CHAPTER III
TYPES OF ŚAIVA MĀTHAS

Śaiva cult, being one of the oldest and the most widely spread cults in India, had developed many sects within its fold. Several of these wielded considerable influence and enjoyed patronage at different times in the Tamil country. Some of them had the Vedic sanction, some followed a mild form of worship and some had shocking and repulsive practices. Commentators like Vasūpati Miśra (c. 850), Bhāskaraśārya (c. 850), Yamunāśārya (c. 1050) Kāṇamūja and other later commentators classify the followers of Śaivism mentioned by Saṅkarāśārya into four groups - Śaivas, Pāṣupatas, Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas. They differ only in naming the fourth group as Karuṇika, Kaṭhaka, Karuka, Kaṭhaka or Kālāmukha siddhāntins.

David Lorenzen is of the view that, though they are described only cursorily, these names apparently stand for the Kālāmukhas. The Suprabhādāgama classified the Śaiva cult into four groups - The Śaiva, the Pāṣupata, the Śoma and the Lākula, on the basis of the āgamas. The Lākula sect in the Suprabhādāgama is identical with Kālāmukha sect. Tirumular's Tirumandiram refers to
Bhairava, Yama, Kalāmikha, Mahāvrata, Pāṣupata and Śaivism as the six sects that came out of the Āgamas.

The sects of Pāṣupata, Kapālika and Kalāmikha had their own priesthood or monkhood. In fact, the Kalāmikha priesthood had been the best organised in South India. But it is doubtful whether the Kapālika, Kalāmikha and Pāṣupata sects had their own exclusive laity. Hence, Lorenzen thinks it more appropriate to call them as Kapālika, Pāṣupata and Kalāmikha 'monastic order' rather than sects. However he uses the term 'sect' in referring to them. It may not be wrong to call the Kapālikas and Kalāmikhas as the sub-sects of Pāṣupata Śaivism.

PĀṢUPATA SCHOOL

The Pāṣupatas, being one of the ancient Śaiva sects, are referred to in the early literature of the country like the Mahābhārata, the Vāyu, Kūrma and Liṅga Purāṇas. Though the above works do not throw much historical information, they uniformly mention Lakuliśa, the founder of the Pāṣupata sect, as an incarnation
of Śiva and originating from Kayāvarōhaṇa which is also called Kayāvatāra, Karoḥapa or Kayāroḥapa located in the Lāṭa or Bhṛgukaccha region.

The epigraphs also bear witness to Lakuliśa as the incarnation of Śiva. Sometimes, the names Nakuliśa and Nakuliśvara are also used to indicate Lakulisa. The Lakulisa Pāşupatas, in early medieveal India show their distinctiveness by their belief in the theory of incarnation of Śiva which is not to be found among the other sects. Their headquarters Kayāvarōhaṇa is identified with the modern village of Karvān, about 19 miles north of Baroda. They were the worshippers of Pāşupati and the observers of the Pāşupata Vṛata, but were denounced as heretics by the Śūrtīs. A number of sub-sects were there among the Pāşupata school of Śaivism of which the Kapālikas and Kalāmukhas were significant ones.

The Pāşupata sect was in existence in the Deccan and the Tamil country as early as 7th century A.D. Its spread in the latter region is attested to by the hymns, according to which Tiruvārūr and
Tiruvāṇaikka were the strongholds of the Pāśupatas. The Lord of Tiruvāṇaikka is addressed as Pāśupatā and the followers of the Pāśupata sect are said to have offered worship to this deity. They had also taken active part in the rituals connected with the temple at Tiruvāṇaikka. Theyvāram and Periyapurāṇam attach the epithet Kārōṇa to Kumbakonam and Nagapattinam, the two important Śaiva centres, in Thanjavur district, indicating their association with the Pāśupatas. The term Kārōṇa is a corrupt form of Īlayarōhana, the headquarters of the Pāśupatas in Gujarat. Rudra Pāśupati, one of the Śaiva Navāṉa is considered to be a Pāśupata. He, according to Periyapurāṇam, used to recite the Rudra mantra, and thereby came to be called Rudra Pāśupati.

The Pāśupatas were very active in the second quarter of the 9th century A.D. at Kuttālam in the Tirunelveli district. Since they wielded considerable influence over this area, they are referred to as Pāśupatanerumakkal, i.e. the greatmen of the Pāśupata order.
During the reign of the Vira Rajendra (1067-68 A.D.) the shrine of Paçambakka dēvar was constructed in the Śiva temple at Tiruvorriyūr and the deity therein was called Karapavitādikā. The term Karapāṭ in this context is taken to represent Karāroha, the birthplace of Lakulīśa. Perhaps it is reminiscent of the Pāśupata tradition continuing even in the 11th century A.D.

Thus the Pāśupatas had their activities centering around some places in the Tamil country. However, it is observed that they did not organise themselves into monastic orders.

**KAPALIKA SCHOOL**

The Kapālika, a sub-sect of the Pāśupata school of Śaivism, is referred to in some of the Purāṇas and the literary texts from the 6th century A.D. onwards. There are also epigraphical references to this sect. The Kapālikas are sometimes identified with the Mahāvratins. But the inscriptions refer to the Kālāmukha priests as Mahāvratins. The Kapālikas are identified...
with Sūmasiddhāntins from their philosophical point of view and they worshipped Bhairava and his consort as their principal deities. The keystone of the Kāpālikas faith was Bhakti. The rituals by which the Kāpālikas expressed their Bhakti were either propitiatory, initiative, or a combination of both.

Scholars believe that the Kāpālikas with their tantric worship of Bhairava and Bhairavi came to the south as a sequel to their migration from North India. In the Tamil country, the existence of Kāpālikas prior to the 7th century A.D. is attested to by one of the twin epics Nārâyana. It is stated that in the cemetery of Kaveripūmpattinam, otherwise known as Sakkaravallakkottam, the Sudalainōndikal (Kāpālikas) wearing the garland of skulls and having the practice of eating human flesh, performed severe austerities. They worshipped Bhairava and Koppavai in the same cemetery. R.G. Bhandarkar points out that the Kāpālikas wore garlands of skulls, ate human flesh and performed penance in the cemetery. Hence, the existence of Kāpālika sect of Saivism in the Tamil country can be traced back to the time of the epics.
This sect had some following in the Pallava period. The Sanskrit play Mattavilāsa Prabhasana of the Pallava king Mahendra Varman I mentions Kāñchi, as an important centre of the Kapālikas. The Tevāram hymns allude to the existence of this sect in some more centres. Mylapore (in Madras) appears to have been a Kapālika centre in the 7th century A.D. The name of the temple Kapālīśvara lends some plausibility to this view. That Tiruvārūr was a stronghold of Kapālika sect is known from the devotional hymns of Tirunāvukkarasar. The Kapālikas played a dominant role in the rituals connected with the temple. During the Ardura festival, the Kapālikas used to carry the objects for bali offerings in the temple. They along with the Rudragāpas and Paśupatas are said to have accompanied the women-folk singing in praise of the Lord of Tiruvārūr, while going around the streets in procession.

Tirumālar's Tirumandiram is another important work that refers to Bhairavam as one of the six important Śaiva sects. Here, the Kapālika system is designated as Bhairavam. The Purapurāṇam, giving a detailed
description of a Bharīva ascetic, indicates the prevalence of the Kāpakālika sect in the age of the Nāyanāra. The Bharīva ascetic is described to have had all the usual characteristics of a Kāpakālika.

Thus the Kāpakālika school of Śaivism existed in some centres of the Tamil country in the age of the Bhakti movement. But due to their repulsive practices, they became unpopular and in fact, we do not hear of the Kāpakālikas after the 9th century A.D. The Kāpakālikas never formed themselves into monastic groups.

However, an epigraph of Rājādhiraja II (1131 A.D.) from Tiruvōrṇyūr mentions a certain Vaiṣṇava Paṇḍita, as one who expounds Sōmasiddhānta. This piece of evidence would suggest that in Tiruvōrṇyūr the Kāpakālika tradition survived as an integrated part of the Śaiva system as late as the 12th century.

**MATHAS OF THE BHAKTI SCHOOL**

In the beginning of the seventh century A.D., there was the revival of Śaivism in the form of Bhakti movement which was spear headed by the Śaiva Nāyanāra.
The emergence of Śaiva matha was a sequel to this revivalism. Important Śiva temples or Śaiva centres had a small matha attached to them. It is from these humble monastic establishments, the Śaiva saints sprayed the seeds of Bhakti ideology to the masses. Hence, it is appropriate to designate these earlier institutions as mathas of the Bhakti school. Sākkilar's Periyamurunām mentions the existence of such mathas in several important centres which were visited by the exponents of the Bhakti ideology.

Kāñchi and Tiruvorriyur were the two notable Śaiva centres in the Chingleput district where the mathas existed in this period. Sambandar is said to have stayed during his pilgrimage, in the matha at Kāñchi, probably attached to the Tirumēṟṟurullai temple. This is corroborated by an inscription of Vantivarman from the same temple registering some grant to the matha attached to the Tirumēṟṟurullai. Tiruvorririyur in Madras had several mathas in this period where regular feeding was carried on. It continued to be a prominent centre of monastic activities as late as the 13th century A.D.
Tillai, otherwise known as Chidambaram in the South Arcot District, had been a famous centre of religious activities for a long period. According to the Periyarapurāṇam, as many as 3000 Brāhmaṇas had settled around the temple complex at Tillai. In the mātha attached to this temple, Brāhmaṇas are stated to have performed Vedic sacrifices. The mātha itself should have been a Brāhmaṇa mātha. Siddhaṇa mātham located in a grove adjacent to the Śiva temple at Tiruvatigai in South Arcot district had been visited by Tirunāvukkarasar. The saint himself has referred to this mātha in one of his Padigama. Tilakavati, the sister of Tirunāvukkarasar had attached herself to this mātha and led a pious life doing religious services.

Thanjavur district was one of the important regions where several Śiva temples grew up in the wake of the Bhakti movement. Tirunāvukkarasar and Sambandar had visited many of these temples and stayed in the māthas attached to them. Amarnāti Nāyanār, a native of Pālaiyāral in Thanjavur district built a mātha at Tirunallur. It was named after him as Amarnātiyar-mātha. Lord Śiva is stated to have come to the same mātha in
the guise of an ascetic. Sīrkalī, Tirumālaikādu (Svētārāpyam), Tiruvārūr, Tirunallur Perumānam and Tirumārugal were all important Saiva centres, the mathas therein were graced by the visits of both Tirunāvukkarasar and Sambandar or either of them. As the very name indicates, the Muruganār-math at Pūmpalur was built by or named after Muruganār, one of the sixty-three Saiva Nayanārs. Kunkiliya kkalavanār matha at Tirukkaṇadur is known from Periyapurāgam where the ascetics had been regularly fed. Tirunāvukkarasar during his visit to Tiruppūnturutti had established a matha there. There is a matha just outside the temple at Tiruppūnturutti even today. Appūdi aṭīgal, one of the sixty-three Saiva saints and a contemporary of Tirunāvukkarasar made provisions for watersheds and mathas in the name of the latter. One such matha, viz., Tirunāvukkarasar matha existed at Tirupālur. Both Tirunāvukkarasar and Sambandar who sang in praise of Śiva are said to have performed the miracle of obtaining money (kāpa) from Śiva for feeding the aṭīyars in the matha at Tiruvillimālai. Sēyñālūr, the birth place of Chandēśvara, in Thanjavur district, had mathas
where the sounds of the Vedic chanting could be heard. Tiruvāvaṉūrurai is another centre having a maṭha during the period of the Nīyantārya. This centre has continued to flourish as a great seat of monastic activities till date.

The Saiva maṭha at Madurai in the time of Sambandar and his activities there to restore Saivism are well portrayed in the Periyacurangam. Sambandar came to Madurai at the request of the Pāṇḍya queen Mangayarkkarasi and the minister Kulaccīral in order to save the king Nīrāṣir Meṇḍumāṇ from the clutches of the Jains and to restore Saivism. Sambandar stayed in the maṭha at Madurai along with the adiyārs and recited Mruppadigama. The infuriated Jains, hearing the greatness of Sambandar and his activities set fire to the maṭha where he stayed. Sambandar by his miracles foiled their attempt and made the Pāṇḍya king realise the greatness of Saivism and thus restored Saivism in the Pāṇḍya domains.

A number of Saiva maṭhas must have existed in the Chēra country in this period. One such was at Kodungōḻur (Cranganur), the capital of the Chēras and also
the birth place of Kalagaṇīvar, one of the sixty-three Śaiva Nayanāras. Kalahasti, now in Chittoor district (Andhra), also had a Śaiva matha in the time of Sambandar.

The above said mathas were simple in nature and served as the temporary residences of the Bhakti saints who propagated their religious ideals from these centres.

**Kālāmukha Mathas**

The Kālāmukha sect, an off-shoot of the Lakulīśa - Pāṇḍūrāja system had spread from the north to the southern region by the end of the 8th century A.D.

The name Kālāmukha, sometimes called Kālāmukha, may refer to the practice of marking their forehead with a black streak. The Vaiṣṇava saint Rāmānuja had portrayed the Kālāmukhas as extremists. According to him, the Kālāmukhas held that dining in a skull, besmearing the whole body with ashes, eating the ashes, holding a club, having a vessel full of liquor and worshipping the god as seated therein were conducive to
one's welfare both in this world and thereafter. On the other hand, the inscriptions depict them as preceptors of a very high order, free from revolting rites or customs associated with the Kapālikas sect. R.G. Bhandarkar is of the opinion that Kāmarūja apparently seems to have mixed up the practices of Kālamukhas with those of the Kapālikas. In this context it may be observed that the Kālamukhas in their early stages had performed repulsive and shocking practices like the Kapālikas. Perhaps the adversities faced by the Kapālikas had also been felt by the Kālamukhas. Hence, they in their desire to win over the religious minded populace, had necessarily to adopt milder forms of worship, like the Kapālikas. In this process the Kālamukhas, unlike the Kapālikas, organised themselves into monastic orders.

It is interesting to note that the Kālamukhas were the pioneers in establishing Saiva monastic orders in the Deccan and they organised professional monkdom. The Kālamukha mathas were based on Agamic principles. Lakulīśaṇa was the text of the Kālamukha sect. Tirumandiram alludes to the Kālamukha sect as one of the
six Śaiva tenets originating from the Agamas. The Mathas were also guided by the Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya system of philosophy.

The Kalāmukha sect appeared in the Deccan at the end of the 8th century A.D. Numerous inscriptions speak about the sect and its institutions in the Deccan from the 10th century A.D. and continue to pour information till late 13th century A.D. They reveal the existence of two major divisions of the Kalāmukha monastic order, the Ṣakti-pariṣad and the Śimha-pariṣad. The records of Ṣakti-pariṣad seem to have been confined mostly to the Dharwar and Shimoga districts of Karnataka. But the records of Śimha-Pariṣad have been found over a wide area including various parts of Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka. Telugu speaking districts of eastern Deccan came under the influence of this sect as early as the beginning of the 9th century A.D.

The spread of the Kalāmukhas in the Tamil country is distinctly seen from the 10th century A.D. It has been suggested that the Kalāmukha movements into the Tamil country were generally associated with the
directions of military campaigns and wars which the rulers of the Kannada dynasties encountered. Here, the Kalamukhas associated themselves with the nascent institution, viz. the matha. They systematised this institution by creating a professional monkdom and by having control over temples. They erected temples and monasteries in the Tamil country as they did in Deccan earlier. Their temples and mathas existed in Dharmapuri, Chingleput, South Arcot, North Arcot, Thanjavur, Pudukkottai districts. Their activities mainly centred around the regions of Tongaimandalam and Cholamandalam and they were less influential in the Pandy country.

A Kannada epigraph of the 8th century A.D. from Tagapir (Dharmapuri) hints at the possible existence of this sect in that area. A Kalamukha teacher Vidyarshi figures prominently in this record. He is called Kanchi bhujaanga varvali Kanthirava and Lalukacakika. His teacher was Rudra-bhujaanga. The epithets clearly show that there was a lineage called, the bhujaanga-vali, that probably Kanchi was the birth place of the teacher, and that Rudra-bhujaanga was a preceptor in this lineage as early as the eighth century A.D.
However, the sect took roots in the Tamil country only in the tenth century A.D. In the North Arcot district, Vēdal (Wandiwash taluk) seems to be a Kālāmukha centre. Dasapuriyan, a Kālāmukha follower who belonged to the Haritra-gōtra, of Āpastamba śūtra, is mentioned in the epigraph⁷⁸ of Parantaka I (926 A.D.) from Vēdal. Mēlpādi in the same taluk was another centre of the Kālāmukhas. In 1021 A.D. an agreement was reached by some shepherds of the place in the presence of Lakulīśvara Paṇḍita, who was the head of the maṭha in the Choliśvara temple at the place.⁷⁹

A certain Mahāvratīn Lakulīśvara Paṇḍita as head of the Pūjarīs is mentioned in an inscription (1069-69 A.D.) from Jambai in the South Arcot district.⁸⁰ V. Kangacharya has suggested⁸¹ that this person could be the same as his name sake in the Mēlpādi and Baligami epigraphs. This identification need not be correct as there are many inscriptions in the Kannada country from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries mentioning Kālāmukha teachers bearing the same name.
There was some following for this sect in Thanjavur district as evidenced by three epigraphs. In 1018 A.D., during the reign of Rājendra I, a Lakulisvara Pandita who had a monastery at Tiruvaliyagam, received an śārvabhūga gift. It is stated in the epigraph from Pandanallur that the Śiva brāhmaṇas of the temple received a gift of gold for burning a lamp from Perianambi-bhaṭṭan son of Dakshinamūrti-bhaṭṭan Gomatha Saravakrtuyajī. Somadeva of Gomadhagir is referred to in the inscription (1263 A.D.) from the Kapardēvaram temple at Tiruvalaṇḍuḷī.

Koṭumbāḷur, in the Pudukkōṭṭai district was a very prominent centre of the Kālāmukha sect. The Sanskrit inscription at Koṭumbāḷur datable to the first half of the tenth century A.D. of Bhūti Vikramakēśari provides valuable information regarding the Kālāmukha activities in the periphery of Chōlamanḍalam. Vikramakēśari, a contemporary of Sundararachōla Parantaka II (957-73) besides building three temples, famously known as Mīvarkōyil, also donated the big monastery (bhana-mathā) to the chief Kālāmukha ascetic Mallikārjūpa after endowing it eleven villages for the regular feeding of fifty Asita-Vaktra (Kālāmukha) ascetics residing
there and for other offerings to the god of the three temples. Mallikārjuna was a resident of Mathura (Madurai), a master of Vedas and a pupil of Vidyarasi and Taporaśi. Thus Koṭumbalūr was a great Kālāmukha monastic centre yielding greater influence over the masses of the region.

The Chingleput district was a stronghold of Kālāmukhas between the tenth and the thirteenth centuries. Tiruvogriyur was the most notable seat, where the Mahavratins had thronged as early as 942 A.D. 99 Chaturānana Pāṇḍita, a Kālāmukha preceptor, had established a maṭha at Tiruvogriyur, which played a dominant role in the affairs of the Adipurisvara temple from the middle of the tenth century A.D. He was originally a general in the army of the Chōla king Rajaditya who died at Takkōlam. After the death of his master, he took to spiritual life and had initiation in the cave of Niraṅjana Guru at the place. The maṭha had successive heads who came to be called Chaturānana Pāṇḍitas after the founder. The record of the Mānyakaṭṭa merchant at Tiruvogriyur (957 A.D.) refers to Mathanati Chaturānana as holding the office of Dharma. Another inscription (959 A.D.) mentions Niraṅjana guru, the contemporary of Vijayakampavarman.
as Adhirâmapati. Similarly, the inscription of Rajendra Chola (1043 A.D.) mentions Chaturânanâ as one in charge of the temple and the Matha at Tiruvorriyur. At his instance, the architect built the vimâna of the Adipuriśvara temple. In 1077 A.D., the Chaturânanâ Paṇḍita was entrusted with the scrutiny of the temple accounts. Another Chaturânanâ Paṇḍita figures prominently in the inscriptions of Râjâdhîrâja II (1171-72 A.D.). One of the inscriptions reveals that the Chola king had attended the temple festival at Tiruvorriyur in the company of Chaturânanâ. Another record states that Chaturânanâ ordered the recording of some gift left unrecorded. The Sanskrit portion of the same record reveals the position of authority held by Chaturânanâ who scrutinised the accounts. He is expressly called Varâna, i.e. the head of the Varivan which was an executive committee functioning under the sabha. Tiruvorriyur continued to be a seat of monastic activities of other sects also as late as the thirteenth century.

Tiruvânakâkâyil in the same district appears to have been a strong Kâlamukha centre during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries A.D. Three inscriptions from
the Tiruvallivara temple at Tiruvannakkoil mention the priests of Kalamukha lineage. The earliest of the three (1127 A.D.) mentions a teacher of Gomatha, namely Salarasi Pandita. A different Salarasi Pandita along with Ganarasi Pandita of the Gomatha figures in the other two inscriptions of 1205 A.D. 100 and 1231 A.D. 101. A figure of the Kalamukha Parañjoti Pandita is carved on the north wall of the same temple.

The spread of Kalamukhas in the Pandya country is attested only by a stray evidence. The matha of MahaviraJal was attached to the Sundara Pandya-Isvara temple at Pallimadum in the time of Vira Pandya (11th century A.D.) 103.

The epigraphic evidences discussed above clearly show that the Kalamukha pontiffs organised themselves into distinct monastic orders. It is observed that the Gomatha lineage in Thanjavur and Chingleput district seems to have had relatively a longer life from A.D. 1018 to 1253 A.D. and the remaining centres were short-lived. With the appearance of the Ṛṣi school of Śāivism in the end of the tenth century A.D., the influence of the Kalamukhas was gradually reduced and in the succeeding centuries,
the Gōlaki school dominated the religious life of the Tamils.

**Gōlaki Matha**

The existence of another type of matha belonging to the Gōlaki school of Saivism in the Tamil country is revealed by a number of inscriptions. By the end of the tenth century A.D., the Gōlaki sect had penetrated into the Tamil country and subsequently spread throughout the land due to royal patronage and popular support.

A group of Saivāchāryas belonging to the Gōlaki school of Saivism was patronised by the Kalachuris of Tripuri who were ruling over the Dāhala Maṇḍala (Central India and United Provinces). The Malkapuram inscription (1261 A.D.) from Andhra Pradesh, besides recording the grant of villages to one Visvēśvara Śiva Gōlaki, the spiritual guru of Kōkatiya king Janapatiḍēva, traces the history of Saiva teachers and of their influence on royal families of that period. Incidentally, it mentions the name of the Kalachuri king who endowed the original Gōlaki matha with a gift of three lakhs of villages. This matha has been identified with the monastery at
Bhedaṅghāt on the banks of the river Narmada. Sādhvakāmāsambha, the author of Sūryasambha Paddhati, a work on Salīgamāna, was its founder. The māṭha derived its name Gōlaki from Gōlagiri, the roundish hillock over which it was constructed. Thus the original name Gōlagiri māṭha in course of time got corrupted into Gōlaki māṭha. By about the third quarter of the tenth century the māṭha had started some branches near Kalachuri. The most important among them were situated at Gorgi and Chandrehe. The priests of this māṭha had affiliation to the Pāśupata sect.

The kings of Mālwā, Tripuri and Warangal who were the followers of the Pāśupata sect endowed and patronised the Gōlaki māṭha. The māṭha and its branches became popular because they had learned scholars as their heads and devotees from a wide area extending from Bengal to Malabar. Iśāna Siva, Rudraśambha, Mattamayūranātha, Hṛdayaśiva, Aṅgaraśiva, Visvesvarasiva and others were some of the Śivachārīyas of the Mattamayūra line and their influence made the Gōlaki māṭha a popular institution of the age. Visvesvarasiva was so influential that he founded the Gōlaki māṭha in the Andhra country. Besides being
the spiritual preceptor of the Kalachuri king, he also became the royal 
guru of the Kakatiya Ganapatideva.

The epigraphs indicate that the Gōlaki line of teachers had already settled down in the Andhra country in the tenth century during the reign of the Nolamba-Pallava king Annayyaḍēva, ruling around Anantapur. The appearance of the Gōlaki line of teachers in the Tamil country was a sequel to the conquest of the eastern part of the Kannada country by the imperial Chōla kings (Rājarāja I and Rājendra I). Some followers of the Gōlaki school moved into the Chōla country and received the patronage of the rulers and the subjects.

Though the sect had its beginnings in the time of Rājarāja I, the existence of Laksādhvārī (Bhikṣa) in the Tamil country is distinctly noticed only from the reign of his son Rājendra I. The Kilaiyur inscription (1041 A.D.) refers to a teacher named Kanakasabapati-desikar residing at Kilaiyaṭṭu which was a seat of the gōhryag of the Laksādhvārī santāna in the Patañjaliidevar-māṭha situated at Mēlaicēri in Chidambaram. This being the earliest epigraphical evidence for this
santuṣa, it could be that this lineage should have had predecessors in these centres (Mālaiçōrī and Kīlaīyūr). In the beginning of the twelfth century, Uṅkāradēva-rāvāḷar, a disciple of Gñanaśiva rāvāḷar of this lineage had affiliation with the Kolla-māṭha of Varanāśī (Benares). 112

The proliferation of this lineage in the thirteenth century A.D. is testified by the Chōla and Pāṇḍya records. 113 A record of Kūṭottunga III (1217 A.D.) mentions Rāvāḷar of the Varanāśī-Bhikṣa-māṭha. Saivaḍanapperumāḷ alias Aghoradēvar-rāvāḷar finds a place in another record of Kūṭottunga III 114 (1216 A.D.) Probably, he belonged to the same lineage. The name Aghoradēvar-rāvāḷar indicates that Saivaḍanapperumāḷ had some kind of initiation (dīkṣa) before entering into the religious order. Evidently, he was of the indigenous stock and was initiated into Gōlakī sāmaya by virtue of his having received a site for establishing a monastery. Gñanaśiva rāvāḷar a disciple disciple (prāśiṣṭha) of the great Śaiva teacher Svamidēva is said to have purchased a site for building a māṭha at Jambukesvaram (Tiruchirapalli district) in the time of the Hōysāla king Vira Rāmanāthadēva. 115 One Tatpurashaśiva, the disciple of Lakṣāḍhyāya rāvāḷar
and an exponent of Śaiva siddhānta was made the head of the above mātha, 116 Kallasadēvār-ruvalar of the Gōlaki mātha at Tiruvappāmalai 117 Tēnanālva ruvalar of Sri Parvati-mātha at Tirukkoṅāṅkuṟam 118 and Pāsūpata ruvalar of Ponnambalakūttan-mātha 119 were all teachers belonging to the Laksādhvārye sāntāna. The preceptor Tēnanadēva and his disciples residing in Nallaoncrrumu-mātha at Karuṅgalam, alias Sadavēcakenallur are said to have immigrated from the Kṛṣṇa-Gōlaki-mātha at Tīruvārūr in Thanjavur district, during the time of Sundara Pāṇḍya I. 120

The Tiruppattur (Ramanad district) record 121 of Vīra Pāṇḍya (1284 A.D.) refers to a mātha headed by the teacher Rājendrattu-mudaliyar Śivaprakāsar, a disciple of Bhiksha-mādattu mudaliyar. He founded the Śivaprakāsar tirumādām at Tiruppattur presided over by Sarvēśvara, a disciple of the Bhiksha-mātha. 122 An undated record, probably of Rājarāja III 123 mentions a certain Śvamidēvar as belonging to the sāntāna of Laksādhvārye mudaliyār. Ekāmradeva mudaliyar of Kṛṣṇa-Gōlaki-mātha at Tīruvārūr resided for sometime in Tirukkoṅāṅkuṟam and established a monastery called Vīradēvadittān-mātha (1303 A.D.) 124
The above evidences are significant in showing the slow replacement of the name ācārya by ādālivār. It is observed that the replacement of the titles of Bhikshu-māthas by ādālivārs was no doubt due to the influence of Tamil Śaiva māthas of ādālivār lineages which appeared in large number in the thirteenth century A.D.

There came into being another lineage of the Gōlaki school, known as Gōnapārtacārīva lineage in the Tinnevelly district in the thirteenth century A.D. The preceptors of this lineage had their activities mainly centering around Tiruvaliśvaram in Tinnevelly district. The record of Maravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya from Tiruvaliśvaram refers to a certain preceptor Aghoradēvar alias Sōlanśiyān belonging to Īyar santāna of the Gōlaki school. But the epigraphs of Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya from the same place mention the same preceptor Aghoradēvar as belonging to the Gōnapārtacārīva-santāna. Evidently, Īyar santāna and Gōnapārtacārīva-santāna appear to be the same. The above epigraphs also confirm that these two lineages were affiliated to the main line of the Gōlaki sect.
During the reign of Jayavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya, a certain teacher, Pugaliperumāḷ by name, is said to have received some land in return for his service of expounding Tirugñānam in the Śiva temple at Tiruvāḷiśvaram. Similarly, Maravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya II had provided for the recitation of Tirugñānam in the Śiva temple at Tirunelveli. The eleven tapasvins of the matha at this place who recited the Tirugñānam were drawn from various Gōlaki mathas of the Tamil country which were presided over by important pontifical heads of several lineages. These heads were Ellaiyillādēvar of the Vishakapṭadēva-santāna, Mahadeva of the Bhaṭṭavīrā-santāna, Sīlapadāḥyidaya and Astradēva of the matha at Tiruvarūr, Irāvalar Pāsupatidēva of the Bhisikha-mathā-santāna, Nilakaṇṭa of the matha at Madurai, Uyyakkoḍadēva of the Alagiyamēyaka santāna at Tirunelveli and Aṉukkavaṉpōndan of the matha at Tirunelveli.

The above facts indicate that Tirugñānam was a religious text pertaining of the Gōlaki philosophy. It is also clear that the above mentioned lineages, like Vishakapṭadēva-santāna, had affinity with the Gōlaki sect and, particularly, to the Gōlakapīṭāgārya lineage.
The **Hasikēvra-santāna** was another lineage of this sect affiliated to **Āmṛṣa-māṭha**. Aghoradēva of **Āmṛṣa-māṭha** at **Virāṇṭi** in **Madurai** district, 129 Ariyavṛtakonda mudaliyar of **Hasikēvra-māṭha** at **Tiruvorgiyūr** in **Chingleput** district 130 and Gūṇāpāṭadēvar of **Kanappurīvār-māṭha** at **Vedagiri−Varanāsī** paṭṭinam 131 were the preceptors of this lineage.

The **Kīlai-māṭha** lineage has another, having affiliation to the Gōlaki sect and had its origins in the thirteenth century. This lineage spread in the districts of **Madurai**, **Thanjavur** South **Arcot** and **Tinnevelly**. A teacher Aḷagīya Tiruchippambalam udaiyār was a disciple of the **Kīlai-māṭha** which was an institution at Tirupparāṅkūram in **Madurai** under the Gōlaki School. 133 Kayilāyadēvar alias Śivadēvar was the preceptor of this māṭha. 134 The Kīlai māṭha figures in an inscription 135 (1260 A.D.) from Ģermaṇēvi, Tirunelvelly district. Purappavaḷaśiva mudaliyār 136 of the **Śaivappurumāṭha** at Tirunelveli Vagisattappurumāṭ 137 of the **Yāḍakkil-māṭha** at **Tiruvārūr**, Tirunattappurumāṭ, a disciple of Śivapādahūdaya in Tiruvārūr, 138 Thanjavur district, Vanaśiva mudaliyar in **Tiruvaṅgāvūr**, Thanjavur district, Vagisvaradēva in Chidambaram, South **Arcot** district, were all the preceptors of this lineage.
The preceptors of the Gōlaki school who were active in the different parts of the Tamil country for a long period and dedicated themselves to the propagation of Gōlaki dharma which incorporated in itself the Suddheśvara philosophy. Some of them acted as preceptors of the Chōla kings. The Māheśvaras of this sect belonging to various māṭhas in the Tamil country played a dominant role in the temple administration.

**Tamil Śaiva Māṭhas**

At the close of the twelfth century A.D. a new type of monastic institution, viz. the Tamil Śaiva māṭhas were coming into prominence in various parts of the Tamil country. Their number and influence steadily increased. The thirteenth century was a landmark in the history of Śaiva monasticism since almost every important temple in the land had one or more māṭhas attached to it, or functioning in collaboration with it. The activities of these māṭhas were confined to the Tamil country.

The māṭhas of this type, headed by non-brāhmaṇ Śaiva preceptors, had as their aim the following of the
Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta philosophy and their doctrinal works. This philosophy with its intense monotheism and Bhakti emphasis was systematised into a sect during the thirteenth century. It was initiated by Meykaṇḍar, the author of Śiva-Gaṇeśa-Pedam and was zealously fostered by his illustrious disciples Arulnandi, Manavāsagam kaṇḍandar, Arulnandi’s disciple Maraṅgana Sambandar, and his disciple Umāpati. The Tiruvannamalai inscription of Kājarāja III (1252 A.D.) refers to one Tiruveppanallūr Meykaṇḍadēvar who is identified with Meykaṇḍar, one of the Santānāchāryas. Umāpati Śivachārya established a matha at Koṅavankudi from where he taught Siddhānta literature to his disciples. He is said to have lived at the close of the thirteenth century and in the early years of the 14th century. In order to propagate Śaivism and its philosophy the disciples of Meykaṇḍar and other Santānāchāryas founded several mathas in many parts of the Tamil country.

It is interesting to note that Meykaṇḍar, the first of the Tamil expounders of Siddhānta was a vellāla and his disciple Arulnandi was a Brāhmaṇ Maraṅgana Sambandar was a vellāla. Umāpati Śivam is alleged to have suffered excommunication from his Brāhmaṇ community
at Chidambaram for his association with the Vellālas. The epigraphs bear evidence to the founding of several Śaiva māthas which were presided over by non-Brahmap heads of different mūndalivār lineages. The proliferation of these māthas in the thirteenth century coinciding with the period of systematisation of Śaiva Siddhānta philosophy, leads us to conclude that most of these institutions had been founded by various disciples of Meykanḍār though some of them seem to have been in existence even before Meykanḍār.

These māthas under the headship non-Brahman teachers, Śivanārāja or Māhēśvarasa were often named after the famous Tamil Brāhmaṇ saint Tirugnānasambandar and the non-Brāhmaṇ saint Tirunāvukkarasar. In these māthas the non-Brāhmaṇ, agriculturists played an important role. The sects Vellāla progenitors played a major role in running these institutions. This development was a sequel to the cultural development modelled on existing Brāhmaṇical institutions during the period of transition to supra-local integration in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries.
The pontiffs of these mathas were the Saiva spiritual teachers attached to particular succession of gurus such as the mudaliyar of Tiruchchattimurram lineage, Malizal Madattu lineage, the Sembakkudi lineage and Marutha perumal lineage etc.

The Tiruchchattimurram mudaliyar-santana was very popular and it wielded greater influence in the Tamil country. Most of the epigraphs bearing on this lineage belong to the reign of Rajaraja III and Rajendra III. Tiruchchattimurram is identified with Rajarajapuram, a village in Thanjavur district. Tiruchchattimurram mudaliyar lineage belonged to the Tirugnanasambandar-madam of the same place. Branches of this matha under the same lineage came into existence in places like Mruvunakkai, Usattanam Mruvilimalai and Valimalam, all in Thanjavur district. Paripurna Sivacharya of the same lineage presided over the Kuttach Navanar-matha at Usattanam. Tavapperumal alias Ganasiva constructed Alagiva Tiruchchirambala mudaliyar-madam at Mruvilimalai and granted lands to it. Similarly, Somanathadeva alias Edioppiladar presided over the Tavapperumal-matha at Valimalam. The disciples of Namasivayadevar of the
Thiruchchattu mudaliyar-santana lived in the Mandattanavarar-thirumathra at Tiruvanaikkaval. It was built by Ivurucaiyaig-Solakop on the northern side of the temple at Tiruvanaikkaval and was meant for feeding the ascetics. It is significant to note that the epigraphs relating to the Mandattanavarar-thirumathra are found in the walls of the present Sankara matha at Tiruvanaikkaval. Apparently, the Siva matha had been converted into Sankara matha.

The next in the order of influence was the Maligai madattu-mudaliyar-santana. In the thirteenth century this lineage had its matha at Tiruvigaimarudur. Tattan udhyan Yasanadivar of Maligai-matha at Tiruvigaimarudur was popular in Mallur during the reign of Rajaraja III. In all probability, the members of this lineage were descendants of Tirumaligaittevar one of the authors of Tiruvilippa, who is said to have lived at Maligai-matha at Tillai. It continued to exist in the 13th century. One Vinayaka, the student of Venkatagan, the head of the Maligai matha at Tillai refers to Perumbakkappullyur Nambi as his spiritual teacher (Gnanasiriyar). Perumbakkappullyur Nambi, the author of the Tiruvilaiyadal-
Purāṇam belonged to the thirteenth century. One of the heads of this Maligai mātha at Tīlai finds a place in the invocatory verses of the Vaiṣṇava Purāṇa and Tirukkānappār Purāṇam both of later period.

The Sembaiikkudi Mudaliyar lineage is known from the epigraphs of Kāṇeṇdra III (1250 A.D.) It is stated that the Andar-Embirānāy-mātha at Tiruvānaikkä was presided over by the heads of Mudaliyarp-tantān of Sembaiikkudi. Thus Sembaiikkudi, like Tiruchchattiriyam was the headquarters of a group of Tamil Śaiva māthas and both had their branches at Tiruvānaikkā. It may be said in passing that Tiruvānaiikkā had been a great religious centre in fostering different schools of Śaivism such as the Kālikṣeṣṭha, Ślaki and Śaiva Siddhānta, through out the Chōla period. Later on, it became centre of the smārtha tradition also.

There was an Andar-Merudappurūḷai-tantān functioning at Tiruchchenganṭānkuḍi. It was represented by the teacher Nāmasivayadevar of Śiruttopdar-tirumāṭha (1232 A.D.). The Acharaśaḷaśivayānt-tirumāṭha at Tiruvānur with its branch, the Tirupāṇasambanda-mātha at Tiruppatṭur (Kānnaḍa district), the Tiruttappatodesivāṇ-
tirumāṭha at Govindaputtur (1248 A.D.) with its branch at Tillai, the māṭha of the same name at Tiruppattur (1290 A.D.), the Tirumaṭaṭaa-baṭandar-māṭha, presided over by Umaiyarubāgar of the Pāṇḍaraṅgaṇeṣvar lineage, at Tenkari (near Solavandan, Madurai district) were all important Tamil Śaiva māṭhas.

There were many other māṭhas of this school of Šaivism functioning at places like Tiruvōriyūr, Kaṅchi, Tiruppālaivanam, Tirukkaḷukkuṅgam and Tiruvānmiyūr in Chingleput district; Chidambara, Tiruvāṭi, Karaṅgiyūr, in South Arcot district; Tribhuvani in Pondicherry, Kōṭṭūr, Tiruvalaṅjuḷi, Tiruvaṅguturai, Tiruvalaṅgāḍu, Köviḷūr, Tiruppālaatturāl, Valiḷaṇam, Tirutturāippūḍi, Tiruviḷaṅkali in Thanjavur district; Tirukkaḷārēri, Giriyaṅbaḷpuram, Sevaṅadēvi, in Tirunelvelly district; Tiruvedagam in Madurai district; Kamaraṅavalli, in Tiruvōchhirāppallī district; Kōḷumāṭi in Coimbatore district; and Perinchikkoil in Ramnad district.

QUBAI

Qubai is another type of māṭha, generally attached to the Śiva temple. Though the term Qubai literally means a cave, it is also used to connote an isolated room
located in the interior portion of the temple, exclusively meant for the monks and only accessible to the persons concerned with it. Generally, they were found in Śiva temples. The fact that gunah represents a matha is attested to by an epigraph of Rājarāja III which registers money and land endowments to gunah as maḍappuram. Thus it is obvious that the term gunah is synonymous with that of matha.

The emergence of these gunahas in the twelfth century A.D. in the Tamil country was in all probability due to the influence of the Mattamayūra clan of North India. Some inscriptions from within and outside the Dāhala country (Chōdi kingdom) reveal the religious activities of the Mattamayura clan and their connection with different parts of India. The Chandreha inscription of Prabhōdaśiva, the Bilahari inscription of HVARAJADIVA II and the Qurgi record, besides the Ranōd and Kharepatan charters, throw welcome light on the genealogy of the preceptors of the Mattamayura clan. The head of this clan was one who came from the line of Gunahāśi, viz. 'Kaḍambaruga adhyāśin' the inhabitant of Kaḍambaruga. Scholars have identified Mattamayura, the chief seat of the clan, with the capital of the king
Avantivarman. According to Ranod inscription, Avantivarman invited Mattamayuranatha to his country to establish a muttha at his capital and another at Ranipadra. This great seat of the Saiva sect had sent its monks to such far-off places like Malwa, Deccan and Central India. Apparently, due to such monastic activities, the muthal in the Chola country must have been founded by a spiritual teacher of Mattamayura clan of Cuhavāja line which was popular in North India during the tenth and eleventh centuries A.D.

The epigraphs of the Chola period reveal as to how these monasteries (mutha) attained prominence from the time of Kulottunga III and played an important role in the religious life of the people. They functioned in places like Tiruttugippundi, Kurukkal, Tirukkalumalam (Shiyali), Mruvdaivayal, Tiruppugalur, Tirumangalam, Tirumananjeri and Nagiyur (all in Thanjavur district) and Chaturvedi-mangalam in Ramnad district. Like Tamil Saiva muthas of madaliyar-santa of the 13th century, these mutha were presided over by non-Brahman Saivites. The mutha at Tiruttugippundi was constructed for a Saiva teacher, Tiruchirambalamarudaiya madaliyar.
These guhaiś were named after the Tamil saints of the Bhakti age, namely, Tirugñānasambandar and Tirunāvukkarasar. Tirugñānasambandar-guhai at Chaturvedimangalam was constructed by Uyyanināduvan Kapādan alias Taṇadēvan. Tirugñānasambandar-guhai at Mupiyur is known from an epigraph from Rājarāja III (1220 A.D.) from the same place. Alāsundara-guhai at Tirumanāṇjeri was presided over by Pugaiāndar of Pupṭi (1222 A.D.) Tirunāvukkarasar guhai existed at Kurukkai (1201 A.D.) where the feeding service was conducted. The guhai at Tirukkālām was known as Polīsattalagirai-guhai.

As in the case of other māṭhas, the guhaiś were also presided over by a regular succession of pontiffs well versed in Śaiva Tirumurai. They were also centres of feeding and learning. The disciples were taught to recite the Tirumurai and trained in the art of reading Tirunāṭiyog. An inscription of Rājendra III (1250 A.D.) indicates that Tirumurai was consecrated in Tiruttapot-tokaiyan-guhai at Mruvidaṭayil. The guhai at Tirukkālām was named as Tirumurai Tevāraṭchelaiyan-guhai. This would clearly indicate that the guhaiś undertook to preserve Tevāram texts and to recite hymns.
An important event in the history of guhaś was that occurred in the 22nd year of Kulottuṇḍa III (1200 A.D.) when there was a crusade against the monasteries of this type. It is known that a guhaś was constructed by the local people for a Śaiva teacher by name Tiruchchirrambalamudaiya madaliyar who came to Tiruttuppalpur. He is stated to have died two years after, when there was a revolt (kalagar) against guhaś, and when the monastic property was confiscated. The teacher was succeeded by one Hridayadeva. This revolt is referred to in the epigraph as guhaś-idi-kalagar. It is to be observed that it must have been a revolt by a section of the people. The Government epigraphist surmised that it would have been due to the Brāhmaṇical instigation. On the other hand S.K. Aiyangar opined that such a general prosecution is the more unlikely. He referred to the prosperous existence of such non-Brāhmaṇical institutions in the reign of Rājarāja III. In the absence of a tangible evidence one cannot derive a definite cause for such a revolt.
The āyaṅgār which wielded great influence in the religious life of the Tamils almost practically disappeared after the Chōlas as there is no evidence to prove their existence later on.
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MAPS

Location of important Śaiva mathas (sect-wise)
A. MATHAS OF THE BHAKTI SCHOOL

Chingleput district (Cg)

1. Kanchi
2. Tiruvogriyur.

South Arcot district (Sa)

3. Tilla
d
4. Tiruvatigal.

Thanjavur district (Tj)

5. Pumpuhalur
6. Seynalur
7. Sirkali
8. Tirukkadavur
9. Tirumagalakkadu
10. Tirumarugal
11. Tirunallur Perumagaam
12. Tiruppunturutti
13. Tiruvinimalai
14. Tiruvurur
15. Tiruvagutugai

Madurai district (M)

B. KALAMUKHA MATHAS IN THE TAMIL COUNTRY

Chingleput district

1. Tiruvānakkōyil
2. Tiruvonāriyūr

North Arcot district

3. Mēlpādi
4. Vēгал

Dharmapuri district

5. Tagaṇur

South Arcot district

6. Jambāl

Thanjavur district

7. Pandanallūr
8. Tiruvaliyāru
9. Tiruvalaṅjuḷi
10. Tiruvalālūr

Pudukkottai district

11. Koṇumbāḷūr

Bīrurad district

Chingleput district (Cg)
1. Tiruvorriyur
2. Tirukkalukkunram
3. Palur
4. Tirupāchchur

North Arcot district (Na)
5. Tiruvannāmalai
6. Tiruvottur

South Arcot district (Sa)
7. Mēlaicēri
8. Chidambaram
9. Tirunāmanallur

Tiruchirappalli district (Tp)
10. Jambukēśvaram (Tiruvanaikka)
11. Tirumēngalam
12. Ratnagiri

Thanjavur district (Tj)
13. Kēlayur
14. Tiruvāṟūr
15. Tirukkaṇnagāpuram
16. Tirukkoṭalīḷūr
17. Tiruvāguṟṟīḷai
18. Kuttāḷai
19. Tirukkoṭikkēval
20. Sīvapuram

Ramanad district (R)
21. Tiruppattur

Madurai district
22. Madurai
23. Tirupparanku
24. Virappāṇḍi.
25. Vīkkīramānīg

Tirunelveli dist.
26. Manappāḍaiṉīp
27. Pataṉādai
28. Sēnādēvī
29. Tiruvāḷisvara
30. Tirunelveli
31. Giri yambāḻpur

Coimbatore distric
32. Sōḷānādēvī
D. TAMIL ŠALVA MATHAS AND GHILÁIS

Chingleput district (Cg.)
1. Kanchi
2. Tiruvotiyur
3. Tiruppalavanan
4. Tirukkalukkanam
5. Tiruvaniyur

South Arcot district (Sa)
6. Adiwarahanattam
7. Maranglyur
8. Tiruvadi
9. Tilla
10. Tribhuvani

Trichirappalli district (Tp)
11. Tiruvanesikka
12. Gvindaputtur
13. Kamarasavalli
14. Tiruppalattur

Thanjavur
15. Kottur
16. Kuttalai
17. Nodiyr
18. Palayarel
19. Mruchchattimurram
20. Tiruppugalur (both)
21. Mruchchenganottankudi
22. Mruvigalamurdur
23. Mruvazur.

Thanjavur district
24. Mruvilinimalai
25. Mruvalesjuji
26. Mruvayiyur

Thanjavur district
27. Mruvagutural
28. Mruttugalppural
29. Mruvigaiikkalei
30. Tilaiyalinallur
31. Valivalam
32. Kurukkal (guhal)
33. Mrukkalumadalag
34. Mruvailagvur (pi)
35. Maniyur (guhal)

Puthukottai district
36. Peraiyur
37. Koyilur
38. Chaturvedimangal

Madurai district (M)
39. Tenkaraal
40. Mruvodagasam

Ramanad district (Ra)
41. Tiruppattur

Tirunelveli district
42. Kiriyanambalpur

Sermadevi

Coimbatore district
44. Koluman.
NATURE AND ORGANISATION OF THE SAIVA MATHAS

The Saiva matha provided the institutional basis for the medieval Saiva sects for their expansion throughout the Tamil country. The phases of development of the matha, the relationship between the matha and the temple, the doctrinal basis of the institution, its internal organisation, the life of the monks in the matha and the relationship between the preceptor and disciple are examined in this chapter on the basis of available data.

TWO PHASES OF DEVELOPMENT

The matha which had its beginning in the time of the Pallavas became a prominent centre of religion and culture during the time of the imperial Cholas. Its history in the period between A.D. 600 - 1300 A.D. can be divided into two phases. The first phase comprising the period between seventh century and tenth century A.D. signalled the origin and formation of the institution. It had its humble beginning in the seventh century A.D. when the Tamil country was in the grip of the popular religious upsurge fostered by the Tamil saints of the Bhakti movement. It was still in its formative phase.
The ninth and tenth centuries A.D. marked an important stage in its history. We hear of the organised institutions, simple in nature, with the preceptors attached to them. The monastic institution at Kāvērippākkam (836 A.D.) marks the transition in this regard. When the Kālāmukha sect began to have foot hold in the tenth century A.D., this development became significant. They organised themselves into professional monadom and systematised the māthas. The mātha at Tiruvorriyūr, presided over by the 2 Chaturānana Pandita and the big mātha at Koṇambūlūr with its preceptor and fifty ascetics, 3 both of the Kālāmukha sect, would indicate this development.

The second phase of development during the period between eleventh century and thirteenth century A.D. marks the consolidation and proliferation of the institution. This period witnessed its growth in all its varied aspects. (The māthas of different sects that came into being in this period, were well-organised institutions. Their role as propagators of religious thought and practices in collaboration with the temples, are well attested to by the contemporary epigraphs. The welfare and charitable activities of these māthas and their socio-economic impact in the life of the people show how these institutions
consolidated the social basis of Śaivism. The twelfth and thirteenth centuries represented the culmination of all these mathas in greater part of the Tamil country.

ŚAIYA MATHA AND TEMPLE

The development of the matha was almost parallel to that of the temple. We see a gradual rise in the position and the status of the matha in the socio-economic and cultural life of the people very much akin to the development of the temple itself. Striking parallels between them have been noticed in their growing prosperity and influence. Like the temples, the mathas gradually acquired more and more resources by virtue of land grants and other benefactions conferred on them by the people of various social ranks from the king to the commoner. 

Though the mathas and temples were established with the same religious motive or sentiment, they served different purposes. The temple, primarily, was meant for worship. It also served as the centre of religious instruction, which was only secondary in purpose. On the other hand, the matha was primarily intended for providing instruction to disciples and laity by some preceptors or experts in the tenets of a sect.
Śaiva mathās were very much connected with the affairs of temples. Initially, the matha was a temporary residence of the saints propagating the Bhakti ideology and was indistinguishable from the temple. By about ninth and tenth centuries, they became prominent having their own identity and often supervising the temple. (The mathās in most cases, were located in the precincts or in the vicinity of the temple complex.) Periyavārāpan states that the mathās were situated by the side of the temple. Their location within the Śiva temples is attested to by a good number of inscriptions. Besides, some inscriptions refer to the mathās having been located well within the environs (tirumāyilālrām) of the temples and in particular streets.

The growth of the mathās into a full fledged religio-cultural institution is related to the growth of temples into a complex institution. With the increasing of temple rituals and festivals in the Chōla period, the mathās increased in number and in importance and their activities grew more and more. In the second phase, the mathās, with their own organizational setup and resources, developed into almost independent institutions. However, they continued to have affiliation to the temples for the propagation of religious ideals and practices. Throughout the centuries both have been complementary to each other. Gradually, the mathās attained prominence and
had more and more associations with the temples and their festivals. Their influence over the temples gradually increased to the extent of taking active part in the temple administration as described in the sequel.

**DOCTRINAL BASIS OF THE MATHAS**

The **Agamas** provided the doctrinal basis for the Śaiva mathas. The Śaivaśāstras are twenty-eight in number, and are divided into three parts (**Karma**, **Upāsana** and **Gnāna**). Their philosophy is popularly known as Śaiva Siddhānta, which emphasizes the importance of **Pati**, **Pānu** and **Pāma**, its basic tenets.

The Śaivaśāstras were popularized by the saints, like Tirumālar and Manikkavacakar. Tirumālar, in his work *Tirumandiram*, rendered into Tamil the Śaiva doctrines found in the Sanskrit Śaivaśāstras which became the foundation upon which the later structure of Śaiva Siddhānta philosophy was built. Tirumālar, while stressing the importance of the **Agamas**, states that the books of the Agamas of Śaivism form as much a part of the Śiva temple as the liṅga, the stone image, the pearls, precious stones, the bead of corals, the carved wood, the cooked and uncooked rice.
He emphasises that the *Agamas* contain the one imperishable truth, that is, *Vedānta Siddhānta* which is pure Śaivism. According to him *Vedānta* is *Suddha Śaiva Siddhānta*. The *Agamas* teach the *Upāsanā* or the Bhakti path. The *Tāvāram* of saint Tirunāvukkarāsar emphasises the sanctity of the *Agamas*. Śaiva Siddhānta is also referred to in the inscription of Rajasimha Pallava at Kailasanātha temple at Kāṇchi. Śaiva Siddhānta or Śiva Ṣāstra which is the same as the *Agamas* is also referred to in the inscriptions of the contemporary Deccan.

Śaiva maṭhas of different sects, providing the institutional basis for the Bhakti ideology were based on the *Agamic* principles. Tīrūmāndiraṇam states that the Kālāmukha sect was one of the six Śaiva systems that came out of the *Agamas*. The Gōlaki maṭhas propagating *Suddha Śaiva* philosophy, and the Tamil Śaiva maṭhas, preaching the Śaiva Siddhānta philosophy in Tamil, were all institutions having the *Agamic* base.
In the seventh and eighth centuries, the mathas were temporary residences where the Nayanārs stayed and received their disciples. But, then, the disciples were not in the habit of residing permanently in the mathas. With the increasing popularity of the institution, and with a strong emotional fervour of devotion to the Lord, there evolved a professional monachdom which in turn led to the creation of the office of the Pontiff. The Kalāmukhas took a leading part in this particular development, and this trend was clearly noticeable in the history of their mathas. Thus, by about the middle of the tenth century A.D., the Śaiva matha evolved itself into an organised institution. The mathas were headed by the spiritual guru, or the pontiffs, who were invariably cultured ecclesiastics and their duty was not only the management and administration of the mathas but also the encouragement of religious and philosophical learning. The epigraphs of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries refer to the heads of the mathas as belonging to different lineages (sautrānas). They were popular not only with their disciples but also with the laity.
THE PONTIFF

(The Pontiff, was generally known as Mathapati. Sometimes, the pontiff, as the head of the local institution, was also designated as athānapati. The main function of the pontiff, i.e. administering the matha and the temple, is referred to in the inscriptions as madapatiya. Occasionally, there were more than one pontiff presiding over a particular matha. The pontiff held office by the process of succession.

The mode of assumption of office by the pontiff is known from a few records. He was either appointed or nominated; the mode of appointment varied with mathas and circumstances. In most cases the head of the matha nominated his successor. For instance, the pontiff Vagiśuradēva mudaliyar of Kilai-matha, on his death bed, assigned a portion of land and his matha to one of his disciples and thereby nominated his successor. If the head of the matha died without nominating his successor, the successor was chosen by the head of the branch matha. This is known from a record from Govindaputtur (1248 A.D.) which states that Subrahmanya Śiva, the head of the Tiruttongattogaiśa tirumādhām at Tiruviśaiyamangal
(Govindaiputtir) laid down that in case he died without choosing his successor, he was to be chosen by the head of another matha at Chidambaram (also named Tiruttappatto-
25 gaiyan-tirumadam). An inscription recording the royal order permits a certain person Rājarājappichchaṇ, probably the pontiff, to make over the right of maṇḍapatyam to a person of his choice. This seems to be a sort of formal recognition of the authority of the pontiff by the king. The above evidences clearly show the authority of the pontiff in nominating his successor. The principles of seniority and merit determined such nominations. On certain occasions, the king himself appointed the pontiff as evidenced by a Chōla epigraph from Adivarāhanattam in South Arcot district. King Rājendra Chōla issued an order (ārimukha) at the instance of a person appointing one Tiruvarangadeva alias Mrukkarrali Nambi as the head of the matha in succession to Śivapādasekharappichchi. These are stray cases which took place under exceptional circumstances.

Unlike certain epigraphs from the Deccan and the Madhya Pradesh, those from Tamil country do not furnish details of genealogical list of pontiffs. However, they attest to the system of spiritual lineage in the Śaiva
monasteries in this region. The epigraphs refer to the pontiffs or preceptors belonging to certain *santana*. The pontiffs and their disciples of the Śaiva *matha* wielded considerable influence both within and outside their organization. The epigraphs from the Tamil country incidentally throw light on the position of the authority and the functions of the pontiff.

**PONIFF AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE MATHA**

The pontiff carried on the most important task of the maintenance and the administration. Indeed, his primary function was the propagation of the doctrines of the sect and the management of the *matha* was incidental to the spread of his sect. The right of administering the *matha* and sometimes both the *matha* and the temple is referred to in the inscription as *mathanatya*. The pontiff (*mathanatil*) by virtue of his authority received maintenance grants from the donors of various social ranks and managed the resources of the *matha*. It is known from Tirunallār (Pondicherry state) inscription (11th century A.D.) that Vaiāḷur Nāgūdaiyarbhāṭṭa endowed lands for maintaining successively a *matha* and for feeding the Śaiva ascetics there in. The Jambukēśvaram record of Kōnerinmaikorangān
refers to the construction of the *Nārupattināţiramamāṇam* by Avūrudaiyan Sōlakōn, who provided for feeding the ascetics. This *mātha* was built by him for Namaśiva-yādevar of *Tirugūnumamamāṇam-mātha* at Palayārai. Here, it is implied that a disciple of a *mātha* at one place is gifted with a new *mātha* and is made its pontiff. It is endowed with land for its hereditary maintenance (*śāhva parambaramaivaga*). A Pāṇḍyam royal order mentions that the pontiff Sarvēśvara of the *Dhikaha-mātha* *rāvaras* purchased some lands for the upkeep of the *Śaivañaśigam-mātha*, in the temple of Tirupattur (Kamnad) supervised by him. In 1243 A.D. Subrahmapya Śiva, the head of the *Tiruttongattogalvān-tirumadham* at Govindaputtūr purchased lands from several persons and created an endowment for certain specific services to be undertaken by his *mātha*. He also laid down that his successor should also carry on the same services under that endowment.

"The pontiff looked after the routine facilities and spiritual needs of the disciples." A Pāṇḍyam record from Madurai of Tribhuvanachakavatārīn Kōnerinmalkōppan mentions that the preceptor Gūthamārtidēva, a disciple of Periyadēvar of the Nandikēśuvaradēvar *sautēna* in the
Ammapā-māṭha, built a māṭha called Manamperiyān-māṭam. He raised 10 mā of land by way of collecting donations and by purchase, and endowed the same to the māṭha built by him for the maintenance of his disciples.

The pontiffs laid down rules to maintain discipline among the disciples. They were empowered to turn out the monks who violated the rules of the māṭha. This is well evidenced by an inscription from the contemporary Deccan.

**PONTIFF AND THE TEMPLE ADMINISTRATION**

The pontiff by virtue of his spiritual leadership exercised greater influence in the administration of the temple. Even as early as 986 A.D., the māṭha had some control over the temple affairs. The gift to the temple was entrusted to the members of the māṭha (madatu satṭappēru-makkal) at Kāvērippakkam (North Arcot district). Gradually, the pontiff's hold over the temple increased. At Tiruvōrriyūr, the pontiff acted in his dual capacity as the head of the māṭha and incharge of the administration of the temple. The endowment made to the temple was entrusted with the sabha of Narasimhamangala by the Chaturānana Paṇḍita, the chief of the māṭha at Tiruvōrriyūr (959 A.D.). In an inscription of Hājēndra Chōla Chaturānana is
described as one in charge of the temple and the matha at Tiruvorriyur (Tiruvorriyur tirumayanaam maadam Quotes). In the time of Kulottunga I, the Chaturanana Pandita was entrusted with the scrutiny of the temple accounts. This would illustrate as to how gradually the temple came under the supervisory control of the pontiff of the matha at Tiruvorriyur.

Instances are there to show how the pontiff played an important role in the administration of the temple. Some shepherds of Marpadi, a city in Jayankonda Chola-mandalam, had made a declaration in 1021 A.D. before Lakulasvara Pandita, the head of the matha who exercised control over the Arunijasvara temple at the place. Mahavratin Lakulasvara pandita, the chief priest of the temple and the pontiff of the Kalamkha matha at Jambai, along with the other temple authorities, assigned some lands to one of the temple employees (accountant). Similarly, Kuppaduggaikan Tiruvengambam-udaiyan Tiruvatuurai-udaiyar who was in charge of the madanaiyan of the temple at Tiruvatuurai, had made arrangements for grant of lands to those who did temple service in the year 1238 A.D. Certain priests Jnanaarsi Pandita and Sailarsi Pandita, the members of the goudar were made in charge of donations made to the temple.
The growing influence of preceptors over the temple affairs is borne out by an inscription from Tirukkaṇḍaiyūr (Thanjavur district) which mentions that Śvāmīdēvar cancelled an order of the king appointing two Śaiva ēcārya and put in two others who possessed hereditary rights to the office. Thus, the pontiff’s influence increased in the twelfth century to such an extent that he could cancel an order of the king in order to keep up the traditions and regulations in the temple administration.

The preceptors and the Māhēśwaras of the Śaiva māṭha evinced keen interest in the temple affairs and sometimes, they figured prominently among the executives of the temples. During the reign of Rājarāja III, when the resources at the disposal of the Kānanandiśvara temple at Tirukkaṇḍapuram (Thanjavur district) were inadequate to meet the expenses of the festivals and worship, the Māhēśvaras of Perumbāḻappuliyūr (Chidambaram) at the instance of the temple officials, raised funds by the gift of annual payment of money and paddy collected from various temple servants in Chōḷamaṇḍalam, Rājarāja Paṇḍimāṇḍalam, Viṟa-Chōḷamaṇḍalam, Naduvil-nādu and Jayankoppiśölā-māṇḍalam.
The pontiffs were also responsible for building and repairing temples. In Tiruvorivyūr, at the instance of the chief of the matha, the architect Havi built the vimāna of the Adhipuriśvara shrine. Similarly, the Tampikonda grant of Amma II indicates that the preceptor was authorised to utilise a portion of the revenue for repairs of the temple.

**OTHER FUNCTIONS**

The pontiffs had another important role of arranging for the regular services for the deities in the temples. They made provisions for worship, daily offerings on special and festive occasions. They were also responsible for the arrangement of the recital of Tiruppadigama and other religious texts. This is discussed in greater detail in the next chapter.

It is of interest to note that the māheśvaras also came to be associated with judicial matters. During the reign of Rājarāja III (1239 A.D.), the committee which enquired into the affairs of the temple of Tirumānikkamalai-uḍaiya Nayanār in Kurukkaināgu included the great minister, the athanika, merchants and also the māheśvaras. Another instance of the māheśvaras taking part in the judicial
administration is borne out by a record from Sivapuram (Thanjavur district). It is stated that two Śiva-brähmapas who had misappropriated some of the temple jewels, were apprehended and punished by the māhēśvaras and the Uravar.

The pontiff being the supreme head of the monastery exercising supervisory control over the administration of the temple, began to wield considerable influence over the society. It was due to this, that the pontiff was described as holding the office of Dharma. Mirañjana Guravar of the Tiruvōrīyūṟ māṭha came to be called the lord of Tiruvōrīyūṟ and Adigrāmapati. Thus, the spiritual leadership made the position of the authority of the pontiff very powerful.

The authority of the pontiff and the irrevocable nature of the royal grants led at times to abuse of power. Such an occasion was rare in the Tamil country. Atleast in one case, in 1194 A.D. a certain Palūvūraṅgaṇ, the mādānātvar of the temple in the village of Govindaputtūr (Mūruchirāppalli district) had misappropriated areca nuts and money belonging to the establishment. In this case the punishment meted out to him was that his properties were confiscated to the temple and he was expelled. In
anticipation of such an abuse of power, some records
from the contemporary Deccan contain warnings. The Sogal
charter states that a pontiff who violates the monastic
rules ruins the king, the country and the establishment
itself. It laid down that if the head of the establishment
himself did harm or violated the code of conduct, the thirty
townsmen of Sogal were to protect it from possible blastomy.
The Malkapuram record states that if the preceptor
happened to be negligent of his duties or otherwise
misbehaved, the whole Śāiva community (santanika) was
empowered to appoint another in his place.

The māthas were not always free from the control
of the secular bodies. There is an instance to show that
the king interfered in the affairs of the mātha. Rājendra
Chōla issued an order appointing Mrukkaṟṟali Nambi as the
head of the mātha in succession to Śivapādasēkharappichchi.
A royal order from Tillaṟṟayali records the permission
granted by the king to a certain Kājarājappichchan to make
over the right of māṇḍapatvam in the temple at Tillaṟṟayali-
nallūr in Kurumbūrnāṟū to persons of his own choice.
Besides the monks, the matha also included non-monks such as servants and slaves who devoted themselves to the service of the former.

**MONASTIC LIFE**

The very term matha refers to the living quarters of the monks. It also means the residences of maistraka, ascetics who took to the service of the teachers. The Sāīva matha, in its initial stage of development, was a temporary residence of the preceptors, ascetics and itinerant monks. In course of time (9th and 10th centuries A.D.) the practice of the monks residing permanently in the monastic establishments became a regular feature. This is borne out by an inscription registering gifts of land in favour of monks living in the mathas. The epigraphs frequently refer to the establishment of mathas and provisions made for the maintenance of the pontiffs and their disciples. The term maṇḍapuram refers to the lands or villages gifted to the matha for its maintenance.

The practice of the permanent residence of the monks in the matha was related to the growing temple complex. It was mainly due to the increasing participation of the
monks in the temple affairs. Further, the economic support extended by land and other endowments, catering to the daily needs of the monks, also contributed to the growth of the concept of permanent residence in the Śaiva matha.

In fact, the permanent residence of the monks in the matha was the foremost and essential feature of monastic life. This principle was universal for the monastic life of almost all the religious sects. It was believed that a monk should be content with his enclosure, without which he loses his identity. The Śenakapt inscription forbids the monks from leaving their monastic abode. Though the familial records do not lay such a condition, they refer to the Śaiva monks invariably as residing within the matha. As early as 806 A.D., the teachers and students (māṇattu cattanperumakkal) lived in the matha at Kaveriippakkam. The inscription from Kalligakkuṟichchi (Tinnevelly district) states that a new matha was instituted for the sake of the Śri māhēśvaras from the eighteen vishayas. The permanent residence of the monks in the matha is recorded at Śivapuram which refers to the māhēśvaras living exclusively in the mathas (tirumadangalil elundarulivirukkuṁ māhēśvararum). Similarly, the Kalāmukha monks are said to be residents of the matha at Tiruvānakkōil (Chingleput district) (Kalāmukhan
Gnagattu Gnäraí napditanum Sälläraí napditanum). Thus, it is clear that permanent residence in the matha is a must for one who aspires for the spiritual upliftment, the status of a monkhood.

The resident monks and the preceptors of the mathas were engaged, primarily, in study and teaching religious doctrines. The pontiffs well versed in their respective siddhântas, disseminated theological knowledge of their disciples and laity through exposition and discourses. They fostered and propagated the philosophy of the Saiva creed. A detailed account of the educational activities in the Saiva mathas in the Tamil country is given in the sixth chapter.

The pontiffs and their disciples performed austerities (vrata) such as yôga (meditation) utterance of the pâñcâksara mantra (five syllabbed mantra) and the vow of silence (maunamustâna). Though the epigraphs from the Tamil country are silent on these practices, the contemporary Bhakti literature presents a clear picture as to why they have to be observed. The Tirumandiram alludes to the sañ^ya-yôga, viz., yama, niyama, äsana, prânâyâma, pratyãbha, dharana, dhyâna and samãdhi, the performance
of which would lead to the attainment of eternal bliss.
The observers of the austerities in the *mātha* are
glorified as *kavattīr* in the *Parivārapurāṇa*. 67 Tirunāvukkarasar had stressed the need to conquer one's own mind and body by
contemplating upon the ultimate principle in order to attain
Śiva-mukti or final deliverance. 68 Thus the monks had to
control the lower impulses and rise to greater spiritual
heights. It is also known from the Gurgi record 69 that
monks living in the monastery performed austerities. The
pontiff Rudraśakti performed austerities such as *yama*,
*nīyama* etc.

The utterance of the *Pancakṣaṇa mantra* while
engaged in deep meditation is an important practice to gain
transcendental happiness. 71 The monks had to repeatedly
utter the five-syllabled *mantra* of *Śivayavanamahā*. The
*Pancakṣaṇa mantra* is said to be a rare jewel like the *Veda*
and its six *āṅgas*. 72 The *Tiruvēndakam* emphasizes that by
uttering this *nilamantra*, one can escape from rebirth.
Karuvārar, one of the authors of *Tiruvāṇiippa* had stressed
the significance of contemplating five-syllabled mantra.
It was by uttering the *Pancakṣaṇa* and performing *dhyāna*,
the bhakti saints Śirappuli nāyanār and Sūmasimāra-nāyanār
are said to have attained the grace of Lord Śiva. 75
Observance of the vow of silence (mauna-muñśtana) was another essential feature of the monastic life. The greatness of this vrata is recognised even by the Bhagavad Gita in which Lord Krishna is spoken of as the silence of Hidden ones (mauna-muñśyam). There is a belief among the Jains that ailments can be cured by proper observance of the vow of silence. Sometimes the vrata also included observance of fasts for fixed periods.

The most important pre-condition of the monastic life was to maintain celibacy. It is evident in a record from Pārthivasēkharapuram (366 A.D.) that the disciples (gaṭṭara) should not maintain maid servants (vellattikal) in the matha. Such gaṭṭara are mentioned in the Kāveri-pakkam record of 836 A.D. T.N. Subramanian views that sāṭṭa was a brahmacarī wedded to life-long study and teaching with no other worldly attachment.

Though there is paucity of epigraphic evidence in the Tamil country, the royal charters from Deccan provide more information with regard to this condition in the monastic life. It is invariably enjoined that the inmates of the monasteries should observe celibacy. Imprecatory passages are also found in the inscriptions
condemning any possible violation of this rule by the members of the monastic establishments. If the preceptor does not observe celibacy, it would bring about the downfall of the king, the state and the assemblies of the villages. It is also laid down that these monks who violated this rule were to be considered sinners and expelled from the monasteries. At times mahaajas of the locality were empowered to drive away the erring monks from the mathas with the help of the district officials.

The Kalamukhas who made this condition essential in the beginning stages, relented and made it optional. In later times, some preceptors got married as evidenced by a record from Tiruvilaiyur. It mentions a lady Amudangalasani as the wife of Gumappa Yajnamaninayaka Bhatta of Kilanadicchcheri, indicating the married status of the preceptor. In this connection, it may be noted that the Belur pontificate (in Karnatak) became hereditary suggesting a change in their attitude towards family life. The Kalamukhas even admitted nuns in the monastic life. Tiruvorrilliyar, a female mendicant, finds a place in an inscription from Tiruvorrillur (1204 A.D.). It has been pointed out that the custom of admitting women in the
monastic order was possibly due to the influence of Jains who permitted monks to be attached to their establishments.

In general, however, the Śaiva monks of various denominations were expected to observe celibacy. The very purpose of entering monastery after renouncing the mundane life was to attain spiritual upliftment which could be realized by adhering strictly to the monastic rules particularly celibacy. The very term matha also denotes a living quarter of nāistika brāhmaṇarīṇa. That the ideal of celibacy as a means to the spiritual upliftment as an accepted tradition is suggested by a sixteenth century inscription from Jambukēśvaram. In this record, there appears to be an apologia for having deviated from the above tradition in appointing a married person (ghṛastha) to the pontificate of the matha at Tiruvānasikka.

(The members of the Śaiva mathas were also not to possess property of their own. The pontiffs received lands and other benefactions only to administer on behalf of the institution. This ideal of non-possession of property was also prescribed as a means to non-attachment which is very essential for those who took to monasticism.) In this regard the Senakapat record lends plausibility to the
above view. In strictly prohibits lending by money on interest and earning profits thereby.

It is apparent that the 'Saiva monks' adhered to vegetarianism. The *Periyavurapam* verse clearly informs us that the vegetarian food was served in the *matha* (chennel aḍicil pirṇigal unavōya tirumaṇgaṇgal). The strict vegetarianism as a surest means of spiritual attainment was emphasized not only by the Buddhists and Jains but also by the great Tamil poet Valluvar. It was successively upheld by all Tamil saints including Rāmalinga Aṭigal.

**PRECEPTOR-DISCIPLE RELATIONSHIP**

The preceptor-disciple or the pontiff-monk relationship forms an interesting aspect of the study of the Saiva *mathas*. This relationship is relevant to the authority of the pontiff over his fellow monks and lay followers which was vested in the pontiff by virtue of his office. There developed an intimate and sacred relationship between them often termed as ṛuru-sīgya relation. This implies a process by which a disciple clung fast to his teacher to discipline his body and mind and to prepare himself for final deliverance.
The inscriptions suggest that the pontiffs were popular with all sections of people. The relationship between the preceptor and the monk was almost patterned on the line of parentage. It was the spirituality rather than the blood that determined the relation between the guru and sīya, i.e., spiritual parentage. This system is the gurukula system. In this system the position of the disciple to his pontiff was that of a son to his father. The preceptor was the god-father. He was shown greater reverence than the real father. Infact the monk who entered into a monastic life for his spiritual upliftment accepted the pontiff as his god-father who trained him spiritually.

Some inscriptions add strength to the above view. An inscription from Virapendi (Nadurai district) refers to a certain Ṭopāṇāṭapīḷḷaiyar, one of the spiritual disciples of the preceptor Aghoradevar as one of the sons of the latter (Amunāṭam pāṇṭhu sri Nandikēśayava-santānatu Aghoradevar pillāganillai Ṭopāṇāṭapīḷḷaiyar kku). Here it is implied that the pontiff treated all his disciples as his sons (pillai). This spiritual parentage in the gurukula system is clearly indicated in a Sambovaraya record from Tiruvarkku. Herein is mentioned that the monk-disciple Alagiyā-Tiruchendripambalai mūḍaiyar who was spiritually brought up by his preceptor Varagurudevar is the
brought up by his father i.e. with parental affection.

(நூந வில்லையாவ வர்த்தக அகாய திருச்சிர்ப்பம்பலம் உடையர்கு.)

Another inscription from the same place refers to samavattar Bhuyanabhuthavar alias Kaliyaga Virabhadratavar as the son of Alagiya Tiruchchirappambala udaiyar. (Alagiya Tiruchchirappambala udaiyar mahadar samavattar Bhuyanabhuthavar).  

The contemporary literature, Mṛumandiram states how the pontiff or the preceptor was to look after the spiritual welfare of the monks or his disciples. It states that guru who is called Suddha Siva or Para Siva is one who helps the man aspiring for final release from his bondage (နாய). The disciple aspiring for spiritual release gets help from guru param who instructs him in the path leading to the Muktī. Suddha Guru seems to confer upon him Divine grace. When he receives this grace he obtains several powers, namely the ability to comprehend the mantra, the vīraic powers, the purity conferred by the eight Śaktī and the eight higher siddhis.

The disciple's deep devotion to guru gradually developed into a cult. The preceptor himself was conceived as equivalent to god. Mṛumaller himself has stated that Guru is Siva Himself. He has also lamented that people do
not understand this truth. In the same verse it is also seen that the Guru will remain as Siva and as the leader transcending the Veda, Agama, Prakāra. Sometimes, the service done to the preceptor was considered more important. It was by a mere sincere reverence to Tirunāvukkarasar that Appūdi Adigal is said to have gained the grace of Siva.

He even disapproved of Sundaramurti Nayanār worshipping God before worshipping the devotees of Siva. Tirumālār devotes one complete section of his work to the topic of gurūpūja (worship of preceptors.)
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