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Before proceeding to study the character and nature of forts of the Medieval period, it is necessary to examine their antiquity and evolution through the preceding periods. In order to do this we have to depend largely upon Archaeological sources i.e., excavated remains, epigraphical references and sculptural representations. But it must be noted that the evidence of excavated remains like ramparts, bastions and towers is confined only to the early or ancient period i.e., Śātavāhana and post Śātavāhana, while in the case of subsequent periods we have to rely only upon the information supplied by various epigraphs which refer to the capital cities that were fortified. In this context it may also be noted that forts in Ancient Andhra appear to be comparatively later in origin and followed almost the same principles and pattern in their constructions as in North India in matters of selecting the site, choosing suitable building materials, laying out their plan and design etc. The reasons for this are not far to seek, for, we know that the political history of Andhra Deśa begins much later than in North India and was hence influenced to a large extent by the already existing examples of fortifications in the North.

SECTION I:
Antiquity:

The earliest mention of forts or fortified towns in Andhra
occurs in the accounts of Megasthenes followed by Pliny. The latter states that they "The Andrae (Andhras) had possessed thirty walled towns, numerous villages, and an army of 100,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalry and 1,000 elephants". From this we learn that the Andhras i.e. Sātavāhanas the earliest rulers of the Andhra Country were already a strong political and military force to reckon with. Originally, being the feudatories or subordinates of the imperial Mauryas of Magadha, they slowly expanded their power and authority and rose to imperial position in Deccan when Kanha or Krishna, the second member of the Purānic genealogy declared independence. Their empire at its zenith comprised the whole of Deccan and hence they were known as "Dakshināpatha patis". Several attempts have been made by scholars to locate and identify the 30 walled towns mentioned by Pliny. But it must be noted that they are spread over the entire Deccan and not confined to the limits of the present day Andhra Pradesh alone. Apart from their capital cities Dharanikota in Guntur district, Andhra Pradesh and Paithān in Aurangabad district, Maharashtra, a number of other sites of the same period have come to light as a result of a number of archaeological discoveries. To mention a few are Tagara in Kolhapur district, Junna and other sites in the valley of Ghod river in Pune district, Nevasa on the river Pravara, Bahal on Girnar also in Maharashtra, Khandesh and Maheshwar in Central India. In Andhra Pradesh also a few sites of the same period have been discovered by the state department of Archaeology and Museums.
Notable among them are Peddabahkūr, Dhūlikaṭṭa, Kōṭalingāla in Karimnagar district and Poolakonda in Warangal District.

SECTION II:

Dharanikōta: is also known as Dhamnakada, Dhanakada, Dhānyakataka and Dharanikōta in inscriptions and literature. Situated on the southern bank of river Krishna, a little over 20 miles higher up than Bezawāda near Amaravatī, it was first noticed by Colonel Colin Mackenzie in 1797. He calls it as "Durnacotta" which according to him "was however an impressive ruins". He described it as being "surrounded on all four sides by a massive embankment of earth and broken brick and stones, about 650 yards on each side, the west side being a little shorter and irregular and owing to a curve in the river bank". This embankment marks the site of the ancient walls of what must have been the Citadel of a city and a place of considerable strength in early times. The ancient city of Dharanikōta is said to have extended 3 1/2 miles in length, on the west to the village of Muttayapalem and on the East to a small Pagoda of Peddantiyamman on the road to Vaikunthapuram. These places are each about 1 3/4 miles from the centre of Dharanikota. On the south the extent is not precisely known but it is supposed that it did not extend beyond Nakkadevara Dinne. He also says that "at a distance of 500 yards from the western end of the town of Amaravatī is situated Durnacotta. . . . . . . " The vestiges of this ancient fort indicate that it has been a place of some strength; the walls appear amazing thick and of considerable elevation. Its form is
that of a square, but somewhat irregular to the north, the space between which and Kistna is adorned with small gardens. The embankments on this side are much higher and divided by Nullahs which run into the river. He further says that "The dimensions of each side of the fort are about 630 yards. The gateways appear to have stood opposite each other in eastern and western directions. The quantity of bricks said to have been dug up and the abundance of small pieces with which the excavations are filled, give every reason to suppose that it was a brick construction, the walls of which appear to have been 25 feet thick. The surface of the ground within is very uneven in one part in particular where the Nullah takes its passage, the slopes on either side of it are very considerable." 8

The above account of Mackenzie is corroborated by the depiction of an ancient Indian city in the carvings at Sanchi and Amaravati with a wall and a moat adjoining. "An interesting coping stone of a rail, offers a very elaborate representation of the outskirts of a city with a gate house surrounded by a brick wall, above which many storied buildings and towers raise their heads." 9 A somewhat analogous scene with an open court yard in front bounded by two projecting towers and an entrance gateway on the side is seen in a Medallion from Amaravati. 10 Gate towers of the cities occur in the sculptures at Amaravati which Kumaraswamy has identified as the cities of Kasināra and Benaras which have the characteristic moat, walls in bricks circular in shape evidently round the boundaries of
According to Sri C. Sivarama Murty, the Prākāra or wall is nowhere fully shown in Amarāvati, from which the absence of a moat (Parikha) can be understood. The gateways break the continuous line of Prākāra. The tōrāṇa and Gōpura known as Bahirdvāra and puradvāra (outer and inner entrances) of the city respectively are represented. The Gōpura of the city inner entrance had three important adjuncts like the tower (Aṭṭa, Aṭṭāla, Aṭṭālaka) rampart wall (prākara) and arched gateway.

The above account enables us to get a general picture of the fort of Dharanikōta as it stood in the Śatavāhana period. But we do not know anything about its shape or plan and about its other architectural adjuncts like bastions, parapet wall or palace complex. Similarly it is also not known whether the plan of gateway was plain and simple without entwining turns or complex as in the case of forts of the Medieval period. Even Archaeological excavations conducted at the site in 1962-63 do not help us in the matter. A cutting laid across the western side of the fort brought to light seven structural phases, the earliest being dated to 3rd-2nd C. B.C. The final phase belongs to the Ikshvāku period which saw the embankment converted into a defensive wall, after which it had been abandoned. But subsequent excavations conducted in 1974 brought to light some striking results. In the earliest levels of Dharanikōta and in the earliest strata of Pd I at Amarāvati were discovered profuse quantities of N.B.P. ware.
The N.B.P. at Dharanikōta has a date range of 405 ± 95 B.C. to 145 ± 100 B.C.\textsuperscript{15}. The C14 dates obtained for Dharanikōta are as follows.\textsuperscript{16}

1. T.F.:246: Early Historic period 2,355 ± 95 (2,425 ± 100) B.P. DKT-I layer 11 (475 ± 100) B.C.

2. T.F.:247: Early Historical period 2,275 ± 100 (2,340 ± 100) B.P. DKT layer 8 (390 ± 100) B.C.

3. T.F.:248: Early Historical period II 2,095 ± 100 (2,155 ± 100) B.P. (Fortifications) (205 ± 100) B.C.

From the above study of the Archaeological material, it is clear that the fortifications of Dharanikōta belong to the middle of 4th-3rd C.B.C. and is a younger contemporary of North Indian forts like Kauśāmbi\textsuperscript{17} 500 ± 105 B.C., Ujjain 450 ± 95 B.C., Vāranāsī\textsuperscript{18} 400 ± 110 B.C., Rājagir\textsuperscript{20} 266 ± 105 B.C., Śravasti\textsuperscript{21} 275 ± 200 B.C., Vaisāli 2nd C. B.C.\textsuperscript{22} and Sisupalgarh 200 ± 100 B.C.\textsuperscript{23}. Further it falls under the first two categories of the traditional classification of forts viz., Sthala and Jala durgas for it fully satisfies the requisite qualifications of being situated on a plain terrain and on the banks of a river. Even the very name of the place indicates that it was a Sthala durga. The absence of a moat or Parikha may be explained due to its situation on river bed of Krishna. In this respect it appears to stand in close parallel to the fort of Pātalīputra which also stands at the confluence of two rivers namely Ganges in the North and Son in the South and West. From this it appears that the builders of the fort of Dharanikōta were guided by the already existing example of Pataliputra, the Capital of Magadha. This is further supported by the fact that other fortified towns
of the same period in Deccan like Paithan in Aurangabad district in Maharashtra and Kotalingala in Karimnagar district, Andhra Pradesh are also situated on the banks of the river Godavari. Dhulikatta is a small village of special importance in Peddapalli taluk of Karimnagar district in Andhra Pradesh. Here lies a huge Sātavāhana fort extending over an area of about 36 acres of land. Preliminary excavations conducted at this site revealed a mud fortification and brick wall over rubble foundation with 6 courses running in North-South direction. The wall, according to excavators, appeared to be a portion of the gateway to the fort, as another trench laid parallelly also revealed a brick wall with the same orientation. The bricks measure 53 x 30 x 10 cms. Few postholes over the brick structures are also noticed. The width between the walls is 10 mts. and width of the wall is 1.60 mts. Trench V laid across the western bund of the rain gully revealed 7 layers including natural morum. Layers 2 and 3 yielded typical Sātavāhana wares. Trench VI in the South East corner across the fortification mound brought to light at a depth of 3 mts. a deep moat around the fort on the outside.

Further excavations conducted during the field season 76-77 exposed the full view of the southern gateway, guard rooms and adjoining structures. The gate complex consisted of a series of guard rooms in two rows facing each other with a central path way to serve as in and out let to the fort. The total
length of outer walls running in North-South direction measured 15.30 mts. The structure above it is raised across the mud fortification. The middle path way was probably provided with doors at either end to regulate entrance to the fort.

There are 3 guard rooms of 6 x 30 x 3 mts. in each row outside the main gate in the South is another brick structure of an earlier phase. The extant western wing of the above structure with recesses and projections is Swastika in plan.

"In the middle of the rampart about 100 mts. North of the gateway was traced a palace complex which revealed 5 phases of structural activity."

From the above study it becomes clear that Dhulikatāṭa began its existence in the pre-Satavahana period and became a nucleus of political activity during the Satavahana period. The evidence of structural remains is supplemented by the pottery found at various levels in different phases.

Satanikotai is situated in Nandikotkur taluk of Kurnool district, on the right bank of the river Tungabhadra. The name of the place itself appears to be a corrupt form of Satavahani kōṭa' which indicates its being fortified place in the Satavahana period. The mound situated to the west of the village yielded on the surface postsherds of Black and Red ware, thick necked jar rims etc. Trench III taken at the western side on the top of the mound in North-South and East-West directions and dug up to the natural soil, revealed two occupational deposits beneath the surface humus of 10 cms. thickness which could be assigned to the early historical and medieval periods.
The only evidence of habitation available for the site is pottery which consists of thin necked jar rims and carinated bowls etc. Both thick grained and thin grained are represented. 

Bodhani\textsuperscript{26} is another place of antiquity in Nizamabad district Andhra Pradesh. In the early Jātaka literature it is styled as Potali, Podana, and Paudanya, the capital of Asmaka and Bahudhānya in medieval inscriptions. The country in which it lies corresponds to Asmagai of Pliny. The existence of a huge earthen mound leads us to surmise that it must have been a strong fortified city during the Sātavāhana period.

From the above study of a few fortified sites of the Sātavāhana period we understand that the art of fortification was well known in ancient Andhra. Further the fortifications were not confined to the capital city alone but were spread over different parts of the empire including those of the feudatory chiefs.

SECTION II: 
Post-Sātavāhana period: 

Consequent on the decline and fall of the Sātavāhana empire, in the middle of 3rd C. A.D. rose to power a number of erstwhile feudatories like the Ikshvākus, Śālaṅkāyanās, Pallavas, Brihatphalāyanas and Vishmukunādis. To this period belonged the fortified capitals of Vijayapuri, Vēngi, Kudūra, Kāndārapura, Keesaragutta, and Lendulūra.
Vijayapuri: 27

This place is identical with modern Nāgarjunakoṇḍa in the Krishna valley of Guntur district. Archaeological excavations conducted here between 1955-60 revealed numerous structures of early historic period. "Of them, the citadel with its grand fortification wall, ditch, gates, and barracks is indeed very important. The citadel wall which encloses a trapezoidal area of 3000' x 2000', ran along the right bank of river Krishna, in the west, at an average distance of about 350' from it, while on the South it over lay the Pedda Kundella Gutta Hill. Trenches laid accross the wall showed two phases of construction - the first or lower represented by a rampart of mud or muram about 80' wide at the base resting on natural soil, while the second was represented by a brick wall about 9' to 14' thick generally built either on the existing rampart or on a secondary filling over it. The fortification wall was surrounded by a ditch 12' deep and varying from 74' to 132' in width. It is provided with two gateways one each in the Eastern and Western sides and a narrow postern gate on the North. Outside the Western Gateway of the citadel the existence of an outer work or Barbican was suggested by a strong brick wall 6 to 7 ft. in height and 3 to 4 ft. in width. Exploration revealed that the area had four fortifications - the first built of rubble, stood at the entrance of the valley from the East. The second, archaeologically most important, enclosed the citadel of the Ikshvākus. Sections cut across this defensive wall revealed two phases. In Phase I the
wall consisted of only heaped up mud and muram with a wide
ditch on all sides except in the South. In Phase II a brick
wall with an average width of 11' was built over the first
rampart. A retaining wall along the inner slope of the rampart
protected the filling below. the foundation of the brick wall,
while rubble packing strengthened its outer face. The third
fortification wall is built of rubble on the summit of
Siddaladari hill. The last, of medieval construction ran over the
top edge of the Nāgarjuna Hill. It was divided into three zones,
their partition walls and six gates approached by ramps and
steps running through well guarded outworks."

Vēngi or Vengipura corresponding to modern Peda Vegi near
Ellore in West Godavary district was the seat of power of the
Śālaṅkāyanas as we know, from their copper plate charters. It is
referred to as BENAGOURON situated in the country of SALEKENOI
by Ptolemy in 2nd C. A.D. Yuan Chwang who visited this part
of the country in 7th C. A.D. calls it as PING-KI-L0, the
capital of ANTO-LO or Andhra. We also find its mention in
the Allahabad prasasti of Harisēna, while describing the
Southern exploits of his master Samudragupta in the later half
of 4th C. A.D. Since then Vēngi continued to enjoy a place
of Political importance in the history of Āndhra Dēśa and even
a dynasty that ruled over it latter, i.e. Eastern Chālukyas came
to be called after it as Chālukyas of Vēngi. The fact that it
still contains some antiquarian remains of interest points
evidence to its being a fortified city. There are evidences of
extensive ancient remains here and many curious mounds which
Sir Walter Elliott thinks "probably cover the remains of the
old city. 31

Kudūra: Next in order, comes Kudūra in Krishna district. Ptolemy calls it as Kodoura. 32 From the Kondamudi plates of Jayaraman we learn that it was the capital city of the Brihatphalāyanas, 33 who ruled over the kingdom, comprising the region on either side of the river Krishna near its mouth, corresponding to modern Gudivāda and Baniar taluks of Krishna district and Repalle and Tenali taluks of Guntur district.

Leṇḍulūra: or modern Denduluru is yet another town of antiquity in West Godavary district, that we come across in the Chikkulla plates of Vikramāndiravarman of Vyṣṇukūṇḍi family. 34

Keesaragutta 35 To the same period also is ascribed a newly discovered fortified site, Keesaragutta about 40 Kms. from Hyderabad, by Dr. V.V.Krishna Sastry. According to him "a thorough exploration over the plain surfaces of the hill revealed an extensive fortification wall, around the periphery encompassing an approximate area of 3 to 4 Sq. Kms. The fort wall was constructed over rubble foundation and the super structure was raised with brick which one assessed 50 x 25 x 8 cms. At most of the places, the rubble wall was divested of the brick super structure; but the fallen brick is visible along the entire length of the fortification wall; ............................. The fort was provided with three main gates on the east, west, and north; prefaced by strategic secondary walls to stop direct on slaught of enemy's forces. The
natural precipices of the hill, were utilised as natural barriers and the vulnerable points were plugged by constructing ramparts. This is supported by the pottery which consisted of black, grey, mattered, red, and red slipped and black slipped wares. Further the site also yielded many Vishnukundin coins with squatting lion on the obverse and poornaghata flanked by two lamp stands on the reverse. The above evidence is corroborated by a terracotta linga and two lable inscriptions engraved in Telugu characters datable to Vishnukundī period as they resemble those in the records of Mādhava Varma II.

Pishtāpura: or modern Pithapuram in East Godavari district is another fortified town in ancient Andhra. It finds mention for the first time in the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta and is said to have been captured by him. Again the Aihole inscription of Pulakēśin II, the western Chālukya king of Bādāmi, mentions it as captured by him from the Durjayas who were holding sway over the region. The Maruturu plates of Pulakēśin II issued in his 8th regnal year, make explicit reference to his capture of Pishtapura by seizure.

While the above-mentioned are some of the sthala durgas (Land forts) of the traditional classification, we also find reference to the existence of a Jala durga or Island fort at Kolleru, near Ellore, in West Godavari district. The Allahabad pillar inscriptions calls it as Kusala lake, while the Aihole inscription of Pulakēśin II refers clearly to the
existence of a Jaladurga there. Its continued existence even in the subsequent periods i.e. medieval period, is known through the chelluru plates of Chalukya Chola king Kulottunga II dated 91066, where it is referred to as Sarasipuri of Kolanu whose chief at the time was Kāṭamanāyaka.

From the foregoing study it is clear that the art of fortification continued in the post Satavahana period also. Although direct references to forts or fortified cities are lacking in the literature and epigraphs of the period, the evidence of archaeological excavations proves the point. Further testimony is provided by the writings of foreign travellers like Megasthenes, Pliny and Ptolemy. However the meagre evidence of archaeological excavations, and the representation of an ancient Indian city in the sculptural carvings at Dharanikōta, do not give us a complete picture of the fort, with all its architectural adjuncts like bastions, towers, etc., as prescribed by Kautilya. Further we also do not have any idea about the plan or shape of the fort. But according to the account of Col. Mackenzie, "it was square in form".

This meagre defensive equipment of the fort, like bastions, towers, turrets, loopholes etc. lead us to believe that siege warfare or direct attack against enemies' forts was comparatively less prevalent as against the prevailing phenomenon of land battles, at a chosen site or terrain. This again leads us to the surmise that, during this period the terms fort and town were one and the same i.e. every town or city of importance was invariably fortified. The comparative
absence of siege warfare reduced the incidence of attack on forts considerably, and hence, the defensive equipment and machinery of these forts was less, when compared to the huge and magnificent fort complexes of the medieval period. The absence or near absence of the Giri durgas or hill forts may also be attributed to the above reason, which of course is conditioned by a number of other factors like geography, geology and contemporary trends of warfare. Bastions do not appear to be in existence during this period for which evidence is wanting.

As regards the building materials, mud or morum and brick appear to be the main materials of construction as seen at Dharanikota, Nagarjunakonda and Keesaragutta. Coming to the organization and maintenance of forts, we suffer from paucity of material. Forts, during this period appear to have occupied a place of lesser importance in the body politic, or in the four-fold division of the army into infantry, cavalry, elephants, and chariots. The main reason for this appears to be that, forts in this period, were considered as centres of political authority being the residences of imperial rulers or kings, and not centres of military power, as war fare was not centred round towns or capital cities. Kautilya prescribes a series of rules governing the construction and maintenance of forts. He mentions, the office of ‘antapāla’ to command a fort, and refers to a revenue from forts, and lists a series of toll duties, as coming under the head of forts. It is not known
to what extent the above rules were followed by the Satavahanas or their successors. The Satavahanas divided their empire into several āhāras and rāṣṭrās or rāṭṭikas, each of which was governed by an amātya or governor, besides several feudatories like Mahārathis and Mahā Bhājas, who were perhaps holding the charge of forts also. The post Satavāhana period, saw the rise of several petty principalities, small in size and extent, which were governed by the kings themselves directly and hence did not require a separate office to look after forts.

The next period that draws our attention is the Chālukyan period, from the beginning of the 6th century A.D. to the 11th Century A.D. During this period, Rāyalaseema and parts of Telangāna were under the sway of the main line (viz) the western Chālukyas of Bādāmi, and their successors i.e. Rāṣṭrakūtas, while coastal Andhra remained under the Eastern Chālukyas of Vēngi. Extant structural remains of forts belonging to this period are almost absent, and we have to depend only upon epigraphical references.

Chālukyas of Bādāmi ruled for nearly 2 centuries from the middle of the 6th to 8th century A.D. It was during this period in the reign of Pulakēsin II that Andhra country came for the first time under the authority of the Chālukyas of Bādāmi, when he is said to have subdued several kingdoms one after another, viz., the Eastern Gāṇgas of Kālinga, the Pallevas, Vishnukundis etc. Their kingdom at that time was divided into several vishayas as Tōrāmarā Vishaya, Pedekallu vishaya, Pāṅgunāra vishaya etc. each of which was entrusted to the rule
of either the governor or a feudatory. A few inscriptions even mention an office called Māndalika or Mandalādhīpati whose status is equivalent to that of a governor. All capital cities of the period, including those of the subordinates were heavily fortified. From the Aihole inscription of Pulakesin II we learn that he captured the forts of Pisṭapura and Kunāla, modern Kolleru, a jala dūrga. Another important fort that flourished during the period is Guttī in Anantapur district, situated in Tūrūmāra Vishaya and ruled by his Bāna feudatories.

Eastern Chālukyas of Vēṇgi

Pulakesin II, immediately after the successful completion of his eastern campaign in Vēṇgi, appointed his younger brother Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana, to rule over the newly conquered territories, independently of the main line. Thus came into authority a new power in Coastal Andhra, called the Eastern Chālukyas of Vēṇgi, who exercised their sway over the region, for well over a period of 5 centuries. Information about the forts that flourished during the period is quite meagre. However the Addanki inscription of Pāndaranga, the celebrated Brāhmaṇa general of Gunaṇa Vījayaḍitya III, provides us some useful information. According to it, Vījayaḍitya III Gunaṇa, despatched an army under the command of his general, Pāndaranga, in 848-'49 A.D. the very first year of his coronation, against Bōya Kottams, which lay in the present Northern taluks of Nellore district. The Bōyas, an original tribe, inhabited the hill tracts along the North eastern frontier of the Pallava kingdom in 8th-9th century A.D. and their
territory consisted of 12 Kottams, of which Kaṇḍukūru, modern Kaṇḍukūru, in the present Prakasam district, and Kaṭṭemu, were the most important strongholds. Pāndaraṅga according to the above record, accompanied by the forces of the feudatory chiefs, proceeded against the 12 Bōya Kottams, brought them to subjection, by dismantling the fort of Kaṭṭemu and established himself at Kaṇḍukūru, which he made as beautiful as Bezawāḍa.

Another important fort that we find, during the period is Nellūru modern Nellore, a place of considerable strength, to which he set fire, according to the Attili copper plate grant of Chāḷukya Bhīma I. Hence forward, Pāndaraṅga continued to rule over the conquered tracts, with Kaṇḍukūru as his capital, to guard the southern frontier of the Eastern Chāḷukya kingdom. Other important forts that we find during the period are Bezawāḍa and Rāja Mahēndravaram. The former i.e. Bezawāḍa flourished as the capital of Yuddhamalla II who ruled the territory south of the Krishna. During the time of Rājarāja, the Chāḷukya Chōla king of Vēṅgi, Jayasiṃhavallabha II, the Chāḷukyan king of Kalyāṇa who espoused the cause of Vijayaditya VII, his ally, sent an army to conquer the kingdom. The Kalidindi plates of Rājarāja, refer to the western Chāḷukyan invasion of Vēṅgi by Jayasiṃhavallabha II. It was probably about this time, that Dandanāyaka Chāvanaarasā, the Kannada Sandhi Vigrahi, captured the fort of Bezawāḍa.
Similarly Rājamahēndravaram, also came into prominence during this period. According to Sewell, "there exists an old fort with walls of great size and height, made of earth, faced with stone". According to a tradition, the credit of founding the city goes to Vijayāditya Mahēndra, one of the Chālukyas. Another ruler who is credited with the foundation of the city was Amma I, who was also known as Rājamahēndra. It was suggested that Amma I, unable to repel the frequent Rāṣṭrakūṭa attacks upon his capital Vēṇgi, found it advisable to remove the seat of Government to a more secure place far beyond their reach. He is therefore said to have laid the foundations of a new city called Rājamahēndravaram, after his own name on the farther side of the Gōḍāvari and made it his head quarters. This identification of Amma I with the builder of Rājamahēndravaram is untenable according to Dr. N.Venkatamanayya. He says that there is little evidence to show that he had any connection with the foundation of Rāja Mahēndravaram. His title Rājamahēndra does not in itself serve the purpose, for, there are two more members of the line Amma II Vijayāditya and Rājarāja who had the same title. Tradition prevalent in Vēṇgi in 14th century attributes the foundation of the city to the latter i.e. Rājarāja, and there is nothing which militates against its genuineness.

The administration of the Eastern Chālukyan kingdom was based upon Śaptāṅga theory of the state or 7 constituent elements of sovereignty and 18 tīrthas, or ministers, which included a durgapāla—an officer in-charge of the forts or home defence.
No structural remains of this period have come to light so far. Another important kingdom that flourished during the same period is the Rashtrakūta of Mālkhēd, who exercised their sway over Rayalaseema and Telingāna regions of Andhra Pradesh, after the western Chālukyas of Bādāmi, from the middle of 8th century to the last quarter of the 10th century A.D. Like their predecessors the Chālukyas, they also divided their kingdom into several Rāṣṭras or vishayas each of which was governed by a Rāstrapati or Vishayapatī enjoying both political and military authority. References to forts of the Rāṣṭrakūta kingdom are almost absent in the epigraphs. However this lacunae is supplemented by Nītivākyāṁritam, a literary work on polity, compiled by Sōmadēva sūri. He emphasises upon the need for forts for a king and their importance in the body politic, their different kinds, the methods of construction and the system of maintenance. According to him forts are of two kinds viz., akritrima and kritrima (natural and artificial).

Proceeding on the premise that all capital cities of the feudatories were fortified, we can notice some fortified capitals of the period, like, Pothana or Bodhan, Vēmulavāḍa, Koṃāvī, Kolanupāka, Gooty, etc., which appear to have been important political and military strongholds.
REFERENCES

1. McGrindle, "Ancient India as described by Magasthenes and Arrian" p.140
2. Burgess, J.A.S. "Nasik cave inscription of Gautamiputra Salasri" "Buddhist cave temples and their inscriptions" No.18 pp.108-09
4. Lüders H, List of Brahmi inscriptions Nos.1225, 1271, and 1205
7. Ibid, p.13
8. Ramaswamy, N.S. op.cit. p.20
10. Ibid, pl. XVII : 2
11. Ibid Pl. XXV:2, also Gangooly, O.C."Andhra Sculptures" p.82
13. IAR 1962-63 p.1
15. Ibid p.53
17. Ramachandran, K.S. "Radio Carbon dates of Archaeological sites in India" pp.64-66
18. Ibid p.140
20. Ramachandran K.S. *op. cit.* p.116
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid
24. Krishna Sastry V.V. "Proto and Early history of Kareemnagar-region" unpublished thesis p.208
26. Yazdani, G. *EHD. I*, p.26
27. I&R, 1957-68 pp.5-9
29. Cunningham, Alexander "The ancient Geography of India" p.444 Also Yazdani *op. cit.* p.30
30. Fleet, *Corp. Ins. Ind.* III pp. 6 ff
31. Sewell, Robert "Antiquarian Remains in the Presidency of Madras" p.36
32. Yazdani, G *op. cit.* p.57
33. Ibid.
34. VI, p.315
36. Fleet, "Corp. Ins. Ind." III pp. 6 ff
37. VI, p.2
38. Ramesan, N. Ed. "Copper plate inscriptions of A.P.Govt.Museum" I, pp.36-39
39. Ibid
40. VI, p.2
41. IA XIV : 1 p.51
42. Kautilya's "Artha Sastra" Bk. I Ch. II
43. Ibid Bk. II, Ch: VI, p.63
44. Corresponds to present Gutti taluk in Anantapur district.
45. Comprises the present Dronachalam taluk in Kurnool district
46. Comprises the present Dars, and Kandukur taluks of prakaram district.
47. The Betapalli inscription of Vijayaditya mentions a certain Vikramaditya, a Bana subordinate who had the titles Taruna Vasanta and Samanta Kesari as ruling Turumara vishaya SII IX :47. Similarly, another inscription of the same period i.e. Vijayaditya, dated in his 23rd regnal year, from Kondapalli, in Anantapur district, states that a certain Vikramaditya Bali Indra Banaraja, son of Narasimha Banadhira was governing Turumara vishaya, SII IX :23
48. Eli, XIX : pp.271-277
49. Journal of Telugu Academy XI, p.241
50. El, XVI : No.11, p.77
51. Sewell, Robert op.cit. p.21
52. Ibid, p.22
53. JAHRS III, pp.156-159
54. Venkataramsyya, N. "Eastern Chalukyas of Vengi"Ch.XII: p.163 also SII, VI, No.662, v.7