

ARCHIV FÜR INDISCHE PHILOSOPHIE

AN UNNOTICED FRAGMENT OF A MANUSCRIPT OF LĀSAKA'S COMMENTARY ON THE PARĀTRĪŚIKĀTANTRA

By Jürgen Hanneder, Marburg

I. Lāsaka (Lāsakāka) or Lakṣmīrāma is certainly not to be reckoned among the great figures of the Trika system of Kashmir Śaivism, but his commentary on the Parātrīśikātantra (PT) evinces the fact that even centuries after the zenith of the Trika main works of the school were commented upon. The two known works of Lāsaka are his commentary on the Bhagavadgītā (BhG) which, according to RASTOGI¹, is available in manuscript form, and a commentary on the PT edited as no. LXIX of the Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies (KSTS)². The latter edition is based on two mss. which are described as follows³:

“*ka*. A modern copy of the Research Department. Script Śāraḍa of recent origin [!]. Number of leaves 13 with 18 lines on an average per page, each line having 16 letters. Size 6½" × ½" [!]. This manuscript happens to be abounding in spelling mistakes and omissions.

“*kha*. A country-paper manuscript belonging to Dr. Shiv Nath Sastri, Ācharya, D.O.C., etc., of this Department. Script Śāraḍa. Contains leaves 20. Lines per page 14 with 23 letters in a line; size 8" × 6". Almost correct. Date 1949 Vikrami.”

His date is given in this edition as 1732 of the Śāka era, based on the concluding verse of his commentary on BhG⁴. Lāsaka's literary activity must therefore be placed between the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century⁵.

¹ N. RASTOGI, *The Krama Tantricism of Kashmir. Historical and General Sources I*. Delhi 1979, p. 109.

² *The Parātrīśikā Vivṛiti of Rājānaka Lakṣmīrāma*, ed. JAGADDHARA ZĀDU SHĀSTRĪ. Srinagar 1947.

³ In J. ZĀDU's preface to his edition of *The Parātrīśikā Laghuvṛitti* by Abhinavagupta. [KSTS LXVIII]. Srinagar 1947, p. 2.

⁴ *lakṣmīrāma iti dvijo 'tra nivasan lakṣmīrabhūmaṇḍale, meror mātur upātadehajanano rājānagopālakāt | śrīśākte dviguṇādribhūparimite māse tathavās-vine, śuklāyām pratipady ajāṅghrinirato gūḍesu śikām vyadhāt ||* (ib. p. 9).

⁵ Cf. A. PADOUX, *La Parātrīśikālaghuvṛitti de Abhinavagupta*. Paris 1975, p. 10.

2. During research on a ms. of the Pratyabhijñāhrdaya the present author noticed, in a codex deposited in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, a fragment of a work not mentioned in CABATON's catalogue⁶. According to him the codex "Sanskrit 865" comprises three works⁷, but right at its end there is one more change in the marginal abbreviations of titles: in the margin of the last three pages we have *pa rā*. For one familiar with the Trika system the first association had to be the above Tantra, but this could not be known to CABATON.

One question that is posed by this ms. is the date of Lāsaka. At the end of the 3rd part of the codex there is a colophon: *saṃvat 61 mārga vati 3 budhe likhitam idam*. This corresponds to Wednesday, November 4/14 1685⁸. The Lāsaka commentary starts immediately after this colophon. The discrepancy between the date of the BhG commentary and our colophon could be explained in different ways, but none of them seems finally convincing: there could have been two Lāsakas separated by a century, the last verse of the BhG commentary could be an interpolation or – which is the easiest explanation, for it dispenses with further enquiry – the scribe of our codex lived a century later and copied the old colophon. This is also not convincing as the marginal notes prove that the scribe was well aware of what he was writing. As none of these explanations seems satisfactory, the question has to remain unsolved as long as a study of the ms. of the BhG commentary and a detailed paleographical study of the Śāradā codex is wanting.

3. Nevertheless the ms. is interesting for its variant readings, which are given with reference to the pages and lines of the KSTS ed.:

p. 1,4 °*sudhārṇavam* for °*svadhārṇavam* – 5 °*śrīparameśvara*° for °*śrīparamaśiva*°, °*citsudhāsamudrasya* for °*citsvadhāsamudrasya*, °*nispandasya* for °*pūrṇasvarūpasya* – 6 °*anunmelana*° for °*anunmīlana*° – 7(f). °*varṇa*° in °*varṇapratyāhāra*° is placed between the lines with °*kākapādas* – 10 °*kriyātmake* for °*kriyātmakam* – 11f. °*cittabuddhilakṣaṇā antaḥkaraṇasrotaḥ* for °*cittabuddhilakṣaṇāntaḥkaraṇam srotaḥ*.

⁶ A. CABATON, Catalogue sommaire des manuscrits Sanskrits et Pālis. Paris 1907.

⁷ CABATON'S description runs as follows (p. 143): "Īśvarapratyabhijñāhrdaya. II. Śivasūtravimarśinī. III. Sadācāraprakaraṇa, par Śaṅkarācārya. XVIIIe siècle. Écriture kāśmīrī. Papier indien, 195 × 145 mm., 255 pages, 12 à 15 l., 12 à 16 aks. D.-rel. (Sanskrit Dév. 360)".

⁸ The date was calculated by Prof. Claus Vogel, Bonn.

p. 2,1 *udyataḥ* for *udyuktaḥ*, *pātañjalahaṭhayogavādīpūrvamīmāṃsaka-*
kadharmasāstrādyāḥ for *pātañjalahaṭhayogīpūrvamīmāṃsakādayaḥ*
 – 4f. °*varṇavikāsam adhi*° for °*varṇavikāsatmakam* [!] *adhi*° – 5f. *adh-*
vānaṃ mupa° (with redundant *anusvāra*) for *adhvānam upa*° – 7
brāhmaṇā ya for *brāhmaṇā ye* – 9 after *iti* the ms. adds *catvāri parā-*
paśyantīmadhyamāvaikharīti vācaḥ pariṇatāḥ padāni svarūpāni
brāhmaṇā brahmanājñāḥ manīṣiṇaḥ sāstrajñāḥ guhāyāṃ cidguhāyāṃ
trīṇi parāpaśyantīmadhyamārūpāni neṅgayanti na paravedyībhā-
vanti turīyaṃ vaikharīrūpaṃ bhōgaṃ manusyādyā jīvā vadanti
spaṣṭam uccārayanti || śrīdevy uvāca for śrībhairavī – 12 °samatā for
samatām – 13 *vidyante* for *vidyate*, *uttaram prakṛṣṭam* for *prakṛṣṭam*
uttaram – 14 *kule śarīre* for *kaulikasiddhidam kule dehe* – 16f. *dehasya*
 for *dehādeś*, *cidaikātmyarūpā jīvanmuktiḥ tad uktaṃ* for *cidaikāt-*
myapratipattidārḍhyaṃ jīvanmuktiḥ | uktaṃ ca – 18 The ms. ends
 with °*pratipatti*.

There are several marginal and interlineary notes, some of them
 hardly readable: *yataḥ*, the first word of the introductory verse has
 the comment *cidarṇavāt*, *āvedayanti jñāpakībhavanti*. The position of
 the *eva* has provoked the following comment: *evakāro bhinnakramaḥ*
tā ity anena sambadhyate, and *vande* is paraphrased as *samāviśāmi*.

Although our ms. may not be a major contribution to the improve-
 ment of the KSTS ed., it yet underlines the fact that at least some
 of the editions in this series are in need of thorough revision. For
 what is plain at first sight is that the scribes of the two late mss. of
 the edition, or even the editor, have confounded the Śāradā *su* with
sva (p. 1,4), because for the Vedic *svadhā-* was most probably not
 meant by Lāsaka.