

**BODHĀYANA AND DRAMIDĀCĀRYA, TWO OLD VĒDĀNTINS
PRESUPPOSED BY RĀMĀNUJA**

BY

PROF. S. KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI, M.A., I.E.S., MADRAS.

PART I—BODHĀYANA.

In the very first sentence of the Śrī-Bhāṣya, Rāmānuja refers to a Vṛttikāra, as Bhagavad-Bodhāyana, the author of a Vṛtti on the Brahma-sūtras ; and the same Vṛttikāra is referred to without the name Bodhāyana, in six other places in the Śrī-Bhāṣya. The relevant extracts are given below :—

१. “ भगवद्बोधायनकृतां विस्तीर्णां ब्रह्मसूत्रवृत्तिं पूर्वाचार्याः संचिक्षिपुः ।
तन्मतानुसारेण सूत्राक्षराणि व्याख्यास्यन्ते ॥ ”

[Śrī-Bhāṣya-Part I, p. 1 Ānanda Press, Madras.]

२. तदाह वृत्तिकारः—“ वृत्तात्कर्माधिगमादनन्तरं ब्रह्मविविदिषा ”
इति । वक्ष्यति च कर्मब्रह्ममीमांसयोरैकशास्त्र्यम्—“ संहितमेतच्छा-
रीरकं जैमिनीयेन षोडशलक्षणेनेति शास्त्रैकत्वसिद्धिः ” इति ॥

३. वृत्तिरपि “ जगद्व्यापारवर्जं समानो ज्योतिषा ” इति । *Ibid*, p. 70.

४. तदाह वृत्तिकारः—“ सता सोम्य तदा सम्पन्नो भवति इति सम्प-
त्त्यसम्पत्तिभ्यामेतदवसीयते ; प्राज्ञेनात्मना सम्परिष्वक्तः—इति
चाह ” इति । *Ibid*, p. 164

५. यथाह वृत्तिकारः—“ सर्वं खल्विति सर्वात्मा ब्रह्मेशः ”—
इति । *Ibid*, p. 234.

६. तदाह वृत्तिकारः—“ भूमात्वेवेति भूमा ब्रह्म, नामादिपरम्परया
आत्मन ऊर्ध्वमस्योपदेशात् ” इति । *Ibid*, p. 289.

७. तदाह वृत्तिकारः—“ अस्ति हि मध्वादिषु संभवो ब्रह्मण एव
सर्वत्र निचाय्यत्वात् ” इति । *Ibid*, p. 332.

In some of the footnotes appearing in part I of the Śrī-Bhāṣya, it is found that the Ānanda Press edition erroneously attributes certain extracts from the Vākyakāra's Commentary to the Vṛttikāra. The Viśiṣṭādvaita tradition of the Rāmānujīyas accepts Rāmānuja's identification of the Vṛttikāra with Bodhāyana. The identity of Bodhāyana, to whom a Vṛtti on the Brahmasūtras is attributed, has so far remained one of the obscure problems in the Cultural History of India. There does not appear to be any reliable evidence which would enable us to identify this Vṛttikāra-Bodhāyana with the Bodhāyana of Kalpa-Sūtra fame; nor is there any good reason to equate the former with Bhavadāsa, a Vṛttikāra of the Mīmāṃsā-Sūtras referred to by Kumārila-bhaṭṭa as having been presupposed by Śābara-svāmin. (See Kumārila's Śloka-vārtika pages 11 and 21 Benares edition). Śaṅkarācārya presupposes in several places in his Bhāṣya on the Brahmasūtras, a Vṛttikāra, who seems to have written a Vṛtti on the Pūrvamīmāṃsā-Sūtras and Brahma-Sūtras; and this Vṛttikāra seems to be Upavarṣa, who is definitely referred to by Śābara-svāmin in his Bhāṣya on the Pūrvā-Mīmāṃsā-Sūtras. In the Brahma-Sūtra-Bhāṣya, Śaṅkara refers to a Vṛttikāra, according to commentators, under I-i-19 (Sūtra), I-i-23 (Sūtra), I-i-31 (Sūtra), and I-ii-23 (Sūtra); and unmistakably refers, at the beginning of his Bhāṣya on 3-3-53 (Sūtra), to Upavarṣa as having written a commentary on the Brahma-Mīmāṃsā-Sūtras and Karma-Mīmāṃsā-Sūtras, this Upavarṣa being identified with Vṛttikāra, both by Ānandagiri and Rāmānanda. The subjoined relevant extract from Śaṅkara's Brahma-sūtra-Bhāṣya deserves careful consideration.

“इह देहव्यतिरिक्तस्यात्मनः सद्भावः समर्थ्यते बन्धमोक्षाधिकारसिद्धये । न ह्यसति देहव्यतिरिक्तात्मनि परलोकफलाश्चोदना उपपद्येरन् ; कस्य वा ब्रह्मात्मत्वमुपदिश्येत ? ननु शास्त्रमुख एव प्रथमे पादे शास्त्रफलोपभोगयोग्यस्य देहव्यतिरिक्तस्यात्मनोऽस्तित्वमुक्तम् । सत्यमुक्तम् भाष्यकृता, न तु तत्रात्मास्तित्वे सूत्रमस्ति ; इह तु स्वयमेव सूत्रकृता तदस्तित्वमाक्षेपपुरस्सरं प्रतिष्ठापितम् ; इत एव चाकृष्य आचार्येण शबरस्वामिना प्रमाणलक्षणे वर्णितम् । अत एव च भगवतोपवर्णेन प्रथमे तन्त्रे आत्मास्तित्वाभिधानप्रसक्तौ शरीरके वक्ष्याम इत्युद्धारः कृतः ।”

(Śaṅkara's Brahmasūtra-Bhāṣya under 3-3-53.)

Upavarṣa is referred to in the following extracts also :—

“अथ गौरित्यत्र कः शब्दः ? गकारौकारविसर्जनीया इति भगवानुपवर्षः”

Śābara-Bhāṣya p. 10, Chowkhāmba edition.

“वर्णा एव तु शब्द इति भगवानुपवर्षः”

(Śaṅkara-Bhāṣya on the Brahma-Sūtras I-iii-28).

II. It can be clearly made out from these extracts that Upavarṣa was the Vṛttikāra presupposed by Śaṁkara and that Upavarṣa-the Vṛttikāra was decisively in favour of treating the Karma-Mīmāṃsā and Brahma-Mīmāṃsā as forming the former and latter parts of an integral whole. Those who are sufficiently acquainted with the Vedānta-darśana know well that the interpretation of the first word 'अथ' in the first Sūtra of the Brahma sūtras depends largely upon agreement or disagreement with the view indicated above regarding the interrelation of the Karma-Mīmāṃsā and the Brahma-Mīmāṃsā. While, in this matter, there is striking divergence between the above-mentioned view associated with Upavarṣa-the Vṛttikāra and Śaṁkara's view, Rāmānuja's own view and what Rāmānuja attributes to Bhagavad-Bodhāyana-the Vṛttikāra are in complete harmony with Upavarṣa's view. In this connection, it would be useful, in particular, to compare the extract No. 2 from the beginning of the Śrī-Bhāṣya given above with what Upavarṣa is said to favour in the beginning of Śaṁkara's Bhāṣya under III-iii-53 of the Brahma-sūtras. And it would also be of advantage to note how the particular interpretation of the word 'अथ' refuted by Śaṁkara in the first adhikarana of his Sūtra-Bhāṣya happens to be identical with the view attributed by Rāmānuja to the Vṛttikāra. These facts would naturally lead to the inference that Bodhāyana-the Vṛttikāra and Upavarṣa-the Vṛttikāra presupposed by Rāmānuja and Śaṁkara respectively are identical. Some over-zealous latter-day representatives of the Viśiṣṭādvaita system, however, like the late Paṇḍit Rāmamiśra Śāstrin who edited the Siddhi-traya in the Chwkhāmba series and the Agama-prāmānya, Śāstra-Dīpikā and Vedārtha-Saṁgraha in the Paṇḍit series of Benares, would insist that the Bodhāyana-Vṛtti relied upon by Rāmānuja should be differentiated from the Upavarṣa-Vṛtti sometimes relied upon and sometimes refuted by Śaṁkara in his Brahma-sūtra-Bhāṣya. Nevertheless, there are luckily available a few significant data which would enable us to definitely equate Bodhāyana-the Vṛttikāra with Upavarṣa—the Vṛttikāra. Vedānta-dēśika is discovered to clearly suggest this identity in the following sentence, which occurs as lines 7 to 10, at page 149, part II of his learned commentary called Tattva-ṭikā on Rāmānuja's Śrī-Bhāṣya.

[वृत्तिकारोपज्ञं स्वमतमाह—शब्दस्येति । अपिर्दूषणसमुच्चयार्थः । अत्र-
शाबरम्—“गौरित्यत्र कःशब्दः ? गकारौकारविसर्जनीयाः” इति । वृत्तिकारस्य
बोधायनस्यैव हि उपवर्ष इति स्यान्नाम ।] (Tattva-ṭikā Conjīvaram Oriental

Library Institution series No. 6, Telugu edition 1906, Sudarśana Press, Conjīvaram.)

III. The Bodhāyana-Upavarṣa-Vṛttikāra equation, suggested as it happens to be by Vedānta-Deśika, one of the greatest authorities of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school, and supported as it is by the other references given above, can easily be pulled up to the level of an historically acceptable fact. And the weight of evidence in favour of the view that Bodhāyana was perhaps the gotra-name of Upavarṣa himself would be considerably enhanced by the well-known fact that many an Indian philosopher had two or even three names, one of them being a gotra-name, as, for instance, in the case of (1) Kāśyapa-Kaṇāda-Ulūka (2) Vātsyāyana-Pakṣila Svāmin, (3) Ātreya-Brahma Nandin-Taṇka, and (4) Akṣapāda-Gautama.

PART II. DRAMIDĀCĀRYA.

IV. Yāmunācārya, the spiritual ancestor and Prācārya of Rāmānuja, refers, in the beginning of his Siddhitraya, to a Bhāṣya-Kṛt; and it is rightly believed that this Bhāṣya-kṛt is Dramidācārya.

“यद्यपि भगवता बादरायणेन इदमर्थान्येव सूत्राणि प्रणीतानि, विवृतानि च परिमितगम्भीरभाषिणा भाष्यकृता, विस्तृतानि च तानि गम्भीरन्यायसागरभाषिणा भगवता श्रीवत्साङ्कमिश्रेणापि; तथापि आचार्य-टङ्क-भर्तृप्रपञ्च-भर्तृमित्र-भर्तृहरि-ब्रह्मदत्त-शङ्कर-श्रीवत्साङ्क-भास्करादि-विरचितसितासितविविधनिबन्धनश्रद्धाविप्रलब्धबुद्धयो न यथावत् अन्यथा च प्रतिपद्यन्त—इति तत्प्रतिपत्तये युक्तः प्रकरणप्रक्रमः ।”

(Siddhitraya-Chowkhāmbā edition, Benares—Pages 5 and 6.)

V. Rāmānuja refers to Dramidācārya in several places in his Vēdārtha-saṁgraha and Śrī-Bhāṣya, as the following extracts will show :

१. “तत्त्वमसीतिसद्विद्यायामुपास्यं ब्रह्म सगुणं सगुणब्रह्मप्राप्तिश्च फलमित्यभियुक्तैः पूर्वाचार्यैर्व्याख्यातम् । यथोक्तं वाक्यकारेण—‘युक्तं तद्गुणकोपासनात्’ इति; व्याख्यातं च द्रमिडाचार्येण विद्याविकल्पं वदता—‘यद्यपि साच्चित्तो न निर्मुग्नदैवतं गुणगणं मनसानुधावेत् तथाप्यन्तर्गुणामेव देवतां भजते’—इति ।

(Vēdārtha-Saṁgraha) Paṇḍit edition, Benares, page 138.

२. भगवद्बोधायन-टङ्क-द्रमिड-गुहदेव-कपर्दि-भारुचि-प्रभृत्यविगीतशिष्टपरिगृहीतपुरातनवेदवेदान्तव्याख्यानसुव्यक्तार्थश्रुतिनिकरनिदर्शितोऽयं पन्थाः ।

(Ibid page 148).

• N.B.—Here the Tātparya-dīpikā of Sudarśanasūri says that Tanka is Brahmanandin;— टङ्को ब्रह्मनन्दी (*Ibid* Tātparyadīpikā p. 148).

३. वाक्यकारश्च ध्रुवानुस्मृतेर्विवेकादिभ्य एव निष्पत्तिमाह—“तल्लब्धि-
विवेकविमोकाभ्यासक्रियाकल्याणानवसादानुद्धर्षेभ्यस्संभवान्निर्वचनाच्च”—इति ।
विवेकादीनां स्वरूपं चाह—“जात्याश्रयनिमित्तादुष्टादज्ञात् कायशुद्धिर्विवेकः”
इति । अत्र निर्वचनम्—आहारशुद्धौ सत्त्वशुद्धिः, सत्त्वशुद्धौ ध्रुवा स्मृतिः”
इति । * * * “तद्विपर्ययजा तुष्टिरुद्धर्षः” इति । निर्वचनमपि—
“शान्तो दान्तः” इति ।]

Madras Ānanda Press edition of the Śrī-Bhāṣya Vol. I, pages 11 and 12.

४. [द्रमिडभाष्यकारश्च—“देवतासायुज्यादशरीरस्यापि देवतावत्सर्वार्थ-
सिद्धिस्स्यात्” इत्याह ।]

(*Ibid* Vol. I, page 70.)

५. [यथाहद्रमिडभाष्यकारः—“यथा लोके राजा प्रचुरदन्दशूके
घोरेऽनर्थसङ्कटेऽपि प्रदेशे वर्तमानो व्यजनाद्यवधूतदेहो दोषैर्न स्पृश्यते, अभिप्रे-
तांश्चलोकान् परिपालयति, भोगांश्च गन्धादीन् विश्वजनोपभोग्यान् धारयति;
तथासौ लोकेश्वरः भ्रमस्वसामर्थ्यचामरो दोषैर्नस्पृश्यते, रक्षति च लोकान्
ब्रह्मलोकादीन्, भोगांश्चाविश्वजनोपभोग्यान् धारयति” ।]

(*Ibid*. Vol. II, page 23.)

६. तथाह द्रमिडाचार्यः—“फलसंविभत्सयाहि कर्मभिरात्मानं पिप्रीषन्ति
स प्रीतोऽलं फलायेति शास्त्रमर्यादा” इति ।

(*Ibid*. Vol. II, page 75.)

From the foregoing extracts it may be made out that Dramiḍācārya wrote a Bhāṣya on the Chāndogya and perhaps also on certain other Upaniṣads and that he also commented on the text of the aphoristic Vākyas of the Vākyā-kāra, otherwise known, according to the Viśiṣṭādvaita tradition, by the names of Brahmanandin and Tanka. Vēdānta-Deśika also refers to Dramiḍācārya in the following places in Part I of his Tattva-ṭīkā :—Page 7, lines 8 to 10 (The Sudarśana Press, Telugu edition of the Tattvaṭīkā—above referred to); Page 34 Vākyā and Dramiḍa-Bhāṣya and Vāmanaṭīkā on the latter are referred to *Ibid*; page 60, lines 1 and 2 *Ibid*; and page 138—“अत्र भाष्याकरो ब्रह्मनन्दिवाक्यव्याख्याता द्रमिडाचार्यः—*Ibid*.”

VI. According to Ānandagiri, Śaṃkarācārya presupposes Dāmiḍācārya, the author of a lengthy and learned commentary on the Chāndogyopaniṣad, in his introductory statement at the beginning of his Bhāṣya on the Chāndogyā:—

“ ओमित्येतदक्षरमित्यष्टाध्यायी छान्दोग्योपनिषत् ।” तस्याः संक्षेपतोऽर्थ-
जिज्ञासुभ्य ऋजुविवरणमल्पग्रन्थमिदमारभ्यते ॥ ”

(Śaṃkara's Bhāṣya on the Chāndogyopaniṣad—page 1). Ānandagiri has the following note in this connection:—

ऋजुविवरणमिति—ऋजु पाठक्रमानुसारि विवरणम् अर्थस्फुटीकरणं
प्रकृतोपनिषद्: यस्मिन्भाष्ये तत्तथेति यावत् । अथ पाठक्रममाश्रित्यापि द्वाविडं
भाष्यं प्रणीतम्, तत्किमनेनेत्याशङ्क्याह ॥

At the end of Śaṃkara's Bhāṣya on II-32 of the Maṇḍūkya-kārikās, the following quotation is found, from Dāmiḍācārya's work according to Ānandagiri:—“सिद्धं तु निवर्तकत्वादित्यागमविदां सूत्रम् ” Again in the Śaṃkara-Bhāṣya on III-8 to 10 of the Chāndogyopaniṣad, Śaṃkara is found relying upon Dāmiḍācārya's explanation to meet a difficulty arising from an inconsistency between the Chāndogyopaniṣad and the Paurāṇika account of the time of sunrise and sunset in the different parts of the world of Gods.

“ अत्रोक्तः परिहार आचार्यैः ”

Śaṃkara-Bhāṣya on the Chāndogyā—Ānandāśrama edition page 145.

In this connection Ānandagiri says—

“ यद्यपि श्रुतिविरोधे स्मृतिरप्रमाणम्, तथापि यथाकथंचिद्विरोध-
परिहारं द्रविडाचार्योक्तमुपपादयति ” (Ibid—page 146.)

It may be observed here that the names द्रमिडाचार्य and द्रविडाचार्य occur as variants in Vedānta literature. Again, on page 34, part I of Vedānta-Deśika's Tattva-ṭīkā (Telugu edition), the following quotations are found:—

तथा च वाक्यम् “ उपनिषणत्वादोपनिषत् ” इति । तत्र द्रमिडभाष्यम्—
“ गहने हीयं विद्या संनिविष्टा ” इति । तस्य च वामनटीका—“ गहने
ब्रह्माणि उपनिषणा ” इति ।

• Careful scholars cannot miss the unmistakable echo of the above extract in the following passage from Śaṁkara's Bhāṣya :—

• “ उपनिषदिति विद्योच्यते : तच्छीलानां गर्भजन्मजरादिनिशातनात्, तदवसादनाद्वा, ब्रह्मणो वोपनिगमयितृत्वात् ; उपनिषणं वास्यां परं श्रेय इति । तदर्थत्वाद्ब्रह्मणोऽप्युपनिषत् ” ।

(Śaṁkara's introduction to his Bhāṣya on the Taittirīyopaniṣad.)

VII. It will be seen from page XVI of the introduction to the Tarkasamgraha, Gaekwad's Oriental Series No III, that some scholars, like my friend, the late Mr. T. M. Tripāṭhi, are inclined to differentiate the Dramiḍācārya presupposed by Śaṁkara from the Dramiḍācārya presupposed by Rāmānuja and to identify the latter with the great Śrī Vaiṣṇava saint Nammālvār otherwise known as Śaṭṭhagōpa. There are, however, two conclusive evidences which would show that Śaṁkara's Dramiḍa and Rāmānuja's Dramiḍa should be held to be identical and that Dramiḍa cannot be equated with Nammālvār. The sub-joined extracts from the third chapter of Sarvajñātmamuni's Saṁkṣepa-Śārīraka may be perused here with advantage :—

“ आत्रेयवाक्यमपि संव्यवहारमात्रं कार्यं समस्तामिति नः कथयां बभूव ।
सत्कार्यवादविषयो न हि दोषराशिर्मायामये भवितुमुत्सहते विरोधात् ॥

Chap. III, 217.

काणाददर्शनसमाश्रयदोषराशिर्दूरान्निरस्त इह संव्यवहारमात्रे ।
वेदान्तभूमिकुशलो मुनिरतिवञ्श्यस्तेनाह कार्यमिह संव्यवहारदृष्ट्या ॥

Ibid, 218.

षष्ठप्रपाठकनिबद्धमुदीरितं यत् तत्सत्यमेव खलु सत्यसमाश्रयत्वात् ।
अत्रैव यत्पुनरुवाच समुद्रफेनदृष्टान्तपूर्वकमदो व्यवहारदृष्ट्या ॥

Ibid, 219.

पूर्वं विकारमुपवर्ण्य शनैःशनैस्तद्वृष्टिं विसृज्य निकटं परिगृह्य तस्मात् ।
सर्वं विकारमथ संव्यवहारमात्रमद्वैतमेव परिरक्षति वाक्यकारः ॥

Ibid, 220.

अन्तर्गुणा भगवती परदेवतेति प्रत्यग्गुणेति भगवानपि भाष्यकारः ।
आह स्म यत्तदिह निर्गुणवस्तुवादे संगच्छते न तु पुनः सगुणप्रवादे ॥ ”

Ibid, 221.

VIII. In the commentaries published in the Poona Ānandāśrama edition of the Śaṁkṣepa-Śārīraka and in Nṛsiṁhāśramin's commentary on this work, available in manuscript, the Vākyakāra referred to by Sarvajñātman as Ātreya is identified with Brahmanandin, and the Bhāṣyakāra, in verse 221 quoted above, is taken to be Dramiḍācārya, the author of a lengthy Bhāṣya on the Chāndogyopaniṣad-vārtikā consisting perhaps of the aphoristic vākyas of Brahmanandin, otherwise known, in the Viśiṣṭādvaita tradition, as Ṭaṅka, the Vākyakāra. The last of the verses quoted above (221) requires particular attention, in this connection, as it is discovered to incorporate in the first pāda, an important part of the quotation from Dramiḍācārya's Bhāṣya, which is set forth above as occurring at page 138 of Rāmānuja's Vedārtha-Saṁgraha, Paṇḍit edition, Benares. Sarvajñātman was Surēśvarācārya's disciple and contemporary, as may be made out from the eighth and penultimate verses of the Śaṁkṣepaśārīraka; and Sureśvara was one of Śaṁkara's (788—820 A.D.) disciples. If, as the late Mr. T. A. Gopinātha Rao says at page 21 of his history of Śrī-Vaiṣṇavas, published by the Madras University in 1923 at the Government Press, Madras, the first half of the ninth century A.D. is the time when Nammālvar lived and wrote his memorable Tiruvāymoḷi, Dramiḍācārya, the author of the old Bhāṣya on Brahmanandin's Vākyas and the Chāndogyopaniṣad, presupposed by Rāmānuja, Sarvajñātmamuni and Śaṁkara, must, for obvious reasons, be held to be different from Nammālvar.

IX. A critical investigation of the hagiographic accounts of the Ālvārs and Ācāryas in the literature of Śrī-Vaiṣṇava-Sampradāya, like the Guruparamparāprabhāva by Pinbalahiya-perumāl-jīyar, has led historians of Śrī-Vaiṣṇavism to the conclusion that Tirumaḷiśai-Ālvār, who produced the Tiruccanta-Viruttam and the Nānmukan-Tiruvantāti and was contemporaneous with the three Mutalālvārs, was born in Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam and flourished there during the period of Pallava supremacy; and that he might, with good reasons, be assigned to the first quarter of the 8th century A.D. (See the late Mr. T. A. Gopinath Rao's history of Śrī-Vaiṣṇavas already referred to—pages 16 and 17). A careful examination of all the details relating to Tirumaḷiśai Ālvār in the Śrī-Vaiṣṇava Sampradāya literature, in comparison with the material gathered by me about Dramiḍācārya, also known as Draviḍa, from Vedāntic literature in Sanskrit, has revealed to me three striking correspondences between Tirumaḷiśai and Dramiḍa—(1) a biographic correspondence (2) a textual correspondence, and (3) a phonetic correspondence.

X. In the traditional accounts of Śrīvaiṣṇavas, it is stated that Tirumaḷiśai was born as the son of the sage Bhārgava, and afterwards became the foster-son of Tiruvāḷan, a Sūdra. After critically studying all

the systems of philosophy, Tiruvāṇ's foster-son found complete satisfaction in Vaiṣṇavism. A reference to the Tirumaliśaippirān-vaibhavam in Pinbalahiya-perumāl-Jīyar's Guruparamparā and Periyavāccānpillai's introduction to his commentary on Tirumaliśai's Tiruccantaviruttam would show how Tirumaliśai was born of a sage, and thrown into the slums by adverse fate and reclaimed later by some great Ācārya. There is an interesting parallelism between this aspect of Tirumaliśai's life and an illustrative story which is known in the Vedānta-literature in Sanskrit as व्याधसंवर्धितराजपुत्राख्यायिका and which is found narrated *in extenso*, in verses 506 to 527 at pages 970 to 972, in part II, Sureśvara's Brhadāranyakabhāṣyavārtika (Poona edition) and at pages 152 to 154 in Haradatta's Ujjvalā on Āpastamba's Dharma Sūtras, Mysore Government Oriental Library edition. Ānandagiri, in his commentary on verse 506 of the Sureśvara-vārtika above referred to, definitely attributes the authorship of the व्याधसंवर्धितराजपुत्राख्यायिका to Dramiḍācārya. Would it require any great strain on imagination to see that, if Dramiḍācārya and Tirumaliśai Ālvār should be identical, the *ākhyāyikā* in question could easily be taken to strike an autobiographical note?

XI. The textual correspondence is such as might well support the suggestion that Dramiḍācārya should be identified with Tirumaliśai. At page 75, Part II of the Madras Ānanda Press edition of the Śrī-Bhāṣya, Rāmānuja gives from Dramiḍa-Bhāṣya the extract:—फलसंविभत्सया हि कर्मभिरात्मानं पिप्रीषन्ति, स प्रीतोऽलं फलायेति शास्त्रमर्यादा ”

Any scholar who has fully understood the meaning of this extract can easily realise how the same idea is reproduced in a slightly amplified form in the seventy second verse of Tirumaliśai-ālvār's *Nānmukan tiruvantāti*:—

“ இல்லற மில்லேல் துறவற மில்லென்னும்
சொல்லற மல்லனவும் சொல்லல்ல—நல்லறம்
ஆவனவும் நால்வேத மாத்தவமும் நாரணனே
ஆவதீ தன்றென்பாரார்.”

XII. Would it now be felt a far-fetched suggestion that the phonetic parallelism between *Dramiḍa* and *Tirumaliśai* should be taken to be, not merely accidental, but full of significance? It should be borne in mind, in this connection, that the Dramiḍācārya who is presupposed by Sureśvara and Sarvajñātman and who is identical with the Dramiḍa presupposed by Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja, may well be assigned, on historically acceptable grounds to the first quarter of the eighth century A.D., to which period historians of Śrīvaiṣṇavism would assign Tirumaliśai Ālvār.