

## 4 Flower Texts in Nepal

The Nepalese manuscripts microfilmed by the NGMPP bear witness to a rich textual tradition on *pūjā* flowers. According to a preliminary survey of the approximately one hundred manuscripts I could trace, they can roughly be grouped into three categories.<sup>126</sup> Firstly, there are fully rounded texts; secondly, passages copied from larger works; and thirdly, multilingual lists and glossaries. As J. Miśra (PuCi 1966: 16–17) already noticed in his introduction to the PuCi, the form and content of these texts are similar. Frequently, several texts were copied in the same manuscript, which is another indication of an interdependent textual tradition. Before the position of the PuCi within this corpus is elucidated, a brief overview of the major representatives of the three groups of flower texts preserved in Nepal will be provided.

In addition to the direct relatives of the PuCi—the *Puṣpamālā*, the *Puṣpamāhātmya [I]* and the *Puṣparatnākara*, which will be dealt with in more detail below—there are two other fully rounded flower texts. The *Puṣpasāra* is a comparatively extensive compilation, preserved in twelve manuscripts, some of them in Newar script and others in Nagari script. Some of them only cover the text of the *Puṣpasāra*, while others are multi-text manuscripts. The oldest copy dates to 1725 CE (N.S. 845, NGMPP H 340/2). Citing from texts in some cases identical with ones quoted in the PuCi,<sup>127</sup> this anonymous text is structured according to deities. A general introduction leads on to a treatment of flowers for Sūrya, Viṣṇu, Śiva and the goddess (Bhavānī). Some manuscripts transmit translations into Newari or Nepali. That the latter depends on the former can be inferred from cases where plant names are retained in Newari, with or without adding the respective Nepali renderings. Thus, for Sanskrit *kurumṭaka* the Newari name is kept in the Nepali text: *kurumṭaka koloṭasvām* (NGMPP A 452/43, fol. 5b<sub>3</sub>); for Sanskrit *kunda* both terms are given, first the Newari, then the Nepali one: *kundaṃ dvāphosvām māghyā* (A 452/43, fol. 6a<sub>9</sub>). The *Puṣpasāra* resembles the PuCi, and to

---

126 My survey has been limited to texts whose titles feature the word *puṣpa* in the NGMPP catalogue and may thus not be exhaustive.

127 Authorities cited in the *Puṣpasāra*: *Agastya[samhitā?]*, *Agnipurāṇa*, *Āgama*, *Kriyāsāra*, *Garuḍapurāṇa*, *Gāndharva[tantra]*, *Gautamīya[tantra]*, *Gauriyāmala*, *Jñānamālā*, *Devipurāṇa*, *Narasimhapurāṇa*, *Nārādīyasaptasāhasra*, *Puṣpamālā*, *Puṣpādhyāya*, *Brahmayāmala*, *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, *Merutantra*, *Yāmala*, *Yoginīrahasya*, *Vāmanapurāṇa*, *Viśuddheśvara[tantra]*, *Viṣṇudharmmottara*, *Śivarahasya*, *Hārīta*.

some extent even contains the same citations. And yet, the two texts do not appear to be related over a direct line of descent. For the interpretation of the PuCi, the Newari glosses to the *Puṣpasāra* are of particular interest, because they largely coincide with, but sometimes revealingly differ from, ones found in the PuCi.

In addition to the *Puṣpamāhātmya* [I], introduced below, there are other flower texts bearing the same title. The *Puṣpamāhātmya* [II], transmitted in one complete (NGMPP A 334/19) and one fragmentary (H 131/1) manuscript in Nagari script, deals with flowers for Sūrya, Śiva, Viṣṇu, Durgā and other Puranic goddesses, and for the planetary deities and ancestors, although they are not always neatly separated. For the most part, the text contains verses known from other flower compilations, but it features neither textual attributions, introductory phrases nor commentarial passages. The Sanskrit text is accompanied by a translation into Nepali. Other manuscripts with the title *Puṣpamāhātmya* belong to the group of texts that conceive of themselves as parts of other text. A *Puṣpamāhātmya* styling itself as part of the *Viṣṇukalpalatā* is preserved in a single copy in Newari script (NGMPP E 2024/4) dating to 1655 CE (N.S. 775). This text deals exclusively with flowers for Viṣṇu and quotes from a long list of popular Vaiṣṇava texts.<sup>128</sup> Moreover, the section concerning the *ūrdhvāmnāya* from the PuMāh [I] was copied independently several times, sometimes with but at other times without a visible title.<sup>129</sup>

The *Puṣparahasya*—according to its colophon, part of a *Rahasyakallolīnī*<sup>130</sup>—was copied about thirty times, but always together with other texts, whether in Newari or Nagari script. It has been translated into Newari. The oldest copy, filmed as NGMPP A 334/17, dates to 1681 CE (N.S. 801). This anonymous work is comparatively short—depending on the particular version, it features 17 to 21 verses—and contains rules for the offering of flowers to female deities in *kāmyapūjās*.

Another passage from flower texts that was often copied separately is one on monthly flower offerings to Śiva, parallel to PuCi 1.31c–44.<sup>131</sup> Further, three flower manuscripts contain transcripts of the end of the 23rd chapter of the *Saubhāgyaratnākara* (2000: 319<sub>3</sub>–323).<sup>132</sup> The same manuscripts and one more contain text

128 E.g. the *Narasimhapurāṇa*, *Vāmanapurāṇa*, *Viṣṇudharma*, *Viṣṇudharmottara* and *Viṣṇurahasya*.

129 The text either starts with: *atha śrī ūrdhvāmnāyapuṣpamāhātmya* or with: *athoddhāmnāya* (sic), and corresponds to PuCi 4.70–95 plus the Sanskrit commentary (for the relation between the PuCi and the PuMāh, see below).

130 I have not been able to trace any other reference to a text with the name *Rahasyakallolīnī*.

131 The passage has different colophon readings in Sanskrit (e.g. *iti māsi māsi śrīmahādevāya puṣpapradānaṃ*) and in Newari (e.g. *lasa lasa śrīmahādevayāke svāna chāyāya phala*).

132 In the Nepalese manuscripts the text ends: *śrīvidyānandanāthēna śivayoḥ priyasūnū kṛtasaubhāgyaratnābdhau trayoviṃśattaraṅgakaḥ*. In the edition, the *Saubhāgyaratnākara* is called *Saubhāgyaratnābdhi* in its chapter colophons.

attributed to the *Durgābhaktitarāṅginī* (DBhT) as well. As discussed above (see pp. 41–42), this or a similar text passage was possibly used for compiling the PuCi.

Finally, there are scattered fragments copied in single instances each, and always together with other texts. For example, 4½ verses from the *Mahākālasaṃhitā* (parallel to PuCi 3.17c–21) are found in NGMPP A 334/19 (fol. 9b) following the *Puṣpamāhātmya* [II]; four verses about the duration of use permitted for flowers in E 820/13 between the *Puṣparahasya* and the Newari translation of the *Puṣpamālā*; and some lines on the importance of the *aparājītā* and other flowers in E 1136/8 (fols. 8b<sub>6</sub>–9b<sub>2</sub>).

The third group of flower manuscripts, comprising lists and glossaries, is much more heterogeneous than the other two. Many of them exhibit multiple styles of handwriting in different scripts and languages, indicating that they were copied by two or more different persons. They were frequently registered by the NGMPP under provisional titles, such as [*Puṣpanirūpaṇa*]. Apart from one example, where a list is preserved in two copies, they represent unique creations highly individual in character and tend to fall into the category of personal notebooks:

written and produced solely for private and practical use. They are *aide-mémoires* for the priests [or other specialists, A.Z.] and therefore provisionally designed, full of trans- and overscriptions, additions, corrections and marginalia. (Michaels 2010: 137).

Despite their rather low quality in terms of language proficiency and writing skills, these notebooks are valuable witnesses to the way Sanskrit texts such as the PuCi were received in a local context. Rather than discussing each manuscript in detail here, I will confine myself to some general remarks.

The main concern of these texts are the flower names that are given in Sanskrit, Newari or Nepali, either in the form of lists in up to three languages, or in short prose sentences in Nepali or Newari stating the rewards associated with particular flowers. Most of the information they contain can be traced back to the flower texts in Sanskrit. Still, it is the exception that such a notebook is based on a single text. One such case is a list named *Puṣpasārapañjikā*, which, as its name betrays, is related to the *Puṣpasāra*. Most of the other lists seem to have taken details from different sources. Some even treat flowers as the most prominent among other offering material, such as incense (*dhūpa*), fruits (*phala*) or food offerings (*naivedya*). It is, again, the Kaula *āmnāyas* that attracted most scribes' interest. Hence, many manuscripts deal prominently, or even exclusively, with material close to the Sanskrit passages of the PuMāh or the fourth chapter of the PuCi.

The translation of the flower texts into the vernaculars is attested right from the beginning of the textual tradition, with many manuscripts of the Sanskrit texts featuring interlinear glosses or full translations into, most prominently,

## 4 Flower Texts in Nepal

Newari. Among the lists there is a—judging from the script—comparatively old specimen that contains a three-page list filmed as NGMPP E 1467/11 under the provisional title [*Puṣpanāmāvalī*], and which starts with the mix of Sanskrit and Newari words: *atha svānayā nāma likhyate*, “now the names of flowers are written (down)”.<sup>133</sup> Such lists long continued to appear. The most recent dated notebook of the corpus, filmed as NGMPP E 206/11 (second copy: E 278/34), is from 1931 (dated V.S. 1988, N.S. 1051, Ś.S. 1853).

This type of text might be seen as a link bridging the gap between texts like the PuCi, more theoretical in character, and actual ritual practice. For that purpose, only the main components of the rules—the flowers, deities and results—were selected and rearranged for quick referencing. When discussing the content of the PuCi, I will occasionally draw on examples from the notebooks. There is, however, no single list which follows the Sanskrit text of the PuCi so closely that it must be treated as being among its direct descendants.

### 4.1 Antecedents and Descendants

The PuCi is directly related to a number of other flower texts, in virtue of either being dependent on them or of forming a source for later ones. Its antecedents have already been mentioned when discussing the production of the text in chapter 3.2 above.

#### *Puṣpamālā*

Above I have argued that, although the compiler may have quoted the verses PuCi 1.128c–129b as secondary borrowings from the *Tārābhaktisudhārṇava*, it seems more likely that the full text of the *Puṣpamālā* (PuMāl) was at his disposal. For one thing, no alternative source could be traced for the four verses quoted as PuCi 2.81c–83b and 2.90c–92b. Secondly, the text of the *Puṣpamālā* in three of its six textual witnesses from Nepal is copied together with the above-mentioned passages from the *Durgābhaktitarāṅginī*.<sup>134</sup> Like other sources, the *Puṣpamālā*

---

133 In Newari, the plural of inanimate nouns (here *svānayā nāma*) is not marked, so that the number must be inferred from the context (Jørgensen 1941: §16).

134 Two manuscripts microfilmed by the NGMPP came from Janakpur, were written in Maithili script, and contain interlinear glosses on the flower names. Four more copies are from the Kathmandu Valley. The *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (Veezhinathan et al. 1988: s.v.) lists three more copies.

was compiled in Mithila. The author, named at the end of the composition as well as in its colophon, is a certain Rudradhara:

*āhṛtya patrapuṣpaṃ nipuṇaṃ kalpatarupārijātādeḥ |  
pūjāvīdhau surāṇāṃ praśastadalapuṣpamāleyaṃ ||  
rudradhareṇa manoramaguṇajālena gumphitā yatnāt |  
vitanotu toṣapoṣaṃ manasi ciraṃ sarvavibudhānām ||  
iti mahāmahopādhyāśrīrudradharakṛtā puṣpamālā samāptā*

Having with effort carefully plucked leaves and flowers from *kalpatarus* (i.e. wish-fulfilling trees)—*pārijātas* etc.—Rudradhara has strung together this garland of extolled leaves and flowers with a net of charming strings for the worship of deities.

May [this garland] long extend joy and prosperity in the mind(s) of all learned men.

Thus ends the *Puṣpamālā*, produced by the venerable Mahāmahopādhyāya Rudradhara.<sup>135</sup>

There are two Rudradharas known to have composed *nibandhas* in Mithila (Kane 1968–77: I, 840–842). The writer of a *Varṣakṛtya*, a *Vratapaddhati*, a *Śrāddha*- and a *Śuddhiviveka*, who claimed the title Mahāmahopādhyāya, worked between 1425 and 1460.<sup>136</sup> The creative period of the second Rudradhara, a pupil of one Caṇḍeśvara<sup>137</sup> and the author of the *Kṛtya*-, *Vivāda*- and *Śrāddhacandrikā*, is of uncertain date. Ganguly (1972: 180–181) assumes that he may have lived in the 16th century. The Nepalese manuscripts of the *Puṣpamālā* disclose no personal details about the author. Hence it must be left to further investigation to perhaps discover which of the Rudradharas is more likely to have been its author. The mention of the title Mahāmahopādhyāya in the colophon of the text certainly suggests the earlier Rudradhara. Yet, as this title was widely used by scholars of the Mithila School, no safe conclusions can rest on this fact alone.

Among the known flower texts, the literary form of the *Puṣpamālā* is exceptional. It is an independent composition of 29 verses partly exhibiting more complex metres than the *anuṣṭubh*, which otherwise dominates in the flower texts. Seven verses are written in different forms of the *triṣṭubh* (PuMāl 11, 18, 22–26), five verses in the *sārdūlavikrīḍita* (PuMāl 6, 7, 12, 16, 17), and one (PuMāl 13) in

135 For a complete transcription of the PuMāl based on two manuscripts, see A. Zotter (2013: 386–387). My thanks go to Diwakar Acharya for his help in translating this verse.

136 Ganguly (1972: 154–161) discusses the life and work of this Rudradhara in more detail.

137 This teacher must be different from the famous *nibandhakāra* Caṇḍeśvara, who wrote in 14th-century Mithila (Kane 1968–77: I, 763–775).

#### 4 Flower Texts in Nepal

the *vasantatilaka* metre. The author did not simply pile up lines on *pūjā* flowers, but has, as he states in the last verse of his work, “strung together a garland” of newly composed verses, drawing on details (“flowers and leaves”) from earlier authorities. In this context, the words *kalpataru* and *pārijāta* recall the names of earlier *nibandhas*. Some of the verses, first and foremost those in the *anuṣṭubh* meter, sound quite familiar to readers of the PuCi.<sup>138</sup> Among the flower texts accessed here, the *Puṣpamālā* is the oldest.

### ***Puṣpamāhātmya***

Much more closely than to the *Puṣpamālā*, the PuCi is related to a work with the widely used title *Puṣpamāhātmya* [I] (PuMāh). This PuMāh covers the same text as the fourth chapter of the PuCi, but in addition provides a Sanskrit commentary. The work is transmitted in many copies in either Newari or Nagari script. The beginnings of a translation into Newari can be found from an early stage of transmission. For example, in the earliest dated copy from 1681 CE (N.S. 801, NGMPP A 334/17), the Newari names for almost all of the flowers mentioned are given. Later on, there is a full translation into Newari and, in a very recent copy (NGMPP A 944/12), into Nepali too. The writing style of the older Newari copies bears close resemblance to the earliest attestations for the PuCi. NGMPP A 452/40 even seems to have been written by the same scribe as the third-oldest copy of the PuCi, dated 1661 (N.S. 781).<sup>139</sup>

Thus the age of the extant textual witnesses provides no evidence about which of the two texts, the PuCi or the PuMāh, might be the older. There is no other way to judge the relationship between them than a closer textual comparison. To limit the amount of work involved, the following will be based on a collation of those copies of the PuMāh that by their dating or on account of their script appear to be the oldest, namely NGMPP A 334/17, A 335/12, A 452/40, B 269/16 and E 587/17. These five manuscripts feature sufficient significant commonalities that distinguish the Sanskrit text of the PuMāh from that of the PuCi and allow a firm conclusion about the interdependency of the two works. After the common formula of invocation, the text of the PuMāh begins: *puṣpamāhātmyaṃ || atha paścimāmnāya*, or very similarly.<sup>140</sup> The ensuing text starts with the verse

---

138 For example: *padmāni sitaraktāni kumudāny utpalāni ca | eṣāṃ paryuṣitā śaṅkā kāryyā pañcadīnordhvataḥ* (= PuCi 1.139ab) || *tulasyagastyabilvānām nāsti paryuṣitātmata* (= PuCi 1.136cd) | *bakasyāpi na ṣaṅmāsān tāvat paryuṣitātmata* (PuMāl 27–28).

139 See also the remarks on the PuCi manuscript C<sub>1</sub> in appendix B.

140 A 334/17: *oṃ śrī gurave namaḥ || puṣpamāhātmyaṃ || atha paścimāmnāyakramaṇ;*  
A 335/12: *oṃ atha paścimāmnāya || puṣpamāhātmyaṃ;* A 452/40: *oṃ śrī gurave*

corresponding to PuCi 4.2 and then follows the same order as the PuCi, omitting the lines that would have paralleled PuCi 4.3a, 4.6b–7a, and 4.82b–83a. Verses identical with PuCi 4.45–50 are transposed to a position following 4.32b. The PuMāh exhibits some fairly characteristic differences to the PuCi:

4.8b <i>supatrakaṃ</i> for <i>suputrakaṃ</i>	4.52c <i>bhyaṅgais</i> ( <i>bhṛṅgais</i> A 334/17)
4.16a <i>keśasaṃyukte</i> for <i>keśasaṃyuktaṃ</i>	for <i>puṣpāis</i>
4.20c <i>pārijātaḥ</i> for <i>pārijātaiḥ</i>	4.55b <i>dravya°</i> for <i>rakta°</i>
4.21c <i>anaśāsā</i> ( <i>aneśāis</i> A 334/17)	+4.68 <i>prara°</i> ( <i>om.</i> A 334/17) for <i>guru°</i>
for <i>aśanaś</i>	4.70c <i>sarvvakālaṃ</i> for <i>sarvvakāmaṃ</i>
4.27d <i>sadā caret</i> for <i>samācaret</i>	4.71d <i>tripurāpriyaṃ</i> for <i>tripurāpriyā</i>
4.28c <i>stamo</i> ( <i>°stano</i> A 334/17)	4.77a <i>ca</i> for <i>tu</i>
for <i>°stomo</i>	4.77d <i>sūtamāli</i> for <i>pūtamāli</i>
vor 4.32c <i>hārāva°</i> for <i>hāhārāva°</i>	4.84b <i>satyaś</i> for <i>satyaś</i>
4.34a <i>mahīpālā</i> for <i>mahilābho</i>	+4.95 <i>tantrasāra°</i> for <i>tantrasārakāra°</i>
4.39d <i>janāgamaḥ</i> for <i>dhanāgamaḥ</i>	+4.95 <i>divyavīram</i> (or similar)
	for <i>divyavīraparam</i>

All these divergences, be they omissions of verses or other common readings, can be explained text-critically as corruptions of the wording in the PuCi. Nowhere does the PuMāh feature more text or better readings than the PuCi. The above-mentioned transposition of the verses for offering *aparājītā* and *karavīra* (PuCi 4.45–50) from the section on *kāmya-* to the one on *naimittikapūjā* may go back to dissimilar views on the classification of this ritual, but this in itself does not militate against the conclusion that the PuMāh descends from the PuCi in a direct line.

Thus, immediately after the PuCi was composed, its fourth chapter apparently started to be transmitted independently under the title PuMāh. A Sanskrit commentary was added, which mainly specifies the *vākyas*, formulas to be spoken when offering particular flowers to particular deities.<sup>141</sup> These formulas, which

---

*namaḥ* || *puṣpamāhātmyaṃ* || *atha paścimāmnāya*; B 269/16: *om namaś caṅḍikāyai* || *puṣpamāhātmyaṃ* || *paścimāmnāyasya*; E 587/17: [*siddhaṃ*] *śrī gurave namaḥ* || *puṣpamāhātmyaṃ* || *atha paścimāmnāyakramaṃ*.

141 These *vākyas*, “that which is to be spoken”, closely resemble *saṃkalpas*, declarations of ritual intention, but lack details regarding time, place and the identity of the worshipper (for *saṃkalpas* in general, see Michaels 2005). In short renderings of *saṃkalpas*, the first two details are, however, often implied in the phrase *adyeḥa*, “now and here”. In the PuMāh we find *adya* only. That a *saṃkalpa* is also called a *vākya* is attested to elsewhere in Newar ritual handbooks (e.g. Gutschow and Michaels 2008: 213, 227, 250). It seems to be a common technique for texts of the *prayoga* genre to transfer the statement of a result (*puṇyaphala*) from a metrical text into liturgical speech and integrate the result into the *saṃkalpa* (see A. Zotter 2010: 247–248).

#### 4 Flower Texts in Nepal

follow a common scheme (see Table 4.1), provide ready-to-use sentences filled with the details from the prescriptive statements in the flower compilation. Here we witness another technique for drawing the normative rules on flowers closer to actual ritual practice, different from the one followed in the above-mentioned notebooks.

Table 4.1 Liturgical formulas in the *Puṣpamāhātmya* following the common scheme: *adya N.N.prāptikāmaḥ ebhiḥ N.N.puṣpaiḥ śrī N.N.devīm ahaṃ pūjayiṣye*.

	Root text	Liturgical formula ( <i>vākya</i> )
<i>paścimāmnāya</i>	<i>bhuktimuktiḥpradā jātī</i> (PuCi 4.6a)	<i>adya bhuktimuktiphala-prāptikāmaḥ ebhir jātīpuṣpaiḥ śrīkubjikādevīm ahaṃ pūjayiṣye</i>
<i>uttarāmnāya</i>	<i>datte caiva javāpuṣpe paṭṭavastraphalaṃ labhet   brahmahatyādikaṃ pāpaṃ kṣaṇān naśyati niścitam</i> (PuCi 4.45)	<i>adya paṭṭavastrādilābhabrahmahatyādipāpamuktikāmaḥ ebhir javāpuṣpaiḥ śrīguhyakālikādevīm ahaṃ pūjayiṣye</i> addition: <i>śrīsiddhilakṣmyārcane 'pi tad eva phalaṃ</i>
<i>ūrdhvāmnāya</i>	<i>mandāraṃ pārijātaṃ ca vaśyasaubhāgyadāyakam</i> (PuCi 4.70ab)	<i>adya vaśyasaubhāgyaphalaprāptikāmaḥ ebhir mandārapārijātapuṣpaiḥ śrītripurasundarīdevīm ahaṃ pūjayiṣye</i>

Remarkably, not the complete text but only rules concerning the *paścimāmnāya*, *uttarāmnāya* and *ūrdhvāmnāya* are thus operationalized, in each instance disclosing the actual names of the deities that were not explicitly mentioned in the PuCi. Thus, the formulas for the western tradition and for the one facing upwards are addressed to their main goddesses, Kubjikā and Tripurasundarī, respectively. The *vākyas* for the northern tradition are first directed to Guhyakālī. In an addition, though, the formulas are said to be applicable to Siddhilakṣmī as well (*śrīsiddhilakṣmyārcane 'pi tad eva phalaṃ*). The PuMāh thus features the names of the two goddesses of decisive importance for the Nepalese *uttarāmnāya*. The PuMāh offers further proof of what has already been noticed more than once: the material concerning the Kaula traditions attracted Nepalese scholars' particular attention. Within the *ṣaḍāmnāyas*, it is, above all, the trio Kubjikā, Kālī (in her forms as Guhyakālī and Siddhilakṣmī) and Tripurasundarī which is of special importance, and thus receives the most elaborate treatment in the textual tradition.

## ***Puṣparatnākara***

Another composition whose dependence on the PuCi has already been determined (Krause 2005: 29–30) is the *Puṣparatnākara* (PuRat). Unlike the author of the PuCi, its compiler, Navamīsiṃha, can be clearly traced in historical records.<sup>142</sup> Coming from a family that had been resident in Kathmandu for many generations, he was not the only family member serving at the court.<sup>143</sup> In accordance with his *kṣatriya* origin, he initially held a high military post and earned laurels for leading a military campaign to Gorkha in 1687 (D. R. Regmi 1960: 132). Probably in the year 1696<sup>144</sup> he ascended to the rank of *mahāmātya/cautārā*<sup>145</sup> at the court of Kathmandu, where he served till his death in 1712, first under Bhūpalendra Malla (r. 1687–1700), and then under the latter’s son, Bhāskarendra Malla (r. 1700–1714), who was enthroned as a four-year-old child.<sup>146</sup> Navamīsiṃha seems to have enjoyed a rigorous education in Sanskrit and gained fame by his literary work, his renown spreading beyond Nepal. In his masterpiece, the *Tantracintāmaṇi*, he mentions Bhūpalendra as the ruler.<sup>147</sup> In the PuRat it is stated that this text was

142 Navamīsiṃha’s name figures in many documents. In 1698 CE (N.S. 818), for example, he is named as a witness in the copperplate from Patan that is so far the only historical evidence for the politician Mayāsiṃha (l. 16–17: *thvate bhākhāyā dṛṣṭasākṣī, śrī 3 candra suryya, śrīśrūgramalla, śrīśrījayabhāskaramalladeva* || *śrīviśvaṃbhara upādhyā* || *śrīvidyānandra upādhyā* || *śrījayanta upādhyā* || *śrīkṛṣṇa bhāṭṭabhāju* || *śrīmaheśvara bhāṭṭabhāju* || *śrīhariśaṃkara bhāṭṭabhāju* || *navamīsiṃha bhā, gvagala bhā*, A. Zotter 2013: 380).

143 The following is based on the introductions to the editions of the *Tantracintāmaṇi* (1997) and the *Puṣparatnākara* (1991: ka–ca).

144 In a *thyāsaphu* published by D. R. Regmi (1966a: 38) the date on which Navamīsiṃha assumed official duties is given as the 7th of the dark fortnight of Phālguna N.S. 816 (1696 CE). The introduction to the PuRat (1991: kha), however, states that Navamīsiṃha had already been appointed in Māgha, that is, one month earlier. The introductions to the *Tantracintāmaṇi* mention still other dates. According to the introduction in Sanskrit (not paginated), Navamīsiṃha became *mahāmātya* in V.S. 1750 (1693 CE); according to the one in Nepali (*Tantracintāmaṇi* 1997: 6–10, first page count), in V.S. 1752 (1695).

145 For the office of the *cautārā* in Malla times, see D. R. Regmi (1960: 434–435).

146 According to Slusser’s (1998: I, 400) list of the kings of Kathmandu, Bhāskarendra, whom she identifies with Mahindrasīṃha, reigned until 1722 CE (N.S. 842). D. R. Regmi (1960: 128–177), however, treats Mahindrasīṃha as Bhāskarendra’s successor. Bhāskarendra’s last inscription is dated Kārttika of N.S. 835 (autumn 1714 CE), and Mahindrasīṃha’s first was issued in Pauṣa of the same year, thus two months later (D. R. Regmi 1960: 169).

147 See *Tantracintāmaṇi* 1.3. The introduction to the PuRat (1991: ca) states that the composition was only finished under Bhāskara in N.S. 823 (1703 CE). The *Kulamuktikallolinī* and the *Caṇḍibhaktivinodinī* are listed as his other works.

#### 4 Flower Texts in Nepal

composed when Bhāskarendra Malla acceded to the throne, so in all likelihood in 1700.<sup>148</sup>

Apparently, the PuCi, then about fifty years old, served Navamīsiṃha as a template that provided him not only with the main textual modules, but also with a road map for how to structure it. The text of the PuCi is taken over almost in its entirety, large portions being wholly identical (see Table 4.2). The PuCi is, however, not acknowledged as the source. On the contrary, Navamīsiṃha boasts of his examination of original sources.<sup>149</sup> He bundles together all textual ascriptions at the beginning of his text (PuRat 1.4–12)<sup>150</sup> and then goes on with his metrical text, only interrupted by short introductory statements. Verses that, in the PuCi, exhibit more complex meters reappear in the PuRat reworked into the *anuṣṭubh*.<sup>151</sup> In this way, the first chapter of the PuCi is integrated passage by passage into the first three chapters of the PuRat. The first chapter of the PuRat not only enumerates the text's sources, but also the flowers generally prescribed,<sup>152</sup> while the second chapter enumerates common rules and the flowers generally prohibited. The third chapter starts with five verses treating of flowers for Gaṇeśa. In its following section, on Śiva, it more or less coincides with the PuCi. Likewise, in its treatment of flowers for Viṣṇu, Sūrya, the

---

148 *bhāskarendramahīpāle nave rājyaṃ praśāsati ... karoti navamīsiṃhaḥ puṣparatnākaraṃ śubham* (PuRat 1.2–3).

149 *eṭāni samyag ālokya vacanāni vicintya ca | sarvalokahitārthāya kriyate puṣpanirṇayaḥ* (PuRat 1.12).

150 With a few exceptions Navamīsiṃha claims all source texts of the PuCi as his own sources and extends the list by *Śambhunitāyā?*, *Rudrayāmala*, *Śaktisaṅgama*, *Kālot-tara[ tantra ]*, *Meru[ tantra ]*, *Rahasyādikallolinī*, *Puṣpakallolinī*, *Viṣṇudharmottara*, *Viṣṇurahasya*, *Garūḍa[ purāna ]?*, *Viṣṇudharma*, *Viṣṇusaṃhitā*, *Śivadharmottara* and *Agni[ purāna ]*. The *Rahasyādikallolinī* and the *Puṣpakallolinī* might point to the *Puṣpa-rahasya* (see p. 54 above), which ascribes itself to the *Rahasyakallolinī*.

151 For example PuCi 2.93 (*atha niṣiddhāni tatraiva || uktetaraṃ lohitaṃ apraśastam mandāram arkodbhavabhāntike ca | śukletaraṃ gandhavihīnam ugragandhaṃ ca puṣpaṃ na hitaṃ pitṛbhyah*), cited from the *Puṣpamālā*, runs parallel to PuRat 5.24c–25b (*atha niṣiddhāni || uktetararaktapuṣpam arkamandārabhāntike | śukletaram agandhaś ca nogragandhaḥ praśasyate*).

152 Some verses recall lines of the PuCi, e.g. PuCi 1.79c–82 (*aṭarūṣasya patraṃ ca patraṃ śiṃśukacolikam || tamālasya ca patraṃ ca devapatrīkasambhavam | unmattāśvetakṛṣṇaṃ ca patraṃ ca kamalasya ca || gaṅgapatrīkapatraṃ ca patraṃ kahlārakasya ca | jalakahlārikāpatraṃ patraṃ hy atra marūbakam || śatapatraṃ sadā proktaṃ gandhālam bukapatrakam | patraṃ dumberikāyās ca grāmaśiṣyās ca patrakam*) and the somewhat carelessly edited text in PuRat 1.69–72b (*jātichadam gaṃdarīkāpatram unmattakasya ca | manothendrāṇīkāpatraṃ aṭarūṣadalam tathā || śiṃsapācolīkāpatraṃ gaṃgāvātrīkapatrakam | jalakahlārikāpatraṃ kamalasya dalam tathā || kahlālasya dalam caiva devapatrīkasambhavam | śatapatraṃ ca gāndhāram droṇadumvarīkādalaṃ || grāmaśiṣyāpalāśam ca kṛṣṇonmattatasya patrakam*).

Table 4.2 A comparison between the *Puṣpacintāmaṇi* and the *Puṣparatnākara*.

	<i>Puṣpacintāmaṇi</i>	<i>Puṣparatnākara</i>
Author	Māyāsiṃha	Navamīsiṃha
Ruler	Pratāpa Malla	Bhāskara Malla
Origin	1641–1651 CE, Kathmandu	1700 CE, Kathmandu
Structure	1. Common rules (1.1–16b) Śiva (1.16c–141)	1. Sources, common flowers
		2. Common rules: use of flowers, prohibited flowers
		3. Gaṇeśa (3.1–4) Śiva (3.5–120)
		4. Viṣṇu
		5. Sun (5.1–18) Planetary deities (5.19–21b) Ancestor worship (5.21c–26)
3. Durgā	6. Bhavānī (6.1–23b) Durgā (6.23c–55) Gāyatrī (6.56–58b) Sarasvatī (6.58c–61)	
		7. Dakṣiṇakālī (7.1–31b) <i>paścimāmnāya</i> (7.31c–48)
4. <i>paścimāmnāya</i> (4.1–16) <i>uttarāmnāya</i> (4.17–51) Dakṣiṇakālī (4.52–62b) Nīlasarasvatī (4.62c–69) <i>ūrdhvāmnāya</i> (4.70–95)	8. <i>uttarāmnāya</i> (8.1–31) <i>ūrdhvāmnāya</i> (8.32–55) Nīlasarasvatī (8.56–64)	

planetary deities and the ancestors, chapters four and five of the PuRat parallel the second chapter of the PuCi. In addition to the third chapter of the PuCi, the sixth chapter of the PuRat adopts most verses of the *Puṣparahasya*.<sup>153</sup> Thus far the text of the PuRat closely follows the PuCi sequentially, albeit with a few transpositions.<sup>154</sup> In the last two chapters, however, the material from the last chapter of the PuCi appears to be thoroughly restructured. The seventh chapter of the PuRat includes material for Dakṣiṇakālī and the *paścimāmnāya*. Apart

153 PuRat 6.5–16b ≈ PuRah 2–13b.

154 Among others, the verses PuCi 3.17c–25, general rules for flower garlands, are transposed to the section on common rules and reappear as PuRat 2.5–13b.

#### 4 Flower Texts in Nepal

from a few exceptions,<sup>155</sup> the section on the western transmission largely parallels in content and structure its counterpart in the PuCi. The treatment of Dakṣiṇakālī in the PuRat, by contrast, is very different: she is explicitly referred to as belonging to the *dakṣiṇāmnāya*,<sup>156</sup> stands first among the *āmnāya* deities, and is dealt with extensively over 30½ verses. Only occasionally are lines known from the PuCi included.<sup>157</sup> The eighth chapter of the PuRat goes back to following the rest of the last chapter of the PuCi quite precisely, except that the verses on Nīlasarasvatī are transposed to the end of the chapter and are attributed to the tradition facing downwards in the colophon to the chapter.<sup>158</sup>

Though the PuRat does not make mention of the PuCi, everything points to it having been composed on the template of the latter. As might be expected, Navamīsiṃha tried to surpass his predecessor and thereby render the latter's text obsolete. Not only did the PuCi provide the main textual building blocks for the PuRat and a road map for how to structure it, but it seems to have inspired the later author in other regards, too: four chapters become eight, and a *cintāmaṇi*, a “wish-fulfilling jewel”, turns into a *ratnākara*, a “mine of jewels”. Besides the PuCi, the PuRat exploited the *Puṣparahasya* and possibly other flower texts. A detailed study of these interrelations (which is beyond the scope of the present study) should take into account the evidence of the nine Nepalese manuscripts of the PuRat.<sup>159</sup>

In addition to the lasting impact it had on the Nepalese textual tradition surrounding *pūjā* flowers, the text of the PuCi has entered into even more comprehensive digests. Borrowings by later authors were either acknowledged or made

---

155 An introductory line mentions the goddess under discussion (*kubjidevārcanaṃ puṣpaṃ dhusturatulasīṣu ca* PuRat 7.31cd), and another line leads over from the pre-scribed to the forbidden flowers (*etāḥ puṣpaprasiddhāḥ syur niṣiddhā puṣpakathyate* [sic] PuRat 7.45ab).

156 The colophon reads: *iti śrīpuṣparatnākare dakṣiṇāmnāye puṣpavivaraṇaṃ nāma saptamaḥ paṭalaḥ*. As the *paścimāmnāya* is explicitly treated in the chapter, the assignment to the *dakṣiṇāmnāya* must apply to Dakṣiṇakālī.

157 The few direct parallels: PuCi 4.58ab ≈ PuRat 7.22cd, PuCi 4.59cd ≈ PuRat 7.24cd, PuCi 4.60cd ≈ PuRat 7.23cd.

158 The corrupted reading of the chapter colophon in the text edition (*iti śrīpuṣparatnākare jaṃtarōjādha āmnāyapuṣpavivaraṇaṃ nāma aṣṭamaḥ paṭalaḥ*) may go back to *uttarorddhvādha āmnāye puṣpavivaraṇaṃ*. Unfortunately, the last folio in the probably oldest manuscript (NGMPP C 69/2) is missing. The other copies read: *uttarorddhvādha* (A 1376/30 : *uttarōjādha* D 16/03 : *atarōjādha* A 452/41 : *jatarōjādha* B 134/13, A 1308/02) *āmnāye puṣpavivaraṇaṃ*. The corruption is probably due to the well-known difficulties scribes of Nagari script have in deciphering Newari-*akṣaras* for *u-* and *-rddhva-*.

159 In addition to the six manuscripts of the *Puṣparatnākara* recorded under that title, I have identified three more manuscripts of the PuRat in the NGMPP corpus.

silently, as in Navamīsiṃha's treatment of *pūjā* flowers in his *Tantracintāmaṇi* (1997: 333–340). Thus, the Tantric digest *Puraścaryārṇava* by King Pratāpasīṃha Śāha, in which the treatment of flowers (*Puraścaryārṇava* 1985: 232–239) seems to be a compilation of material provided by the PuCi, the TBhS and some other sources, directly refers to the former author's opinion.<sup>160</sup>

Overall speaking, the search for texts related to the PuCi genetically and thematically has proven to be extremely fruitful. Nepalese manuscripts attest to a continuous and vigorously pursued tradition of collecting and interpreting rules for *pūjā* flowers. The two earliest dated manuscripts stem from the PuCi itself, dating to 1651 and 1652. Judging from the extant textual attestations of the corpus, the late 17th and early 18th centuries saw a virtual burgeoning of the topic in Nepal. Many flower texts existed in parallel and were copied frequently. New texts and forms of transmission emerged. The Sanskrit texts were supplemented by translations into the vernaculars, first into Newari and then also into Nepali. Plant names were collected in lists and glossaries. One special interest of authors lay in quoting rules for the worship of the *āmnāya* deities. Dated manuscripts of the corpus, as documented by the NGMPP, extend almost up to the present day, with the last copy being from 1931 CE. Modern publications, such as P. P. Regmi's *Patraṃ puṣpaṃ* (1983) and *Religious and Useful Plants of India and Nepal* by Majupuria and Joshi (1997), in which much space is devoted to the ritual use of plants, attest to the enduring interest in the topic in Nepal. Lists of plants and their ritual applications are also found in recent Nepalese handbooks on *pūjā* or on the daily ritual routine (*nityakarman*).<sup>161</sup>

Even if further investigation is needed to judge whether the PuCi is the oldest Nepalese representative of the corpus, or whether it is only by coincidence that the oldest manuscripts existing in this genre transmit this compilation, the transmission of the text of the PuCi can be regarded as paradigmatic of the whole corpus. A text originally composed in Sanskrit, and dependent on earlier texts, serves as a source for later texts in the genre and is supplemented by a vernacular translation. This translation comes to lead a life of its own, including entering later lists and glossaries.

Regarding the compiler of the PuCi, it has been argued that the actual author is of secondary importance for the transmission of the text. Likewise, it appears that much more important than preserving a single text faithfully and in its

160 In the *Puraścaryārṇava*, the commentary on the verse paralleling PuCi 4.95 reads: *viphaleti kvacit pāṭhas tatrāpy akāraprasleṣāt saphalety arthaḥ paryavasyati | brahmaviṣṇuvivasvatām iti puṣpacintāmaṇiḥ ṛllikhitapāṭhaḥ prāmādikah | viṣṇupūjāyām tulasīṣedhasya svapne 'py aśrutatvāt* (*Puraścaryārṇava* 1985: 237<sub>9-11</sub>).

161 E.g. Bhaṭṭarāi (2003: 93), Duṅgānā (1982: 26), E. Upādhyāya (1991: 74–75), G. Upādhyāya (2004: 28–30).

#### 4 Flower Texts in Nepal

entirety is to transmit the knowledge it imparts. From this perspective, it is as if a single work such as the PuCi was a snapshot of a river branching out into an ever-changing web of streams and rivulets. Texts may even be swallowed silently by later ones, as the PuCi was by the PuRat. The dependency may be much stronger and reference to the actual sources may be much weaker than in the case of the PuCi. A more detailed investigation of the interdependencies of the Nepalese flower texts could help to paint a clearer picture of their close entanglements.