

RNI Title Code: TELENG/2017/74418

ISSN 2581-6322

RNI Title Code: TELENG/2017/74418

ISSN 2581-6322

# SPWI JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL WELFARE

(A Multi Disciplinary Peer-Review Bi-Quarterly Research Journal)

**Volume: 2 Issue 2 April-June 2019**

*Editor*

**Dr. D. Suresh**

SPWI JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL WELFARE  
Volume 2 Issue 2, April-June 2019



**SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC WELFARE AND INITIATIVES**

H. No. 5-11-559, Srinagar Colony, Naimnagar,  
Hanmakonda, Warangal- 506009. Telangana State (India)

[spwi.ngo.2014@gmail.com](mailto:spwi.ngo.2014@gmail.com) / [sjsw.jp.spwi@gmail.com](mailto:sjsw.jp.spwi@gmail.com)

[devathsuresh@gmail.com](mailto:devathsuresh@gmail.com) Ph: 9959026635



**SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC WELFARE AND INITIATIVES**

H. No. 5-11-559, Srinagar Colony, Naimnagar,  
Hanmakonda, Warangal- 506009. Telangana State (India)

[spwi.ngo.2014@gmail.com](mailto:spwi.ngo.2014@gmail.com) / [sjsw.jp.spwi@gmail.com](mailto:sjsw.jp.spwi@gmail.com)

[devathsuresh@gmail.com](mailto:devathsuresh@gmail.com) Ph: 9959026635



## SPWI JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL WELFARE

(A Multi Disciplinary Peer-Review Bi-Quarterly  
Social Science Research Journal)

**Volume : 2 Issue : 2 April-June 2019**

**An ISO 9001-2015 Certified Journal**

### Contents

1. Status of Education and Employment in Telangana State 1  
----- *Dr. D. Suresh*
2. Performance Appraisal Practices in India 10  
----- *Dr. M. Kavitha*
3. Fort and Defence Mechanism in Kakatiya Dynastry 23  
----- *Dr. Kundur Sudhakar*
4. Value Based Education in Higher Education - A Study 42  
----- *Dr. Adulapuram Thirupathi*
5. Nationalism and Dalit Literature - A Study 51  
----- *G. Rajitha Devi*
6. Multi Puposue Female Health Workers in Health Sector- A Study in 61  
Warangal Urban District  
----- *B. Rama Devi*
7. Public-Private Partnership in Health Administration- 69  
A Study on Aarogyasri in Telangana State  
----- *Enumula Ankush*
8. Tribes in Telangana State 89  
----- *Kunja Varalaxmi & M. Rajeshwari*

9. Organization and Working of Urban Health Care System- A Study of Warangal District of Telangana State ----- <i>Varayogula Venkateshwara Swamy</i>	96
10. Women in Work Participation in India ----- <i>Shanganti Swathi</i>	105
11. Demographic Profile of Scheduled Tribes in Telangana State ----- <i>Kunja Varalaxmi</i>	113
12. Human Resource Development in Indian Industries ----- <i>Padakanti Rajendra Prasad</i>	125
13. Migration of Agricultural Labour A Study in Telangana ----- <i>B. Kishan</i>	140
14. Innovative Recruitment Tools & Techniques for Modern Human Resource Team ----- <i>P. Maheshwari</i>	151



## SPWI JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL WELFARE

(A Multi Disciplinary Peer-Review Bi-Quarterly  
Social Science Research Journal)

Volume : 2 Issue : 2 April-June 2019

An ISO 9001-2015 Certified

# FORT AND DEFENCE MECHANISM IN KAKATIYA DYNASTY



**Dr. Kundur Sudhakar**

Government Teacher, Government Primary School,  
Kunoor, Zafargard, Jangam (TS)

**Abstract:** *The history of the Kakatiyas has been attracting the attention of more and more researchers. As a result of it, Kakatiya history has been subjected to scrutiny and a good number of research works are being produced. Some foreign scholars like Phillip Wagoner, George Michel, Cynthia Talbot, and others undertook studies on many aspects of the Kakatiya history. But the military history of the Kakatiyas as a special study is found missing. To understand the history of any kingdom, it is necessary to know the intricate details of the military system, where forts played an important role. It is a significant thing to note that the fort city of Orugallu was constructed with unique plan accommodating every need of the capital city within the fort avenue. Many other major and minor forts spreading all over the kingdom were constructed by them making use of the local potential. Keeping in view all these things the present topic is chosen for investigation. The present article is developed on the basis of Historical Research method since it is exclusively based on the contemporary records and evidence in the form of inscriptions, forts, memorial stones, contemporary literature, and foreign accounts. The hypothesis to be tested is whether forts played a multifaceted role or merely served as military structures and also to critically examine their defence mechanism and their role in the political, economic, social and cultural life of the day. The main focus is on the fort city of Orugallu since it was the main fort located in the capital city, constructed by the Kakatiya rulers from the foundation plan to its total finishing by the local talent and placing it as an example of the Kakatiyan architectural tradition. Various other forts with their categorization are studied and explained vividly in the thesis. Much care is taken to provide an empirical base of source material to every bit of information.*

## Introduction

The fact that fort was an important component of the army during the period under study can be grasped through the slaying of Sivatatva-Ratnakar, a contemporary

work when it compares a king without fort to a snake without poison and an elephant without rut. *Purtusartha-saramu* (A.D. 1250-1300) also expresses the same opinion and says that a king without a fort is like a snake without fangs and an elephant without rut. It also says that by constructing forts, the ruler can be in a position to promise safety and security to his subjects and can successfully beat back the enemy forces during the invasions (*Sakalaniti Sammatamu, I, 47-50*). Fortifications belong to the military art or science of defence. Defence in open country is more difficult with natural obstacles and those defendable through the engineer's art. Regarded as strategic means, these serve two purposes to shield the defender to delay the aggressor. The defender builds these to derive maximum advantages from his own resources, forces, and weapons and deprive the enemy of chances as using these to his advantage. If situated along the frontier, these serve to cover it and act as a frontier defence, though these may not always be able to ward off the enemy permanently from a particular area. Besides being artificial obstacles to the enemy, these also serve as the main base of defence against foreign invasions. These were built to gain time to inflict the maximum delay on the attackers at a maximum loss of men on the part of defenders and also to increase the relative value of the defensive forces. *Manu* says, "A single Bowman standing on a rampart can fight against a hundred and a hundred can fight against ten thousand; it is for this reason that fortification has been enjoined,"

Fortifications also aid the operations of the campaign and subserve certain other military needs, to safeguard supply depots of land and movements, to command roads and rivers and neighbouring areas, to threaten the enemy's communications and afford a sanctuary, refuge or shelter during need or enemy pressure, especially when it is large and well provisioned. At the same time, these also sheltered towns and villages. *Purusartha-saramu* of Sivadevayya, the Kakatiya Prime Minister, says that a fortress safeguards one's people, treasure and person (*Ibid*). Thus the lawgivers and the rulers realized the significance of fortifications for the maintenance of peace and prosperity of a kingdom or a country.

The Andhra Satavahanas, who became independent rulers after the fall of the Mauryan Empire, ruled almost the whole of South India and called themselves as *Dakshinapathapatis*. Pliny records that the Andhras were a powerful race and possessed 30 walled cities, along with an army consisting of 1,00,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalry and 1000 elephants (*McCrendle:140*). This observation reveals the defence strategy of the Andhras who had defended their settlements with fortified walls. These monumental buildings also speak of the planning of the towns in early Andhra. Scholars have identified some of the above mentioned 30 walled towns that were situated in the south. Archaeological excavations conducted at many places of historical sites such as Kotilingala (*P.V.P. Sastry: IV*), Dhulikatta (*V.V. Krishna Sastry: 1978: 124-125*), Bodhan, Cqadluru, Satanikota, Sasanikota, Dharanikota, Dantapura, Puduru, Kotamitta, Nagarjunakonda (*Indian Archaeological Report: 1957-58: 5-9*) and Kesaragutta (*V.V. Krishna Sastry: Op. Cit: 97-103*) brought up light well developed fortified townships.

The forts in their first phase were built of massive mud ramparts which were strengthened and perfected by brick walls. Some of these forts were provided with moats, gates, and guard-rooms or check-posts. *Milindapanha*, the Buddhist text describes the method of planning a township in detail. According to it, a good site should be selected before its foundation and it ends with the laying of roads inside it, connecting the entire city. It further mentions that the architect of the city should first search for a good spot with which no fault can be found out even with hills or undulating ground and rocks and not open to the danger of attack. Then, when the place was made, he would clear it thoroughly of all scrubs and stakes, and would proceed to build there a city fine and regular, measure out into quarters, with excavated moats and ramparts abutting it, with stout gatehouses and towers, with market places, cross-roads, street corners, and public squares with regular lines of open shops and parks, gardens, lakes, lotus-ponds and wells, adorned with many kinds of temples of gods.

Regarding the selection of sites, almost all the historic settlements such as Kotilingala, Dhulikatta, Pedabankur, Dharanikota, Kondapur, Satanikota, and Nagarjunakonda are situated both on plains and hills, in close proximity to perennial water sources, which also offered natural protection. As mentioned in the *Milindapanha*, habitational and public utility structures were systematically planned as observed at Dhulikatta and Nagarjunakonda. The archaeological excavations conducted at Dhulikatta (*V.V. Krishna Sastry: 121-125*) laid bare a place complex and roadways. Workshops or manufacturing centers of terracotta, kaolin and metal objects have been unearthed at Dhulikatta, Pedabankur, Kondapur, and Nagarjunakonda.

The occurrence of punch-marked and indigenous coinage along with seals and sealings found at Pedabankur, Kotilingala, Dharanikota, and Kondapur attest that these settlements were urban in character. At Dharanikota, a huge wharf-cum-navigational channel was unearthed and this reveals the brisk trading activity. Pottery of different wares among which the Roman Empire, Arretine and Rouletted, recovered from most of the coastal settlements prove the contacts of early Andhra with the western and eastern countries. These urban centers were provided with well built religious structures also. Almost all the settlements were well fortified either by mud or brick walls, surrounded by deep moats.

During the medieval period, the importance of a fort as a politico-military institution came to be realized on a wide scale. Depending on the strategically situation and vulnerability to outside attacks, villages and towns were fortified. The increase in the number of forts is mainly due to the increase in warfare, which came to be fought on a large scale, with improved methods of attack and defence and advanced equipment and machinery. Forts, which remained sublime in the ancient period, built of perishable materials like brick and mud, began to occupy a place of prime importance in the medieval period in the field of warfare, and were the chief targets of attack, for, the capture of a fort meant during this period, the virtual occupation of the entire land

under its command by the victorious king. Hence, grew forts, as a matter of military expediency, large in size and complexity, and equipped with up-to-date materials, machinery, and arsenal.

Almost all the contemporary writers on polity followed the earlier Sanskrit works and explained about the importance of a fort for a king worthy the name. Madiki Singana, in his anthology *Sakalaniti Sammatamu* devotes an entire chapter called *Durgasamraksanam* (*Sakala: I: 44-90*) in which he discusses the various aspects of the fort, as its importance, kinds of forts, methods of attack and defence, equipment and garrison, etc. dealing with their importance, he cites a verse from *Purusartha-saramu* of Sivadevayya, the Prime Minister during Ganapatideva and Rudrama, which states that 'a king should take refuge in a fort-like a tiger in the bushes, an elephant on the hill-tops and a lion in caves' (*Ibid: I: 48*). Praudhakavi Mallana, the author of *Rukmangada Charitra*, says 'a king requires a strong fort, situated on high mountain cliffs or in the midst of the dense forest, like lord Vishnu, whose abode is in the deep ocean or Siva on the high Himalayas' (*Rukmangada Charitra: III: 23*).

Prataparudra I, in his *Nitisara*, explains the significance, categorization and four forms of forts. He categorized the forts as natural and man-made. The structure built on land with *Prakaras* is mentioned as a natural fort and the other three viz., *Jala*, *Giri* and *Vana* as natural forts. These natural forts also are suggested to be equipped with *Prakaras*, gateways, *Gopuras*, *Attalakas*, *Yantras*, weapons, mechanical contrivances made of wood, soldiers, garrisons, secret entry, and exit ways, internal roads, cattle-feed, water bodies, etc. Without these amenities, he further says that it should not be considered a fort and it is merely a pig's sty.

Praudhakavi Mallana explained different parts of a fort as *Kota* (*Prakara*), *Agadta* (Moat), *Attada* (Tower), *Gavani* (Gateway) and *Kavata* (Door-frame), besides the need for a strong garrison consisting of machines, weapons, horses, chariots, soldiers and elephants (*Sakala: I: 53*). *Bhaskara Ramayana*, another work of the same period describes the different parts of a fort as *Prakara*, *Agadta*, *Attada*, *Vapra*, and *Vakili*, which shows only a slight change in terminology. It also says that a fort should be equipped with *Yantras* (missiles), *Ayudhas* (weapons), elephants, horses, chariots and soldiers (*Bhaskara Ramayanamu: V: 15*).

### Shape and Structure of a Fort

With regard to the shape of the structure, *Vishnudharmottara Purana* says that forts in the shape of a triangle or oval are of no use and semi-circular or round-shaped structures also are to be avoided on the land but are useful on hills and on river banks. The contemporary literary works are silent on this subject. But it is a fact that the forts built in medieval Telugu regions reveal the non-adherence to the prescriptions of the texts on architecture. The Kakatiyas built circular forts which were later followed by the Rayas of Vijayanagar. However, as mentioned earlier, the plan or shape of the fort

depends to a large extent on the site on which it is built and its contours and other military exigencies.

The structure of a fort went on changing from time to time, depending on the war-techniques and military exigencies. During the medieval period, received a greater modification with regard to the structural plan, material, and equipment used. New masonry work is known as cyclopean, in which large blocks of stones were piled up one above the other and tightly fitted into each, without the use of any binding material or mortar. In the construction technique also we can find advancement during this period. Fort-walls were constructed in two vertical layers i.e., exterior and interior and the hollow space inside these two was filled up as core with earth and rubble. This technique gave strength to the fort walls and helped to keep the halls within the fort cool and pleasant. The stones used in building walls were relatively small and dressed blocks of cut stones. Another feature of the structure of the forts of this period is the expansion in size with many additions like barbican, loopholes, machicolation, etc. and the enlargement of the existing ones like the gateways, walls, bastions, towers, turrets, both in height and thickness.

Let us examine the salient features of a fort as aspired executed by the kings and the architects of the period under study:

### **Selection of a Site**

The strength of a site depends on its strategical significance and availability of the building material in close proximity and the availability of water resources in plenty. Mainly its location should not be exposed to external attacks and not so easily accessible, besides being impregnable to the besieger. Almost all the Kakatiya forts were fed by several natural springs and tanks formed in the clefts of the rocks which are invaluable for any fort. The Warangal fort was endowed with Balasamudram, Mummadamma tank, the moats and hundreds of wells within the fort city provided sufficient water catering to the needs of the fort and the surrounding city. Prola-II and Rudradeva identified the significance of Ekasila site as a more strategical and inaccessible site to build a fort and had decided to shift the capital from Anmakonda to Orugallu.

### **Components of a Fort**

Any fort consists of some essential structures such as moats, rampart, gateway, bastions, towers, secret passages, garrisons, magazines, stables for horses and elephants, barracks for soldiers, civilian quarters and finally the royal palace and the harem, besides temples, pleasure gardens, and swimming-pools etc. Kakatiya Prataparudra-I, in his *Nitisara*, explains the essential components of a fort and also the mode of accommodation within the fort (*Sakala: 153, 59, & 60*). Let us examine the importance of each component part:



## Moat

Moat, an important component of a fort is termed as *Parikha* in Sanskrit and *Agadta* in the Telugu language. Every *Sthala-Durga* is provided with one or mostly two moats surrounding it. Though Kautilya had prescribed three moats (*Arthashastra: II: III: 51*), we can find the existence of two moats in general in the Kakatiya kingdom. The main idea behind the arrangement of moats is to make the fort impregnable and unapproachable to the enemy forces. The moats are of two kinds – the dry and wet. The former is known as ditch which is filled up with hay-stock, wild thorns and creepers concealing underneath poisonous weapons. The latter (wet-ditch) is filled up with deep pools of water up to the mouth and crocodiles and other poisonous creatures. The Warangal fort was endowed with another moat surrounding the mud fort which served the needs of the people living outside the fort.

## Rampart or fortification wall

The most important pre-requisite of a fort is the rampart or *Prakara*. Since it is the main target of the besieger, it should be of sufficient thickness and height which vary according to the contours of the ground. Dharma-Sastras suggest that they should be free of any breaches and even if any gap takes place in the course of time, it should be immediately filled by fresh mud (*Ibid*). The materials mainly used in building the ramparts are mud, stone, and brick. During the ancient period, the main materials used in this regard were mud and brick, but in the medieval days, stone occupied a prime place and hence can be found with imposing appearance. As time passed on, the need to strengthen the *Prakara* also became inevitable with improved methods of an attack like artillery and mining, and the number of *Prakaras* increased with up-to-date techniques of construction. If we observe the ramparts of the Kakatiya forts, most of them were provided with more than one *Prakara*. According to the information from *Pratapa Charitra* and *Siddhesvara-Charitra*, the fort of Orugallu had *Itika* (Brick) *Kota*, *Kampa-Kota* (rampart of thorny bushes) and *Kamcu* (Stone) *Kota* in addition to the mud *Prakara* and three moats. Likewise, the Gutti fort which was constructed by the Chalukyas, and later came under the Kakatiyas, had as many as seven rampart walls, built behind one another, on different peaks of the hill, leading to the citadel on the top of the hill.

## Gateways or *Dwaras*

These are termed as *Gavanis* in the contemporary Telugu literary works. According to Kautilya, an entrance gate to the fort should be  $1/6^{\text{th}}$  as broad as the width of the street (*Kavata*) *Sakalaniti Sammatamu* draws a verse from *Nitisara*, which says that it is impossible to even for Indra, the lord of Heaven, to rule a city, which is not provided with well-guarded gateways (*Sakala: I: 60*). He lays stress on the maintenance of secret entry and exit ways (*Ibid: V: 53*). *Kridabhiramam* describes the fort city of Warangal as endowed with *Peda-gavani* and equipped with golden thresh-holds or door-frames resembling a mountain (*Kridabhiramam: 112*), *Siddhesvara-Charitra* describes it as having

doorways, four in the mud rampart i.e., *Putta-Kota*, four in the *Kalukota* or stone fort, and two in the brick wall (*Siddhesvara Charitra: 129*). *Kridabhiramam* describes that there are several side-ways or posterns or sally ports called *vamka-darulu* and *Siddhesvara-Charitra* refers to *Didi-vakillu* (*Ibid*). Another striking feature of the Kakatiya gates is the plan of the gateways in a complex manner turning from right to left and entering into the fort from the right-hand side. They were provided with a slightly curved pathway, flanked by a semi-circular screen wall on the left of the exterior, separated by barbican and approached by turns, towards the right and left alternately at right angles. The forts of Warangal and Gandikota had two courtyards and two inner entrances besides the main one, with two barbicans in the interior.

### **Bastions**

Kautilya called it as *Attalaka* (*Arthasastra: II: III:50*) and in Telugu, it was termed as *Kottala* and later it was called as *buruzu* in Persian. Rudradeva mentioned it as *Attalaka* in his work *Nitisara* (*Sakala: I: 53*). The value of a bastion is immense in fort-architecture since they reinforce the strength of the fort wall, which runs for long distances continuously, spaced at regular intervals of destination and at corners. Regarding the shape of bastions, we can find square, rectangular and circular structures. Some scholars opined that they were indigenously square or rectangular and the circular structures are due to the impact of the Muslim architecture (*Henry Cousens: 51*). But N.S. Ramachandra Murthy contended this opinion "as most of the bastions in forts belonging to the Hindu dynasties like Warangal, Aihole, Badami and Vijayanagar are square or rectangular in design, while the latter i.e., circular or round bastions are available in plenty, in several forts of the Muslim period. Further, both the types co-exist in several forts during one and the same period, thus making it difficult to accept" the above opinion and to identify them as Hindu or Muslim based on the shape of the bastion (*N.S. Ramachandra Murthy: 1995: 113*).

A keen examination in this regard reveals that square or rectangular shaped bastions were built on the land-forts while circular bastions were preferred to the hill-forts. "From the viewpoint of defense scaling or climbing up the fort walls is easy by the square bastions when compared to the round or circular bastions, which stand at the precipices of several hills with a steep and slopy scarp on the outside" (*Ibid*). At a time when soldiers used mainly bow and arrow to besiege the forts, square or rectangular bastions were mostly built. But when advanced weaponry like artillery and mining methods were applied in besieging a fort, circular or semi-circular bastions were preferred. Thus it can be said that the technological advancement in weaponry necessitated the change in the architectural form of the bastions.

### **Parapet walls**

These walls of lesser size gave protection to the inmates of the fort and enabled them to escape from the attacks of the besieger from a vantage position. Generally,

these parapet walls were pierced with several loopholes in several tiers one above the other and side by side both horizontally and vertically, thus enabling the defenders of the fort to peep through them the approach of the enemy forces, or insert weapons of smaller size and open fire without being seen. Rudradeva stressed on the need for regular and incessant vigilance of the soldiers and proper lighting arrangements throughout the nights at these parapet walls (*Sakala: I: 60*).

In addition to these component parts, barbicans, watchtowers, clock towers, temples, civilian buildings, palaces, gardens, swimming pools, wells, lakes, main streets and sub-streets, and lanes were well planned out and executed in constructing forts.

### Fort Administration

The administration of forts during the Kakatiya period was based on *Nayamkara* system. According to *Nitisara*, cited by *Sakalanitisammatamu*, the king was to assign a number of villages to several Nayakas, in lieu of their salary and maintenance of army (*Ibid: I: 59 & 65*). The exact number of forts maintained by the Kakatiyas is not known. *Pratapa Charitra* mentions that they had maintained seventy-two forts. *Siddhesvara-Charitra* gives the information regarding the defence system of the fort of Orugallu. According to it, each *Kommu* was defended by 50 men, each *Gawani* by 500 and each *Diddiby* 100 (*Siddhesvara Charitra: 129*). Thus to calculate the total strength of the forces, on the basis of this account would be 6,350, if taken into account the number of bastions and the gateways. It also refers to the names of the prominent Nayakas guarding the fort such as Raya Rudradeva, Srirangamadeva, Penakuci Rudradeva, Nidadavolu Candradeva, and Induluri Annayadeva. The names of the some Lemka-nayakas were also referred in this work. They are Viswanathuni Ramulanka, Tirthinathuni Ramu Lemka, Gogulavari Mallu Lemka, Koduri Ramaya Lemka etc. Each of these lemkas was entrusted the duty of training three lakhs infantry and held the responsibility of towns, cities, and cantonments called *Gudemulu*. The city of Orugallu was protected by Pedda Talari Nissanka Vallabha, whose annual pay was 88,20,000 *Varahas*. The gateways were kept under the vigilance of nine lakh archers, whose annual pay amounted to 3,80,00,000 *Varahas* (*Ibid: 129*). Besides these officials and staff, there were others like *Srivakili-adhikari*, *Sribhandaramu*, *Ghatasasulu* and other civilians in the fort city performing various duties. *Rudradeva*, in his work *Nitisara*, lays down that all the soldiers should be treated with equal respect and should be paid without any discrimination, if not a king, even if it be Indra, the Lord of Heaven, cannot rule the fort (*Sakala: I: 60*).

### Granary

In military administration, maintenance of a granary in every fort is an essential task. As a matter of fact, the granary is the most important component of a fort as it contains all the commodities needed for feeding the army and for healing the wounded in times of war. It was the duty of the governor of a fort to make available all sorts of requirements like weapons, plenty of water, food, salt, fodder, chaff, fire, honey, butter,

oils, cereals, medicines, all sorts of chemicals, mechanical contrivances, etc *Sakalaniti Sammatamu* quotes from Nitisara, which emphasizes that a fort should always maintain in its granary all the food grains, salt, foodstuffs, medicines, weaponry, and everything, including the rare ones needed by the army. Rudradeva insisted mainly on storing food-grains in abundance and in a proper way (*Ibid: I: VV: 59 & 65*). It was realized by all the Kakatiya rulers.

Unfortunately, Prataparudra, misled by the assumption that the Sultan's forces retreated to Delhi unable to siege the fort of Warangal, celebrated the success by hoisting the flag of victory and distributing all the grocery and grains taking out from the granary of the fort to the needy people. But the army of Ulugh Khan stationed in the middle at the fort of Devagiri was strengthened by the additional forces sent by Ghiyaz-din Tughluq from Delhi, swiftly moved into the capital city of the Kakatiyas after putting fire to the neighbouring towns and villages. He stopped the water supply into the fort and surrounded it and with the help of the traitors could make Prataparudra surrender to the enemy. Unable to bear the hungry cries and thirst of the old people and women he had decided to sue for peace. But Ulugh Khan was not interested in making a peace treaty and he sent Pratarudra to Delhi under the leadership of two generals, but sources reveal that Prataparudra committed suicide on the way to Delhi. Here these things are discussed again to explain the dire need of maintaining a fully equipped granary in a fort ready forever.

### **Methods of Diplomacy, Attack, and Defence**

From the very ancient times, the Indian rulers preferred to avoid war and maintain peace, aiming at the prosperity of the state and society. The office of a *Sandhi-vigrahi* was maintained by the kings to look after the duties of foreign affairs ministry and embassy. The kings used to send the nevoys to the neighbouring rulers or enemy kings to settle the disputes if arose among them. It is laid down in the *Dharma Sastras* that the invading king should set out for conquest when the enemy is slack and when his own state is in a prosperous condition, with soldiers and war animals in good condition and well equipped. He must influence those kings by four expedients of statecraft such as *Sama*, *Dana*, *Bheda*, and *Danda* or by using all of them simultaneously. It must be his endeavour to bring other kings under his dominions by such diplomatic methods. The Dharma-Sastras suggested thus since they realized that war is an evil and full of horrors. *Sakalaniti Sammatamu* of Madiki Singana quotes the instructions of the dharma-sastras regarding the military diplomacy and strategies to be followed by the kings (*Ibid: II: 512-641*).

### **Sandhi**

War was always suggested to be avoided as it is ruinous to both the parties. To undertake a military operation against a strong enemy is like a foot-soldier attacking an elephant rider and to make war against an equal is like the collision of unbaked mud

vessels against each other causing mutual destruction. But the inferior must be attacked and to make submissions if the differences cannot be amicably settled. Sometimes the inferior king may sue for peace to avoid the destruction of army and wealth.

The South Indian works on *Rajaniti* like *Kamandakaniti Nitisara* and *Panchatantra* give the following list of alliances, which are 16 (*Sodasa*) in number (*Ibid: II: 512-518*):

1. *Kapala-sandhi*
2. *Upahara-sandhi*
3. *Santana-sandhi*
4. *Sangatamu-sandhi*
5. *Upnyasa-sandhi*
6. *Pratikara-sandhi*
7. *Samyoga-sandhi*
8. *Purusantara-sandhi*
9. *Adrstanara-sandhi*
10. *Adistaka-sandhi*
11. *Atmamisa-sandhi*
12. *Parikraya-sandhi*
13. *Vigraha-sandhi*
14. *Ucchinna-sandhi*
15. *Paradusana-sandhi and*
16. *Skandopa-sandhi*

All these are the approaches to make an alliance so as to avoid war. It is said that a king should not make peace with a greedy uncultured and villainous enemy kings (*Ibid: VV: 519-520*).

### **The Instruments of Diplomacy**

*Sama, Dana, Bheda, and Danda* were the four cardinal points of diplomacy during the ancient period. These were believed to be effective instruments during the medieval period also to avert wars and avoid heavy loss of men and money. Kamandaka adds three more to this viz., *Upeksa, Maya* and *Indrajala*. Let us examine each of these modes of this diplomacy with regard to their nature and application:

**Sama:** The Policy of conciliation is the best method prescribed to be followed towards the weak king. The conquering king is advised to observe this policy of conciliation by the promise of protection of villages and forests, of cattle, of roads and traffic the restoration of the banished and the runaway kings.

**Dana:** The policy of conferring titles or offering gifts was to put into operation if the method of conciliation did not produce the intended effect. The *Sivatatva Ratnakaram* (*Sivatattvarathnakara: V: 12*) mentions sixteen kinds of *Dana* or gifts.

**Bheda:** The policy of *Bheda* or decision is the policy of 'divide and rule'. A kingdom is apt to be troubled by internal dissensions as well as by external aggression. To launch a policy of either aggression or defence, internal peace is essential. To conquer an enemy, it is necessary to create division among his kinsmen or among his subjects and to attack him when they are disunited, and again if it were a confederation of his enemy and his allies, the invader must use his full power among his different members of the confederation, and strike him at the psychological movements, when he hears of a division in their organized effort.

**Danda:** If the above strategies failed, then different modes of *Danda* are mentioned in the dharmasastras (*Sakala: II: 616-631*). One was to capture in open fight, the second was to subdue him by resorting to treacherous warfare, the third was to strike him by planning a secret conspiracy, and the last was to besiege his fortress to create panic and to capture him during the tumult and confusion caused by the fall of the fortress.

**Maya:** In invoking the aid of this method, it can be noticed that no actual war is implied here, and the success over an adversary was to be achieved by a network of intrigues and counter-intrigues. Some interesting details can be gathered from the *Kamandakaniti* (*Ibid:616-631*) the king might visit the enemy in the disguise of a woman, of a devil, or an evil spirit and slay him when he is at close quarters. Kamandaka gives the example of Bhima's meeting Kichaka, dressed as Draupadi, which was the example of *Maya*.

**Upeksha:** It consists in not preventing a person from doing what is unjust or being addicted to some vice or engaged in a fight, and is illustrated by king Virata's connivance at the death of Kichaka. There seems to be the further implication that even in case of the more powerful state should give trouble unprovoked, it was for the small power to ensure it for the time being and not to retaliate. In such cases, patience has its own reward. Kamandaka speaks of a threefold *upeksha* and cites the classical example of the Virata king leaving alone the wicked Kichaka and Bhimasena leaving uninjured Hidimba's brother (*Ibid: VV: 635-638*).

**Indrajala:** It means creating an illusion by means of incantation and other tricks, creating the illusion before the eyes of the enemy that a vast army is coming to attack them or showing that angels are descending to fight against them or making a shower of blood-fall in the enemy's camp (*Ibid: V: 637*). A keen perusal of the use of this policy indicates that it partook of the nature and character of *Maya*. This is in other words, the use of stratagem to win over the enemy.

### Preparation for War

When negotiations through envoys failed, it was the duty of the king to consult with the royal gurus, advisors and the military generals and give an ultimatum and

declare war. It is also significant to notice that the rulers used to discuss with the council on the financial implications and other factors. There was a good tradition of inviting the military generals of all categories and offering them betel through an officer known as *Adapam*. It was a custom of inviting a general to shoulder the responsibility of leading the army to success. The war preparations were started generally with the selection of an auspicious day and time after consulting the almanac and the expertise. Then the information was passed on to the generals.

### Rituals

The worship of the war-god or goddess was an essential pre-requisite to initiate war. The Kakatiyas, generally worshipped Ekaviradevi, the war-goddess before marching to the war-field. They also worshipped Virabhadra, the militant form of Lord Siva or Mallanna. The Kakatiya rulers from Prolaraja to Ganapatideva used to celebrate the ritual of war-initiation from Ainole, the seat of Mallanna (Lord Siva), but from the days of Rudramadevi, this venue was shifted to Moglicerla, the seat of goddess Ekavira. To inspire the soldiers and inculcate martial spirit and patriotism in their minds, a special type of dances starting with Siva-tandava and the appropriate music were played at the instance of the war-deity. Then gifts were presented to scholars, poets, and preceptors to receive their blessings.

### Military Arrangements

The military arrangements were of two types, viz., 1) defensive and 2) offensive. The defensive arrangements were required to be made when the fort or the capital city was attacked by an enemy's forces. On the other hand, the offensive arrangements were to be undertaken when the king himself was launching a military campaign. When a ruler sensed the impending danger of an enemy's attack, he used to take necessary steps to safeguard all the forts all along the boundaries of his kingdom by alerting the army and setting their gates closed securely.

### The Military Camp

After taking all the preliminary steps carefully, the army used to start its march. They marched to the battle-field intermittently by halting at certain places until they reach the destination. They used to prepare camps wherever they stayed in the middle to take rest at nights. These temporary military camps of the king and his soldiers were carefully guarded by special personnel intended to perform it under the supervision of an officer known as *Capparam-adhikari*.

The king stayed in a tent (*Capparam*) specially erected for him and surrounded by a great hedge of thorns and with a single entrance. It was guarded all through the night by armed soldiers and spies. Bolnenimgaru was the *Capparam-Adhikari* (*Kanada Inscriptions: 295*) during the reign of Rudramadevi who attended many war camps and finally died in the war field along with Rudrama in November 1289.

It is natural that a lot of bloodshed takes place during the war and many injuries were received both by men and animals who were involved in the war. To heal them of their ailments and treat them both by surgery and medicines, physicians were required in the war-field. The presence of physicians in the war filed can be grasped from the verses explaining the diplomatic strategies in *Sakalaniti Sammatamu* (*Sakala: II: V: 561*).

The role of spies was as determined as the army in the war field. *Nitisara* of Rudradeva and *Kamandakamu* give a graphic description of the need of the spy system, the duties of a spy and relation between the king and the spies (*Ibid: VV: 371-339*).

The success or failure in the war depended not merely on the strength of the army, but also on their strategy adopted by the rulers and the arrangements made of the army depending on the upon the geographical situation and the strength of the army of the enemy king. That's why Rudramadevi trained Prataparudra as specialized in *Vyuharacana* (military strategy). But the information regarding the methods employed in attacking a fort, its siege or defensive techniques is not available in detail. *Pratapa Charitra* informs us that Rudrama arranged military training on the lines of the polity prescribed in the dharma-sastras. Hence the instructions of Kautilya, who provides sufficient information as regards the methods employed in the capture of a fort, are valuable for consideration in this context.

Kautilya describes five methods of sieging a fort viz., *Upajapa* (*Intrigue*), *Apasarpa* (*Pretending retreat*), *Vamana* (*Winning over people*), *Paryupasana* (*Siege*) and *Ayamarda* (*General Assault*) (*Arthasastra: XIII: IV*). The first method suggested to be followed is to sow the seeds of dissension in the rival camp, giving publicity to his own power of omniscience and close association with deities through spies, monks or sooth-sayers and thus threaten the enemy camp. The second method is to pretend retreat temporarily and attack all of a sudden leaving the enemy in much confusion and chaos. The third method is to assess initially his military capacity, availability of resources and wait upon favourable season while the enemy should have unfavourable conditions, resources and of time. The second resort here is to employ fire by using gun-powder. Kautilya mentions that birds like vultures, crow, parrot, myna, and pigeon which have nests in the walls of the fort, may be tied to their tails the inflammable material like *Agniyoga* and then allowed to fly on enemy's fort (*Ibid: 309*). The fourth method of siege is by storming the fort and cutting off supplies and communications to and from the fort. The fourth method is the general assault by leading the forces in huge numbers suddenly and besiege the fort and taking the enemy king as captive at a time when his forces were at rest and in drunken position after their daily engagements and weariness out of it, and thus reduce the enemy garrison by killing or taking them prisoners. The Kakatiya rulers, especially from the days of Ganapatideva, did not prefer the killing of enemy soldiers but took them as prisoners. Rudrama, it is said, took 3,00,000 soldiers of Devagiri as prisoners when they tried to siege the fort of Orugallu and later released them on receiving a huge amount as war compensation from Mahadeva of Devagiri.



Lastly, Kautilya prescribes the two-pronged attack on the fort from both the front and the rear, taking the help of an ally. But the Kakatiyas always followed a three-pronged attack, dividing their forces into three organized divisions and thus succeeded many a time. The causes for their failure in the fatal war in A.D. 1323 by the siege of Orugallu fort, in spite of wise strategies, will be discussed in the succeeding chapter.

### Siege Warfare

In the Telugu language, the word *Lagga* came into existence during the medieval period to indicate 'siege warfare' or siege-craft (*N.S. Ramachandra Murthy: 116*) with an emphasis on cavalry and artillery. It was regarded as a heroic task to siege as many forts as possible. Hence it had become the most common method of attack during the period under study, which can be grasped by the titles the generals had borne after achieving success in siege warfare. *Kotagelpata, Divichurakara, Dwipa-luntaka, Durgatraya-malla, Kanci-kavata-churakara, Giridurga-malla, Jaladurga-badabanala, Vanadurga-davanala, and Sthaladurga-samcurana* are some of such titles that we come across in the inscriptions of the Kakatiya generals. Juttaya-lemka Gonkareddy had borne the title *Gandikota-Durga-vibhala* as he had sieged the fort and became the governor of Gandikota during the reign of Prataparudra.

This method of sieging a fort was done by encircling the fort, vacating the moats, breaking the ramparts and gates by using cavalry and elephantry added with strategic methods of diplomacy like pretending retreat and sudden attack with lightning speed, etc.

The other method of attack was fire, which was discouraged by Kautilya and other law-givers (*Ibid: 119*). In the history of Andhradesa, we come across two incidents of siege-fire. One was during the reign of Gunaga Vijayaditya when his generals occupied Nellore, Kiranapura, and Achalapura and had borne the title *Tripura-martya-martanda* after capturing them and them to fire. Another was that of the capture of Vardhamanapura by Rudradeva, who applied the method of siege by firing the fort. The firing devices were of many types as described by the scholars. Kautilya described a list of weapons including the missiles, firearms and the method of preparing gunpowder using chemical compounds. The author of *Sukraniti* also refers to a weapon called *Nalika*, which is having a *Nala* or a hollow tube resembling a gun through which fire can be sent to attack a target at a distance (*N.S. Ramachandra Murthy: 118-119*). But it is a fact that powerful firearms entered into with the Muslim invaders.

Barani and Isami had referred to the siege engines known as *Manjaniqs* or *Manjanikalu* which were used both by the Malik Kafur's army and the army of Prataparudra. "The apparatus consisted of a long wooden beam pivoted on a wooden stand. The short arm of the beam had a counterweight put on it, while the long arm had a sling suspended at its far end which carried a missile, usually a large piece of stone. The long arm pulled down by rope by many men would raise the weighted short arm. If now all the men released the rope, the short arm would fall, making the

long arm ascend fast, and the missile would shoot forth out of the swinging sling" (*Irfan Habib: 2017: 88-89*). In place of stone, firearms also must have been used, which were to open fire at the target. Anyhow these weapons were regarded as ineffective and slow when compared with the guns. That's why the Muslim historians compared the pelted stones through *Manjanikas* with those released from the sacred thread of a Brahmana.

Storming all of a sudden and seizure, hemming (attacking from both front and the rear), general assault (when the enemy's forces are tired and had become weak), escalate (climbing the walls of the fort and siege it by sudden destruction of *Yantras* arranged on the walls and bastions), mining and starving are the other methods of siege. The contemporary literary works also describe these methods while narrating the events during wars (*Harivamsamu: V: 84: 138, 247, 261 & 386*).

### Defence of a Fort

For defending a fort, the rampart walls are to be always guarded by soldiers and observed with a critical glance by the spies. Next, care should be taken of the gateways, the most vital part of a fort on which the besieger had his eyes to pounce upon for seizure. The contemporary Telugu literary works had ample references to the protection of forts by kings. *Sakalaniti Sammatamu* quotes a verse from Nitisara of Rudradeva, which mentions "a fort should be defended by means of strong gateways, placing armed barracks at appropriate places. Guarding of all approaches and patrolling the entire fort area around including the postern gates, by appointing sentries and spies, both day and night" (*Sakala: I: 60*) *Rukmangada Charitra* mentions that a king cannot rule the country if his subordinates fail in protecting the gateways effectively (*Rukmangada Charitra: V: 448*). Nachana Somana went deep into the matter and explained the methods of defence, a siege by an enemy, the methods followed by the enemy in the siege, the weapons used by him etc (*Uttara Harivamsamu: 61- 62, 93-94 & 102*). in detail as if he had participated in the war. He used the local term *dancana* to stone-pelting machine and *Daddadas* to missiles.

Above all *Sakalaniti Sammatamu* mentions that the effective strength of a fort lies in the strong garrison it possesses, consisting of huge wealth, food-grains, weapons, soldiers, perennial water supply, unending availability of fire-wood, inflammable material and a number of missiles (*Sakala: I: 56-58*).

The advanced fortification methods care taken in maintaining the forts in all aspects, the wars took place in Andhra country, the descriptions in the literary works reflect the attack and defence techniques followed by the Kakatiya kings and their chieftains.

### Celebration of Victory

It is a general custom to celebrate the victory by the kings during the ancient and medieval days. The victory over a fort was celebrated with much joy and pomp during

the period under study. It was celebrated in many a way like distributing money among the soldiers and generals, offering gifts to the scholars, artist, etc, by conferring titles on the military generals who played a key role in the successful military operation, by constructing temples to the deities in gratitude and in commemoration of the occasion, by digging tanks and other water bodies, etc. Prola I constructed a tank and named it as Arikesari-Samudra to commemorate his military exploits (*P.V.P. Sastry: 44-47*). Rudradeva constructed the thousand pillared temple at Anmakonda and installed a pillar with an inscription inscribed on it explaining his military achievements (*The Kakatiya Inscriptions: 2011: 61-65*). Ganapatideva conferred high sounding titles on his military generals like Chaunda Senani, indicating their achievements *Divicurakara, Dwipaluntaka (Ibid: 96, 99)* etc. Likewise, his ally Tikka of Nellore received the title *Prithvoisvara-sirah-kanduka-krida-vinoda (P.V.P. Sastry: Op. Cit: 108-109)*. Gangaya Sahini received the rank of *Bhattara-niyogadhipati* along with a *Gandapendera* (hero's anklet) on his victory over the Vaiduba chiefs. Another general of Ganapatideva received the titles *Aruvela-dusaka (the destroyer of Velanadu)* and *Kanchi-curakara (Plunderer of Kamchi)* for their Achievements in capturing those forts (*Ibid: 117*). After the victory over Mahadeva of Devagiri, Rudrama distributed the money received as war compensation from the enemy among all the military personnel and conferred the governorship of Bedadakota on Bhairava, who stood as her right hand in the siege of the fort (*Ibid: 128*). She built many villages and named them as Ambapurams and Rudravarams to commemorate the occasion. She built Rangamantapa in the fort of Orugallu and on one of the pillars; her image as depicting her title of *Rayagaja-kesari* was depicted. This title was conferred by Ganapatideva on her achievement of capturing the fort of Bedadakota (Bidar) and successfully chasing Mahadeva upto his capital Devagiri. She made many charities over her success. Likewise, Prataparudra conferred titles on his military generals Machayanayaka, Devinayaka, Potiganti Maili and others on their achievements in the southern campaign and had given gifts to deities, Brahmanas and preceptors (*P.V.P. Sastry: Op. Cit: 133-134*).

## References

1. Abhilashitartha Cintamani, Ed. Shama Sastry, Mysore, 1926
2. Andhra Sahitya Parishat Patrika, Kakinada
3. Annual Report on Epigraphy, Govt. of A.P.
4. Annual Reports of Archareological Survey of India
5. Annual Reports of South Indian Epigraphy
6. Arthasastra of Kautilya, Tr. Shama Sastry, R, Bibiothica Sansrtica, No. 37, Mysore
7. Baddena, Nitisastra Muktaivali, Tanuku, 1910
8. Chakravarti, P.C., Art of Warfare in Ancient India, Delhi, 1941
9. Corpus of Inscriptions in the Telangana Districts of H.E.H.The Nizam's Dominions, Ed. By P. Srinivasachari, 1940, The Nizam's Government.

10. Date, G.T., Art of War in Ancient India, London,1929
11. District Gazetteer of Anantapur, 1968
12. District Gazetteer of Cudapah, 1967
13. Ekamranatha, Prataparudra Caritra, Ed. Ramachandra Rao, c.v., ICHR, N. Delhi, 2017
14. Elliot & Dowson, History of India As Told by its Own Historians, 8 volumes
15. Epigraphia Indica
16. Gazetteer of Cuddapah District, C.F. Brackenbury, 1915
17. Gona Buddhareddy, Ranganatha Ramayanamu, Madras
18. Gutti Kaifiyat, Vol. 153
19. Hulakki Bhaskara & others, Bhaskara Ramayanamu, Madras
20. Hyderabad Archaeological Reports by G. Yazdani
21. Hymavathi P., Kakatiya Vaibhava Toranalu, Warangal, 2005
22. Indian Antiquary
23. Inscriptions of Andhradesa, Ed. Rama Rao, M., S.V. University, Tirupati, 1968
24. Iswaradutt, K., Historical Geography of Andhradesa, Hyd.1962
25. Itihas, A Journal of A.P. State Archives
26. Jakkaraju Venkata Kavi, Andhra Kamandakamu Ed. Prabhakara Sastry, V., Tanjore Saraswati Mahal, Series, No. 14
27. Jayapa Senani, Nrittaratnavali, Madras, 1965
28. Journal of Andhra Historical Research Society, Rajahmundry
29. Kaifiyat of Adavani, Mack. Mss. Vol. XXIX, 142 to 144.
30. Kaifiyat of Gandikot
31. Kaifiyat of Hanumakonda, Vol. XXVI
32. Kase Sarvappa, Sri Siddhesvara Caritramu, Ed. Laxmiranjanam, K., Hyderabad, 1960
33. Ketana, Dasakumara Caritra, Hyd., 1967
34. Kondaviti Kaifiyat, L.R. Vol. 157
35. Krishna Sastry, V.V., Proto and Early Historical Cultures of A.P. Hyderabad, 1983
36. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar, South India and Her Mahammadan Invaders, OUP, 1921
37. Laxmiranjanam, K., Andhrula Caritra-Samsriti, Hyderabad
38. Madiki Singana, Sakalaniti Sammatamu, Ed. Ramakrishna Kavi, M., 1923

39. Mahalingam, T.V., Mackenzie Manuscripts, Summaries, Madras, 1976
40. Manasara, Ed. & Tr. Acharya, P.K., Oxford University, London, 1927
41. Manchana, Keyurabahu Caritra, Hyd., 1966
42. Mannua; of Krishna Dsitric, Mackenzie, G., 1883
43. Mannual of Cuddapah District, J.D.B. Gribble, Madras, 1875
44. Mannual of Godavari District, Henry Morris, 1878
45. Mannual of Kurnool District, M. Gopala Krishna Murthy, 1886
46. Mannual of Nellore District, Boswell
47. Manusmriti, Nirnayasagar Press, Bombay
48. Mc Crindel J., Ancient Inda as Described by Megasthanese and Arrian, London, 1877
49. Nachana Soma, Uttara Harivamsamu, Ed. Ramakrishna Kavi, M., Vavilla, Publication, Madras, 1913
50. Nagabhushana Rao, S., Ed. Cultural Heritage of the Kakatiyas, Warangal, 1993
51. Narayana Rao, V., A Lover's Guide to Warangal, David Shulman Permanent Black, 2002
52. Nilakanthasastry K.A., Foerign Notices of South India, Madras, 1932
53. Nitiprakasika, Oppert, Gustov (Ed) Hauz Khas, New Delhi, 1970
54. Nitisara of Kamandaka, ed. Ganapati Sastry, T., Trivendrum Sanskrit Series, No. XIV, 1912
55. Nitivakyamritam, Somadeva Suri Grantha Ratnamala
56. Oppert Gustav, On the Weapons, Army, Orgnisation and Political maxims of the ancient Hindus, Higginbothams & Co., London, 1880
57. Pant, G. N., Studies in Indian Weapons and Warfare, Army Educational Stores, N. Delhi, 1975
58. Pratapa Reddy, S., Andhrula Samghika Caritra, Hyd., 1950
59. Praudhakavi Mallana, Rukmangada Caritra, Andhra Sahitya Parisht, Kakinada
60. Proceedings of A.P. History Congress
61. Proceedings of Indian History Congress
62. Ramanaiah, J., History and Culture of Karimnagar District (A.P.), Jagityal, 2008
63. Sachau, Alberuni' India, 2 vols., London, 1901
64. Sarkar, J.N., The Art of War in Medieval India, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, Delhi, 1984
65. Sastry, P.V.P., The Kakatiyas, Hyderabad, 1978

66. Satyanarayana K., The Study of the History and Culture of the Andhras, N.Delhi, 1975
67. South Indian Inscriptions
68. Srinatha, Palnativira Caritra, Hyderabad, 1958
69. Sukraniti, Tr. Sarkar, B.K., SBH Series
70. Telugu, Vaignanika Masa Patrika, Telugu Akademi, Hyderabad
71. Toy Sidney, A History of Fortification (From 3000 B.C. to A.D. 1700)
72. Toy Sidney, The Fortified Cities of India, Delhi, 1954
73. Vallabharaya Vinukonda, Kridabhiramam, Ed. Prabhakarasastry, V., Hyderabad, 1960
74. Volumes of Districtwise Inscriptions of A.P. Government
75. Yazdani G., The Early History of the Deccan, V. II, Hyd, 1960.