



FORTS IN MEDIEVAL ĀNDRADĒŚA: A SPECIAL REFERENCE TO REDDI KINGS

Dr. D. Mercy Ratna Rani

Associate Professor

History, Archaeology & Culture, Dravidian University

Kuppam, Andhra Pradesh, India

Abstract

The Reddi kings ruled coastal and central Andhra for over a hundred years from 1325 to 1448 A.D. First, they were the subservient of Kākatīya kings. After the death of Pratāparudradēva and the subsequent fall of the Kākatīya Empire, the Reddi chiefs became independent and this led to the emergence of the Reddi kingdom. The Reddi kings assumed the titles like Prajāparipālanabharata, and Prajāparipālanachatura in their records. They built about eighty forts in the Krishna valley to protect Āndhradēśa from the invaders and who extended their rule over almost the present-day Andhra were considered as principal chiefs. The kingdom comprised the whole of the coastal area lying between Simhachalam in the north and Kandukur in the present Prakasam district in the south, Srisailam on the west and the sea on the east. The kings followed the practice of defending their kingdom by means of well-organised forts. There are eighty-four forts termed as thanas. Important forts of these were Kōndavīdu, Kōndapalli, Bellamkōnda, Vinukōnda, Dharanikōta, Rājahmahēndravaram, etc.

Keywords: Thānās, Rattakudi, Pura, Durga, Audaka.

Introduction

The present paper deals with the forts in medieval Āndhradēśa particularly built by Reddi kings of Kōndavīdu. They Reddi kings ruled coastal and central Andhra for over a hundred years from 1325 to 1448 A.D. It is necessary to know the brief political history of Reddi kings because they had established their power over the local or regional chieftains are given more space.

The usage of the word Rēddi specifically was first seen in the records made during the Rēnāti Chōla period (seventh century A.D.). There are numerous epigraphical references to Rēddis or Raddis as agriculturists, businessmen and administrative officials (village headman). It is generally agreed that the word Rēddi is related to Rāshtrakūta which itself is taken to be a Sanskritized form of the Dravidian word rattakudi. This community was variously referred to in the records as rattadu, rattōdi, rattagullu, rēddi, etc. Rattakudi or rattagudi seems to have been made up of two words ratta and kudi. The latter term conveys the meaning habitation or settlement. Rattakudi may, therefore, be tentatively rendered as settler in the country or cultivator as suggested by H.K. Sastry.¹ These Rēddis are mentioned in a number of records in Rayalaseema as donors.² These evidences clearly show that the term Rēddi denotes some status in the administration. The first of the Rēddi clans came into prominence as feudal lords during the Kākatīya period. After the death of Kākatīya Prataparudradēva and the subsequent fall of the Kākatīya Empire, the Rēddi chiefs became independent and this led to the emergence of the Rēddi kingdom. According to Edgar Thurston,³ Rēddis were the village chiefs and listed them under the section Kāpu. The village chiefs were given the title Rēddi. The Rēddi dynasty was established by Prōlayavēma Rēddi, also known as Kōmativēma. His ancestors served the Kākatīyās as officers in the army. Prōlayavēma Rēddi was part of the group that started a movement against invading the armies of the Delhi Sultanate in 1323 A.D. and succeeded in repulsing them from Warangal. The fall of the Kākatīya kingdom in 1323 A.D. after being subject to seized by the Tughlaq dynasty, led to a political vacuum in the Andhras. The Islamic conquerors failed to keep the region under effective control and constant infighting among themselves coupled with the martial abilities of the local Telugu warriors led to the loss of the entire region by 1347 A.D.⁴ This led to the rise of Mussunūris and Rēcharlās in the Telangana region, the Rēddis of the Panta clan in the coastal region. The Rēddis extended their kingdom from Cuttack, Orissa to the north, Kanchi to the south and Srisailam to the west. The capital of the Rēddi kingdom was Addanki. It was shifted to Kōndavīdu and then another branch of Rēddis shifted to Rajahmundry. Prōlayavēma Rēddi's rule was (A.D. 1325-A.D. 1353) characterised by the restoration of peace, patronage of the arts, literature and broad development. Errana, the translator of the Mahābhārata, lived during this period. Prōlayavēma Rēddi was succeeded by Anavōta Rēddi (A.D.1354- A.D.1364) who consolidated the kingdom extensively and established its capital at Kōndavīdu in Guntur district.⁵ Anavōta had a son by name Kumāragiri but he was very young. Hence, Anavōta's brother Anavēma (A.D. 1364-A.D.1382) came to throne. He was a great warrior and administrator. Anavēma was successful in recovering his territory from Vijayanagara kings as seen from his Śrīśailam records of A.D.1377. Kumāragiri Rēddi (A.D.1386-A.D. 1404), the son of Anavōta succeeded his uncle Anavēma. Kumāragiri Rēddi was ably assisted by Kātayavēma Rēddi, his brother-in-law, who was also the Prime Minister and general in the task of preserving the integrity and maintaining the security of the kingdom. But, he was deposed by Pēdakōmativēma Rēddi (A.D. 1404-A.D. 1420), who then governed the kingdom. Kumāragiri Rēddi and Kātayavēma Rēddi fled to Rājahmundry. The hostility between Pēdakōmativēma Rēddi and Kātayavēma Rēddi continued even after the death of Kumāragiri Rēddi. Kumāragiri Rēddi lost his life in a battle with Pēdakōmativēma Rēddi. Allāda Rēddi, a feudatory of



Cover Page



DOI: <http://ijmer.in.doi./2021/10.11.06>

Kāṭayavēma Rēddi came to the throne of Rājahmundry branch of the Rēddis. He placed Kumāragiri Rēddi III, the son of Kāṭayavēma Rēddi, on the throne of Rājahmundry. However, the hostilities between the Rājahmundry and the Kōndavīdu branches of the Rēddi ruling family continued and this provided a great opportunity to the Vēlamās, Vijayanagaras and the Bahmanis, to profit by it. Vēlugotivārivamsāvali mentions that the conflict of Kumāravēdagiri and Lingamanaidu, the Vēlama chiefs, with Pēdakōmativēma Rēddi. Thus, checkmated on all fronts, Pēdakōmativēma Rēddi could not achieve his subject of occupying Rājahmundry. But in the cultural history of the period, he occupies a unique place. He was a poet and patron of letters and was proficient in the art of music. Pēdakōmativēma Rēddi was killed in a battle of Rēcherlavēlama chiefs. He was succeeded by Rāchavēma Rēddi in A.D.1428. He was a weak and the last king of this dynasty. By the way of excessive taxation, he soon became unpopular. According to Kōndaviti Dandakavile⁶ Rāchvēma Rēddi is an oppressive ruler and he was assassinated by a soldier named Chadarapu Mallayya in A.D.1424., with him the Kōndavīdu kingdom disappeared from the political map. The Rēddis of Kōndavīdu which was occupied by the Vijayanagara rulers and the Rēddis of Rājahmundry occupied by the Gajapatis of Cuttack.

The term fort denotes; defence from the hazards of nature like rain and sun and attacks from outside. Forts are built in times of peace, designed to defend political, industrial, transportation and communication centres.⁷ Their importance is chiefly strategic, erected for the purpose of strengthening a place or position. Fort is considered as mother in a Hindu society and by their respective kings. These are political seats of the rulers. Military headquarters and civil buildings/ public buildings are located around the forts. Hence, it is administrative and defence are centre of the state. The fort is a huge structure, built of heavy and large blocks of stone, with a number of walls and halls to provide safety to the king, his family and other inmates. All forts are having similar features in the construction. According to G.T. Data in times of yore, the fortress, was a capital means defence. Defence is the major characteristic feature of the fort. The growth of the fort as a defensive structure depended to a large extent upon the contemporary trends of warfare i.e. the methods of attack and defence, the weapons used and the military organisation of the various kingdoms in different periods. In the opinion of B.P. Sinha, fort grew as an effect to the existing trends of warfare, which one of the oldest aspects human survival.⁸ He also remarks that the art of warfare evolved from the earliest times with attention paid to both offensive and defensive weapons and it continued to be the most dominant and persistent features of Indian history. The concept of fort, as a military structure, has undergone several changes from time to time in its size, methods of construction, disposition of various structures, additional defensive equipment, etc., depending on the contemporary trends of warfare viz., the methods of attack, defence, weapons and implements used.

The Vēdic literature mentioned the forts and fortifications made of stone and iron. While pura is a word of common occurrence meaning town or city, enclosed by a rampart or strong hold, durga is another word, which occurs frequently meaning hard to approach or inaccessible. The two Epics like Mahābhārata and Rāmāyana also refer to contemporary forts and fortifications (Indrastha and Ajodhya). Buddhist Jātaka and Nikaya literature also refer to forts and fortifications. According to Panini, the most important parts of a city are, moat (parikha), rampart (prākāra) and gates (dvarah), which served as the main defences. The plan of the fortified city was usually square, but also rectangular, pierced with four gates; one in the middle of each wall facing the four quarters.⁹

In Kautilya's Arthaśāstra also we find four kinds of fortifications viz., the water-fortification (audaka) such as an island in the midst of a river, a plain one surrounded by low ground; the mountainous fortification such as a rocky track or a cave; desert such as a wide track, devoid of water and over-grown with thickest in barren soil; the forest fortification (vanadurga), full of wagtail (khajana) water and thickets. Kautilya gives his prominence to hill forts and considers them as the most indisputable. A fort on a hill or mountain is of a self-defensive nature, and not easy to siege or to ascent.¹⁰ He also mentioned that, a fortress known as sthāniya shall be set up in the centre of 800 villages, a drone mukha in the centre of 400 villages, a kharvatika in the centre of 200 villages and sangrahana in the midst of a cluster of 10 villages.¹¹ A series of rules governing the construction and maintenance of forts given by Kautilya.

The vāstu vidyāchāryās or expert architects were requisitioned for testing the sites. The Arthaśāstra prescribes the digging of ditches (parikha) as the first item in the construction of forts (durga-vidhana). The moat was first built so that the earth so obtained was utilised for constructing the mud rampart (pamsu prākāra) or moulding bricks for the city wall. It also refers to the digging of three moats round the fort, having an intermediate space of danda (six feet) between each other. The Udaya Jātaka mentioned three types of moats, viz., udaka (water), kaddama (mud), and sukha (dry). Panini suggests a dēvapatha or passage above the ramparts. According to Kautilya the wide moat on the top of the parapet built along the line of battlement was called dēvapatha. The height of the brick wall above the mud rampart (prākāra) is stated to be 1m. from the ground level, on which the battlements were built. The Manusmṛiti and the Purānās like Matsya, Vāyu, Brahmanda, Agni and Vishnudharmottara, all of which ascribe a place of importance to the institution of fort, and insist upon its possession by a king. For instance, Manusmṛiti says that a king should have a fort, equipped with a spacious palace, habitable in every season and well supplied with water, weapons, money, grains and Brāhmins, artisans, and engines, fodder, etc. It considers that a Bowman placed on a rampart is a match for 100 foes and 100 bowmen for 10,000 foes.¹²



Cover Page



DOI: <http://ijmer.in/doi/2021/10.11.06>

In ancient Āndhradēsa, we understand through archaeological investigations that habitations in the Palaeolithic period were constructed on the river-banks, forest areas and in natural caves. It is revealed that these natural caves served both as habitation areas and were also used for defence purposes. The excavations at Mucchatlachintamānugavi exposed the sub terrain caves by Mesolithic men. In the next stage the Neolithic man chosen mostly to settle the terraces of the hills. In course of time, they lived in pits, probably to protect themselves from wild animals.¹³ Excavations at Uttoor¹⁴ and Nāgārjunakōnda¹⁵ attest evidence for this, in the form of post holes mean for planting stockades, suggesting the existence of barricades for small cattle pens. Similar structures were built around habitations and burial complexes at Chinnamarur and Veligōnda, clearly show that not only the Neolithic occupancy but also Megalithic culture. So, we find that defence was one of the considerations for pre-historic dwellings; it may be a cave, rock-shelter or hut, which in turn led to the construction of houses, formation of villages, towns and cities. Thus, the beginning of fort as a structure lay in pre-historic period. In the Deccan, the earliest mud fortification can be dated between 1500-1200 B.C. in the Jorwe phase, as site of Daimabad and Inamgoan.

The earliest mention of forts or fortified towns occurs in the accounts of Megasthenes followed by Pliny. Pliny mentions the Āndhra territory in the eastern Deccan as including thirty walled towns, besides numerous villages, and as maintaining an army of one lakh infantry, two thousand cavalry, and one thousand elephants. From this we learn that the Āndhras i.e., Śātavāhanās, were already a political and military force to reckon with. Several attempts have been made by scholars to locate and identify the thirty walled towns mentioned by Pliny. But it must be noted that they were spread over the entire Deccan and not confined to the limits of the present-day Telangana and Andhra Pradesh. Archaeological excavations revealed a good number of early historic sites such as Dhūlikatta, Kōtalingāla, Bodhan, Śātānikōta, Dharānikōta, and Nāgārjunakōnda brought to light well developed fortified towns.¹⁶ The forts in early Āndhradēsa were mainly built of perishable materials like mud and brick, as against stone, which became the chief material of later times. The architecture of forts depends, to a large extent, upon the building materials and methods of construction in vogue in a particular period. The earliest phase of fort architecture built of mud, morrum and brick represented by the forts of Śātavāhanās and their successors at Dhūlikatta, Dharānikōta, Nāgārjunakōnda, Kōtalingāla, Keesaragutta, etc.

Fort is considered as mother in a Hindu society and by their respective kings. These are political seats of the rulers. Military headquarters and civil buildings/public buildings are located around the forts. Hence, it is administrative and defence are centre of the state. The fort is a massive structure, built of heavy and large blocks of stone, with a number of walls and halls to provide safety to the king, his family and other inmates. All forts are having similar features in the construction.

The forts were of four kinds in accordance with the position in which they were situated namely, sthaladurgās, jaladurgās, vanadurgās, and giridurgās. Sthaladurga was an ordinary fort built on a plain and protected by a big moat around it and by a number of high enclosing walls. For example, Rājamahēndravara and Niradyapura (Nidadavol) were sthaladurgās. The remaining three were regarded as natural forts; for it was considered difficult to reduce the forts situated in forests (vanadugās), among the mountains (giridurgās) and those surrounded and protected by vast area of water around (jaladurgās), because of their location. The Reddi kings took pride on not only constructing new forts but also in reducing many. This becomes evident from the various titles borne by several kings and generals. Kātamagiri Reddi was an expert in reducing jaladurgās, and consequently he got the title jaladurga-malla. King Anvēma Reddi is extolled in his Śrīśailam record as a veritable Balarama in breaking the sthaladurgās (sthaladurga-vidalana-Balarāma), and a Raghurāma in subduing jaladurgās (jaladurga-sādhana-Raghurāma).¹⁷ Cimakuti plate of above-mentioned ruler contains another title i.e., jaladurgajalādhi-badābanalu. The Harivamsamu by Erra Praggada credits Prōlayavēma Reddi with the title Chaturvidha durga dharana Viharanōdarundu.¹⁸ His son Anapōta Reddi is said to have built a new capital at Kōndavīdu and named it Kundinapura and shifted his headquarters from Addanki.¹⁹ The Drāksharāma record describes him as Dvipijēta i.e., the conqueror of Divi.²⁰

The Reddis of Kōndavīdu built nearly eighty-four forts like Dhānyavati or Dhrānikōta (Amarāvati), Nāgārjunakōnda, Dhanadaprōlu (Tsandavōl), Vinukōnda, Kōndavīdu, Kōndapalli and Bellamkōnda and stationed garrisons in places of strategic importance. Following are the important forts of Reddi kings.

Kōndavīdu fort²¹ is a historically significant ancient hill fortress located in Kōndavīdu in Chilakaluripet of Guntur district of Andhra Pradesh. It is located 16 miles west of the city of Guntur. It is surrounded by dense forests. Apart from this main fort, there are two other forts, names not known nearby. Kōndavīdu fort was built by Prōlayavēma Reddi. It was used as the capital by the Reddi dynasty between 1328 and 1482 A.D. shifting from their former capital at Addanki.²² He was the founder of the dynasty who ruled till 1353, strengthened the defences of his kingdom by building a number of forts. They are Dhrānikōta, Dhanadaprōlu (Tsandavōl), Vinukōnda, Kōndavīdu, Kōndapalli and Bellamkōnda. Early on 2019, remains of the Buddhist stūpa were found under a dilapidated Hindu temple at Kōndavīdu fort.²³ The remains date back to the later Śātavāhana period 1st to 2nd century A.D. The discovery pushes back of the history of Kōndavīdu to the Śātavāhana period.



Cover Page



DOI: <http://ijmer.in/doi./2021/10.11.06>

The three forts on top of the narrow hill range are now in ruins; the earliest built fort is dated to the twelfth century A.D. The main fort built by the Reddi dynasty and refurbished by subsequent rulers, located at a height of nearly 320 mts (1,050ft) was considered then as one of the strongest forts in the region. Twenty-one structures have been identified within the fort. Its fortifications built with granite stones comprise huge ramparts, magazines, warehouses, granaries, Tanisha mahal, extensive cloisters, masjids, ashurkhana, peerlu chavadi, wells, etc. According to Capt. Stevens, it was so extensive that it would require an army rather than a garrison to hold it.²⁴ There are two entry gates into the forts called the Kolepalli Darwaza and Nadella Darwaza. The entrance gate is three storied massive and made of granite stone blocks.

The fortifications consist of two walls and called puttakōta and khila. There are also a number of high towers, and battlements that are loopholes for musketry. The Gajapativai Vrittatamu mentions that there were several bastions (buruzus) known as kommas or uprights, arched hood stones and mattadas in the fort of Kōndavīdu.²⁵ A building with rock pillars and covered with rock slabs, has 116 mts (366ft) long inscriptions. A defence bunker is also seen.

The source of water supply to the inhabitants of the fort was from three sources namely the Mutyalamma chēruvu, the Puttamma chēruvu and the Vedulla chēruvu. The Reddi kings also dug wells at Kōndavīdu like Kattulabāvi, Lankelabāvi, Kanyakalabāvi, and Jeddigalabāvi.

On the way to the fort at Kothapalem, known as Puttapalem in the past, at the foot hill of the fort, an embankment is seen which is inferred as a security ring bund to protect the royal family palaces and houses of the main functionaries of the fort. The fort ruins on the south west side of the Kōndavīdu village is in the shape of an equilateral triangle, and at the turning angles of the triangle at south-west and north-east, tower bastions are provided, which form part of the facade wall of the fort. The length of a single wall is of 30kms. straddles the hills.²⁶ A temple known as the Gopinathaswami lies at the fort of the hill; its bunged stone pillars are carved out of a single rock. Both Hindu and Muslim architectural styles are seen in the fort. A mosque is also located within the fort. Vānapalli (Amalapuram taluk of the Godavari district) plates of Anavēma Reddi mentioned Kondavīdu, a hill-fort in the Narasaraopeta taluk of Krishna district.²⁷ But the record did not give any details about the hill fort.

In view of its strength, it became a goal of attack for all the three super powers in the Deccan and it changed hands often, after the fall of the Reddi kingdom in 1424 A.D. In 1424 A.D. it was captured by Kapilēśvara Gajapati, as is evidenced by a record mentioning Gandēva. It changed hands between the Gajapatis and the Vijayanagara before being captured by Pratāparudra Gajapati. From him it went into the hands of Krishnadēvarāya in 1515 A.D. During the reign of Krishnadēvarāya Kōndavīdu enjoyed the status of a rājya or province. After its capture, Krishnadēvarāya appointed his Prime Minister Sāluva Timma as governor who in turn appointed his son-in-law Nāvendla Gōpa as his kāryakerta²⁸ A record from Bezawada dated 1516 mentions that rāyasam Kōndamarusu governed Kōndavīdu rājya and was succeeded towards the end of his reign in 1529 A.D. by rāyasam Ayyaparasa.²⁹ The Kōndavīdu fort later used by the French and the British as a garrison.

Kōndapalli³⁰ is a historical village located 20 kms. from Vijayawada in Krishna district of Andhra Pradesh. The Kōndapalli hill ranges are a part of the Eastern Ghats. The entire range is covered with thick reserve forest, lush green trees, minerals and medicinal plants. Historically, it was on limelight for more than three centuries and during the reign of the Reddy kings of Kōndavīdu, it reached the zenith of its glory. It was planned and constructed according to the ancient principles of durga vāstu to fulfil the concise feature of giridurga (hill fort). The fortification begins at the fort of the hillock, rectangular on plan, with the passage connected to the road from Ibrahimpatnam and Mylavaram. It is interesting to note that the main and the outer fortification wall run to a length of 5 kms. connecting the peaks of seven hills locally known as Gollaparagutta, Yarrakōndagutta, Yadlakōnda, etc., which is a unique feature of the fort. It is well planned for defending the borders, commercial routes, sea-ports, and river crossings as it was strategically positioned on the lucrative trade route from Machilipatnam to Golconda. It became one of the active forts of the Reddi kings of Kōndavīdu. It is well defended with an outer, middle and inner fortification wall consisting of twenty-seven bastions making it to unassailable.

The Balayapalli grant of Macha Reddi belonging to the reign of Pedakōmativēma Reddi dated A.D. 1404 states that Macha Reddi fortified Kōndapalli and make it his capital. But a recently found inscription engraved on the lintel of one of the gateways mentioned that Kōndapalli was built at the behest of Komaragiri by one Dinakara Reddi in A.D.1394.³¹ In its cay, the fort was a bone of contention between the Reddis and the Velamas of Rāchakōnda. Like the capital Kōndavīdu, Kōndapalli also went into the possession of Gajapathi kings of Kalinga (Orissa), particularly Kapilēśvara Gajapathi who had control over the Kōndapalli for twenty-seven years. However, in 1516 A.D. Vijayanagara king Krishnadēvarāya captured the fort of Kōndapalli. Under the Vijayanagara kings, it enjoyed the status of rājya or province according to an inscription at Bezawada dated 1516 A.D.³² after its capture from Gajapatis, Krishnadēvarāya entrusted the fort of Kōndapalli to Rāyasam Kōndamarasa.



The literary and the epigraphical documents of the time allude to the hill-fort of **Nāgārjunakōnda**, which was built possible by the Reddi kings as one of the peripheral garrisons protecting the main stronghold at Kōndavīdu, then the nerve-centre of the lower Krishna delta.³³ The ruins of the hill-fort Nāgārjunakōnda mentioned in several Vijayanagara inscriptions, embrace the entire length and breadth of the hill. At places its walls, running along the edges of the hill, still retain a height of 6m with an average width of 5.33 m with bastions at regular intervals and six gateways, once guarded by barbicans, the original fortification must have had an imposing look. The main entrance is to the hill-fort from the north-east through a passage leading up to the entrance formed by two colonnaded platforms. There were secret paths in the form of ramps and winding flights of steps as well. In the construction of the fort several sculptural pieces were re used; a panel showing the sapta-mātrikās came from one of the fallen debris of the wall. Covering an area of about 3^{1/2} km. the fort had three different enclosures, still now almost intact. The eastern sector (first enclosure), within which now stands the museum, has two temples and a large well. There are also traces of residential houses used possibly as barracks. A wide rubble-wall., with a circuitous entrance in the centre, separates the eastern from the middle sector (second enclosure), the latter also with remains of rubble-houses meant for army chiefs, two small wells and a stone temple. No less impressive was the dividing wall between the middle sector and the western sector (third enclosure) overlooking the river, Krishna. A flight of steps connects the river bank with this part of the fort.

The epigraphical records mentioned that the Gajapati chiefs of Orissa were in occupation of the fort for a fairly long period unit Krishnadēvarāya conquered it, defeating the Gajapati Pratāparudra in about 1515 A.D. and placed the fortress under the charge of the two generals, Virabhadrayya and Ayyalayya. But it was Rāmarāya who renovated it in about 1565 A.D. using the material of some dilapidated shrines in the neighbourhood. In all likelihood, the present layout of the fort owed its origin largely to Rāmarāya.³⁴

Virakutam is identical with the present Viraghattam in the Palakonda taluk of Visakhapatnam district. It contains the remains of a considerable mud fort in which are now located in same district.³⁵

The Srisailam record of Anavēma Reddi credits him with the title Raja Mahendra Niravadya Bahuvudha Sthala Durga Varga Vidalana Balarama (like the mythical here Balaram in routing many kings of land forts) and Sagara Gautami Salila Sangrama Sakala Jala Durga Sadhna Raghurama (like Raghurama who subdued forts built at the confluence of the sea and the river Gautami) We learn of a durgadhayaksha, or for commandant called Ketaya Mallinathunivema, ruling over Dharanikota.³⁶ The island fort at Mōtupalli was governed by Sōmaya.

A tax called durga rakshana pannu meant for protecting forts was also levied.³⁷ As for as the Andhra epigraphs are concerned, we find across words Durga, Giridurga and Staladurga in various inscriptions. Andhra Pradesh consists of more of Giridurgas and less of Staladurgas. The Vijayanagara king Krishnadēvarāya who captured the above-mentioned forts in 1515 A.D. and was followed by the Gajapatis and Qutubshahis. The reign was also under the rule of the British, French and the Asafjabs who had used these forts for the defence purpose. Colonial buildings were built by both the Dutch and the British in Machilipatnam and Vijayawada.

References

1. B. CH. Chhabra, (Ed. 1985), *Epigraphia Indica*, XXVII, The Government of India, New Delhi, p.231
2. P.V. Parabrahma Sastry (1977), *Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh, Cuddapah, Part-I*, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad, p.17 & II. P.134
3. Edgar Thurston (1909), *Castes and Tribes of South India*, Government Press, Madras
4. Talbot Cynthia (2001), *Pre-Colonial India in Practice: Society, Religion and Identity in Medieval Andhra*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, p.176
5. Ibid. p.177
6. Kondaviti Dandakavile (Tel), p.7&56
7. N.S. Ramachandramurthy (1979), *Forts in Andhra Pradesh*, Bharatiya Kala Prakashan, Delhi, p.71
8. B.P. Sinha, (1941), *Art of War in Ancient India* (Article from *Studies in the Cultural History of India*), Dharwar, pp. 59-60
9. H.S. Bhatia, (2001), *Political, Legal and War Philosophy of Ancient India*, Deep Publications, New Delhi, p.75
10. Kautilya's *Arthashastra* (1992), New Delhi, Penguin Books, pp.349-350
11. Ibid. p.63
12. K. Ramamohan Rao (1992), *Perspective of Archaeology, Art and Culture in Early Andhradesa*, Pradeep Kumar Goel for Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi, p.66
13. E. Siva Nagi Reddi (1998), *Building Technology in Early Andhra*, Hyderabad, p.179
14. F. R. Allchin & N. Ramesan (1995), *Utnoor Excavations*, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad, p.65
15. R. Subrahmanyam, *Nagarjunakonda, 1956-60*, Delhi, 1975, p.98



Cover Page



DOI: <http://ijmer.in.doi./2021/10.11.06>

16. N.R.V. Prasad (Ed.), Journal of Archaeology, Satavahana Special, Vol. III, No.2, The Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad,1995, p.155
17. M. Somasekhara Sarma (1948), History of the Reddi Kingdoms, Second Edition, Facsimile Publisher, Waltair, p.245
18. Erra Peggada's Harivilasam, V. Ramaswamy Sastrulu (Ed.), Madras, p.2
19. M. Somasekhara Sarma, Op.Cit., p.104
20. South Indian Inscriptions (1923), Vol. IV, Archaeological Survey of India, No.1387
21. E. Hultzsch (1979), Epigraphia Indica, Vol. III, Archaeological Survey of India, New Delhi, pp.66-69
22. Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vol. V, 2009, p.393
23. Jonathan, P. Samuel, Buddhist Remains found at Kondavidu fort, The Hindu, ISSN. 071-751X,2019, 6th May
24. Gordon Makenzie (1883), Manual of Krishna District in the Presidency of Madras (Lawrence Asylum Press, Madras
25. Gordon Makenzie (1882), Manuscripts, Vols. 32, 33, 34, 39, 40, Calcutta
26. Singh Rajinder Pal (2009), Census of India,1991, Vol. VI, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad, p.12
27. E. Hultzsch (1979), Op.Cit., pp. 59-60
28. Butterworth and Venugopala Chetty (2006), Nellore District Inscriptions, Reprint, Vols. II, Caxton Publication, New Delhi, No.75
29. Ibid. Vol. I, No.53
30. R. Soma Reddy (Ed), Late Medieval Andhra Pradesh A.D.1324-1724, Tulika Books, 2014, p.279
31. N.S. Ramachandra Murthy, Op.Cit., p.150
32. G.S.Gai (1972), South Indian Inscriptions, Vol. XVI, Archaeological Survey of India, New Delhi, No.54
33. H. Sarkar and Misra, B.N., Nagarjunakonda (1999), Archaeological Survey of India, New Delhi, p.18
34. Ibid. pp.51-52
35. M. Somasekhara Sarma, Op.Cit., p.132
36. V. Apparao (Ed.), Reddi Sanchika, Rajahmundry, 1947, p.59
37. M. Somasekhara Sarma, Op.Cit.