi 4.70–79) and the *Hāhārāvatantra* (PuCi 4.32c–44) remains untraced. Given the general working procedure, it is not at all unlikely that these verses were borrowed from earlier compilations or quasi-compilations of the same type as the excerpts from the DBhT. If one were to speculate a little further, one compilation covering Puranic and Dharmasāstric quotations, and another one Tantric in leaning, may suffice to explain what remains missing.

While this last remark is little more than guesswork, some general observations on the working method can be made based on what has been said above. These largely parallel what F. De Simini (2015) has shown to be the working procedures of the writers of *nibandhas* on gift-giving. The compiler of the PuCi must, first and foremost, have aimed at a concise treatment of the set topic, as his choice of quotations reveals. In terms of content, he appears to have left out repetitions and unnecessary details wherever he could. Moreover, he seems to have refrained from adopting passages that ran counter to his own conception of *pūjā* flowers or ones that were too esoteric. On a formal level, a slight preference for primary over secondary sources is observable. Alternatively, the reason for quoting the Śivadharmaliterature instead of borrowing Puranic passages from the ĀC may have been purely technical, or because the former was held to be more authoritative for guiding the worship of Śiva. The question of relative authoritativeness might also explain why a citation of the *Devīpurāṇa* was transposed from the chapter on Śiva to that on Durgā, why another ascription to the *Devīpurāṇa* was changed to the rather unspecific *puṣpādhyāya*, or why quotations with textual attributions were favoured over ones without. Furthermore, the author seems to have taken some liberties when quoting (PuCi 2.87; 3.1–9) to fit into the arrangement of text. In

100 A Dharmasūtra and several later *smṛti* texts are attributed to an author named Hārīta. As Hazra (1958: 260–262) has observed, many verses quoted in *nibandhas* with ascriptions such as *Hārīta*, *Vṛddhahārīta*, *Laghuhārīta* etc. cannot be traced in a work—published variously under the title *Hārītasamhitā* or *Laghuhārītasamṛti*—that parallels chapters 57–61 of the *Narasimhapurāṇa*. As expected, the verses cited in the PuCi cannot be traced to this text either. A Nepalese manuscript of a *Hārītasamṛti* (filmed NGMPP B 454/10) contains at least one of the quoted verses (PuCi 1.129c–130b on fol. 3b₇₋₈). The same verse, however, can also be traced to the ĀC (1983: 137₂₁₋₂₂). For Hārīta and the texts and verses ascribed to him, see Kane (1968–77: I, 133–136).

101 No parallel was found in the consulted editions of the *Yoginīhṛdaya* or the *Nityāṣoḍaśīkārṇava*, which together form the *Vāmakeśvaratantra*.

3 Textual Production

the case of the citation of the *Devīpurāṇa* (PuCi 3.35c–40), however, the transposition resulted in a mistake, admittedly one already present in the PuCi’s source text, the DBhT. Another type of failure was wrong attribution (PuCi 2.5c–2.8b, 3.35ab, 3.46c–47b). But overall, the compiler of the PuCi has treated his sources faithfully. In terms of arrangement, the last chapter of the PuCi is especially remarkable. For the other three chapters the author could rely on his predecessors when assigning text passages to deities, whereas for a rearrangement of the received quotations according to the Nepalese *āmnāya* system in the fourth chapter—if not based on a source that has remained hidden so far—he was on his own. As will be shown in the next chapter, this required special expertise.

These findings on the composition of the PuCi are in accordance with what has already been said about other genres of religious Sanskrit literature, notably the Purāṇas and Tantras: newly emerging texts borrow passages from their predecessors, rearranging and altering them to conform to the new line of argument. For a *nibandha* this goes without saying. A compilation by its very nature relies on earlier texts. Yet the case of the PuCi shows that the actual dependency on source texts may differ from what is acknowledged in the text itself. As will be demonstrated when discussing the Nepalese textual tradition on *pūjā* flowers, the PuCi is not a singular case. As also De Simini’s (2015) analysis of selected passages on gifts has shown it is a general working principle of the *nibandha* writers to draw heavily on earlier compilations and then add some “fresh” citations from primary sources available at that time and place.

The method exemplified here with the PuCi, when extended to larger arrays of texts, could help to understand dependencies in particular *nibandha* schools, as well as the spread of authoritative quotations over longer distances and spans of time. More than fifty years ago, L. Rocher proposed that by such comparison “Nibandhas may be fitted into a small number of pedigrees” (Rocher 1953: 4). To my knowledge, so far this suggestion is still waiting to be implemented. The time and effort involved could nowadays be largely reduced by using electronic data processing tools. In contrast to the work involved in dealing with genres such as the Purāṇas or Tantras, it should be much easier to establish an absolute chronology and topography of *nibandha* production, as very frequently the name of the author or royal patron of a work, or both names, are mentioned.

3.3 Local Colour

When describing the anonymous copy F₄ of the PuCi, S. Vasudeva aptly remarked: “The sources quoted by the anonymous author betray this as a compendium made in Nepal itself” (Vasudeva 2006).¹⁰² As will be discussed in the following, not only the authorities cited in the PuCi but also its treatment of deities is typical of the elite Nepalese religion of its time.

The Deities

Generally speaking, the PuCi presents a combination of material drawn from sources of the Smārta tradition (i.e. prescriptions for the worship of Sūrya, Viṣṇu, Śiva, Durgā and the ancestors) and from Tantric texts. The arrangement into four chapters, devoted sequentially to Śiva, Viṣṇu, Durgā and the goddesses of the Kaula *āmnāyas*, conforms closely to what has been noted by various scholars to be the basic configuration of the Nepalese theistic pantheon under the Mallas. As B. Bledsoe observed, Śiva, Viṣṇu and a Tantric goddess are “precisely the array of deities that the late Mallas would install at the heart of their newly sovereign kingdoms; these three, plus a king, constituted a minimal set” (Bledsoe 2004: 105–106).¹⁰³

The dominant current of what is subsumed under “Hinduism” in Nepal has been the Śaivite one. To the present day, rather than calling themselves Hindus, Nepalese with a theistic leaning use the term *śaivamārgin* to distinguish themselves from fellow Buddhist countrymen. Śiva-Paśupati is regarded as the Overlord of Nepal (*nepālādhipati*). In their *praśastis*, Nepalese rulers since Aṃśuvarman (ca. 605–621 CE) have invoked him as a protective deity (Mirnig 2013; Slusser 1998: 228). Epigraphic evidence for the worship of Śiva in his form as a *liṅga* goes even back to the 5th century (Mirnig 2016). As the material legacy shows, Viṣṇu, too, has been worshipped by Nepalese royal dynasties from an early period onwards (Gögge 2007; Pal 1985). As elsewhere in South Asia and beyond, the king is compared to or identified with deities of royal character. He is likened to Indra or, as the protector of *dharma*, to Viṣṇu. But apart from his association with male deities (among whom, at least in Malla times, Bhairava too assumed a prominent place), he also depended on his *śakti*, his “might”, or “regal power”, without whom he

102 The same statement reappears in the catalogue of the gallery Sam Fogg in London (2007: no. 31).

103 See also Dyczkowski (2004: 194), Flood (2006: 79), Toffin (2005: 29–50), White (2006: 127).

3 Textual Production

would become powerless (*aśakti*).¹⁰⁴ This female concept, central to Tantric theology and influential for medieval Hindu rule all over South Asia,¹⁰⁵ manifests in human queens—often seen as incarnations of Śrī or Lakṣmī and embodiments of the welfare of the state—but above all in divinities. Thus the relationship to particular goddesses forms part of the self-definition of many South Asian rulers. They may be his family or lineage deity (*kuladevatā*, *kuladevī*, *kulasvāminī*), his chosen deity (*iṣṭadevatā*) or the state goddess (*rāṣṭradevī*). In the case of the Malla dynasty, pride of place was accorded to a goddess named Taleju or Tulajā, who was established in the innermost zone of the royal palaces of each of the three cities of the Kathmandu Valley.¹⁰⁶ Other goddesses close to the hearts of medieval Malla rulers include those of preceding dynasties, such as Māneśvarī or Duimāju (Toffin 1996); their lineage deity, called Digutaleju; and locally important goddesses, such as Guhyeśvarī at Deopatan. The goddesses' worship places and traditions were made to relate to each other and to the kings in various configurations through rituals that were rooted in both textual and oral traditions and sources. One key figure for linking locally resident goddesses to the translocal textual tradition is the warrior goddess Durgā (Sarkar 2017). Durgā is certainly the most important exoteric form of the royal *śakti* (Gupta and Gombrich 1986: 132). Hence, in Nepal as in many Hindu royal cults, the celebrations of the autumnal Navarātra (New. *mohanī*, *mvahni*; Nep. *dasaī*), which are held during the first nine days of the bright lunar half of the month of Āśvina and end in a celebration of victory on the tenth day (*vijayadaśamī*), figure centrally.¹⁰⁷

104 In classical Hindu mythology, this notion finds expression in stories such as the one related in the ninth chapter of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*. There, Indra is cursed by Durvāsā and deprived of his *śrī* because he had disregarded a garland gifted by the seer that is regarded as the “abode of *śrī*” (*śrīyo dhāma*, *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 9.12c). Accordingly, the wealth, righteousness and prosperity of the three worlds, bereft of *śrī*, fades away; see also PuCi 4.93d *indrasyāpi harec chriyam*.

105 For Tantric conceptions of rule, see Flood (2006: 76–81), Gupta and Gombrich (1986), White (2006: 123–147).

106 It is far from certain who Taleju actually is. Her Newari name *taleju*, the venerable (*ju*) on high (*tale*), seems more to veil than to reveal her identity. In the *vaṃśāvalis*, the dynastic chronicles written down only as late as the 19th century, she is mostly called Tulajā (Bhavānī), the deity said to have been brought into the Kathmandu Valley by the early Malla kings from Mithila (see e.g. Pradhan 1986: 274–278; Slusser 1998: I, 189–208, 316–320; Toffin 2005: 42–47; for a possible link to the Bhavānī of Tuljapur in Maharashtra, see Jansen 1995: 139–177). Taleju is addressed with many different names and invested with different esoteric identities, depending on who is speaking or writing and who listening or reading. The name Taleju might even serve as a generic term subsuming deities of different local origin that accreted within the Nepalese royal palaces over the course of time (see Sanderson 2003–2004: 366–372, especially n. 74).

107 Concerning Navarātra, commonly known as Dasaī in Nepal, see Anderson (1988: 142–155), Krauskopff and Lecomte-Tilouine (1996), Filchner and Marāthe

Navarātra is not the only occasion on which relations between the many aspects and manifestations of goddesses worshipped in the Kathmandu Valley are ritually attended to. The PuCi reflects another approach in combining exoteric and esoteric worship traditions fundamental to medieval elite religion in Nepal. It starts with the treatment of non-initiatory worship practice, with typical emphasis upon Śiva and Viṣṇu, while Sūrya and the ancestors are only treated peripherally. Then the whole third chapter is devoted to Durgā. The fact that she is placed last among the Smārta deities does not detract from her importance. On the contrary, this chapter can be viewed as the pivot between two modes of worship. The exoteric identity of all esoteric goddesses treated in the last chapter of the PuCi, the form they assume in public ritual, is Durgā Mahiṣāsūramardīnī.¹⁰⁸

The Tantric tradition as reflected in the PuCi and practised by the textually informed Nepalese elites since at least the Malla period is based on Sanskrit texts of the Kaula schools that are characterized by the dominance of female over male deities.¹⁰⁹ Although the beginning of the Nepalese tradition still needs to be investigated in more detail, there are hints that it predates the Malla rule, as some of the relevant texts were already being copied in the 11th century.¹¹⁰ The system of classifying these traditions into six lines of transmission (*ṣaḍāmnāya*) prevailed from at least the 13th or 14th centuries onwards (Dyczkowski 2004: 259)¹¹¹ and enjoyed the patronage of the Malla kings. According to the—most probably Nepalese (Sanderson 2003–2004: 368–369)—*Parātāntra*, the deity presiding over the tradition facing upwards (*ūrdhvāmnāya*) is Tripurā. Hātakeśvarī

(1953: 124–137), Pradhan (1986: 268–315), Toffin (2005: 93–115), A. Zotter (2018a, 2018b, 2021b). At present I am working on a more comprehensive study of the festival. For Durgāpūjās elsewhere, see e.g. Biardeau (1981), Dirks (1987: 39–42, 167), Jansen (1995: 85–91), Mallebrein (1996), Sarkar (2020), Schnepel (1996: 205–262), and the contributions in Hüsken et al. (2021), Simmons et al. (2018).

108 Dyczkowski (2004: 136, 148, 240, 283). The *Puraścaryārṇava*, written in the early Śāha period under King Pratāpasimha (r. 1775–1777), prescribes the worship of Durgā and Kumārī as a compulsory part of the daily ritual routine of all *āmnāyas*: *kulabālā ca durgā ca sarvāmnāyaprapūjitā | kulabālā kumārī | tathā – tayoḥ pūjā tu sarvatra nityatvenābhidhīyate | tayoḥ durgākumāryoḥ* (*Puraścaryārṇava* 1985: 13_{13–15}).

109 For the place of the Kaula texts within the Śaiva Tantric literature, see Dyczkowski (1989), Sanderson (1988).

110 The earliest Nepalese manuscripts of the Kubjikā tradition date from the 11th century (Dyczkowski 2004: 102, 175; Sanderson 2003–2004: 372). J. Lidke (2000: 153 n. 41) reports on a copy of the *Vāmakeśvarātāntra* from the 12th century.

111 The classification of Kaula scripture developed in the course of time. An earlier four-fold system was expanded by incorporating the *ūrdhvāmnāya* and the *adhāmnāya*. Likewise, the affiliation of goddesses changed, e.g. Tripurā's from the *dakṣiṇāmnāya* to the *ūrdhvāmnāya*; see Dyczkowski (1989: 66–92), Sanderson (1988: 680–690, 2003–2004: 366–369).

3 Textual Production

or, alternatively, the Buddhist goddess Vajrayoginī is held to be the main goddess of the one facing downwards (*adhāmnāya*). The eastern tradition (*pūrvāmnāya*) is headed by Pūrṇeśī, the northern (*uttarāmnāya*) by Kālī in her many forms, such as Guhyakālī or Siddhilakṣmī. The latter seems to be an important esoteric identity of the royal Taleju (Dyczkowski 2004: 224; Sanderson 2003–2004: 370–371; Timalšina 2006) and is closely related to Kubjikā, the goddess of the royal chaplain (*rājapurohita*) and the main deity of the western tradition (*paścimāmnāya*). The southern tradition (*dakṣiṇāmnāya*) is presided over by Niśeśī.¹¹²

The six *āmnāyas* should not be understood as simply being parallel traditions. According to what is known about the ritual practice, which is still strictly secret, the practitioners not only worship the deity into whose cult they have been initiated, but also the deities of the other five traditions, though in dissimilar hierarchic configurations.¹¹³ From the six lines, the three centring on the goddesses Kubjikā, Kālī and Tripurā seemingly have always been the ones most developed in practice, while the sixfold scheme may have remained more theoretical in character (Sanderson 2003–2004: 368).

The system of *āmnāyas* is the one governing the arrangement of the fourth chapter of the PuCi, where, again, the western (PuCi 4.1–16), northern (4.17–51), and upward-facing traditions (4.70–95)—the worship of Kubjikā, Kālī and Tripurasundarī—are treated most elaborately. In contrast, the eastern tradition (*pūrvāmnāya*) and the one facing downwards (*adhāmnāya*) play no role at all. The affiliation of the two goddesses Dakṣiṇakālī and Nilasarasvatī treated in the PuCi between the *uttarāmnāya* and the *ūrdhvāmnāya* is ambiguous in the literature. According to a conception popular in Nepal, codified, for example, in the *Tārābhaktisudhārṇava* and the *Nilatantra*, Nilasarasvatī is a form of Tārā. The *Puraścaryārṇava* lists both Dakṣiṇakālī (as *dakṣiṇā kālī*) and Tārā as deities of the southern tradition (*dakṣiṇāmnāya*).¹¹⁴ The same text (*Puraścaryārṇava* 1985: 12_{16, 21}) reports a second affiliation of Tārā with the *uttarāmnāya*. Dakṣiṇakālī, too, is sometimes counted

112 This classification from the *Parātantra* is cited by Goudriaan and Gupta (1981: 77) and dealt with in more detail by Sanderson (2003–2004: 268–269). Dyczkowski (2004: 259) refers to a Nepalese *paddhati* for the same arrangement. Lidke (2000: 69–70), however, reports a different scheme, according to which the *adhāmnāya* is only headed by Hāṭakesī, and the *uttarāmnāya* by Vajrayoginī, the *dakṣiṇāmnāya* by Kālī, and the *pūrvāmnāya* by Pañcamukhī.

113 Dyczkowski (2004: 193–291) has done research on the ritual system of the Newar Tantrics with a focus on Kubjikā worship. Lidke (2000) has investigated the cult of Tripurasundarī, until today highly popular among Newars as well as Indo-Parbatiyas, and her position in the *ṣaḍāmnāya* (here: *sarvāmnāya*) system. Timalšina (2006) has pointed out some of the complexities and shifting identities of the goddesses involved.

114 *nīśeśī dakṣiṇā kālī bagalā chinmastakā || bhadrā tārā ca mataṅgī dakṣiṇāmnāya-devatāḥ* (*Puraścaryārṇava* 1985: 12₄₋₅).

among the goddesses of the northern tradition (Dyczkowski 2004: 259). The textual arrangement in the PuCi can be interpreted both ways. The treatment of the *uttarāmnāya* might conclude with that of these two goddesses, or, alternatively, their treatment in the text may have been intended as separate from that of the *uttarāmnāya*. The latter standpoint is taken in the Newari translation, where the section starting with flowers for Dakṣiṇakālī carries the heading *dakṣiṇāmnāya*. As will be shown shortly, the same position is taken by the author of the *Puṣpa-ratnākara*, who, moreover, associates Nilasarasvatī with the *adhāmnāya*, probably conceiving of her as the Tārā of the Buddhist tradition. It is hardly surprising that different opinions are attested. From his experience with Nepalese texts that expound the *āmnāya* system, A. Sanderson has gained the impression that, except for the *paścimāmnāya*, *uttarāmnāya* and *ūrdhvāmnāya*, the remaining “slots’ are filled rather randomly for the sake of completeness” (personal communication, March 2012).

If M. Dyczkowski’s (2004: 194–195) description of the ritual system of the Nepalese elites as forming two intersecting circles is adopted, it may be stated in conclusion that the treatment of *pūjā* flowers in the PuCi travels along a radius from the outer circumference of a circle, dominated by the masculine gods Śiva and Viṣṇu, on towards the centre, where the female deities of the Kaulas rule.

The Texts

As mentioned above, an experienced scholar could easily infer the Nepalese origin of the PuCi just by looking at the sources cited. Indeed, all source texts traced can be called typically Nepalese. The main sources for the first chapter of the text (the *Śivadharm[śāstra]*, the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* and the *Uttarottara*) belong to the Śivadharma texts, which were probably formed into an interrelated corpus in Nepal, the oldest of them being the *Śivadharmaśāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara* (De Simini 2016). Most of the extant manuscripts themselves come from Nepal.¹¹⁵ This does not mean that the texts were actually written in the Kathmandu Valley,¹¹⁶ but for some of the later texts of the corpus it has been

115 This was stated to be the case for the ŚDh by R. Grünendahl in an email dated 16 July 2008. According to A. Acharya (email dated 9 February 2007) the ŚDhS has almost exclusively been transmitted in Nepalese manuscripts. Hazra (1952), too, was only working with copies from Nepal. Over the last years the Śivadharma corpus has attracted enormous scholarly interest. Workshops and conference panels have been held and papers published, and various editions and studies will be coming out; for an overview, see Bisschop (2018: 1–2), De Simini (2016: 236).

116 See Bisschop (2018: 25–27) on the question of provenience of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*.

3 Textual Production

proposed that they “could have been composed in Nepal” (De Simini 2016: 239). According to A. Acharya (email, dated 6 February 2007), who at the time was preparing a critical edition of the *Śivadharmaṅgraha*, this text could indeed be Nepalese. A verse cited as PuCi 1.105d (taken from ŚDhS 5.99d) may even contain a tell-tale sign of its Nepalese origin. There a plant named *vaṅkuli* is mentioned. The vernacular seems to have sneaked into the Sanskrit, as *vaṅkulī* is a Newari word denoting the north-eastern direction (Malla et al. 2000: s.v.; Skt. *īśāna*).

The question of origin aside, what is sure is that there has been an enduring and vivid interest in the Śivadharma literature in Nepal. The texts were not only copied frequently, there is also evidence of their being read in public; at the court of Pratāpa Malla, for example (De Simini 2016: 258). Thus the Śivadharma corpus spread out over both publicly displayed court religiosity and texts like the PuCi that codified aspects of it.

The fourth chapter of the PuCi, too, draws on sources that enjoy great popularity among Nepalese scholars and ritual practitioners. The *Manthānabhairavatantra* is one of the basic authorities for the *paścimāmnāya* (Dyczkowski 1989: 97–100), and the *Vāmakeśvaratantra* for the *ūrdhvāmnāya* (Lidke 2000: 153 n. 41), while the hitherto unpublished *Hāhārāvatāntra* transmitted in many Nepalese manuscripts seems to be decisive for guiding the ritual practice of the *uttarāmnāya*.¹¹⁷

Moreover, the influence of the scholarly tradition of Mithila is characteristic of Nepalese compositions. From the 11th century onwards at the latest, this region, lying to the south and variously called Videha, Tirubhakti or Tirhut, has been a major contact zone from and through which Sanskrit texts and various of the Nepalese elites themselves entered Nepal (Slusser 1998: I, 65–68; Dyczkowski 2004: 229 n. 229). The PuCi cites *dharmānibandhas* of the Mithila School, namely Vācaspatimiśra’s¹¹⁸ (1450–1480) *Ācāracintāmaṇi*, Rudradhara’s¹¹⁹ *Puṣpamālā* and Vidyāpati’s¹²⁰ *Durgābhaktitarāṅginī*.

The Tantric *nibandha Tārābhaktisudhārṇava* (TBhS), one of the main sources for the last chapter of the PuCi, seems to have come out of Mithila as well. In the preface to the edition of the TBhS, its author, Narasiṃha Ṭhakkura, is dated to

117 Many cards in the handwritten catalogue of the NGMPP attribute hymns in praise of the most important goddesses of the *uttarāmnāya*, Guhyakālī and Siddhilakṣmī, to the *Hāhārāvatāntra*, e.g. the *Guhyakālisahasranāmastotra* (NGMPP E 27/22, E 70/30, E 165/4, E 395/11, E 429/21, E 449/4, G 33/13, G 186/5, H 77/7, H 242/19, H 369/3) or the *Siddhilakṣmīstotra* (NGMPP E 254/8, E 336/39).

118 For Vācaspatimiśra’s extensive literary activities, including eleven different *cintāmaṇis*, see Ganguly (1972: 112–153), Kane (1968–77: I, 844–854).

119 For more details on the *Puṣpamālā*, see below.

120 For Vidyāpati’s *Durgābhaktitarāṅginī* (first half of the 15th cent.), see Ganguly (1972: 97–99). Kane’s (1975: I, 810–815) treatment of Vidyāpati does not deal with the DBhT.

the second half of the 17th century.¹²¹ This date needs revision, as the PuCi was composed sometime between 1641 and 1651. If the editor's claim proves right that the *terminus post quem* of the TBhS can be set by the year 1612, when Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa finished his *Nirṇayasindhu*, the time of composition can now be narrowed down to the 40 years between 1612 and 1651.¹²² More narrowly, Narasiṃha Ṭhakkura, the author of the TBhS, may have been working during the same time and at the same place as the author of the PuCi. At least there is an indication of this in a story about Pratāpa Malla, in which another of the PuCi's sources, the *Mahākālasaṃhitā* (MKS), is mentioned. The MKS is considered of major authoritativeness for the worship of Guhyakālī in Nepal, so that M. Dyczkowski (2004: 222 n. 41) even assumed it might have been a Nepalese composition. However, as A. Sanderson has repeatedly stressed, the MKS is more likely to come from Mithila.¹²³ Nepalese chronicles hint at its origin in Mithila as well.¹²⁴ According to their account, during the reign of Pratāpa Malla there was a Brahmin from Mithila, named Narasiṃha Thākura, who consulted the *Mahākālasaṃhitā* in his successful Tantric quest to find the seat of the goddess Guhyeśvarī in Deopatan, and it was there that the king subsequently erected her temple. The close connection between Pratāpa Malla and the PuCi, in which both the MKS and Narasiṃha Ṭhakkura's TBhS are cited, indicate a historical core to the chroniclers' tale. Without other corroborative evidence, however, it will be impossible to separate fact from fiction.

The *Tantrasāra* is another text not much older than the PuCi. This compilation is especially popular in Bengal, where it was composed by Kṛṣṇānanda Āgamavāgiśa, probably around 1580 (Banerji 1978: 78), but in any case after 1577.¹²⁵ The examples of the TBhS and the TS bear especially ample evidence as to how fast and far texts travelled in the 17th century, revealing that digests became incorporated or absorbed almost instantly into new compositions.

121 The preface of the TBhS (1940: 3), to which Bhattacharyya (1999: 80) and Goudriaan and Gupta (1981: 154) refer, dates the floruit of Narasiṃha to the years around 1668.

122 So far I could not verify P. Bhaṭṭachārya's vague statement: "from his writing he appears to be later than Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa who wrote his *Nirṇaya-sindhu* in 1612 A.D." (TBhS 1940: 3). At least as far as the edition of the TBhS is concerned, I was unable to trace any reference to Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa or his *Nirṇayasindhu*.

123 Sanderson (1988: 685) and a private communication with Sanderson cited by Michaels (2008: 140).

124 Hasrat (1970: 77) and Wright (2000: 217–218).

125 Different from S. C. Banerji, who refers to an earlier investigation by D. C. Bhattacharya, Gupta and Goudriaan (1981: 139) give the 17th century as the likely time of composition. The *terminus post quem* is set by the year of composition of Pūrṇānanda's *Śrītattvacintāmaṇi*, cited in the TS (Banerji 1978: appendix 3, xxxiii).

3 Textual Production

To sum up, the author of the PuCi availed himself of the śāstric form of a *nibandha* for his text. In drawing on passages from primary and secondary sources that contained regulations for the application of flowers in worship, he hardly went beyond the scholarly tradition at hand. Even the short commentarial passages were largely borrowed from earlier texts. At most, the compiler mediated conflicting views among the learned voices. Apart from three verses framing his composition, then, he himself remained virtually silent.

The structure of the text and its thematic accentuation, however, attest to a skilful reflection of local circumstances. The author tailored his work to fit the “official religion”, the Nepalese royal ritual culture of his time. Accordingly, special attention was paid to those deities that were of major importance in the late Malla period: Śiva, to whom the text is dedicated (and who, in his most important Nepalese manifestation, Paśupati, is mentioned in its penultimate verse), Viṣṇu, Durgā and the goddesses of the Kaula schools. The text mirrors a combination of exoteric (chapters 1–3) and esoteric (chapter 4) worship traditions peculiar to medieval Nepalese religiosity. The third chapter serves to integrate both forms of religion, as Durgā is the common exoteric identity of the *āmnāya* goddesses. The Malla kings, and after them the Śāha rulers, held key positions within both modes of religion. The kings defined themselves through their relation to the state god Śiva-Paśupati, were depicted as forms of Viṣṇu, and acted as the major “ritual patrons” (*yajamāna*) in matters of public religion. Additionally, they were initiated into the secret practices of the Kaula traditions that provided the guidelines for the worship of their royal goddesses.

Not only the pantheon that was dealt with but also the sources drawn upon indicate the author’s objective of producing a text at once recognizable as authoritative for the worship practices patronized by the Malla rulers. On the one hand, long-established authorities of Nepalese ritual practice are prominently quoted, such as the Śivadharma literature and the *Manthānabhairava-* and the *Vāmakeśvaratantra*. On the other hand, in relying on recent textual imports from northern India, such as the TBhS or the TS, the text links up with the then prevalent pan-Indian scholarly tradition. In 17th-century Nepal, the accessibility of these texts must have been limited to a very few places. And what could have granted better working conditions for the composition of the text than the stimulating atmosphere at the court of Kathmandu under King Pratāpa Malla, who was an enthusiast in matters of religion and ritual and who imported religious teachers, texts and scholars?