

Whose *dharma*? Śaiva and Śākta community rules and Dharmaśāstric prescriptions

Judit Törzsök¹

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 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 to 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 would be for us now), or because they had a limited sphere of application, for instance in the case of certain local rules.

¹ The first version of this paper was delivered at the workshop “Visions of Community. Tantric Communities in Context: Sacred Secrets and Public Rituals” (February 5–7, 2015, Vienna, Austrian Academy of Sciences), 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, Marion Rastelli, 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.

And there are additional pitfalls. Tantric scriptures, just as non-Tantric ones, were meant to be applicable eternally and 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 chronologically or geographically particular in them. 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 2015: 228)

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 are the full implications of this, the use of Dharmaśāstric terminology in epigraphical legalese shows that Dharmaśāstric 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 *śamayās* 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

Śivadharma corpus.² The Śivadharmanas 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,³ 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.

Śiva versus Manu: a Purāṇic example

The example comes from the *Skandapurāṇa*, datable in its earliest form to around the end of the sixth century CE. I have chosen to present this case because it shows very clearly how Dharmaśāstric 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.⁴ 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. One day Bhūmanyu, dejected, talks to his wife 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.”⁵

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

³ Several people are working on various texts belonging to this corpus, such as Peter Bisschop, Florinda de Simini, Nirajan Kaffle, Timothy Lubin, Anil Kumar Acharya, Nina Mirnig, and Paolo Magnone.

⁴ For the edition and synopsis of this chapter, see *Skandapurāṇa* vol. IIB.

⁵ I give a summary rather than a translation above. For reference, here is the Sanskrit text, *Skandapurāṇa* 52.29–32: *gautamasyānvaye vipro nāmnā kṛṣṇa iti prabhuh | tasya putro 'bhavat khyāto bhūmanyur iti nāmataḥ | tasya patny abhavat subhrūr ātreyī nāmato yaśā || sa kadācit kṛtodvāho bhūmanyur nāma gautamaḥ | nāvindata sutam tasyā jarayā cābhisamvṛtaḥ || sa bhāryām āha duḥkḥārta idam vacanakovidah | “putreṇecchanti lokāṃś ca anṛṇāś ca bhavanty uta | jarāpariṇatāś*

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 authorisation 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.⁶

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!⁷

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: This woman shall have a true son. This prediction should come true. Whatever ascetic power I have been able to accumulate,

cāhaṃ na ca me drśyate sutaḥ || sā tvaṃ kaṃcit sagotraṃ me anujñātā mayā śubhe | abhipadyasva putrārthaṃ yāce tvāṃ prāñjalir nataḥ” ||.

⁶ *Manusmṛti* 9.59: *devarād vā sapinḍād vā striyā samyaṅ niyuktayā | prajepsit-ādhigantavyā saṃtānasya parikṣaye* ||, transl. OLIVELLE 2005: 193. 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).” (Transl. BÜHLER²1984: 337)

⁷ *Skandapurāṇa* 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 jīvītāni sukhāni ca | putrān kulaṃ ca lokāṃś ca tapaḥ kuru mahāmune* ||.

through your grace, you shall have it. Armed with my *tapas* and yours, you must worship Rudra.⁸

Thus, the wife not only rejects Manu's solution to the problem but even finds it 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 (*adharmā*)."⁹

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 than the replacement of a living husband.¹⁰

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

⁸ *Skandapurāṇa* 52.38–40: *tathā bhavān api tapaḥ karotu susamādhinā | lapsyase tvam sutaṃ śreṣṭhaṃ mahāyogabalānvitam || māṃ hi dr̥ṣṭvā purā prāha atrir brahma-sutaḥ svayam | satputrīṇī bhavitṛīyaṃ na mithyā tad bhaviṣyati || tapo 'sti mayi yat kiṃcit tvatprasādāt samārjitaṃ | tena svena ca saṃyukto rudraṃ ārādhaya prabho ||*

⁹ *Āpastamba Dharmasūtra* 1.20.6–7: *yat tv āryāḥ kriyamāṇaṃ praśaṃsanti sa dharmo yad garhante so 'dharmah*, transl. OLIVELLE 2000: 57. The same *Dharmasūtra* in fact goes on to warn readers that sometimes 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).

¹⁰ See in particular *Manusmṛti* 9.64–66.

defends the better, more virtuous Śaiva one. Women, along with Śūdras, were certainly treated better in Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism than in mainstream Brahmanism, at least in the sense that they had access to some form of initiation (even to full initiation in the Śākta branches) and therefore hope for potential liberation, from which they were entirely excluded according to mainstream Brahmanism. It may not be accidental in our story that it is the woman that proposes the Śaiva solution.

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 was 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, *Svacchandatantra* 4.88:

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.¹¹

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 that 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 in

¹¹ SvT 4.88: *bālabālīśavṛddhastrībhogabhugvyādhitātmanām | eṣāṃ nirbījikā dīkṣā samayādivarjitā* ||. According to Kṣemarāja’s commentary, the word “etc.” refers to other ritual obligations, such as the annual reparatory *pavitraka* rite (*ādiśabdāt pavitrakādividhiḥ*). On this rite, see the entries *pavitraka* and *pavitrārohaṇa/pavitrāropana* 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.

some systems receive their own, female initiation names. It seems quite absurd to perform the *samaya* ritual for everybody and to recite the rules to be observed in front of every neophyte, only to later declare 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 Siddhānta¹² 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.

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) One 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*.¹³ 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*, *dīkṣitas*, *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 sometimes added 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 (*devajagdha*), 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.: *balidāna-paśor api*). Perhaps it means, as it is understood in GOODALL et al. 2015, that one must perform 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

¹² See the entry *nirbījadīkṣā* by Dominic Goodall in TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA vol. III.

¹³ See, e.g., *Manusmṛti* 4.163 for *vedanindā* and 2.200 for *gurunindā*.

understand that the transgression the *Niśvāsa* condemns here is the eating of an animal offered in sacrifice, if we read *balidānapaśor api* with the manuscripts and construe it with *-bhakṣaṇe* as a *sāpekṣasamāsa*. In other words, one must perform 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*).¹⁴

The *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*’s parallel, which is also difficult to understand, seems to say something along the same lines,¹⁵ but it is also possible that a different transgression is meant here.¹⁶ In any case, the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* clearly continues by stating that such things should not be done even when one is in great danger,¹⁷ 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 *saṃayas* forbid initiates to accept food touched by certain categories of women: mainly those who have their period or those who have recently given birth. The traditional eight *saṃayas* mention only women during their menses,¹⁸ but scriptures often include women in the post-partum period (*sūtikā*).¹⁹ Such *saṃayas* reproduce faithfully the Brahmanical principle according to which one is not to accept food from these wom-

¹⁴ See, for instance, *Mataṅgapārameśvara* Caryāpāda 1.7: *niveditaṃ vā yat kiṃcid devadevasya śūliṇaḥ | na ca tat svopayogāya kartavyaṃ manasāpy atha ||*.

¹⁵ SvāSS 10.24cd–25ab: *nirmālya-laṅghanaṃ [-]dānaṃ [-]bhojanaṃ ca vivarjayet || tatṛāviplavanaṃ* (for *tantraviplāvanaṃ*?) *dānaṃ avinītābaleḥ 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.” (I understand a kind of *sāpekṣasamāsa* here, whereby *nirmālya*- is to be understood or supplied with *-dānaṃ* and *-bhojanaṃ*. The same applies in the next citation.)

¹⁶ One could read *tantraviplāvanaṃ dānaṃ avinītābale paśau*, “divulging the Tantra or giving it to an uninitiated person (*paśu*) who lacks any decency or strength.”

¹⁷ SvāSS 10.25cd: *nācarec chivamārgasthaḥ mahātayagato 'pi san* (clearly corrupt for *mahābhayagato 'pi san*). *sandhi* is not applied here at the end of a *pāda*.

¹⁸ See *ārtavisprṣṭam* in the *Niśvāsa* *Nayasūtra* 1.104cd.

¹⁹ See *Sarvajñānottara* 15.26a: *sūtikāyānnasamprṣṭam*; SvāSS 10.24b: *saṃsprṣṭam puṣṭavatyanṇam* (for *puṣpavatyanṇam*) *svaryātānāṇ ca sautikam*.

en (*Manusmṛti* 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 *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*'s version adds that one is also to avoid food touched by someone who has gone to heaven.²⁰

(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*).²¹

These four types of rules – *nindā*, *nirmālya*, not accepting food from certain women, not stepping on any (Śaiva) sacred space – cover the eight traditional *saṃayas* 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.²²

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 *saṃayas*, it also 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 mentioning the *saṃayas*) clearly warns against returning to Vedic ritual and turning one's back to the Śaiva community:

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 Hāṭha-kuṣmāṇḍa-rudra shall punish that evil-minded person.²³

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

²⁰ See *svaryātānāṇ* in the above citation.

²¹ *Sarvajñānottara* 15.26b: *cchāyācatvaralaṃghanam*.

²² Note that different rules for the *nirmālya* apply in Pāñcarātra scriptures, for which see the entry by Marion Rastelli in *TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA* vol. III.

²³ *śivatāntram adhītvā tu śivayajñam prakurvate || yajate vaidikair yajñaiḥ śiva-bhaktāṃś ca nindate | viprāṃś caivānyaliṅgasthāṃ pūjayet stunateti ca || hāṭhakuṣmāṇḍarudras tu taṃ vai badhnāti durmatim |*.

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.²⁴

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 preferred. It was probably not considered impossible to try out (Saiddhāntika) Śaivism and then turn back to Vedic ritual or try out yet something else, probably remaining, by and large, within the rules and boundaries of orthopraxy.²⁵

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 seventh century),²⁶ which is otherwise rather concise on many topics, gives a fairly detailed list of such *samayas*, and the list has many parallels in related texts. With regard to their conformity to Dharmaśāstric prescriptions, there are three kinds of rules here.

²⁴ *pratijñāvrataṁ ārūḍho punas tyaktvā śivaṁ vrataṁ || anyattantravratāṁ gr̥hned devī tena nibandhati* |. I would like to note here that my translations of the *Niśvāsa* 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.

²⁵ In this context, it must be remarked that converts are a recognised category of Śaiva initiates, who normally do not have the right to take up one of the two Śaiva offices, namely that of the *ācāryas* or *sādhakas*. They are called “the reborn,” *punarbhū-*, see the entry in TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA 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 (worshippers of the sun god) or Bauddha and did not simply belong to the nonsectarian/mainstream Brahmanical tradition (*vaidika*).

²⁶ See TÖRZSÖK 1999 and TÖRZSÖK forthcoming.

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,²⁷ one must not look at naked women,²⁸ one must avoid having sex during daytime if one wishes to succeed in obtaining supernatural powers (or liberation),²⁹ one is not to urinate in certain places such as in a field, on the road, on a cremation ground, etc.³⁰ 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 Dharmaśāstric 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, as it were, their own Dharmaśāstra.

Second, several *samayas* are Śaiva inflections of Dharmaśāstric 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.³¹ One must mentally invoke and worship the deity at the three junctures of the day,³² and one must worship one's *ācārya*.³³

²⁷ SYM 6.46a (= *Mālinīvijayottara* 8.133a): *niṣphalaṃ naiva ceṣṭeta*. (See also TSB 9.531c: *niṣphalāṃ varjayeceṣṭāṃ*.) Cf. *Manusmṛti* 4.63a: *na kurvīta vr̥thāceṣṭāṃ*, 4.70c: *na karma niṣphalaṃ kuryān*.

²⁸ SYM 6.47c: *na nagnāṃ vanitāṃ paśyen* (see also TSB 9.532cd). Cf. *Manusmṛti* 4.53b: *nagnāṃ nekṣeta ca striyam*.

²⁹ SYM 6.48cd: *grāmadharmaṃ sadā varjyaṃ vāsare siddhim icchatā* (See TSB 9.534cd: *grāmadharma na kartavyaṃ vāsare siddhim icchatā*.) Cf. *Manusmṛti* 11.174: *maithunaṃ tu samāsevyā puṃsi yoṣiti vā dvijaḥ | goyāne 'psu divā caiva savāsāḥ snānam ācāret ||*.

³⁰ SYM 6.51cd–52ab: *kṣetramārgaikavṛkṣeṣu śmaśānāyataneṣu ca | viṇmūtra[m] śayan[aṃ] vāpi na kuryān mantravīt kvacit*. See TSB 9.547cd–548: *śayanaṃ naiva kartavyaṃ ekavṛkṣe catuṣpathe || kṣetre caiva śmaśāne ca vane copavaneṣu ca | devāgāre nadītre bhasmagomayamadhyataḥ || viṇmūtraṃ naiva kartavyaṃ śthīvanaṃ maithunaṃ tathā |*. Cf. *Manusmṛti* 4.45cd–46: *na mūtraṃ pathi kurvīta na bhasmani na govraje || na phālakṛṣṇe na jale na cityāṃ na ca parvate | na jīrṇadevāyatane na valmīke kadācana ||*.

³¹ In the SYM for instance *śāstranindā* is mentioned in 6.45c, while 45ab enjoins *naivedya* for the deities whenever one eats (as does the TSB in 9.531a).

³² Śakti in the SYM (6.49ab: *traiḥkālaṃ cintayec chaktiṃ sakalīkṛtavagrahaḥ*);

Third, many *samayas* are completely unparalleled in Dharmaśāstras. Some of them are merely specific to certain Śākta texts, for instance that the words *ḍākinī*³⁴ or *rere*³⁵ should not be uttered, probably because they carry particular power and are therefore considered dangerous. But other *samayas* clearly go against Dharmaśāstric prescriptions, for instance that one should not revile alcohol or those who are unmanly (*klībam*).³⁶

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*,³⁷ are also treated with much contempt. In *Manusmṛti* 3.150, *klības* are put in the same group as outcasts, 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.”³⁸

deva in the TSB (9.565c: *traihkālyam pūjayed devam*).

³³ See SYM 6.49cd: *vanded ācāryam āsannaṃ dūrasthaṃ dhyānayogataḥ*.

³⁴ SYM 6.51ab: *ḍākinīti na vaktavyaṃ pramādān mantriṇā –m– api*; the word *śākinī* is mentioned in the parallel in TSB 9.533ab: *śākinīti na vaktavyaṃ*. Words denoting dangerous female spirits (*ḍākinī* or *śākinī*) were not to be pronounced in general.

³⁵ In SYM 6.46cd: *rereśabdaṃ sadākālaṃ na prayuñjyā[t] kadācana*. A similar injunction is formulated concerning the word *hehe* in TSB 9.532ab: *rereśabdaṃ na coccāryaṃ heheśabdaṃ tathaiva ca*.

³⁶ SYM 6.45cd: *surāṃ klībaṃ na nindyāt*, with a parallel in TSB 9.542cd ff. SvT 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.

³⁷ See OLIVELLE’s note on *Manusmṛti* 3.150 (p. 263–264): “[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 *śaṇḍha* 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*.’”

³⁸ *Manusmṛti* 3.150: *ye stenapatitaklībā ye ca nāstikavṛttayaḥ | tān havyakavyayor viprān anarhān manur abravīt ||*, transl. OLIVELLE 2005: 116. Cf. “Manu has declared that those Brahmanas who are thieves, outcasts, eunuchs, or atheists are unworthy (to partake) of oblations to the gods and manes.” (transl. BÜHLER ²1984: 103).

Eunuchs are also said to have a polluting presence (if they watch a Brahmin eat, for example).³⁹ 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.”⁴⁰

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*:

The deformed, the depressed, eunuchs, the unmanly, the blind, and those who suffer [from any illness] [...] should not be treated with contempt.⁴¹

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.⁴² 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.⁴³

³⁹ *Manusmṛti* 3.239: *cāṇḍālās ca varāhaś ca kukkuṭaḥ śvā tathaiva ca | rajasvalā ca ṣaṇḍhaś ca nekṣerann aśnato dvijān ||*. “A Caṇḍāla, a pig, a cock, a dog, a menstruating woman, or a eunuch must not look at the Brahmins while they are eating.” (transl. OLIVELLE 2005: 120).

⁴⁰ Transl. BÜHLER ²1984: 372. *Manusmṛti* 9.201: *anaṃśau klībapatitau jātya-ndhabadhirau tathā | unmattajaḍamūkāś ca ye ca ke cin nirindriyāḥ ||*. Cf. OLIVELLE’s translation (2005: 200), who understands (against the commentators and Bühler) *nirindriya* also to refer to the absence of manly strength: “The following receive no shares: the impotent, outcastes, those born blind or deaf, the insane, the mentally retarded, mutes, and anyone lacking manly strength.”

⁴¹ TSB 9.552cd... 555a: *vairūpyaṃ duḥkṛitaṃ ṣaṇḍhaṃ klībaṃ andhaṃ tathātura-ram || ...na nindeta varārohe*.

⁴² See 6.45cd in the very heterogeneous list of the SYM: *striyaṃ śāstraṃ surāṃ klībaṃ na nindyāt kanyakām api*. “One should not despise women, the scripture, alcohol, the unmanly, and young girls.”

⁴³ See 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

See also a similar list in the *Kubjikāmata* 5.65cd–66ab, mentioning wrestlers (*malla*), leather-makers (*carmakāraka*), liquor-sellers (*dhvaja*), butchers (*sūnākara*), fish-killers (*matsyaghāta*), and hunters (*lubdhaka*).⁴⁴

This set of *samayas* thus appears to defend several categories of those who are marginalised 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 that 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: 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,⁴⁵ who has received the *samayas* and intends to follow them, must see different kinds of worship, the *varṇas*, various (ritual) acts, substances, and bodies in the same way.⁴⁶

numerous, are not discussed here. TSB 9.552–555: *kaivartam kāndukam mleccham dhvajam sūnākaram priye | vairūpyam duḥkhitam śaṇḍham klībam andham tathāturaṃ || malla-vandina-kausadyam cchippakam carmakārakam | jaṭṭam bhuṭṭam mathīram ca kāpotam kulabhakṣakam || medam bhillaṃ ca ḍombam ca tathānyam bhaṇḍakārakam | evam anye pi ye noktā mānavā varavarṇini || na nindeta varārohe vratinaṃ yad upasthitam | haṭṭanāryo na vaktavyā nākroṣet kanyakāḥ sudhīḥ ||*.

⁴⁴ This passage, repeating some elements from the TSB above, also lists several categories that I cannot translate with certainty (see underlined words, of which the first may denote jugglers and the final one archers): *kandukam mallakoṣādhya cchippakam carmakārakam || dhvajam sūnākaram vāpi matsyaghātam tu lubdhakam*.

⁴⁵ More 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 characterised 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 Pāsupatas.

⁴⁶ This is not a full translation of the text, which has a few textual difficulties; *Brahmayāmala* 62.124127ab: *guhyam klībādi conmattam pramattam vihvalam priye | nagnam suratasamsaktam mṛto[ndha/tva]ntam surā striyaḥ ||* (Perhaps read *mṛto 'ndham* or *mṛtoddharantam*?) *na dūṣaye[] †vase† vātha yantranā bhairavasya tu | sarvvatas tu tato devyaḥ śivaś ca labhate priye || ato na nindayet sarvvaṃ jarāsthan tu virūpakam | jñānā-sramī makhām varṇṇām kryādravyām tathā tanuṃ || tulyabhāvena*

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.⁴⁷

Now a somewhat similar argument also figures in the *Svacchanda* in the context of *samayas*. 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:

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.⁴⁸

Thus, just as the *Brahmayāmala* argues for the equality of all substances and people because they are all Śiva's creations, so too does the *Svacchanda* argue for the validity of all Śāstras, since they are also Śiva's creations. After this statement, the *Svacchanda* adds a final member to the list of teachings that should not be reviled: the prescriptions of Smṛtis, because they demonstrate the proper ways to behave and act (*smṛttaṃ dharmaṃ na nindet tu ācārapathadarśakam*, 5.45cd). This confirms, once again, an adherence to the generic *smṛta* rules of conduct.

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

The *Tantrasadbhāva*, for instance, mentions that one should not step over the shadow of a *linga*.⁴⁹ It extends this *samaya* to the various attributes

paśyeta samayī samayārthinaḥ | . Transcription kindly provided by Shaman Hatley.

⁴⁷ For various usages of this argument, see TÖRZSÖK 2014.

⁴⁸ SvT 5.44cd–45ab: *sāṃkhyam yogam pāñcarātram vedāṃś caiva na nindayet | yataḥ śivodbhavāḥ sarve hy apavargaphalapradāḥ* ||. Let us note the alternative reading given by Jayaratha in the *Tantrāloka* (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 tenoktaṃ sarvaśāstre śivaḥ phalam | yataḥ śivodbhavāḥ sarve śivadhāmaphalā iti*). The same reading in the singular (*yataḥ śivodbhavam 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 paṭhanti*). However, the Nepalese manuscript agrees basically with the edited SvT here: *sāṃkhyayogam pañcarātram vedāṃś caiva na nindayet | yataḥ śivodbhavāḥ sarve hy apavargaphalapradāḥ* ||.

(*āyudhas*) of gods that are also not to be stepped over or touched with the foot (9.562–568 ending with: *pharakam vāpi khaḍgam vā anya vāpy āyudham priye | pāde naiva sprśen mantrī na tu laṅghet kadācana* ||. “The master of *mantras* should never touch with his foot or step over the shield, the sword, or any other [divine] weapon, my beloved.”).

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

One should under no circumstances consume the *nirmālya*, which is not to be consumed according to the dualist⁵⁰ *mantra*(*mārga*) tradition.⁵¹

The second passage mentions the eight *samayas*, 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,⁵² 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 *samayas* that increase devotion and faith. Obeying these rules of conduct is the cause of all success.⁵³

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 im-

⁴⁹ TSB 9.550: *varṣās tu navabhiś caiva liṅgacchāyām na laṅghayet*. 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 (understanding a corruption and/or irregular expression standing for *navavarṣāt*, and the idea being that younger children may not comply with such rules and may be allowed to skip over the shadow of a *liṅga*).

⁵⁰ The term “dualist” always refers to ritual dualism in this text, cf. TÖRZSÖK 2014.

⁵¹ *Brahmayāmala* 62.123cd: *dvaitamantre tu nirmālyam nābhakṣam bhakṣayet kvacit* ||. Transcription kindly provided by Shaman Hatley.

⁵² The expression “mothers” may refer to female ancestors and family members as well as to various groups of female spirits and goddesses of the Śākta pantheon.

⁵³ *Brahmayāmala* 86.3cd–5: *na śivasya paro devaḥ ācāryo mātaraś tathā* || 3 || *asmin tanre tu guravaḥ sādhaḥ sādhu eva vā | nāvamānyā nādhikṣepya pūjanīyāś ca śaktitah* || 4 || *aṣṭau tu samayā hy ete bhaktiśraddhāvivarddhakāḥ | siddhīnām kāraṇam hy etat samayācārāpālanam* || 5 ||.

plied 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 count being somewhat problematic again, since here we have perhaps more than eight), in this case a set that does not resemble those of the Siddhānta. While the previous eight were simply said to bring success if one maintains them, the second set is labelled “the eight supreme *samayas*,” distinguishing them from the first, presumably ordinary, set:

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]⁵⁴ 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.⁵⁵ One must be free of anger and transmit [this Tantric] tradition.⁵⁶

This complete recreation of the eight *samayas* points to a new development: to the establishment of nondual Śākta *samayas* that have nothing to

⁵⁴ This 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: *tanroktam 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).

⁵⁵ Interpretation 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 brahmacarya-samanvitaḥ*.

⁵⁶ *Brahmayāmala* 86.6–7: *ananyadevatāsaṅgo hy avikalpo hy alolupaḥ | advaitaś cāpramādaś ca samayācāraceṣṭita[h] || nārīcaryasamutthānaṃ brahmacaryaṃ tathā yamaḥ | akrodha srotasañcāra ity aṣṭau samayā parāḥ ||* (Shaman Hatley’s transcription). To be free from anger (*akrodha*) is commonly considered a separate injunction (see, for instance, SvT 11.144), but then there are altogether nine *samayas*. This may not have been perceived as a problem by the authors, or it is also possible that two of the previous *samayas* were regarded as one.

do with those of other Śaiva currents, and even less with prescriptions of Dharmaśāstras, although they may intend to underline some remote relationship to the eight *śamayas* of the Śaiva Siddhānta, by the mere fact that there are eight of them.⁵⁷

To summarise the situation in the early Śākta Tantras examined above: They include *smārta* rules of conduct in their *śamayas* 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 *śamayas* of the Śaiva Siddhānta. I take this apparent eclecticism to suggest that these Śākta Tantric currents did not intend to separate themselves completely from Brahmanical society and its norms, nor from the Siddhānta, despite the fact that in their ritual and theology they clearly defined themselves as following different or even opposite principles. Even if the inclusion of Dharmaśāstric rules was only a way to pay lip service to Manu and involved only generic rules of conduct, it was apparently thought to be necessary, and the establishment of the rules of the community to some extent still occurred along Dharmaśāstric lines.

The extreme nondualism of later Śāktas

This seems not to be the case in later Tantras, in particular those of the Kaula and the Krama. Their *śamayas* are exclusively nondual, in other words, they go against standard Brahmanic prescriptions in promoting the use of impure substances and rites. No Dharmaśāstric or Saiddhāntika influence is discernible here.

Concerning the *śamayas*, the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* represents a transition between what we see in earlier Śākta Tantras and in later Kaula or Krama ones, for some of its *śamayas* are close to those of the *Brahmayāmala* (a parallel pointed out by Shaman Hatley in his transcription of the *Brahma-*

⁵⁷ In other passages, the *Brahmayāmala* still includes elements of the original eight Saiddhāntika *śamayas* as well as rules coming from the Dharmaśāstra literature, as shown above (as in 62.121ff.: *na nagnāṃ vanitāṃ pasye na cāpi prakāṣtanīm | nālokayet 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 *śamayas* of the Śākta scriptures are possibly related to the animal-headed deities worshipped in these Tantras.

yāmala), but it retains mainly those *samayas* of the *Brahmayāmala* that are particularly Śākta.

It begins with the set of *nindā* rules. These are still somewhat reminiscent of the first four *samayas* 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 (*padatraya*) of the three other Tantric currents (*trayasyānyasya bhedasya*, lit. “of the three other divisions”) that should be taught.⁵⁸

Following 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 (a category of female beings and practitioners). I have noted the equivalents of the *Brahmayāmala* in parentheses.

Yoginīsaṃcāra 9.6–10 /
Jayadrathayāmala 3.32.6–10

Brahmayāmala 86.6–7

anyasmiṃ devatāsaṃgo
hāsyenāpi na kārayet |
tantroktam guruvākyam vā
vikalpair nāvātārayet ||
viṣayeṣv alolupas tiṣṭhen
niyamair hy apavāhinīm |
samayācāraceṣṭāsu
apramādī sadā bhavet ||
ātmānam sarvataḥ paśyed
advaitaparibhāvitaḥ |
nārīcaryāsamutthana
saṃyamo vratapālanam ||
tithau tathaiva tat kuryān
niyataiḥ paribhūṣitam |
svavikalpena lāmānām
sampradāyo nivartate ||

(= *ananyadevatāsaṅgo*)

(= *avikalpo?*)

(= *alolupaḥ*)

(= *cāpramādaś ca*
samayācāraceṣṭitaḥ)

(= *advaitaś*)

(= *nārīcaryāsamutthānam*
brahmacaryam tato yamaḥ)

⁵⁸ *Jayadrathayāmala* 3.32.3–5, which is 9.3–5 of the *Yoginīsaṃcāra*: *samayān tāva vakṣyāmi ye ’smiṃs tantre sudurlabhāḥ | śivā parāparā devā ācāryo yaḥ sa eva tuḥ (?) || ye tantre guravo devi sādhaḥ ye mahāmate | yāni śāstrāṇi siddhāś ca yogi-nyo yā divaṃgamaḥ || na nindyā nāpy adhikṣepyāḥ pūjayet tām tu nityaśaḥ | trayasyānyasya bhedasya etac chikṣet padatrayaṃ ||* I am grateful to Alexis Sanderson for making available his draft edition of the *Yoginīsaṃcāra*.

<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>	

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 Her-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 (?).⁵⁹ 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 the teaching. These are the eight *samayas* of the Lāmās, which bestow success.⁶⁰

The next set of *samayas* is called those of *śākinīs* (*śākinīnām maheśāni samayām śṛṇu sāmpratam*, 3.32.11.1), and the last set perhaps belongs to *yoginīs* (*adhunā saṃpravakṣyāmi yogīnām yogasiddhidā*, 3.32.24.1, *yogī* being commonly used for *yoginī* in Tantric texts). One of the last sentences of the passage adequately summarises 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

⁵⁹ The text may be corrupt. In any case, the parallel with the *Brahmayāmala* suggests that here too, celibacy combined with being with women is meant.

⁶⁰ This translation is very tentative, for the text is sometimes very terse or ambiguous, and sometimes the construction may be irregular (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 final 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 feature the required eight *samayas*.

be respected or daily ritual is to be observed, but these rules are more or less lost among *samayās* that require a particular Kaula attitude and behaviour.

The *Devīpañcaśatikā* (6.5–12ab), for instance, gives the following *samayās*:

One should not revile Kaula conduct or its substances. One is not to pronounce the words *kālī* and *ḍāvī*. One must always worship Kumārī/a young girl⁶¹ 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.⁶²

⁶¹ The word *kumārī* can denote a category of female beings or goddesses in the pantheon, but also an actual young girl before puberty whose worship may be prescribed.

⁶² *Devīpañcaśatikā* 6.5–12ab: *na ninde['] kaulikācāraṃ taddravyāṇi na nindayet | kālīti vākyam na vaded ḍāvīśabdāṃ* (em., *dārīśabdāṃ* ed_{MIRI}) *na bhāṣayet || kumārīm pūjayet nityam ātmajñānarato bhavet | gurvarthena tyajet prāṇān dārābhūmi-dhanāni ca || nityam eva japaṃ kuryād āhnikam na vilopayet | na jugupseta nārīṇām vīrāṇām ca kṛtākṛte || guror no laṃghayed ājñām kulaśāstraṃ ca pūjayet | na kuryāt paśuvat kāryam nātigarvaṃ ca bhāvayet || tarkārthe vātha śabdā-rthe na jugupse['] kulāgamam | parityajya śivadvaitam advaitam paribhāvayet || svacchandām pūjayet lāmām kṛṣṇavāsāṃ na nindayet | yaduktam parameśena* (em., *parameśāna* ed_{MIRI}) *kṛṣṇodaryāthavā svayam || na jugupset tataḥ śāstraṃ vandanīyam yathā hara[h] | etatsamayasaṃyuktaḥ kālībhakto maheśvara || acirāt siddhibhāgī syā[t] prāpya vai-hāyasīm gatim |*. Ed. M. Dyczkowski (MIRI), square brackets enclose my minor additions for better understanding of the irregularities.

Sometimes elements of earlier Śākta *śamayas* 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 *śamayas* 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:

The eminent practitioner must worship Mothers (*mātrī*), perfected *yoginīs* who know the Kālikā 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.⁶³

These Kaula or Krama rules do not seem to be related to other, non-Śākta sets of *śamayas*. 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 Dharmaśāstric rules may also signal that it was no longer felt necessary to define the *śamayas* along Dharmaśāstric lines, because the authority of Dharmaśāstras had perhaps to some extent faded.

Conclusion

Four different forms of Śaivism have been examined here, in order to see which 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 *śamaya*-type rules of its own,⁶⁴ proposes particular

⁶³ *Ūrmikaulārṇava* 4.29cd–31ab: *sahajā pūṭhajā vātha vṛddhastrī bālakanyakā || kulavratadharā nagnā bhagnanāsā rajasvalā | mātaraḥ siddhayoginyaḥ kālīkā-cārapāragāḥ || pūjayet sādhakendreṇa dīnāndhā vikalāḥ tathā |*.

⁶⁴ Again, the Śivadharma 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 *śamayas*.

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 seventh to eighth centuries CE?). They include several *samayas* of the Siddhānta and a number of Dharmaśāstric rules, to which are added their own ones, even though in most cases they clearly go against Dharmaśāstric principles. These Śākta *samayas* often appear to be in favour of those who are not particularly treated well in Dharmaśāstras: 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 Dharmaśāstric 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 date to 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 perhaps it was important to show in what way it proposed something better than mainstream Brahmanism.

The eclectic *samaya* sets of early Śākta Śaiva Tantras seem to disappear in later, more esoteric Śākta branches of the Kaula and Krama systems. Many explanations are possible here. One certainly is 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 Dharmaśāstras, because by that time Śaivism itself had become the dominant form of religion.⁶⁵

Abbreviations

KSTS: Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies

MIRI: Muktabodha Indological Research Institute. E-texts available online: http://muktalib5.org/digital_library.htm (accessed July 6, 2019).

NAK: National Archives, Kathmandu

BIBLIOGRAPHY

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, accessed in 2011, not available in December 2017.

Kubjikāmatatantra

The Kubjikāmatatantra: Kulālikāmnāya version. Ed. T Goudriaan & J. Schoterman. Leiden: Brill, 1988. I am grateful to Somdev Vasudeva for providing me with his etext of the *Kubjikāmatatantra*.

Jayadrathayāmala

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

Tantrasadbhāva (TSB)

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, accessed in 2011, not available in December 2017. For chapter 9, I have used Jung Lan Bang's draft edition, for which I am grateful to the editor.

⁶⁵ I refer to the main thesis about the “Śaiva Age” in SANDERSON 2009.

Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta, with a commentary by Jayaratha

The Tantrāloka of Abhinava Gupta, with commentary (-viveka) by Rājānaka Jayaratha. 8 vols. Ed. Mukund Rām Śāstrī. With an introduction R.C. Dwivedi and N. Rastogi. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1987. (Reprint of KSTS 1918-1938)

Devīpañcaśatikā (Ed_{MIRI}): *Kālikulapañcaśatikā* also known as *Devī-pañcaśatikā*

NAK ms. 5-5183, 5-358, and 1-252. Electronic edition by Mark Dyczkowski, MIRI, accessed in 2011, not available in December 2017.

Niśvāsa(tattvasaṃhitā)

See GOODALL et al. 2015.

Brahmayāmala

NAK ms. no. 3-370. E-text by Shaman Hatley. I am grateful to the editor for making his transcription available to me.

Mataṅgapārameśvara

Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama (Kriyāpāda, Caryāpāda et Yogapāda) avec le commentaire -vṛtti de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. Ed. N.R. Bhaṭṭ. Pondicherry: Institut Français d'Indologie, 1982.

Manu(-smṛti)

Manusmṛti with the Sanskrit Commentary Manvartha-Muktāvalī of Kullūka Bhaṭṭa. Ed. J.L. Shastri. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.

Mālinīvijayavārttika of Abhinavagupta

Śrī-Mālinīvijayavārtikam. Ed. M.K. Shastri. Pune: Aryabhushan Press, 1921.

Mālinīvijayottaratantra

Mālinīvijayottaratantra. Ed. Acharya Krishnanand Sagar. Varanasi: Krishnānand Sāgar, 1985. (1st ed. Madhusūdan Kaul, Bombay, 1922.)

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.

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 editor for making his edition available to me.

Siddhayogeśvarīmata (SYM)

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.

Skandapurāṇa

The Skandapurāṇa. Vol. IIB. Eds. H.T. Bakker, P.C. Bisschop and Y. Yokochi, in cooperation with N. Mirnig and J. Törzsök. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Svacchanda(tantra) (SvT)

Svacchandatantra, with the commentary -uddiyota by Kṣemarāja. 2 vols. Ed. V.V. Dvivedi. Delhi: Parimal Publications, 1985.

Svacchanda

Nepalese recension. NAK ms. no. 1-224.

Svāyaṃbhuvāsūtrasaṃgraha (SvāSS)

Svāyaṃbhuvāsūtrasaṃgraha. Ed. Mysore 1937 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.

Secondary Literature

BÜHLER, G. ²1984 [1886]. (transl.) *The Laws of Manu*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

GOODALL, D. et al. 2015. *The Nīśvāsātattvasaṃhitā. The Earliest Surviving Śaiva Tantra. Vol. 1. A Critical Edition & Annotated Translation of the Mūlasūtra, Uttarasūtra and Nayasūtra*. Pondicherry: Institut Français d'Indologie/École française d'Extrême-Orient.

LUBIN, T. 2015. Writing and the Recognition of Customary Law in Pre-modern India and Java. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 135/2, pp. 225–259.

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

2005. *Manu's Code of Law. A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānavadharmasāstra*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

SANDERSON, A. 2009. The Śaiva Age: the Rise and Dominance of Śaivism During the Early Medieval Period. In: S. Einoo (ed.), *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo, pp. 41–349.

2014. The Śaiva Literature. *Journal of Indological Studies* 24–25 (2012–13), pp. 1–113.

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.
2014. Nondualism in Early Śākta Tantras: Transgressive Rites and Their Ontological Justification in a Historical Perspective. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 42.1, pp. 195–223.
- Forthcoming. *The Teaching of Yoginīs. A critical edition of the Siddhayogeśvarīmata with an introduction and annotated translation*.