

## The Ideology of Legitimacy of The Kakatiya State

Dr. E. Sobhanbabu.

*School of History & Archaeology,  
P.S.Telugu University, Srisailam, Kurnool Dt. A.P.  
Corresponding Author: Dr. E. Sobhanbabu.*

---

Date of Submission: 28-10-2017

Date of acceptance: 21-12-2017

---

### I. INTRODUCTION

Through out the Kakatiya period, the Strongest basis for the perpetuation of the state was its clear and unchallenged claims to legitimate the rule. In the intellectual climate of traditional society, it appears that the idea of progress and change coupled with a notion of the separation of society from the state did not exist, and it was thus natural of accept the inevitability of existing political order. That order was buttressed by both religious doctrine and customary beliefs (William Bake. 1985. P223) The king as the centre of the State, was the focus of the states legitimizing ideology. The king claims to be the lord of all life and resources with in his kingdom was the basis of the power of his officers from the **Mahapradhani** (P.V.P. Sastri, 1978: 192) to the **ayagar** (G. Yazdani ed. 1948. P.672) or **Prabhu**. (P.V.P. Satri. 1978. 193) to demand taxes, labour and military service from the subjects. In doing so, the king accepted a reciprocal obligation to his subjects to maintain social order for their economic and physical security and their religious salvation. (William J.Koenig.1978.168-217) This in turn Justified the economic system of the state as well as the state's intimate involvement in the supervision and Management of the institutions of the Hindu religion.

The ultimate basis in the belief structure for the legitimacy of the Kakatiya state stemmed from the monarch's descent from lunar (Chandra Vamsa) or solar (Suryavamsa Kshatriya ancestry). Thus one of the ways for legitimization of power was to incorporate a fabricated genealogy, linking the ruler solar and lunar ancestry, in the gift deeds of the villages or lands presented to Brahmana and temples. The more such gifts deeds more becomes the evidence to support legitimation. (C.V.Ramachandra Rao. 1990: P67-68) Probably it is not without significance that the earliest of the inscriptions. During the times of Ganapathideva, issued in the every first year of his reign of 1199 AD., speaks of the gift of land to manchibhattopadhyaya, the purohitha of Ganapathideva, the object of the grant being to enable the donee to reconstruct a village and a tank in it (C.V.Ramachandra Rao, 1990: P.67-68)The Indian concept of Kingship contained within it several Notions of the nature of the monarch himself. He was first of all a human, main albeit a superior one. The ruler was obliged to create order primarily by his moral example and powers of persuasion that his moral superiority provided him. When these failed he was able to use force to gain his ends, although the ultimate purpose of his actions had to be for the good of religion (AungThwin. London 1976 pp 52-53). His rule as Dharma raja or lord of the law also made him responsible for the physical well being of his subject and this provided the ideological justification for the states of economic system. (Anug Thwin. 1976.PP.52-53).

There existed a dialectic in this notion of Kingship that posed severe problems, for the legitimacy of the King. His power was Justified by his ability to maintain order and welfare and to uphold dharma., but if he failed to do so his legitimacy was doubted and therefore rebellion against him become Justified. (Aung Thwin 1976. P.55) Hence King's need to resort to force to maintain order; but an excessive reliance upon coercion rather than example would begin to create doubts in masses minds about his moral superiority.The King laid claim to being the supreme ruler on the earth and from this claim stemmed the obligation of all humans to obey him. It was, in a sense, the source of his and the states claim to sovereignty but in a form quite different from the Idea of sovereignty which developed in European monarchial traditions. (**Ibid: P56**) This difference resulted in a significant divergence in the development of the state's notions of political hindrances to political unity in the classical and medieval India. (Charles Tilly, 1980.P.25). As a Monarch, the Kakatiya king was obliged to ensure that within his domain other, lesser Kings or vassals be allowed to exist. (Ramachandra Rao 1990: 68-69). As long as lesser kings or vassals chiefs possessed neither wealth nor the power to challenge his supremacy, he had no Justification for their elimination or the incorporation of their subjects under his direct authority. Thus, there was an ideological Justification for the maintenance of the notion of political authority under a single monarch. (Jean clauds Galey ed. 1991. P.187.The ideology of Kingship was composed of many elements. All were inter-related and sanctioned by the teachings of Hinduism or by folk beliefs about local and regional gods. (R.S.Sarma. 1978. P.162). Individuals through out the society were taught these doctrines

through the religious institutions and through folk tales which shaped the views of the population (Jean clauds Galey. Ed 1991. P.189) During the Kakatiyas regine the monasteries and temples served as the institutional basis of the Bhakti. Concept which encouraged the doctrine of servitude and unstinted loyalty to an absolute superior (C.V.N. Ayyar aregion and Early History of Saivism in south India) (1936. P.260-261) In monostic parlance, the absolute superior was the pontiff who enjoyed un questioned authority in relation to the vast landed property. (R.N.Nandi. 1973. P16) and the men worked on the fields. The subordination of this agricultural labour-force would appear to have been imperative when we consider that during the twelfth and thirteen centuries, servility of a rural work force was a basic to the success of agrarian expansion and increased surplus production. (R.N. Nandi 1984. P. 21-50).The off repeated practice of land grants and sub-feudalization led to the emergence of different groups of land holder in Andhra. These were mostly Brahmana invited from out side Andhra country. The method of installing such land holders proved beneficial to the rulers.

Since they infused in the people loyalty to the established order of the things by maintaining and upholding the authority of their patrons. (Sister M.Liceria. 1974. P.35).In the medieval period, the temple emerges as a legitimizer of political power and as an instrument of peasant subordination and surplus accumulation. In the beginning, the temples remained generally confined to urban places of political importance. From the 10th Century onwards the temples began to invade the rural world which was till now dominated by folk deities and folk rituals unassociated with any permanent structures. The penetration of the Brahmanical temple institutions in rural areas began on a low key during the tenth century but became a wide spread structural enterprise during the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries. (R.N.Nandi 1987. P.243). This seems to be related to the progressive feudalization of the state structure. As private governmental jurisdiction began to expand, the legitimizing role of the temple became more and more relevant.

The temples built in the name of Kings like Prolesvara, Betesvara Rudresvara, Ganapesvara, Mahesvara (K. Satyanarayana. 1987. P.66. P.V.P.Sastri. 1978. P.216). Shows that the deity in the temple, which is the central concept, is equated with the king, thus a Parallel world of authority is also reconstructed on the spiritual plane. It is thus parallelism between the deity and the king which authenticated and legitimized the Kingship. (M.G.S. Narayan and V.Kesavan, 1986. 366-37). The monostic movement of saivites, spear headed by the kalamukhas and Pasupathas in Andhra, during the Kakatiya period bears close relation to the changing political structure. The earliest monasteries were modest houses of mendicant groups which organized theological and sectarian classes, besides practicing various virtues. But slowly the character of monostic foundation changed, and from the close of the eleventh century the institutions developed as degenerate private organizations dominated by certain families of priests on a permanent, hereditary basis (R.N.Nandi. 1986. P.99) These families were not only big owners of landed estates, but also exercised considerable influence over a vast cross section of the subject population which owed spiritual allegiance to the saivite priest hood.

The social control wielded by these religious orders was appreciated by the rulers of Kakatiya kingdom. Subordinates of the Kakatiya state found it politically expedient to promote the monastic organizations because the religious subordination of the masses helped the rulers to perpetuate their political authority (R.N.Nandi. 1986. P 99-100). The growth of understanding between the saivite sects and the feudal administration is suggested by the formed terminology of the land charters (R,N.Nandi. 1986: 100) The records illustrate that the donors submitted to his superior, anticipating favour and security of office in return. The presents of land, money, gold and Cows which the sub-king or feudatory chief made to the pontiff were in the nature of tribute, paid to a higher authority. The donor's are invariably described "Washing" the feet of the donee which making their gifts. (Epigraphic Indica Vo.V.No.25A to 25D. Epigraphia carnatica, Vo.VII.No.416) The description is similar to the one which refers to the Vassals as offering worship or homage to the sovereign. (Ephigraphic Indica Vo. V No.4) In the earlier records dealing with gifts of land to priests and temples, the king is never referred to as subordinate to the beneficiary. Further, in most grants relating to monastic endowments the recipients of gifts is styled as the supreme lord of the world, as the commander of all kings, and also as one at whose feet all monarchs bowed their heads. (E.I.Vo. XV.No.9. Vo.V.No.25A) The subservience of the secular authority to religious authority is characteristic of the feudal relationship which is not met with in earlier official documents registering gifts of land to priests and temples. (Kesavan veluthat, 1991.4).

The alliance between the state and the Saivite monastery is also borne out by inscriptions which show that the head of the monastery is invariably the chief advisor Raju guru of the administration. (G.Yazadani. ed.1948. P. 704. Ei.Vo.V.No.25) The Raju guru who advised the being on major issues was more than a substitute for the earlier Royal, Chaplain, assisted with the Kings in the performance of domestic and public rituals and whose following included a handful of temple priests. That the combination of priests and rulers aimed at the effective control of the subject population is also evident from the involvement of priests in the executive service of the state and from the increasing appropriation of feudal offices by the select families of Brahmins, (R.N.Nandi 1991: P.102) However, historians in different periods interpreted the reasons for the legitimacy of the monarch, the ultimate basis of the monarchy stemmed from the Notion of "Karma" In Hindu religious thought, as Liberman nicely puts it, the people never asked "Why is there no necessary correlations

between reward and virtue? For in the people view the correlation was perfect. (Victor B.Lieberman 1980. P.175). To a Hindu, the doctrine of karma explains one's present status and existence as being the result of the merit that one has earned through virtuous behavior in previous incarnations.

High or low status power or slavery are not the consequence of current behavior and labour, These are consequences of previous action and there is nothing one can do to alter one's situation. One can only live virtuously in the expectations that one's position will improve in the next life. Therefore if one was born or become king or vassal chief. It was because of his Karma was the best of any in the land (Aung Thevin, 1976. PP69). Merit causes glory in the logic of Hinduism. If legitimacy stems from the monarch's Karma, then illegitimacy and the Justification for rebellion against the monarch had to stem from the bad Karmas of the incumbent. Despite the conservative nature of much Hindu thought as applied to politics it was not a doctrine, which made rebellion impossible. (Jean clade Galeyed. P.189) When an unjust or ineffective King was overthrown, he had the act of his demise interpreted in terms of the fact that his Karma was insufficient to maintain the throne, In fact the very act of his removal from office was proof not only of this but also of the fact that his successor, the leader of the revolt against him, Possessed superior, Karma and therefore rightly deserved the throne (Victor B. Lieberman. P.75). The fundamental conservation of the legitimacy principles of the state, Justified by the Hindu theory of the nature of the man, however, is revealed in this, for it was not contemplated that a different form of government other than a King. Could ever replace an unjust King or that a new King had to do more than rule justly in order to demonstrate his Karma. (Victor B.Lieberman).

### REFERENCES

- [1]. Andhra Pradesh Annual Report on Epigraphy.
- [2]. Annual Reports on Indian Epigraphy.
- [3]. Annual Reports on South Indian Epigraphy.
- [4]. Aung Thevin, 1976, Divinity, Spirit, and Human, London, 1976.
- [5]. Ayyar, C.V.N. 1936, Origin and Early History of Saivism in south India. Madras university press –Madras-
- [6]. Charles Tilly, 1986 "Reflections on the History of European State Making" in Charles Tilly (ed) The formation of National States in Western Europe. Princeton university press.
- [7]. Epigraphia Indica. Volumes.
- [8]. Jean –Clade Gale (ed) Kingship and the Kings Harvard Academy 1991 Publishers, London.
- [9]. Kesavan velu that, 1991. "Religious symbols in political legislation: The case of Early Medieval South Indian Mangalore university,
- [10]. Norman Yoffee and George Cowgill(ed) 1988, The Collapse of Ancient states and civilizations Arizona (USA).
- [11]. Narayanan M.G.S. and Kesavan "Bhakti movement in South India in D.N.Jha (ed) Feudal social formation in Early India", Oxford university press 1988.
- [12]. Nandi. R.N. Social roots of Religion in Ancient India, 1973, Religious institutions and Customs in the Deccan. Delhi.
- [13]. Nandi, 1984, "Growth of Rural Economy in Early Feudal India" Presidential address 45<sup>th</sup> IHC.
- [14]. Annamalai nagar, Chennai.
- [15]. Nandi, 1987, "Agrarian Growth and social conflicts in Early India" in D.N.Jha(ed) Feudal Social Formation in Early India. Delhi.
- [16]. Parabrahma Sastri. P.V.P. 1978, The Kakatiyas Andhra Pradesh State Museums Govt. of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.
- [17]. Rama Chandra Rao. C.V. 1990. "The Kakatiya polity, Economy and Society (Proceedings of Andhra Pradesh History congress) Warangal.
- [18]. Sarma. R.S. 1965 Indian Feudalism, Calcutta, Macmillan
- [19]. Sarma. R.S. 1981 Social changes in Early Medieval India circa, 500-1200 AD) Delhi.
- [20]. Satya Narayana, 1986. A Study of the History and Culture of the Andras Delhi.
- [21]. Sister. M.Liciera. A.C. 1974. "Emergence of Brahmanas as landed intermediaries in Karnataka" C.A.D. 1000-1300. Indian Historical Review. Vol.No.1.
- [22]. Victor B. Lieberman, 1980, "The Political significance of Religious wealth: Some Further thoughts" Journal of Asian Studies XXXIX. 4.
- [23]. William J. Kening 1978, Early-Kon being polity. London.
- [24]. Yazadani, G. 1948, Early-History of Deccan. OUP. Delhi.

IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) is UGC approved Journal with Sl. No. 5070, Journal no. 49323.

Dr. E. Sobhanbabu."The Ideology of Legitimacy of The Kakatiya State." IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS). vol. 22 no. 12, 2017, pp. 01-03.