



HAL
open science

Whose Dharma? Śaiva and Śākta Community Rules (samayas) and Dharmaśāstric Prescriptions

Judit Törzsök

► **To cite this version:**

Judit Törzsök. Whose Dharma? Śaiva and Śākta Community Rules (samayas) and Dharmaśāstric Prescriptions. 2015. hal-01447972

HAL Id: hal-01447972

<https://hal.science/hal-01447972v1>

Preprint submitted on 27 Jan 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Whose *Dharma*? Śaiva and Śākta Community Rules (*samayas*) and Dharmaśāstric Prescriptions*

Judit Törzsök

Abstract

In the tantric context, *samayas* are the rules a Śaiva or Śākta neophyte is to follow after he is introduced into his new community and receives an initiation name. The *samaya* rules are therefore part of what defines the Śaiva or Śākta Śaiva tantric community, at least according to the scriptures. This paper attempts to see what these rules are, how they are related to mainstream brahmanical rules prescribed by Dharmaśāstras and in what way they may actually demarcate various Śaiva and Śākta communities. Before turning to the *samayas* themselves, a nontantric Śaiva story is presented, which clearly shows that in spite of their overall conformity to traditional brahmanical prescriptions, lay Śaivas also saw themselves as following a different set of laws and rules. Then three different types of *samaya* sets will be examined: those of the Śaiva Siddhānta, the heterogeneous lists of early Śākta scriptures and the strictly ‘nondualist’ rules of later Śāktas. While these rules cannot reveal the exact relation of the respective communities to their contemporary society or to each other, they may betray something about the way in which these communities saw themselves within a larger context.

Introduction

Shared rules, whether they are explicit or implicit, are among the characteristics that define any given community. In this paper I propose to examine different

*The first version of this paper was delivered at the workshop ‘Visions of Community. Tantric Communities in Context: Sacred Secrets and Public Rituals’ (5-7 February 2015, Vienna, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften), in which I was able to participate thanks to the support of the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) VISCOM SFB Project. I would like to thank Nina Mirnig and Vincent Eltschinger for inviting me to this event. I am grateful for all the comments made by the participants present, in particular to Jung Lan Bang for discussing difficult passages of the *Tantrasadbhāva* and sharing her draft edition as well as manuscript photos, to Shaman Hatley for helping to understand obscure expressions in the *Brahmayāmala*, and to Csaba Kiss for corrections, comments and issues raised in the last stages of the writing of this paper.

sets of rules of conduct that various Śaiva tantric communities claimed to follow, or rather, rules that their scriptures prescribed them to follow. There are several limitations of such an investigation. As it is commonly pointed out, scriptures—as many other types of written sources—are prescriptive and therefore cannot be taken to reflect the social reality of their time. This is true in more than one sense. Scriptures and the rules they define may represent an ideal state of affairs, thus they may include injunctions that were never actually followed in reality. At the same time, there may have been additional rules that were left unmentioned for various reasons: because they went against some of the principles established in the scriptures or elsewhere, because they were not considered worth mentioning (no matter how interesting they may be for us now) or because they had a limited sphere of application, in the case of certain local rules for instance.

And there are additional pitfalls. Tantric scriptures, just as nontantric ones, were meant to be applicable eternally, without any restrictions as to time and place. This implies, first of all, that they are notoriously difficult to date or to locate. But it also means that we cannot always know what is particular in them chronologically or geographically. In the case of community rules, it would be difficult to tell where and when particular injunctions were to be applied or whether certain rules were pan-Indian or local.

With these problems in mind, what one can actually study in scriptural sources is not some factually verifiable historical reality but rather the self-representation of certain religious groups who composed or tried to follow certain scriptures and their prescriptions. It may be disappointing not to stumble upon hard-and-fast historical data. However, such self-representation is actually part of the historical reality that we are trying to understand.

The picture appears to be even further removed from what may have been real when we attempt to compare tantric prescriptions to brahmanical orthopraxy. Orthopraxy as laid down in the Dharmaśāstras seems to have been a theoretical framework, or, in any case, one could say that most Dharmaśāstric rules ‘were considered normative within particular Brahmin circles at particular times, though we cannot now know where or when exactly.’ (Lubin 2014:5)

This leaves us with a very vague basis indeed: comparing tantric prescriptions with Dharmaśāstric ones may seem like comparing two ghosts. However, I would again argue that the situation is not as bad as it seems. First, similarly to Tantras, Dharmaśāstras can also be read to see how certain religious groups represented themselves. Thus, we compare the self-representations of different religious communities, not what they actually were or what they did. Second, concerning Dharmaśāstras, it has been observed that their terminology was also used in inscriptional sources that were to define local or regional law. Whatever the full implications of this are, the use of Dharmaśāstric terminology in epigraphical

legalese shows that Dharmasāstric prescriptions had more than a mere theoretical existence, even if they provided a framework or a normative model rather than a law-code proper.

In what follows, I shall limit my investigations to certain community rules called *samayas* that figure in tantric scriptures; but one must bear in mind that there is a corpus of texts that establishes Śaiva rules for the so-called lay (*laukika*) Śaivas who did not receive tantric initiation: the Śiva-dharma corpus.¹ The Śiva-dharmas were perhaps the first body of texts that attempted to define a particular set of rules for Śaiva communities; and tantric scriptures may in fact presuppose their existence and application. I do not intend to discuss the Śivadharma texts here, which are being edited and studied;² but, by way of introduction, in order to show how lay Śaivism proposes different solutions compared to orthodox brahmanical procedures, I would like to present a purāṇic example.

1. Śiva versus Manu: a Purāṇic Example

The example comes from the *Skandapurāṇa*, datable in its earliest form around the end of the sixth century CE. I have chosen to present this case because it shows very clearly how Dharmasāstric principles may have been and probably were opposed by distinctly Śaiva ideas and solutions. The story is related in chapter 52 of the text, which forms part of a series of chapters dealing with hells and how people can be saved from suffering in hell, particularly by their sons.³ The idea of the son saving his ancestors agrees with brahmanical ideology. However, the way the birth of the son is ensured is not according to traditional prescriptions. The story runs as follows.

A brahmin of the Gautama lineage called Bhūmanyu marries an *ātreyī* woman called Yaśā. They do not succeed in having a son, and Bhūmanyu is getting old. Bhūmanyu, dejected, talks to his wife one day about a solution. He says: ‘People desire to reach a better world and to get rid of their debt towards their ancestors by having a son. I am already very old and still have not got a child. With my full consent, you should resort to someone in my lineage (*gotra*) to have a son. With folded hands, I beg you to do this.’⁴

¹For the texts belonging to this corpus and their place in Śaiva literature, see Sanderson 2014:2–4.

²Several people are working on various texts belonging to this corpus, such as Peter Bisschop, Florinda de Simini and Paolo Magnone.

³For the edition and synopsis of this chapter, see *Skandapurāṇa vol. IIB*.

⁴I give a summary rather than a translation above. For reference, here is the Sanskrit text: *Gautamasyānvaye vipro nāmnā Kṛṣṇa iti prabhuḥ /*

In his request, Bhūmanyu applies a well-known principle taught for instance by the *Manusmṛti* (9.59), which prescribes that if a couple fails to have a son, another male member of the family may replace the husband, provided the necessary authorization has been obtained:

If the line is about to die out, a wife who is duly appointed may obtain the desired progeny through a brother-in-law or a relative belonging to the same ancestry.⁵ (Trsl. Olivelle)

Now in our story, the wife replies the following:

‘I can’t believe my ears! You cannot have said this! How could someone like me even think of such a terrible thing? I was born in the noble family of Atri and came, through marriage, to the eminent Gautama family. How could someone like me commit such a shameful act, condemned by the virtuous? Those who desire wealth, happiness, sons, a family or a better rebirth, practice asceticism. So go and practice asceticism yourself, great sage!’⁶

After this, the wife gives several epic and purāṇic examples of sages who managed to have a son thanks to their asceticism, and then concludes:

You should also practice asceticism with full absorption of your mind, and you shall obtain an eminent son who will have extraordinary yogic powers. When Atri, Brahmā’s son himself, saw me once he said:

tasya putro ’bhavat khyāto Bhūmanyur iti nāmataḥ /
tasya patny abhavat subhrūr ātreṇī nāmato Yaśā //
sa kadācit kṛtodvāho Bhūmanyur nāma gautamaḥ /
nāvindata sutaṃ tasyā jarayā cābhisamvṛtaḥ //
sa bhāryām āha duḥkhārta idaṃ vacanakovidāḥ /
“putreṇecchanti lokāṃś ca anṛṇāś ca bhavanty uta /
jarāpariṇataś cāhaṃ na ca me dṛśyate sutaḥ //
sā tvam kaṃcit sagotraṃ me anujñātā mayā śubhe /
abhipadyasva putrārthaṃ yāce tvam prāñjalir nataḥ”
 (Skandapurāṇa 52.29–32)

⁵*devarād vā sapiṇḍād vā striyā samyañ niyuktayā / prajepsitādhigantavyā saṃtānasya parikṣaye //* Cf. On failure of issue (by her husband) a woman who has been authorised, may obtain, (in the) proper (manner prescribed), the desired offspring by (cohabitation with) a brother-in-law or (with some other) Sapinda (of the husband). (Trsl. Bühler.)

⁶Skandapurāṇa 52.33–35

na mayā śrutam etat te tathā noktaṃ tvayānagha /
mādrśī katham etad dhi manasāpy abhicintayet //
atrīṇāṃ tu kule jātā gautamaṃ kulam āgatā /
madvidhā katham etad dhi kuryāt sadbhir vigarhitam //
tapasā dhanam anvicchej jīvitāni sukhāni ca /
putrān kulaṃ ca lokāṃś ca tapaḥ kuru mahāmune //

This woman shall have a true son. This prediction should come true. Whatever ascetic power I have been able to accumulate, through god's grace, you shall have it. Armed with my *tapas* and yours, you must worship Rudra.⁷

Thus, the wife not only rejects Manu's solution to the problem, but finds it even outrageous. She argues that the replacement of the husband is a custom condemned by the virtuous. By saying this, she justifies her rejection through the Dharmaśāstric principle according to which 'an activity that the Āryas praise is righteous (*dharma*), and what they deplore is unrighteous (*adharma*)' (*Āpastamba Dharmasūtra* 1.20.6–7. Trsl. Olivelle 2000: 57.)⁸

Let us remark here that the rejection of the levirate is not unknown to the *Manusmṛti* either. Contradicting rules are given as to whether the levirate is an approved or rejected practice, and whether it should be stopped after begetting the first son or having a second one is also permitted. However, the prohibition appears to concern the remarriage of widows rather the replacement of a living husband.⁹

In any case, using the authority of the virtuous, the wife argues against the replacement of her husband. She proposes a particularly Śaiva solution to the problem, which obviously does not come from mainstream Dharmaśāstric authorities. Obtaining a son through *tapas* is certainly not condemned by any authority either, therefore such a solution is a legitimate supplement to what is dharmic. The concluding sentence adds the Śaiva element already expected all along the argument but not yet overtly expressed: the *tapas* accumulated should be used to worship Rudra, who shall then bestow one's wish.

The story shows that, while lay Śaivism certainly did not claim to go against the norms of orthopraxy, it had its own solutions that did not necessarily follow what was laid down in Dharmaśāstras.

It is also interesting to note that in the above extract the man represents the traditional brahmanical solution borrowed from Manu and the woman defends the

⁷*Skandapurāṇa* 52.38–40

*tathā bhavān api tapaḥ karotu susamādhinā /
lasyase tvaṃ sutaṃ śreṣṭhaṃ mahāyogabalānvitam //
māṃ hi dṛṣṭvā purā prāha Atrir Brahmasutaḥ svayam /
satputriṇī bhavitrīyaṃ na mithyā tad bhaviṣyati //
tapo 'sti mayi yat kiṃcit tvatprasādāt samārjitam /
tena svena ca saṃyukto Rudram ārādhaya prabho //*

⁸*yat tv āryāḥ kriyamāṇaṃ praśaṃsanti sa dharmo yad garhante so 'dharmah.* The same *Dharmasūtra* in fact goes on to warn readers that some of the conduct depicted in scripture is not legitimate in the present day, since the ancients had "extraordinary power" (*tejoviśeṣa*) that people lack in later ages (2.13.7–9).

⁹See in particular *Manu* 9.64–66.

better, more virtuous, Śaiva one. Women, along with Śūdras, were certainly better treated in Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism than in mainstream brahmanism. It may not be accidental in our story that it is the woman that proposes the Śaiva solution.

2. Whose Pledges?

After this detour to purāṇic Śaivism, let us turn to the so-called *samaya* rules or pledges. They are recited at the end of the so-called *samaya* rite that introduces new members to the Śaiva tantric community. Now who were to follow these rules?

It is often reiterated that women, along with children, the elderly, the sick and the like are to be given a so-called ‘seedless’ initiation (*nirbīja-dīkṣā*), which excludes the obligation to follow the post-initiatory rules (*samaya*). The king, who is too busy to deal with these obligations, is also included in the list. As it is stated in the *locus classicus*:

*bālabālīśavṛddhastrībhogabhugvyādhitātmanām /
eṣāṃ nirbījikā dīkṣā samayādivivarjitā //*

Children, fools, the elderly, women, kings and the sick — for these, initiation is seedless [i.e.] it excludes [the obligation to follow] post-initiatory rules etc.

(*Svacchandatantra* 4.88.)¹⁰

All these categories of people are considered to be unable to follow the rules of the community, therefore they are given an easier version of initiation, which is also less powerful.

It is nevertheless surprising to see here that women are considered unable to follow the *samaya* rules. For the so-called *samaya* ritual itself, which is a preliminary to initiation proper (*dīkṣā*) and which ends with the recitation of the rules to be observed, can also be performed for women, who receive their own, female initiation names in some systems. It seems quite absurd to perform the *samaya* ritual for everybody, to recite the rules to be observed in front of every neophyte, only to declare later a large number of them unable to follow these rules. Indeed, this category of reduced initiation is absent from the earliest surviving Tantras of the Śaiva Siddhānta¹¹ as well as from Śākta scriptures. The ‘seedless’ initiation was most probably introduced at a relatively later point. I would therefore argue that *samayas*, at least initially, were in fact meant to be observed by all initiates.

¹⁰According to Kṣemarāja’s commentary, the word ‘etc’ refers to other ritual obligations, such as the annual reparatory *pavitraka* rite (*ādiśabdāt pavitrakādividhis*). On this rite, see the entries *pavitraka* and *pavitrārohaṇa/pavitrāropaṇa* in *Tāntrikābhidhānakośa* vol. III, where it is also pointed out that the earliest Tantras do not describe this rite. Thus, it is possible that the *Svacchanda*’s author(s) had something different in mind than Kṣemarāja.

¹¹See the entry *nirbījadīkṣā* by Dominic Goodall in *Tāntrikābhidhānakośa* vol. III.

3. Samayas in the Śaiva Siddhānta

Scriptures of the Śaiva Siddhānta list relatively few *samayas* and they tend to cluster around four major topics (as numbered below). Traditionally, eight such rules are given, which figure already in the *Nayasūtra* of the *Niśvāsa*.

(1) A set of rules concern different types of *nindā*, i.e. defamation or criticism. This is mainly a Śaiva application of the brahmanical rule that forbids *vedanindā*, reviling the Vedas, and *gurunindā*, reviling the guru.¹² In Śaivism, those who must be treated with respect are the deity (*deva*), scripture itself (*śāstra*) that comes from him, the guru, through whom the deity can act, and other Śaiva initiates (termed variously as *sādhakas*, *putrakas*, *dikṣitas*, *bhaktas*). These four *nindās* are formulated in four traditional *samayas*. Fire, which is also identified with the deity, can also be included in the list. Moreover, it is also added sometimes that one must always obey one's guru.

(2) It is always mentioned that *nirmālya*, i.e. what has been offered to the deity and been touched or consumed by him (*devajagdham*), should not be eaten. According to Bhojadeva, the eight traditional *samayas* also include that one should not step over the *nirmālya*, and this is also mentioned for instance in the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*, which adds that the *nirmālya* should not be given away either.

At this point, the *Niśvāsa Nayasūtra* (1.104ab) adds something difficult to interpret: *nirmālyabhakṣaṇe vāpi balidāne paśor api* (MS: *balidānapaśor api*). Perhaps it means, as it is understood in Goodall et al. 2015, that one must do a reparatory rite 'if the *nirmālya* is eaten or if it is given to an animal as a *bali* offering'. However, I propose that one could also understand that the transgression the *Niśvāsa* condemns here is the eating of an animal offered in sacrifice, if we read *balidānapaśor api* with the MSS, and construe it with *-bhakṣaṇe* as a *sāpekṣasamāsa*. In other words, one must do an expiatory rite if one eats either the *nirmālya* or the animal given in/destined to a *bali* sacrifice. I suspect that the prohibition to eat the animal offering was later forgotten because nobody would have thought of eating meat anyway, whether prepared as an offering or not. However, this injunction is in accordance with the frequently repeated rule which forbids the touching or eating of any offering (*naivedya*).¹³

The *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*'s parallel, which is also difficult to understand, seems to say something along the same lines,¹⁴ but it is also possible that

¹²See e.g. *Manusmṛti* 4.163 for *vedanindā*, and 2.200 for *gurunindā*.

¹³See for instance *Mataṅgapārameśvara Caryāpāda* 1.7: *niveditaṃ vā yatkimcid devadevasya śūliṇaḥ / na ca tat svopayogāya kartavyaṃ manasāpy atha //*

¹⁴10.24cd–25ab: *nirmālya-laṅghanaṃ [-]dānaṃ [-]bhojanaṃ ca vivarjayet // tatrāviplavanaṃ (for tantraviplavanaṃ?) dānaṃ avinītabaleḥ paśoḥ*. Perhaps understand 'one should avoid stepping over, offering or eating the *nirmālya*, as well as divulging scripture and offering (*dāna*) a sacrificial animal (*paśu*), whose sacrifice (*bali*) has not been performed (*avinīta*) or has not been performed properly'.

a different transgression is meant here.¹⁵ In any case, the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* clearly continues by saying that such things should not be done even when one is in great danger,¹⁶ in other words the *nirmālya* is not to be used or consumed even if there is a famine or some similar situation in which one may be allowed to resort to *āpaddharma*. Such rules about *nirmālya* seem to be specifically Śaiva ones.

(3) Some *samayas* forbid initiates to accept food touched by certain categories of women: mainly by those who have their period or by those who have recently given birth. The traditional eight *samayas* mention only women during their *menses*,¹⁷ but scriptures often include women in the post-partum period (*sūtikā*).¹⁸ Such *samayas* reproduce faithfully the brahmanical principle according to which one is not to accept food from these women (*Manu* 4.232). The *Manusmṛti* (5.85) also points out that touching such women, just as touching an outcaste or a corpse, defiles one and requires a purificatory bath. In the same vein, the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*'s version adds that one is also to avoid food touched by someone who has gone to heaven.¹⁹

(4) Finally, one should not step on the shadow of a liṅga. By extension it is also enjoined sometimes that one should not step on the sacrificial area (*catvara*).²⁰

These four types of rules—*nindā*, *nirmālya*, not accepting food from certain women, not stepping on (Śaiva) sacred space—cover the eight traditional *samayas* and many other, extended lists in the Śaiva Siddhānta. Most of them are either taken from brahmanical rules of conduct or are Śaiva versions of such rules, except rules concerning the *nirmālya* and the liṅga, which appear to be particular Śaiva ones.²¹

Although, as is obvious from the above rules, the Śaiva Siddhānta certainly offered a form of Śaivism that conformed to orthopraxy and assimilated Dharmaśāstric principles in its *samayas*, it saw itself as different from the orthodox mainstream and defended its own territory and validity against Vaidikas, at least at the initial stages represented by the *Niśvāsa*. For the *Nayasūtra* (1.106cd–108ab, just after the mention of the *samayas*) clearly warns against returning to Vedic ritual and turning one's back to the Śaiva community:

¹⁵One could read *tantraviplāvanam dānam avinītābale paśau* 'divulging the Tantra or giving it to an uninitiated person (*paśu*) who lacks any decency or strength.'

¹⁶10.25cd: *nācarec chivamārgasthaḥ mahātayagato 'pi san* (clearly corrupt for *mahābhayagato 'pi san*).

¹⁷See *ārtavisprṣtam* in the *Niśvāsa Nayasūtra* 1.104cd.

¹⁸See *Sarvajñānottara* 15.26a *sūtikāyānnasamprṣtam*; *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* 10.24b: *samsprṣtam puṣṭavatyānnaṃ* (for *puṣpavatyānnaṃ*) *svaryātānāñ ca sautikam*.

¹⁹See *svaryātānāñ* in the above citation.

²⁰*Sarvajñānottara* 15.26b: *cchāyācatvaralaṅghanam*.

²¹Note that different rules for the *nirmālya* apply in Pāñcarātra scriptures, for which see the entry in *Tāntrikābhidhānakośa* vol. III.

If someone studies the Śaiva scripture and performs Śiva worship, [but then] sacrifices with Vedic rites, reviles devotees of Śiva and venerates and praises Brahmins with other religious affiliations, then Hāṭhakuṣmāṇḍa-rudra shall punish that evil-minded person.²²

And in the same vein, the *Nayasūtra* (1.105cd–106ab) also warns against following other, possibly tantric prescriptions:

If someone undertakes a solemn religious observance, but then abandons that Śiva-observance and takes up an observance taught in another [=non-śaiva] scripture, Devī shall punish him for that.²³

These prohibitions show that there must have been people who did not refrain from changing affiliations. Perhaps turncoats or renegades were not so uncommon, for the boundaries between Śaiva and Vaidika or Śaiva and non-Śaiva may not have been as strict for common people as more ardent Śaivas (or Vaidikas) would have liked. It was probably not considered impossible to try out (Saidhāntika) Śaivism and then turn back to vedic ritual or to try out yet something else, probably remaining, by and large, within the rules and boundaries of orthopraxy.²⁴

4. Eclectic Samayas of Early Śākta Tantras

Since Śākta Tantras prescribe nondual tantric practice such as the offering of alcohol and meat and the use of various impure substances, one would expect that their *samayas* also prescribe whatever goes against orthopraxy. It is therefore surprising to see that earlier Śākta Tantras appear to give a very heterogeneous list of *samayas*: they mix some rules taken over from Dharmaśāstras with those that enjoin the very violation of Dharmaśāstric rules.

The short recension of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* (of around the 7th century),²⁵ which is otherwise rather concise on many topics, gives a fairly detailed list of

²²*śivatantram adhītvā tu śivayajñam prakurvate // yajate vaidikair yajñair śivabhaktāṃś ca nīdate / viprāṃś caivānyaliṅgasthāṃ pūjayet stūnateti ca // hāṭhakuṣmāṇḍarudras tu taṃ vai badhnāti durmmatīm.*

²³*pratiññāvratam ārūḍho punas tyaktvā śivaṃ vratam // anyattantravratāṃ grhṇed devī tena nibandhati.* I would like to note here that my translations of the Nīśvāsa passages are indebted to Goodall et al 2015. In most cases, I follow the interpretations given there and alter the translation only slightly, mainly to fit better in the context of this paper.

²⁴In this context, it must be remarked that converts are a recognized category of Śaiva initiates, who normally have not got the right to become *ācāryas* or *sādhakas*. They are called ‘the reborn’ *punarbhū-*, see the entry in *Tāntrikābhīdhānakośa* vol. III. by Dominic Goodall. This category, however, comprises *prāglingins*, i.e. those who had a previous [sectarian] mark. The expression suggests that they were *vaiṣṇava* or *saura* or *bauddha*, and did not simply belong to the nonsectarian/mainstream brahmanical tradition (*vaidika*).

²⁵See Törzsök 1999 and Törzsök forthcoming.

such *samayas*; and the list has many parallels in related texts. With regard to their conformity to Dharmasāstric prescriptions, there are three kinds of rules here.

First, there are *samayas* that are in total agreement with orthopraxic prescriptions and are practically taken over from mainstream brahmanical sources. We have seen that those *samayas* of the Śaiva Siddhānta that forbid people to accept food from women in periods of impurity also belong to this category. The *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* and the *Tantrasadbhāva*, however, add many other such *samayas*: one should not perform fruitless acts,²⁶ one must not look at naked women,²⁷ one must avoid having sex during daytime if one wishes to obtain success,²⁸ one is not to urinate in certain places such as in a field, on the road, in a cremation ground etc.²⁹ All these rules have their equivalents in the *Manusmṛti*, either fully agreeing with the tantric ones or having only some minor variations. Although they are rather generic rules of conduct, their inclusion in the *samayas* suggests a certain adherence to general Dharmasāstric principles. It also betrays perhaps the intention of the authors to become as authoritative in a particular Śākta community as Manu was among the orthodox—or to create their own Dharmasāstra as it were.

Second, several *samayas* are Śaiva inflections of Dharmasāstric rules, just as the *nindā* rules are in the Śaiva Siddhānta. Similarly, the deity or the scriptures are not to be reviled in Śākta Tantras either.³⁰ One must mentally invoke and worship the deity at the three junctures of the day³¹ and one must worship one's *ācārya*.³²

Third, many *samayas* are completely unparalleled in Dharmasāstras. Some of

²⁶6.46a (= *Mālinīvijayottara* 8.133a) *niṣphalaṃ naiva ceṣṭeta*. (See also *Tantrasadbhāva* 9.531c *niṣphalāṃ varjayec ceṣṭām*.) Cf. *Manu* 4.63a *na kurvīta vr̥thāceṣṭām*, 4.70c *na karma niṣphalaṃ kuryān*.

²⁷6.47c *na nagnāṃ vanitāṃ paśyen* (= *Tantrasadbhāva* 9.532cd). Cf. *Manu* 4.53b *nagnāṃ nekṣeta ca striyam*.

²⁸6.48cd *grāmadharmaṃ sadā varjyaṃ vāsare siddhim icchatā* (See *Tantrasadbhāva* 9.534cd *grāmadharma na kartavyaṃ vāsare siddhim icchatā*.) Cf. *Manu* 11.174 *maithunaṃ tu samāsevyā puṃsi yoṣīti vā dvījaḥ / goyāne 'psu divā caiva savāsāḥ snānam ācaret*.

²⁹6.51cd–52ab *kṣetramārgaikavṛkṣeṣu śmaśānāyataneṣu ca / viṇmūtra[m] śayan[aṃ] vāpi na kuryān mantravit kvacit*. See *Tantrasadbhāva* 9.547cd–548 *śayanaṃ naiva kartavyaṃ ekavṛkṣe catuṣpathe // kṣetre caiva śmaśāne ca vane copavaneṣu ca / devāgāre nadītīre bhasmagomayamadhyataḥ // viṇmūtraṃ naiva kartavyaṃ ṣṭhīvanaṃ maithunaṃ tathā*. Cf. *Manu* 4.45cd–46 *na mūtraṃ pathi kurvīta na bhasmani na govraje // na phālakṛṣṭe na jale na cityāṃ na ca parvate / na jīṛṇadevāyatane na valmīke kadācana*.

³⁰In the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* for instance *śāstranindā* is mentioned in 6.45c, while 45ab enjoins *naivedya* for the deities whenever one eats (as does the *Tantrasadbhāva* in 9.531a).

³¹*Śakti* in the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* (6.49ab *traiḥkālaṃ cintayec chaktiṃ sakalīkṛtavigrahaḥ*); *deva* in the *Tantrasadbhāva* (9.565c: *traiḥkālyam pūjayed devaṃ*).

³²See *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* 6.49cd: *vanded ācāryam āsannaṃ dūrasthaṃ dhyānayogataḥ*.

them are merely specific to certain Śākta texts, for instance that the words *ḍākinī*³³ or *rere*³⁴ should not be uttered, probably because they carry particular power and are therefore considered dangerous. But other *samayās* clearly go against Dharmaśāstric prescriptions, for instance that one should not revile alcohol or those who are unmanly (*klībam*).³⁵

The brahmanical aversion to alcohol is well-known. It is perhaps less often pointed out that those who are considered unmanly (whatever that means exactly, including the impotent, the effeminate, transvestites, hermaphrodites etc), designated with the generic word *klība*,³⁶ are also treated with much contempt. In *Manusmṛti* 3.150 *klības* are put in the same group as outcastes, thieves and atheists: ‘Brahmins who are thieves, fallen from their caste, or impotent or who follow the livelihood of infidels—Manu has declared these unfit to participate at divine or ancestral offerings.’ (Trsl. Olivelle)³⁷

Eunuchs are also said to have a polluting presence (if they watch a brahmin eat for example).³⁸ As to inheritance, Manu says: ‘eunuchs [or rather, those who are unmanly, *klība* J.T.] and outcasts, (persons) born blind or deaf, the insane, idiots and the dumb, as well as those deficient in any organ (of action or sensation), receive no share.’³⁹

³³*Siddhayogeśvarīmata* 6.51ab *ḍākinīti na vaktavyaṃ pramādān mantriṇā –m– api*; the word *śākinī* is mentioned in the parallel in *Tantrasadbhāva* 9.533: *śākinīti na vaktavyaṃ*.

³⁴In *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* 6.46cd: *rereśabdaṃ sadākālaṃ na prayuñjyā[t] kadācana*. Similar injunction is formulated concerning the word *hehe* in *Tantrasadbhāva* 9.532ab *rereśabdaṃ na coccāryaṃ heheśabdaṃ tathaiva ca*.

³⁵*Siddhayogeśvarīmata* 6.45cd: *surām klībaṃ na nindyāt*, with a parallel in the *Tantrasadbhāva* 9.542cd ff. *Svacchanda* 5.48 also includes other commonly avoided substances that one should not be disgusted of: meat, fish and so on. Moreover, those who do or do not obey general rules of conduct (*ācāra*) should not be treated with disgust either.

³⁶See Olivelle’s note on Manu 3.150 (p. 263–4): [T]he term *klība* has been subject to widely different interpretations. It probably did have a range of meanings, and in different contexts may have assumed somewhat different meanings. In general, it refers to males who are in some way sexually dysfunctional or deviate from the culturally constructed notions of masculinity. Such individuals include the impotent, the effeminate, transvestites, hermaphrodites and the like. This term does not refer to castrated eunuchs; I think the term *ṣaṇḍha* indicates such a person, although there is scholarly disagreement even with regard to this. A verse of Kātyāyana cited in the *Dāyabhāga* (5.8) gives a definition of *klība*: “If a man’s urine does not foam, if his stool sinks in water, if his penis has no erection or sperm, he is called a *klība*.”

³⁷Cf. ‘Manu has declared that those Brahmanas who are thieves, outcasts, eunuchs, or atheists are unworthy (to partake) of oblations to the gods and manes’ (Trsl. Bühler. *ye stenapatitaklībā ye ca nāstikavṛttayaḥ / tān havyakavyayor viprān anarhān manur abravīt*).

³⁸*Manusmṛti* 3.239: *cāṇḍālaś ca varāhaś ca kukkuṭaḥ śvā tathaiva ca / rajasvalā ca ṣaṇḍhaś ca nekṣerann aśnato divjān* A Caṇḍāla, a pig, a cock, a dog, a menstruating woman, or a eunuch must not look at the Brahmins while they are eating. Trsl. Olivelle.

³⁹Trsl. Bühler. *Manusmṛti* 9.201 *anaṃśau klībapatitau jātyandhabadhīrau tathā / unmatta-jadamūkāś ca ye ca ke cin nirindriyāḥ* Cf. Olivelle’s translation (2005), who understands (against the commentators and Bühler) *nirindriya* also to refer to the absence of manly strength: ‘The

As the last verse (as well as other passages) of Manu show, people who have any physical defect also belong to the bottom of the brahmanical hierarchy—and it is precisely these people that should not be despised according to the longer list of *samayas* in the *Tantrasadbhāva*.

vairūpyaṃ duḥkhiṭaṃ śaṅḍhaṃ klībaṃ andhaṃ tathāturam
...na nindeta varārohe

The deformed, the depressed, eunuchs, the unmanly, the blind and those who suffer [from any illness] [...] should not be treated with contempt.

(*Tantrasadbhāva* 9.552cd... 555a)

Women, who—just as eunuchs and unmanly males—are considered potentially polluting in brahmanical orthopraxy, are also included in the list of those who should not be reviled in tantric sources.⁴⁰ Furthermore, in the *Tantrasadbhāva* many outcastes and low status members of the brahmanical society are enumerated among those who must not be treated with contempt: tribal people such as the *bhillas* and *ḍombas*, fishermen (*kaivarta*), foreigners (*mleccha*), wrestlers (*malla*), leather makers (*carmakāraka*) and so on. At the end of the list, the *Tantrasadbhāva* also mentions that in addition, others who have not been mentioned should not be reviled either.⁴¹

This set of *samayas* thus appears to defend several categories of those who are marginalized according to brahmanical rules.

Now was there some sense of social justice or equality that prompted our authors to establish such *samayas*? I am afraid there is no statement to this effect. There is, however, one passage in the *Brahmayāmala* that appears to give a theological justification which comes relatively close to revealing a certain sense of equality.

The passage in question starts with an enumeration of things and people that are not to be hurt or spoken ill of (*na dūṣayet*) according to Bhairava's command:

following receive no shares: the impotent, outcastes, those born blind or deaf, the insane, the mentally retarded, mutes, and anyone lacking manly strength.'

⁴⁰See 6.45cd in the very heterogeneous list of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*: *striyaṃ śāstraṃ surāṃ klībaṃ na nindyāt kanyakām api*.

⁴¹See the following provisional edition of the passage kindly provided by Jung Lan Bang. Because of the focus of this paper, textual problems, which remain quite numerous, are not discussed here. *kaivartaṃ kāndukaṃ mlecchaṃ dhvaṃ sūnākaram priye / vairūpyaṃ duḥkhiṭaṃ śaṅḍhaṃ klībaṃ andhaṃ tathāturam // malla-vandina-kausadyaṃ cchippakaṃ carmakārakam / jaṭṭaṃ bhūṭaṃ mathīraṃ ca kāpotam kulabhakṣakam // medaṃ bhillaṃ ca ḍombaṃ ca tathānyaṃ bhaṅḍakārakam / evam anye pi ye noktā mānavā varavarṇini // na nindeta varārohe vratinaṃ yad upasthitam / haṭṭanāryo na vaktavyā nākroset kanyakāḥ sudhīḥ //* See also a similar list in the *Kubjikāmata* 5.65cd–66ab: *kandukaṃ mallakoṣāḍhyā chippakaṃ carmakārakam // dhvaṃ sūnākaram vāpi matsyaghātaṃ tu lubdhakam*.

those who are unmanly, madmen, drunkards, those who are delirious, naked or are absorbed in sexual union, alcohol, women and so on. The text then goes on to say that since the goddesses and Śiva can be found everywhere, one should not revile anyone or anything subject to decay or old age, or someone or something deformed. A practitioner who abides in knowledge,⁴² who has received the *samayās* and intends to follow them, must see different kinds of worship, the *varṇas*, various (ritual) acts, substances and bodies in the same way.⁴³

Let us note that the same sort of theological explanation is given to justify or explain the use of impure substances in ritual: since everything is made of Bhairava and the goddess, one must treat all substances alike.⁴⁴

Now a somewhat similar argument figures in the *Svacchanda* too in the context of *samayās*. It is, however, not about the equal treatment of substances or people, but about the validity of different *śāstras*. When the *Svacchanda* prescribes that Bhairava and his teaching should not be reviled, it adds the following:

*sāṃkhyam yagam pāñcarātram vedāṃś caiva na nindayet
yataḥ śivodbhavāḥ sarve hy apavargaphalapradāḥ*

The Sāṃkhya, the Yoga, the Pāñcarātra and the Vedas should not be reviled either, for they all come from Śiva and they all bestow the fruit of final liberation.

(*Svacchanda* 5.44cd–45ab)⁴⁵

Thus, just as the *Brahmayāmala* argues for the equality of all substances and people because they are all Śiva’s creations, so too the *Svacchanda* argues for the

⁴²More precisely, ‘he who is in the stage of life for/of knowledge.’ The text seems to create a fifth stage of life (*āśrama*) added to the traditional four. The name suggests that it is characterized by the knowledge of the doctrine it propounds. It may have been conceived of as an *āśrama* that is beyond the four, in the manner of the *atyāśrama* of the Pāśūpatas.

⁴³This is not a full translation of the text, which has a few textual difficulties: *guhyaṃ klībādi conmattam pramattam vihvalam priye / nagnam suratasamsaktam mṛto[ndha/tva]ntam surā striyaḥ //* (Perhaps read *mṛto ’ndham* or *mṛtoddharantam*?) *na dūṣaye[?] ḥvaseḥ vātha yantranā bhairavasya tu / sarvvatas tu tato devyaḥ śivaś ca labhate priye // ato na nindayet sarvvaṃ jarāsthan tu virūpakaṃ / jñānāśramī makhāṃ varṇṇāṃ kṛyādravyāṃ tathā tanuṃ // tulyabhāvena pasyeta samayī samayārthinaḥ /* (*Brahmayāmala* 62.124–127ab. Transcription kindly provided by Shaman Hatley.)

⁴⁴For various usages of this argument, see Törzsök 2013.

⁴⁵Let us note the alternative reading given by Jayaratha in the *Tantrālokaviveka* (ad 1.18 and 13.302) (*yataḥ śivodbhavāḥ sarve śivadhāmaphalapradāḥ* ‘for they all come from Śiva and bestow the fruit of abiding in Śiva’) and by Abhinavagupta himself in the *Mālinīvijayavārttika* (2.290 *svacchandatantra tenoktam sarvaśāstre śivaḥ phalam / yataḥ śivodbhavāḥ sarve śivadhāmaphalā iti*). The same reading in the singular (*yataḥ śivodbhavaṃ sarvaṃ śivadhāmaphalapradam*) is also mentioned *ad loc* by Kṣemarāja, who claims that some people read this version in old manuscripts (*iti pāṭham purāṇapustakadr̥ṣṭam iha kecit pāṭhanti*). However, the Nepalese MS agrees basically with the edited *Svacchanda* here: *sāṃkhyayogam pañcarātram vedāṃś caiva na nindayet / yataḥ śivodbhavāḥ sarve hy apavargaphalapradāḥ*.

validity of all *śāstras*, since they are also Śiva’s creations. After this statement, the *Svacchanda* adds a last member to the list of teachings that should not be reviled: the prescriptions of Smṛtis, because they show the right way to behave and act (*smārttaṃ dharmam na nindet tu ācārapathadarśakam* 5.45cd). This confirms, once again, an adherence to the generic *smārta* rules of conduct.

Now there is yet another group of *samayās* that are worth pointing out in early Śākta Tantras: those that reproduce or are closely related to the special *samayās* of the Śaiva Siddhānta.

The *Tantrasadbhāva* for instance mentions that one should not step over the shadow of a liṅga.⁴⁶ It extends this *samaya* to the various attributes (*āyudhas*) of gods that one also must not step over or touch with the foot either (9.562–8 ending with: *pharakaṃ vāpi khadgaṃ vā anya vāpy āyudhaṃ priye / pāde naiva sprśen mantrī na tu laṅghet kadācana*).

The *Brahmayāmala* also includes what resembles the *samayās* of the Śaiva Siddhānta in two passages. In the first (62.123cd), it overtly refers to the rule of those who follow dualist practice:

*dvaitamantre tu nirmālyam nābhakṣam bhakṣayet kvacit*⁴⁷

One should under no circumstances consume the *nirmālya*, which is not to be consumed according to the dualist⁴⁸ Mantra(mārga) tradition.

The second passage mentions the eight *samayās*, some of which recall those of the Śaiva Siddhānta, although the *Brahmayāmala* gives its own version and certainly fewer than eight:

There is no higher god than Śiva. And in this Tantra, the respectable persons are the *ācārya*, the mothers, the practitioners and the pious. They are not to be despised or insulted, they must be worshipped as well as one can. These are the eight *samayās* that increase devotion and faith. Obeying these rules of conduct is the cause of all success.⁴⁹

⁴⁶ *Varṣās tu navabhiś caiva liṅgacchāyām na laṅghayet* 9.550. I am not sure how the first half of the verse is to be understood, perhaps it means that the rule applies from age nine of the person (the idea being that younger children may not comply with such rules and may be allowed to skip over the shadow of a liṅga).

⁴⁷ Transcription kindly provided by Shaman Hatley.

⁴⁸ The term ‘dualist’ always refers to ritual dualism in this text, cf. Törzsök 2013.

⁴⁹ *Brahmayāmala* (86.3–5):

na śivasya paro devaḥ ācāryo mātaraś tathā / 3
asmīn tantrē tu guravaḥ sādhaḥ sādhuḥ eva vā /
nāvamānyā nadhikṣepyā pūjanīyāś ca śaktiḥ / 4
aṣṭau tu samayā hy ete bhaktiśraddhāvivarddhakāḥ /
siddhīnām kāraṇam hy etat samayācārapālanam / 5

It is possible that the idea of having precisely eight *samayas* was more prevalent in the Śaiva Siddhānta than in Śākta texts (which had numerous ones), and mentioning the *samayas* as being eight in number may have implied that the *samayas* of the Śaiva Siddhānta were alluded to. In any case, in this passage they include only those that correspond to existing Saiddhāntika *samayas*, without the numerous additional Śākta ones.

The *Brahmayāmala*, however, does not end the list of *samayas* at this point. It goes on to give another set of eight (with the counting being somewhat problematic again, here we have perhaps more than eight), this time a set that does not resemble those of the Siddhānta. While the previous eight were simply said to cause success if one maintains them, the second set is labelled ‘the eight supreme *samayas*,’ distinguishing them from the first, presumably ordinary, set.

ananyadevatāsaṅgo hy avikalpo hy alolupaḥ /
advaitāś cāpramādaś ca samayācāraceṣṭita[h/m] //
nārīcaryasamutthānaṃ brahmacaryaṃ tathā yamaḥ /
akrodha srotasañcāra ity aṣṭau samayā parāḥ //

The eight ‘supreme *samayas*’ are these: one must not be attached to another deity, one must have no qualms or hesitation [concerning the use of impure substances]⁵⁰ and be free of greed. One must be nondual [in the ritual sense] and careful, observing the rules of conduct. One must observe the *yama* of maintaining celibacy while actively consorting with women.⁵¹ One must be free of anger when transmitting/and transmit [this tantric] tradition.

(*Brahmayāmala* 86.6–7.)

This complete recreation of the eight *samayas* points to a new development: to the establishment of nondual Śākta *samayas* that have nothing to do with those of other Śaiva currents, and even less with prescriptions of Dharmasāstras, although they may intend to underline some remote relationship to the eight *samayas* of the Śaiva Siddhānta, by the mere fact that there are eight of them.⁵²

⁵⁰This would be the natural interpretation of *vikalpa* in the *Brahmayāmala*’s nondualist ritual context. However, as the parallel of the *Jayadrathayāmala* pointed out below shows (3.32.6cd: *tantroktam guruvākyaṃ vā vikalpair nāvātārayet* One should not transmit the teaching of the Tantra or the guru’s words with *vikalpas*.) it could also refer to a different/fancy interpretation [of scripture or of the guru’s teaching].

⁵¹Interpretation suggested by Shaman Hatley (in a personal communication). Csaba Kiss has adduced a parallel, 24.108–110, which may point to the expression meaning an alternation between celibacy and sexual relationship with women. He has also kindly pointed out that 68.69ab appears to support Shaman Hatley’s interpretation of the two things happening at the same time: *nārīcaryasamāyukto brahmacaryasamanvitaḥ*

⁵²In other passages, the *Brahmayāmala* still includes elements of the original eight Saiddhānt-

To summarize the situation in the above examined early Śākta Tantras: they include *smārta* rules of conduct in their *samayās* as well as prescriptions that appear to go against Dharmaśāstric ones. These may be considered somewhat self-contradictory, but some of them may also be understood as alternatives, possibly for different kinds of practitioners. In some cases, they also cite, include or refer to the *samayās* of the Śaiva Siddhānta. I take this apparent eclecticism to suggest that these Śākta Tantric currents did not intend to cut themselves off completely from brahmanical society and its norms, nor from the Siddhānta, despite the fact that they clearly defined themselves, in their ritual and theology, as following different or even opposite principles. Even if the inclusion of Dharmaśāstric rules was only a way to pay lipservice to Manu and involved only generic rules of conduct, it was apparently thought to be necessary, and establishing the rules of the community happened to some extent still along Dharmaśāstric lines.

5. The Extreme Nondualism of Later Śāktas

This seems not to be the case in later Tantras, in particular of the Kaula and the Krama. Their *samayās* are exclusively nondual, no Dharmaśāstric or Saiddhāntika influence is discernible here.

Concerning the *samayās*, the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* represents a transition between what we see in earlier Śākta Tantras and in later Kaula or Krama ones, for some of its *samayās* are close to those of the *Brahmayāmala* (a parallel pointed out by Shaman Hatley in his transcription of the *Brahmayāmala*), but it retains mainly those *samayās* of the *Brahmayāmala* that are particularly Śākta.

It starts with the set of *nindā* rules. These are still somewhat reminiscent of the first four *samayās* of the Siddhānta. One must not revile but worship and respect Śiva, the different gods, the guru, the teaching, (other) practitioners and Yoginīs. The text seems to call these rules the three precepts (*padatrayam*) of the three other Tantric currents (*trayasyānyasya bhedasya* lit. ‘of the three other divisions’) that should be taught.⁵³

tika *samayās* as well as rules coming from the Dharmaśāstra literature, as shown above (as in 62.121ff. *na nagnāṃ vanitāṃ pasye na cāpi prakāṣtanīṃ / nālokaḥ paśukrīḍā kṣudrakarman na kārayet*). It must also be noted that in this paper I do not deal with the various prescriptions concerning meat eating and which meats are not to be consumed. These *samayās* of the Śākta scriptures are possibly related to the animal-headed deities worshipped in these Tantras.

⁵³*Jayadrathayāmala* 3.32.3–5, which is 9.3–5 of the *Yoginīsaṃcāra*. I am grateful to Alexis Sanderson for making available his draft edition of the *Yoginīsaṃcāra*.

samayān tāva vakṣyāmi ye ’smiṃs tantre sudurlabhāḥ /
śivā parāparā devā ācārya yaḥ sa eva tuḥ //
ye tantre guravo devi sādhakā ye mahāmate /
yāni śāstrāṇi siddhāś ca yogiṇyo yā divaṃgamaḥ //
na nindyā nāpy adhikṣepyāḥ pūjayet tāṃ tu nityaśaḥ /

After these *nindā* rules, the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* gives a more explicit and elaborate version of the *Brahmayāmala*'s set of Śākta *samayas*, renamed here as the eight *samayas* of the Lāmās. I have put the equivalents of the *Brahmayāmala* in parentheses.

<i>anyasmim devatāsaṃgo</i>	(= <i>ananyadevatāsaṅgo</i>)
<i>hāsyenāpi na kārayet /</i>	
<i>tantroktam guruvākyaṃ vā</i>	
<i>vikalpair nāvatarayet //</i>	(= <i>avikalpo?</i>)
<i>viṣayeṣv alolupas tiṣṭhen</i>	(= <i>alolupaḥ</i>)
<i>niyamair hy apavāhinīm /</i>	
<i>samayācāraceṣṭāsu</i>	(= <i>cāpramādaś ca</i>
<i>apramādī sadā bhavet //</i>	<i>samayācāraceṣṭitaḥ</i>)
<i>ātmānaṃ sarvataḥ paśyed</i>	
<i>advaitaparibhāvitaḥ /</i>	(= <i>advaitaś</i>)
<i>nārīcaryāsamutthana</i>	(= <i>nārīcaryāsamutthānaṃ</i>
<i>saṃyamo vratapālanam //</i>	<i>brahmacaryaṃ tato yamaḥ</i>)
<i>tithau tathaiva tat kuryān</i>	
<i>niyataiḥ paribhūṣitam /</i>	
<i>svavikalpena lāmānām</i>	
<i>sampradāyo nivartate //</i>	
<i>śrotrasaṃcaraṇe caiva</i>	(= <i>akrodha srotasañcāra</i>)
<i>nityam akrodhano bhavet /</i>	
<i>ity aṣṭau samayā proktā</i>	(= <i>ity aṣṭau samayā parāḥ</i>)
<i>lāmāvargasya siddhidā //</i>	

(*Yoginīsaṃcāra* 9.6–10 / (from *Brahmayāmala* 86.6–7)
Jayadrathayāmala 3.32.6–10)

One must not be attached to another deity even for fun, one is not to transmit the words of the Tantra or of the guru with an alternative interpretation. One must not covet the objects of the senses and one should serve She Who Takes [Them] Away with the optional observances. One must always maintain the *samayas* unfailingly. One is to see one's self everywhere with a nondual state of mind and observe the Vrata(s), the vow (*saṃyama*) that comes from engaging with women (?).⁵⁴ One must do the same on the *tithi* days, but with special restrictions. The traditional teachings of the Lāmās [may] cease because of one's own error. One must always be without anger when transmitting

trayaśyānyasya bhedasya etac chikṣet padatrayam //

⁵⁴The text may be corrupt. In any case, the parallel with the *Brahmayāmala* suggests that here too, celibacy combined with being with women is meant.

the teaching. These are the eight *samayas* of the Lāmās, which bestow success.⁵⁵

The next set of *samayas* is called those of Śākinīs (*śākinīnāṃ maheśāni samayāṃ śṛṇu sāmpratam* 3.32.11.1), and the last set perhaps belongs to Yoginīs (*adhunā sampravakṣyāmi yogīnāṃ yogasiddhidā* 3.32.24.1). One of the last sentences of the passage summarizes adequately these numerous rules: one must follow left-hand practice in all actions (*vāmācāreṇa varteta sarvakarmasu suvrate* 3.32.44.1).

Kaula and Krama texts indeed seem to have a tendency to prescribe only ‘left-hand’ rules. They may mention, among other things, that the guru must be respected or daily ritual is to be observed, but these rules are more or less lost among *samayas* that require a particular Kaula attitude and behaviour.

The *Devīpañcaśatikā* (6.5–12ab) has the following *samayas* for instance:

*na ninde['] kaulikācāraṃ taddravyāṇi na nindayet /
kālīti vākyam na vaded dāvīśabdaṃ na bhāṣayet //*⁵⁶
*kumārīṃ pūjayed nityam ātmajñānarato bhavet /
gurvarthena tyajet prāṇān dārābhūmidhanāni ca //
nityam eva japam kuryād āhnikam na vilopayet /
na jugupseta nārīnāṃ vīrāṇāṃ ca kṛtākṛte //
guror no lamghayed ājñāṃ kulaśāstram ca pūjayet /
na kuryāt paśuvat kāryam nātigarvam ca bhāvayet //
tarkārthe vātha śabdārthe na jugupse['] kulāgamam /
parityajya śivadvaitam advaitam paribhāvayet //
svacchandāṃ pūjayet lāmāṃ kṛṣṇavāsāṃ na nindayet /
yaduktam parameśāna kṛśodaryāthavā svayam //
na jugupset tataḥ śāstram vandanīyam yathā hara[h] /
etatsamayasaṃyuktaḥ kālībhakto maheśvara //
acirāt siddhibhāgī syā[t] prāpya vaihāyasīm gatim /*⁵⁷

One should not revile Kaula conduct or its substances. One is not to pronounce the words ‘Kālī’ and ‘Dāvī’. One must always worship

⁵⁵This translation is very tentative, for the text is sometimes very terse or ambiguous, and sometimes the construction may not be regular (or there may be a corruption). On two occasions, the *Brahmayāmala* appears to establish different rules. The first is the above mentioned *avikalpa*. The second is in the last line, for the *Brahmayāmala* could be interpreted to denote two rules (‘one must orally transmit the teaching and one must be without anger’), while the *Jayadrathayāmala* seems to prescribe only one (‘one must be without anger when transmitting the teaching orally’). If the latter is understood in the *Brahmayāmala* too (although this seems a rather unlikely rule), then the *Brahmayāmala* passage may have the required eight *samayas*.

⁵⁶The MIRI edition has *dārī* for *dāvī*.

⁵⁷Ed. M. Dyczkowski (MIRI). Square brackets enclose my minor additions, for better understanding of the irregularities.

Kumārī/a young girl and cultivate one’s knowledge of the Self. One must be ready to abandon one’s life, wife, land and possessions for the sake of one’s guru. One must perform the regular recitation of mantras and never omit the daily ritual. One should not be disgusted by what women or heroes (i.e. male or female practitioners) do or do not do. One must not disobey one’s guru and one must worship the Kula teaching. One must avoid acting as a bound soul and being excessively arrogant. One must not feel aversion to Kula scriptures, neither to their argument nor to their expression. One must give up dualist Śaivism and embrace nondualism. One should worship autonomous Lāmās and should not revile those who are clad in black. One should not be disgusted by whatever has been taught by the Supreme Lord or by the Emaciated Goddess herself, one should worship their teaching as Hara is worshipped. Those who observe these *samayās* and are devoted to Kālī, o great lord, will obtain success shortly and reach the heavenly realm.

Sometimes elements of earlier Śākta *samayās* recur in a combined form. The *Ūrmikaulārṇava*, for instance, prescribes not just the worship of women or Yoginīs, but also the worship of women who are blind or crippled. Furthermore, it clearly goes against orthopraxy by enjoining the worship of women who have their period, a rule that was not yet among the *samayās* of early Śākta Tantras, even if the *Brahmayāmala*, for instance, does include the worship of women who have their period in its chapters on ritual.

sahajā pīṭhajā vātha vṛddhastrī bālakanyakā //
kulavratadharā nagnā bhagnanāsā rajasvalā /
mātarahḥ siddhayoginyah kālīkācārapāragāḥ //
pūjayet sādhakendreṇa dīnāndhā vikalāḥ tathā /
Ūrmikaulārṇava (4.29cd–31ab)

The eminent practitioner must worship Mothers, perfected Yoginīs who know the Kālīkā conduct, whether they are naturally born ones or are born in sacred places, old women as well as girls, those who observe the Kula vow, who are naked, flat-nosed, those who have their period. He must also worship them if they are destitute, blind or crippled.

These Kaula or Krama rules do not seem to be related to other, non-Śākta sets of *samayās*. They appear to betray a much more radical antinomian standpoint, and a much more categorical rejection of orthopraxy than early Śākta Tantras. Nevertheless, the lack of any Dharmasāstric rules may also signal that it was no longer felt necessary to define the *samayās* along Dharmasāstric lines, because the authority of Dharmasāstras had perhaps faded to some extent.

Conclusion

Four different forms of Śaivism have been examined here, in order to see what community rules they establish and how they demarcate themselves from orthopraxy. These four are, in order of increasing distance from mainstream brahmanism: non-initiatory lay Śaivism, the Śaiva Siddhānta, early Śākta Tantras and later, more esoteric Kaula and Krama Tantras.

Lay Śaivism, although it adheres to mainstream brahmanical orthopraxy and prescribes no *samaya*-type rules of its own,⁵⁸ proposes particular, Śaiva solutions to problems such as infertility. In this way, it marks its difference, without nevertheless going against any basic rules of orthopraxy.

The Śaiva Siddhānta most commonly establishes a set of eight community rules, to be observed after initiation. These include borrowings from mainstream brahmanical rules of purity (mainly concerning the avoidance of female impurity) or Śaiva applications of brahmanical prescriptions (respect of the teaching and the guru for instance). They also include a few special rules of their own system: (1) concerning the *nirmālya* or offering made to Śiva that should not be reused, and (2) concerning the shadow of a liṅga and Śaiva sacred spaces, which must not be stepped upon/over.

The post-initiatory community rules are surprisingly heterogeneous in early Śākta Tantras (around the 7th–8th centuries CE?). They include several *samayas* of the Siddhānta and a number of Dharmasāstric rules, to which they add their own ones, even though they clearly go against Dharmasāstric principles in most cases. These Śākta *samayas* often appear to be in favour of those who are not particularly well treated in Dharmasāstras: women, those who are considered genderless or unmanly, the handicapped, the outcast. The theological argument that supports these rules is that everybody is created by Śiva and must therefore be treated with respect.

The inclusion of many Dharmasāstric rules, however, seems to suggest that these Śākta communities probably did not want to separate themselves from those who represented mainstream orthopraxy and the Śaiva Siddhānta. They had an inclusivistic attitude towards other religious forms and currents. The theological justification was, once again, the fact that all teachings originated in Śiva.

By contrast, the *Niśvāsa*, which is the earliest surviving tantric scripture (whose earliest stratum may be from 550–650 CE), insists on delimiting its own territory as opposed to Vaidika religion and warns against following other teachings. This attitude may be explained by the religious context of the period: for the *Niśvāsa* was composed when Śaivism was about to establish itself as a new initiatory religion and it was perhaps important to show in what way it proposed something

⁵⁸Again, the Śiva-dharma corpus and purāṇic śaivism do prescribe their own set of injunctions concerning devotion to and worship of Śiva, but these are not comparable to the tantric *samayas*.

better than mainstream brahmanism.

The eclectic *samaya* sets of early Śākta Śaiva Tantras seem to disappear in later, more esoteric Śākta branches, in the Kaula and Krama systems. Many explanations of this are possible. One is certainly that they simply define themselves more categorically as following left-hand or antinomian practice. But it is also possible that by the time of their composition it was not felt necessary to use the authority of the Dharmasāstras, because by that time Śaivism itself had become the dominant form of religion.⁵⁹

Works Cited

Abbreviations

KSTS Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies

MIRI Muktabodha Indological Research Institute. E-texts available online.

NAK National Archives, Kathmandu

Primary Sources

Āpastamba Dharmasūtra see OLIVELLE 2000.

Ūrmikaulārṇava edited by Mark Dyczkowski on the basis of NAK MS no: 5-5207 (sic. 5-5202); NGMPP reel no: B 115/9. MIRI.

Kubjikāmatatantra, ed. Goudriaan, T. and Schoterman, J. Leiden: Brill. 1988. E-text by Somdev Vasudeva.

Jayadrathayāmala, NAK 5-4650 (ṣaṭka 1 and 2) ; 5-722 (ṣaṭka 3) ; 1-1468 (ṣaṭka 4 A 151-16) E-text by Olga Serbaeva. I am grateful to Olga Serbaeva for making her transcription available to me.

Tantrasadbhāva NAK 5-1985 and NAK 5-445, unpublished edition of chapter 4 by Somdev Vasudeva, unpublished edition of chapters 16 and 25 by Judit Törzsök. Complete e-text established under the supervision of Mark Dyczkowski. MIRI. For chapter 9, I have used Jung Lan Bang's draft edition, for which I am grateful to the author.

Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta, with a commentary *-viveka* by Jayaratha. 8 vols

⁵⁹I refer to the main thesis about the 'Śaiva Age' in Sanderson 2009.

ed. with an introduction R.C. Dwivedi and N. Rastogi. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1987. (Reprint of KSTS 1918-1938) E-text MIRI.

Devīpañcaśatikā: Kālikulapañcaśatikā also known as *Devīpañcaśatikā*. NAK MS 5-5183, 5-358, and 1-252. Electronic edition by Mark Dyczkowski, MIRI.

Nīśvāsa(tattvasaṃhitā) see GOODALL ET AL. 2015

Brahmayāmala NAK Ms. No. 3-370. E-text by Shaman Hatley. I am grateful to the author for making his transcription available to me.

Mataṅgapārameśvara: Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama (Kriyāpāda, Caryāpāda et Yogapāda) avec le commentaire -vṛtti de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. Ed. N.R. Bhaṭṭ. Publications de l'IFI No. 65. Pondichéry, 1982.

Manu(-smṛti) Manusmṛti with the Sanskrit Commentary Manvartha-Muktāvalī of Kullūka Bhaṭṭa, ed. J.L. Shastri. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 1983. E-text by M. Yano and Y. Ikari.

Mālinīvijayavārttika of Abhinavagupta. Ed. Madhusudan Kaul Shastri. Pune: Aryabhushan Press. 1921 (KSTS 31)

Mālinīvijayottaratantra Ed. Acharya Krishnanand Sagar. Varanasi: Krishnānand Sāgar. 1985. (1st ed. Madhusūdan Kaul, Bombay, 1922. KSTS 37) E-text by Somdev Vasudeva and MIRI.

Sarvajñānottara Draft edition by Dominic Goodall, based on IFP MS T.334, IFP MS T.760 and NAK MS 1-1692 and 3 available editions. I am grateful to the author for making his edition available to me.

Skandapurāṇa vol. IIB. Edited by Hans T. Bakker, Peter C. Bisschop and Yuko Yokochi, in cooperation with Nina Mirnig and Judit Törzsök. Leiden: Brill. 2014.

Siddhayogeshvarīmata edition based on NAK Ms. No.5-2403 and on the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, Ms. 5465 (G). See TÖRZSÖK 1999 and TÖRZSÖK *forthcoming*.

Svacchanda(tantra) = Svachchandantra, with the commentary -uddiyota by Kṣemarāja 2 vols. Ed. Dwivedi, V.V. Delhi: Parimal Publications. 1985. E-text based on the original KSTS edition, MIRI.

Svacchanda Nepalese recension. NAK MS No. 1-224.

Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha Ed. Mysore 1930; Transcription No. 39, Institut Français de Pondichéry; 1-348. Electronic edition with notes by Dominic Goodall. I am grateful to Dominic Goodall for making his draft edition available to me.

Yoginīsaṃcāra Part of Śaṭka 3 of the *Jayadrathayāmala* Draft edition by Alexis Sanderson. I am grateful to Prof. Sanderson for making available his draft edition.

Secondary Literature

BÜHLER, G [translated by] *The Laws of Manu* Sacred Books of the East vol. 25. Oxford: OUP. 1886. Repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass 1984.

GOODALL, D. ET AL 2015. *The Niśvāsattvasaṃhitā The Earliest Surviving Śaiva Tantra vol. 1. A critical edition and annotated translation of the Mūlasūtra, U-tarasūtra and Nayasūtra* Pondicherry: IFP-EFEO (Early Tantra Series 1.)

LUBIN, T. 2014. “Writing and the Recognition of Customary Law in Premodern India and Java” Washington & Lee Legal Studies Paper No. 2011–18. Revised version of 31 July 2014, forthcoming in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 2015.

OLIVELLE, P. 2000. *Dharmasūtras. The Law Codes of Āpastamba, Gautama, Baudhāyana and Vasiṣṭha* [Annotated text and translation] Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

OLIVELLE, P. 2005. *Manu’s Code of Law. A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānavadharmasāstra* Oxford: OUP.

SANDERSON, A. 2009. “The Śaiva age – the rise and dominance of Śaivism during the early medieval period”, in Einoo, S. (ed.), *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo.

SANDERSON, A. 2014. “The Śaiva Literature” *Journal of Indological Studies* 24–5 (2012–13)

Tāntrikābhidhānakośa (Dictionary of Hindu Tantric Terms) vol. III. ed. D. Goodall and M. Rastelli. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2014.

TÖRZSÖK, J. 1999. *The Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits — A critical edition of selected chapters of the Siddhayogeśvarīmata(tantra) with annotated translation and analysis* Unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford.

TÖRZSÖK, J. 2013. “Nondualism in Early Śākta Tantras: Transgressive Rites and Their Ontological Justification in a Historical Perspective” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 41.6 (December 2013)

TÖRZSÖK, J. forthcoming *The Teaching of Yoginīs. A critical edition of the Siddhayogeśvarīmata with an introduction and annotated translation.*